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Abstract

Much has been written on the position of the translator; the concept of ‘position’ being understood variously in terms of spatial, ideological, sociological, philosophical, or narratological orientation. The present research project contributes to this body of work through the empirical investigation of translator position as an epistemological function, examining patterns of evidential stance-taking in original vs. translated autobiographies.

A defining characteristic of autobiographical writings is a NARRATOR=EXPERIENCER relationship: the narrator has privileged access to the memory from which the narrative is sourced. However, when an autobiography is translated, the connection between the narrator and the source of the narrative – the memory of the experiencer – is interrupted. The translation of an autobiography, then, presents an epistemological paradox: the translator’s first person discursive position is at odds with the evidential basis from which he or she narrates.

This research aims to investigate the extent to which the translator’s occupation of the position of an autobiographical ‘I’ is purely nominal or extends to the experiential, asking whether the textual production of a translation reveals distance between the narrator and the autobiographical experiences being narrated – a NARRATOR≠EXPERIENCER relationship – or reveals empathetic identification between the narrator and the author, projecting a NARRATOR=EXPERIENCER relationship.

Based on an assumed contrast between the phenomenological and narrative character of memories acquired by first-hand experience vs. memories based on other sources, a framework is developed for the analysis of evidential stance-taking in the narration of autobiographical memories. Focusing on the narration of acts of recollection and descriptions of how recalled experiences ‘seemed’ to the experiencer, patterns of complement choice (e.g. remember –ing vs. remember that) are differentiated on the basis of their construal of memories as being either ‘experiential’ or ‘non-experiential’ in character.

Applying the framework to a purpose-built, bi-directional comparable corpus of translated vs. non-translated autobiographies in English and Japanese, the study reveals a tendency towards a less frequent construal of memories from an ‘experiential’ stance, and more frequent construal of memories from an ‘non-experiential’ stance in translated texts in both English and Japanese. However, variation in stance-taking exhibited between the individual texts comprising respective sub-corpora is also in evidence. The findings are interpreted as a manifestation of the NARRATOR≠EXPERIENCER relationship characteristic of translated texts in general, but also as a possible indicator of the influence of variable degrees of translator-author identification on individual translators’ negotiation of position.
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A Note on the Translation and Transliteration of Japanese

Numbered examples extracted from the data are given with the original Japanese, a transliteration and back-translation. In-line examples (not numbered) are given without the original Japanese, in order to aid readability. Back-translations are my own, unless otherwise indicated.

The system of transliteration of Japanese used in this thesis follows the Modified Hepburn conventions for romanisation, as adopted by the British Association for Japanese Studies. However, a distinction is made between long o sounds, such that おお (oo) is transliterated as ō, and おう (ou) as ou, in order to resolve potential ambiguity particularly in in-line examples which are not accompanied by the original Japanese.

An exception is made for Japanese words that are in common usage in English, in which case their accepted English form is used.
Chapter 1. The Position of the Translator in Translating the Memories of an Other

Both everyday and academic discourse on translation accepts that every translated text has a source text. This means that the source of the knowledge being communicated in a translated text is always different from the source of its original (i.e. source text). In the case of autobiography, the difference in the source of the knowledge narrated in an original vs. translated text is particularly obvious: an original autobiography narrates the author’s memories of personal experiences, whereas a translated autobiography narrates knowledge of the author’s memories of personal experiences acquired by the translator from the source text. While this may be something of an oversimplification, the contrast between the source and mode of acquisition of the knowledge in an original vs. translated autobiography is clear.¹

Based on the assumption that we entertain knowledge acquired by direct experiential, or ‘immediate’, means differently to knowledge acquired from indirect, ‘mediate’ sources, the present thesis hypothesises that a translator’s relationship with the knowledge being communicated will differ from the original author’s relationship with that knowledge. Characterising this relationship in terms of ‘evidential stance’, it is suggested that translators are likely to adopt an evidential stance that reflects a mediative relationship with the knowledge being narrated and, further, that the contrasting evidential positioning of authors vs. translators is likely to be manifest in the textual production of translations, when examined in a contrastive relation to non-translated texts.

Focusing on autobiographies translated between English and Japanese, the present research aims to investigate whether patterns of certain textual features that construe ‘evidential stance’ reveal a difference in the relationship between authors/translators and the autobiographical memories being narrated. In addition to describing patterns of evidential stance-taking, an interpretation of the patterns observed is offered in terms of the translator’s negotiation of a position in relation

¹ It is acknowledged that, in practice, an autobiographical narrative is a rather more complex synthesis of actual memories, acquired memories and other knowledge. Furthermore, in addition to the source text, a translator may make use of a range of resources, including personal experiences, imagination, research and so on.
to the autobiographical author, based on variable degrees of identification arising in perceived difference and similarity between the translator-SELF and author-OTHER.

1.1. Introduction: Translation means ‘other-translation’

It is evident from the terminology in everyday use that ‘translation’ is implicitly accepted as the norm in relation to ‘self-translation’, which is marked. This terminological convention takes for granted the assumption that, in translation, the identities of author and translator are not coincidental, masking the fact that ‘translation’ means, in effect, ‘other-translation’. While this may appear to be a trivial observation, it has important consequences for the epistemological character of translations (as compared to either original texts or self-translations), vis-à-vis the relationship between a translator and the knowledge being communicated.\(^2\)

Surprisingly, the significance of the non-coincidence of author/translator identities has largely been overlooked in the translation studies literature; the fact that they are not the same person is assumed to be so obvious as to go without saying.\(^3\) However, the present thesis argues that the non-coincidence of the identities of the translator and author is of central importance in investigating the nature of the process of translation and its products. In addressing such questions as What are the features of translated texts? (Baker 1993, 1995) and What is the ontological status of translations? (Hermans and Koller 2004), What actually happens in the process of translation? (Baker 1996) and What kinds of cognitive operations take place during translation? (Halverson 2007, 2010), and How does the translator experience the act of translation? (Robinson 2011), an awareness of the SELF vs. OTHER separation between translator and author is likely to provide significant insights.

In response to Baker’s (1993: 243) call for the “elucidation of the nature of translated text as a mediated communicative event”, a number of studies examining features of translated texts have investigated what have been labelled controversially ‘translation universals’, that is, “features which typically occur in

---

\(^2\) A brief survey of the terms ‘translation’ and ‘self-translation’ in a number of European and East Asian languages suggests that the terminological convention whereby self-translation is marked is widely shared.

\(^3\) Exceptions can be found in the literature on self-translation, which draws attention to the widely assumed “standard binary model of author and translator” (Hokenson and Munson 2007: 3).
translated text rather than original utterances and which are not the result of interference from specific linguistic systems” (ibid.). This area of research has been perhaps the most active and disputed in the discipline in recent years, prompting debate in relation to the definition and identification of hypothesised universals (Chesterman 2004a, 2004b; Mauranen and Kujamäki 2004, and House 2008 among others), and explanations for why such universals might exist (Toury 2004, Halverson 2003, 2007).

As a consequence of the disagreement surrounding this area of enquiry, it has become apparent that, prior to attempting to address fundamental questions about the nature of translation, such as those mentioned above, it is necessary to clarify which aspects of translation are being investigated. In particular, there is a need to differentiate characteristics of translated texts that may arise as a result of interlingual transfer and those that arise in mediation in general. Chesterman (2004b), for example, argues that linguistic patterns that have been associated with translation may also be characteristic of other forms of ‘constrained communication’, such as “communicating in a non-native language or under special channels, or any form of communication that involves relaying messages, such as reporting discourse” (ibid. 10-11). Similar reasoning underpins an emerging body of work suggesting that, if features common to translated texts can be identified, this is likely to be a function, not of the fact of translation per se, but rather of the process of mediation this entails (Ulrchy and Anselmi 2008, Ulrchy and Murphy 2008, Ulrchy 2009).

Drawing on Lefevere’s (1992) exploration of the similarities between translation and other types of mediation, Ulrchy and Anselmi (2008) and Ulrchy and Murphy (2008) compare a corpus of mediated discourse – comprising translated, edited, and English as a lingua franca (ELF) texts – with non-mediated discourse. On the basis of this research, Ulrchy (2009) reports that patterns of “additions, deletions, substitutions, rearrangements, [and] elaborations” similar to those that have previously been associated with translated texts can also be observed in other forms of mediated discourse (ibid. 223). Ulrchy interprets such textual patterning

---

4 Baker, who introduced the term, is later reported to have questioned the advisability of describing translated texts in terms of ‘universals’ (Mauranen and Kujamäki 2004a: 2).

as being indicative that mediation – whether it be intralingual, interlingual (translation) or intersemiotic – involves ‘recontextualisation’, motivated by an aspiration to ensure clarity and accessibility for a particular audience (ibid. 227). On this basis, Ulrych proposes that the ‘translation universals’ of explicitation, simplification, normalisation and levelling out, posited on the basis of observation of additions, deletions, substitutions and so on, might be more appropriately termed ‘mediation universals’ (ibid. 229).

The present thesis shares with these studies the view that approaching translation as a form of mediated discourse is key to furthering understanding of the nature of translation. However, in contrast to Ulrych et al, who investigate linguistic patterning that may be motivated by recontextualisation for a particular target audience, the present study is concerned with textual patterns that might reveal aspects of the translator’s relationship with the knowledge being communicated and, importantly, how this relationship may differ from that of an author. That is, since the identities of author and translator do not coincide, it is argued that author-knowledge and translator-knowledge relationships are likely to differ, in particular, in terms of the source and mode of acquisition of that knowledge.

Returning to the literature describing the features of translated texts, there is a noticeable absence of discussion as to whether the features identified are also assumed to apply in the case of self-translation. If they are not assumed to apply, it follows that, when elaborating probable explanations for the features of translated texts, it should be considered whether they are grounded in the non-coincidence of the identities of the author and translator. The lack of attention paid to this question may, in part, be the result of a lack of consensus regarding the nature of self-translation and bilingual selfhood: i.e. *Is self-translation an act of translation or creation?* (Hokenson and Munson 2007: 3), and *Do bilinguals identify plural selves linked to different languages?* (Pavlenko 2006). However, it is also likely that the

---

6 There are very few known extended studies of the features of self-translations, either in contrast with ‘other-translations’ or non-translated texts. Exceptions include Jung’s (2002) examination of textual indicators of coherence and reference in self-translations of academic texts, and Munday’s (2008) comparison of the textual features of a self-translated autobiographical narrative with the features of (other-)translations. Although, in a “self-translation of an autobiographical text … the author-translator has a monopoly of knowledge” (ibid. 212), Munday observes a number of similarities between the stylistic features of the self-translation and those of (other-)translations (2008: 206-216).
absence of mention of self-translation in the discourse on the features of translated texts is indicative of the extent to which the presupposition that translation means ‘other-translation’ is taken for granted. In any case, it appears that the explanatory potential of the non-coincidence of the identities of author and translator has so far been overlooked in attempts to elucidate the nature of translation.

Addressing this gap, the present study proposes an approach to translation which foregrounds the SELF vs. OTHER contrast between translator and author, and considers the implications this has for their respective relationships with the knowledge being communicated. In the case of autobiographical narratives, the focus of the present study, it is hypothesised that original texts and translations are likely to display textual characteristics that reflect contrasting modes of acquisition of the knowledge being conveyed: an original autobiography narrates memories that were acquired directly, through the personal experience of the SELF, while a translation narrates knowledge that was acquired indirectly from an OTHER.

Based on the assumption that there is a qualitative difference in the ways in which knowledge acquired directly by the personal experience of the SELF and knowledge acquired indirectly from an OTHER are entertained cognitively and represented in both conceptual and linguistic structure, it is suggested that the contrasting source and mode of acquisition of knowledge bring narrated in an original vs. translated autobiography may be manifest in certain linguistic structures. On this basis, the present study sets out to describe one aspect of the position adopted by an author/translator in relation to the knowledge being communicated by examining patterns of use of evidential strategies that reveal either an experiential (immediate) or non-experiential (mediate) stance.

1.1.1. Theorising the translator’s position I: SELF vs. OTHER separation

A fundamental aspect of human experience is the apprehension of a SELF, from which OTHER entities are understood in contrastive relation.⁷ The SELF vs. OTHER relationship is a situated one: entities that are not the self can always be located at

---

⁷ Although the perception of a SELF vs. OTHER contrast is assumed to be universal in human cognition, it is acknowledged that conceptualisations and boundaries of selfhood are subject to variation (culturally and individually). For example, the concept of ‘self’ evident in Japanese linguistic structure has been contrasted with that in English (Quinn 1994, Hirose 2000). Furthermore, the possibility of split selves (Lakoff 1992, Langacker 2008), past and present incarnations of the SELF, multiple personae, and dissociations from or extensions to the SELF is also acknowledged.
positions of relative distance with respect to the self. In the first instance this pertains to actual, spatial positioning, but also extends metaphorically to temporal, modal, attitudinal and other dimensions of meaning.

Following the principles of cognitive grammar (see Langacker 1987, 2008), it is assumed that the perception of a self and other entities relative to the self, is a key experiential gestalt, central to the representation of experience in both conceptual and linguistic structure. In linguistic structure, this is obviously apparent in deixis systems, such as demonstrative, tense, and person marking. A self/other contrast also underpins evidential aspects of meaning. That is, knowledge that is indexed to the self, for example by a direct perceptual relationship, is framed differently to knowledge that is indexed to another person and acquired indirectly, for example by hearsay. Thus, one facet of positionality pertains to epistemological (or, more specifically, evidential) concerns: speakers adopt variable stances with respect to knowledge being represented, based on the mode of its acquisition.

Examination of the resources available in different languages for source-marking – referred to as ‘evidentiality’ – reveals that speakers indicate the source (or, evidential basis) of knowledge being conveyed using a variety of grammatical and lexical means (Aikhenvald and Dixon 2003, Aikhenvald 2004/2006). The pervasive and systematic nature of evidential marking in language attests to the fundamental significance of source monitoring in the conceptualisation and representation of knowledge (cf. Papafragou et al 2007). Although languages display variable levels of complexity in the types of source they mark, in all cases a contrast is made between knowledge acquired by the self from immediate sources and knowledge acquired from an other by mediate sources (Aikhenvald 2004/2006).

The ‘self-as-source vs. other-as-source’ contrast has clear significance when considering translation. In translation, the source of the knowledge conveyed by a

---

8 A sensitivity to source is readily observed in many communicative contexts, from everyday conversation, in which speakers persistently signal the evidential basis from which they speak (I heard, I saw on TV, I dreamt, I think and so on), to institutional and social discourses. For example, just as eye-witness testimony, expert opinion and circumstantial evidence are systematically differentiated in courtroom discourse, so too are attested witness and belief in religious discourse. Generic conventions for many text types are directly linked to their evidential character: scientific texts use what has been described as ‘metadiscourse’ (Hyland 1998, 2005a) to indicate whether knowledge is based on observation, literature review, or reasoning; academic writing, historical accounts and journalistic texts are similarly required to indicate their sources (see Hyland 2005b, Chafe 1986, Biber 2006).
translator originates in an OTHER and is acquired by indirect means (typically as ‘hearsay’ evidence from the source text). As such, the knowledge being translated is mediate in character. On the other hand, the source of knowledge conveyed by an original author might, depending on the type of text, include observation, imagination, inference or combinations thereof. These types of knowledge are regarded as (relatively) immediate in character. Although it is also the case that a source text can include mediated knowledge, acquired by indirect means, the contrast between an author’s relationship with the source of knowledge being communicated vs. that of a translator remains relatively proximal.⁹

According to Floyd (1999), deriving from the real-world situation in which the range of sensory perception is limited to the apprehension of proximal entities, knowledge that is acquired directly, through sensory perception, is conceptualised as being relatively proximal to the self, whereas knowledge acquired indirectly, for example through hearsay, is conceptualised as being relatively distal. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that the position occupied by a translator in relation to the knowledge conveyed in a translation might be characterised as being relatively distal, based on the fact that the knowledge was acquired by indirect (mediate) means. This position can be contrasted with the relatively proximal position occupied by an author who has a direct (immediate) relationship with the knowledge vis-à-vis its source and mode of acquisition.

Although the discourse on translation naturally makes frequent reference to the relationships between translations and their individual source texts, there has been a lack of attention paid to the contrasting character of the sources of original and translated texts in general. Indeed, there is no known precedent for interpreting translator position as an epistemological function that has its basis in general cognition and which reflects the (mediative) relationship between the translator and the knowledge being translated in terms of its source and mode of acquisition. In response to this, the present study foregrounds the contrasting evidential relationships between authors and translators and the source of the knowledge in translated vs. non-translated autobiographies.

⁹ Although the primary source of a translation is the source text, that is not to say that the translator does not also draw on secondary sources such as personal experience, imagination, other research and so on.
1.1.2. *Theorising the translator’s position II: SELF-OTHER identification*

In addition to the apprehension of SELF vs. OTHER separation, human cognition incorporates an ability to impute/infer mental states of others that are not directly observable – a facet of cognition discussed under the rubric of ‘theory of mind’ (Fodor 1978). This ability allows transcendence of the embodied self to adopt alternative perspectives. When inferring the mental states of others, the cognising self makes assumptions based on perceived similarity to the self such that it is possible to infer the mental states of other humans in a way that is not possible with, say, a bat (cf. Nagel 1974). Although a comprehensive review of current understanding of this cognitive function is beyond the scope of the present thesis, it will be assumed that, in inferring the mental states of others (to the extent of being able to adopt their perspective), the SELF identifies with the OTHER, the basis of this identification being in empathy, a mechanism that, in its simplest terms, is grounded in the perception of similarity between SELF and OTHER (Lakoff and Johnson 1999).

Empathy is a subject of enquiry in a range of disciplines – including psychology, philosophy, literary studies and linguistics – and a phenomenon regularly referred to in relation to everyday experience. In terms of its everyday meaning, empathy is associated with the ability to understand the experience of another person as though it were one’s own: defined in the *Oxford English Dictionary* as “the power of identifying oneself mentally with (and so fully comprehending) a person or object of contemplation”. Lakoff and Johnson define empathy as “the capacity to take up the perspective of another person”, noting the manifestation of empathy in conventional metaphors such as *I see your point of view*, and *see it from my perspective* (1999: 307). Although there is little consensus in the literature regarding the precise nature of empathy, its motivations and manifestations (Batson 2009), in the present study, empathy is interpreted as an identificational mechanism that has its basis in a perceiver’s appraisal of kinship, or similarity, with the object of perception and which allows access to the experiential and knowledge states of an OTHER.\(^\text{10}\)

---

\(^{10}\) Of the range of psychological states and processes that are respectively referred to as ‘empathy’, the function of “knowing another person’s internal state”, sometimes referred to as “cognitive empathy” (Batson 2009: 4), is of particular relevance here.
Since empathetic identification is based on judgements of similarity, it follows that the ability of different entities to stimulate empathy will differ with the degree of perceived similarity. In his discussion of the manifestation of empathy relations in linguistic structure, Langacker notes that speakers persistently evaluate “the various sorts of entities that populate the world ... according to their potential to attract our empathy. i.e. on the basis of such matters as likeness and common concerns” (1991: 307).\(^{11}\) Langacker sets out a hierarchy that indicates the relative potential of entities to attract speaker empathy:

speaker > hearer > human > animal > physical object > abstract entity

In this hierarchy, maximal empathy is with the SELF: “the highest degree of empathy is of course with oneself – one is exactly like oneself, and shares precisely the same concerns” (1991: 307).\(^{12}\) In the case of other entities, although Langacker argues that “a participant’s location on the empathy hierarchy is for the most part objectively determinable: whether an entity is human, animate, physical or abstract is a matter of its intrinsic character” (ibid.), he acknowledges that the situation becomes more complicated when considering the relative degrees of empathy attracted by different members of the same class. For example, not all members of the class ‘human’ have equal potential to attract the empathy of an individual speaker, and it must be acknowledged that the factors affecting empathetic identification in individual instances may be unknowable.\(^{13}\)

The concept of empathetic identification may be particularly pertinent when considering translation since, unlike many other forms of mediated discourse (including quotation, report, and so on), translated discourse is governed by a convention whereby the non-coincidence of the identities of the translator and author is effaced and the translator adopts the discursive position (or discursive ‘identity’) of the author (Pym 2004). When, for example, the translator adopts the

---

\(^{11}\) A similar discussion of an empathy ‘continuum’ can be found in Kuno (1987: 212).

\(^{12}\) Since maximal empathy is achieved with the coincidence of the identities of the perceiving SELF and perceived OTHER, it might be suggested that a translator will experience maximal empathy with the author (and, therefore, full access to their knowledge states) only in the case of self-translation.

\(^{13}\) Although a depiction of the basis of empathy in ‘similarity’ is provided here, it is acknowledged that the circumstances in which empathy arises may not be straightforward. For example, it is possible to empathise with individuals who are not at all similar to the self, as documented in such extreme cases as Stockholm Syndrome.
first-person position, the ‘I’, of an OTHER, it may be the case that the adoption of an alternative position is purely nominal, i.e. occurs only at a textual level.

However, it may also be that a translator identifies with the subject to the extent that it allows him or her to occupy, not only discursively but also experientially, the position of the “I”. If this is the case, the translator may assume privileged access to the consciousness of the subject by imaginative projection, appropriating the knowledge being conveyed as though it were his or her own, and adopting an evidential stance accordingly. As Hermberg puts it, empathy allows the acquisition of knowledge by “affording access to what others have constituted and known” (2007: xi), thus allowing the translator to occupy, or at least approach, the position of the author.  

1.1.3. The dialectical epistemological position of the translator
In theorising the position of the translator, the present study focuses on the translator’s relationship with the knowledge being communicated, which is contrasted with that of an original author. Assuming that the position of a translator is governed by the same principles of positionality that apply to situated experience in general, two facets of human cognition which arise in the relationship between SELF and OTHER are proposed as being operational in acts of (other-)translation: firstly, the perception of difference between SELF and OTHER and, secondly, the perception of similarity between SELF and OTHER.

The present thesis is that we position ourselves relatively proximally in relation to knowledge acquired directly, through immediate experiential means (such as sensory perception) and relatively distally in relation to knowledge acquired indirectly, through mediate non-experiential means (such as hearsay). On this basis, it is suggested that a translator’s relationship with the knowledge being conveyed, vis-à-vis its source and mode of acquisition (i.e. epistemological character), is one that is characterised by relative distance (as compared to that occupied by an original author). On the other hand, it is also suggested that this conceptual distance may be attenuated by a process of empathetic identification,

---

14 Following Langacker (1991) in assuming that maximal empathy is with the SELF, in (other-)translation, complete identification between translator and author is impossible. This echoes Venuti’s (1991) argument that simpatico between author and translator is an impossibility.
which diminishes the SELF vs. OTHER contrast between translator and author and, by extension, the distance between the translator and the knowledge that originated in the author. That is, the translator may, in adopting the discursive position of the author–OTHER, project to the experiential position of the author–OTHER through an identificational process.

Conflicting directional forces, arising in the perception of difference and similarity between the translator–SELF and author–OTHER, are assumed to interact in the translator’s negotiation of a position in relation to the knowledge being communicated. In a complex duality, translation entails at once separation and, by implication, distance between the translator and author (and between translator and knowledge), and also alignment of translator and author, in terms of discursive positioning, at least nominally and potentially identificationally. Since a SELF vs. OTHER contrast is common to all acts of translation (‘other-translation’), it might be argued that the adoption of an epistemological stance reflecting distance is the ‘default’ position in translated (and other mediated) discourse. From this starting point, variable degrees of identification, influenced by a range of contextual factors, are possible. Thus, it is hypothesised that relative distance is characteristic of translation in general, but that the degree of distance is variable in individual cases (and, indeed, may vary within a given translation).

Before progressing to a discussion of how translator position (specifically, epistemological stance) might be investigated in practice, the following section locates the present study in relation to existing accounts of positionality in translation.

1.2. Approaches to Positioning in Translation
Position is a pervasive trope in the discourse on translation. It has been interpreted with various meanings and interrogated from various perspectives. This section provides a brief overview of how ‘position’ features in the translation literature in general, and examines the extent to which the descriptive tools of distance and empathy have been utilised in characterising translator position.
1.2.1. The presence of the translator

Any discussion of translator position assumes the presence of a translator which, importantly, can be identified and located. Within translation studies there has been on-going interest in identifying the presence of the translator, both in terms of ‘visibility’ in systemic and institutional structures, and within the textual artefact of the translation itself (Venuti 1995). Of particular relevance to the current discussion are studies that trace the translator’s presence and, by extension, position, by identifying the voice of the translator in either the paratextual or textual production of a translation. Although a comprehensive survey is beyond the scope of the present thesis, the complementary work of Hermans (1996a, 1996b, 2007) and Baker (2000, 2006) demonstrates the main thrust of this area of research.\(^{15}\)

According to Hermans, discourse on translation has long been dominated by the prioritising of ‘equivalence’, a notion concomitant with an “insist[ence] that translators reproduc[e] originals completely and accurately, without addition, deletion, distortion or intervention” (2007: 26). Such convention, argues Hermans, “demands the elision of the translator as a subject in the text” and the creation of an “illusion [that] requires a translator so disembodied as to be invisible” (ibid. 27). Yet, Hermans (1996a) finds that, in practice, the presence of the translator is frequently visible; for example, in paratextual devices that frame a translation. This is most obvious in forewords, where the translator speaks as him or herself, and the use of the first person pronoun is autoreferential (ibid. 27). Within the body of the translation itself, Hermans also finds the translator’s presence to be apparent in ‘interventions’ (such as footnotes, the use of glosses, italics, brackets and so on), and ‘incongruities’ that draw attention to the fact that the text is a translation, revealing the “ambivalence of reference” of the first-person pronoun (ibid. 29-30).\(^{16}\)

Hermans argues that, just as voice functions as an index of presence, presence in turn indicates a position: “a voice, after all, betrays a subject-position, and positioned subjects embody views, opinions and values” (2002a: 4). He

---

\(^{15}\) See also Munday’s (2008: 11-41) stylistic approach to the presence/voice of the translator.

\(^{16}\) In the case of interpreting, in which the presence and position of the interpreter are apparent in actual, physical terms, the ambivalence of reference of the first person pronoun is revealed in more obvious ways. Diriker (2004: 160), for example, discusses the interpreter and speaker occupation of the same subject position, ‘I’, within the same physical space.
provides a number of examples in which the views, opinions and values of a translator, which might collectively be regarded as constituting an ‘ideological position’, are apparent. In one such example, Hermans (2007) demonstrates how two translations of Hitler’s *Mein Kampf* reveal the contrasting positions occupied by their respective translators in relation to Hitler’s ‘I’. In one translation a “consonance of voice” reflects the “ideological alignment of translator and author” (ibid. 53), in the other, an anti-Nazi stance is apparent in pervasive paratextual devices that serve to affirm that “the ‘I’ that addresses the reader in English refers exclusively to Hitler and not to the translator” (ibid. 56).17

Although Hermans’ analysis maintains a focus on explicit paratextual interventions and textual incongruities, he does not limit the locus of identification of the translator’s presence to such momentary surfacings, arguing that “that other voice [i.e. the translator’s] is there in the text itself, in every word of it” (1996b: 9). Yet, Hermans also observes that “many translations keep this voice well covered up and hence impossible to detect as a differential voice in the translated text itself” (2002a: 11, emphasis added).18 The point made here is that, aside from interventions and incongruities in which the translator’s presence is foregrounded, the convention by which translator and author share an apparent “consonance of voice” (2007: 26) makes it impossible for the reader of a translation to differentiate the translator’s voice from that of the author. In order to detect traces of a translator’s voice that are not apparent in a translation “as it reaches its audience”, it is therefore necessary to utilise methods for comparing the translation with other texts – for example, the source text or other translations of the same text – in order to throw the translator’s voice into relief (Hermans 2010: 63).

One such method for detecting otherwise obscure traces of the translator’s voice is elaborated by Baker (2000). Using analytical techniques that might be termed ‘forensic stylistics’, this method examines multiple translations by the same translator in order to retrieve evidence of “subtle, unobtrusive linguistic habits which are largely beyond the conscious control of the writer and which we, as receivers, register mostly subliminally” (ibid. 246). By identifying such subtle, yet

---

17 Similar cases are reported elsewhere in the literature. O’Sullivan (2011), for example, describes the substantial paratextual apparatus constructed by John Wilson Croker, the Irish translator of Comte Charles Forbes de Montalembert’s *De l’avenir politique de l’Angleterre* (1855) [The Political Future of England], in order to distance himself from the ideological position inscribed in the text.
18 The term ‘differential voice’ is from Folkart (1991: 394-5).
Baker demonstrates the possibility of tracing the translator’s voice and, therefore, identifying his or her presence within the translated text itself. Baker argues that, although such subtle indicators may not be deliberate, nor necessarily consciously registered by the reader (cf. 2000: 246), they nonetheless position translators in relation to their readers and other participants, spatially, temporally and, by extension, ideologically (2006: 132-3).

Baker (2006) demonstrates how the choice of linguistic features – including, for example, spatio-temporal and interpersonal marking – can also reveal a particular position. Using the example of Martha Cheung’s introduction to an edited collection of Hong Kong fiction translated into English, Baker observes the development of a narrative in which pronominal and deictic reference positions Cheung with the people of Hong Kong and in opposition to both the former colonial powers and current political leadership (ibid. 133). Baker also demonstrates that evidence of such stance-taking is not limited to paratextual devices; in the body of the translation itself, where the translator no longer speaks as him or herself, deictic elements (including register and tense marking) may still be indexed to the translator and, as such, are indicative of the translator’s subject position (2006: 135-139).

Thus, using contrasting methodological approaches, Hermans and Baker have been successful in identifying the translator’s presence – either as a ‘differential voice’ apparent in momentary interventions and incongruities, or by virtue of pervasive lexico-grammatical patterns – and, in so-doing, are able to infer the translator’s position. Methodologically speaking, the present study resembles Baker (2000, 2006), since it examines particular lexico-grammatical patterns as they occur throughout the body of the translation itself. However, there are two key differences in the focus and objectives of the work mentioned here and the present study.

Firstly, while the work of Hermans and Baker demonstrates a particular interest in elucidating the position of individual translators in specific translations, the present study aims to identify patterns of positioning that might be shared by translators in general. This relates to the second point, that, although the studies
mentioned here share an interest in unearthing the ‘views, opinions and values’ of a translator, and can therefore be considered to approach position as an *ideological* function, the present study seeks to interrogate position as an *epistemological* function which reflects the relationship between the translator and knowledge being conveyed vis-à-vis its source and mode of acquisition. Since it is hypothesised that this relationship is grounded in variable translator-author separation/identification, the following sections review characterisations of positioning in translation that make particular reference to ‘distance/distancing’ (1.2.2.) and ‘empathy’ (1.2.3.).

1.2.2. Distancing in translation
Since positionality is a central area of concern in translation research, and any discussion of position naturally invokes spatial imagery, it is unsurprising that the notion of ‘distance’ is pervasive in the discourse on translation. Distance figures in elaborations of conceptual metaphors for translation, descriptions of relationships between source and target texts, languages and cultures, and, of particular relevance to the present discussion, relationships between the author, translator and subject of translation. In addition to descriptions of relative distance between such entities in individual cases, there are also suggestions in the literature that translation in general may be associated with ‘distance’, or a tendency towards ‘distancing’.

There are a number of empirical studies that engage, either directly or indirectly, with the notion of distancing in translation. Mason and Serban (2003), for example, explicitly set out to investigate distancing by analysing patterns of use of demonstrative pronouns (*this*/*that*) and spatio-temporal adverbs (*here*/*there*, *now*/*then*) in a parallel corpus of literary translations from Romanian into English. Observing a marked increase in the use of distal forms in all translations, they report “significant differences between the use of deixis in source texts and translations ... the main tendency [being] one of distancing” (ibid. 269). Although

19 Distance is regularly invoked in the work of Hermans, for example. Hermans suggests that, when a translation is declared to be such, by the use of a stamp of certification on an official translation, or the indication of a translator’s name on a work of fiction, it “marks the distance between the original and translation” (1996a: 25, emphasis added). Elsewhere, when discussing possible analogies for translated discourse, Hermans proposes indirect speech as an appropriate analogy since, among other things, “indirect speech increases distance” (1996b: 5, emphasis added).
not directly concerned with the question of distancing, Bosseaux’s (2007) study of translator style, based on an examination of deixis, modality and transitivity in the work of two French translators, also reveals less frequent use of proximal spatio-temporal adverbs in translated texts as compared with their source texts. Such studies can be regarded as part of a body of work investigating what Goethals (2007) refers to as the ‘distancing hypothesis’.

Although both Mason and Serban (2003) and Bosseaux (2007) observe shifts in deictic relations that can be interpreted as evidence of distancing, their findings are not corroborated by other studies. For example, neither Chiu (2000) nor Cuenca and Ribera’s (2010) examination of demonstratives in fictional texts, translated from English into Japanese and Spanish respectively, indicates a clear directional tendency. Both studies observe significant variation in the patterns of choice of demonstratives made by different translators, including shifts from proximal to distal and vice versa, as well as the insertion and deletion of demonstratives.

However, it must be noted that all four of the studies mentioned above make observations based on the analysis of uni-directional parallel corpora. Therefore, the extent to which the patterns observed are influenced by contrastive differences between source and target languages – for example, in translating between two-term and three-term demonstrative systems – is unknown. Addressing this limitation, Goethals (2007) and Defrancq and Demol (2010) investigate distancing using bi-directional parallel corpora.

Goethals’ (2007) examination of demonstratives in fiction and non-fiction translated between Spanish and Dutch identifies a higher frequency of proximal demonstratives in the translated texts, which is not explained by contrastive differences in the languages alone. In contrast, Defrancq and Demol’s (2010) analysis of spatial adverbs (here/there) in spoken and written (literary and journalistic) texts translated between French and Dutch observes that proximal adverbs are less frequent than expected in translated texts, and are often either left untranslated or translated by a distal adverb. The findings of these studies therefore respectively contradict and support a hypothesis of distancing in translation.
It is clear from the six case studies reviewed here that, while deictic relations (as realised in demonstrative marking) may be changed in translation, there is no consensus regarding the directional tendency of that change. While this might be due in part to limitations in research design – the use of uni-directional parallel corpora that do not control for SL/TL systemic differences – and of scale – to date, only a limited amount of data (almost always literary fiction) has been described – at this stage it remains unclear whether claims for distancing in translation can be substantiated by empirical observation of spatial deictic marking. An additional problem in considering these studies together lies in the fact that respective accounts differ in relation to the discourse entities between which they identify distance – e.g. narrator-storyworld or narrator-audience distance and so on – and in terms of their explanations for such distance.

The respective case studies offer a range of explanations for the various tendencies observed, including contrastive language differences (Chiu 2000, Cuenca and Ribera 2010, Goethals 2007), stylistic preferences of individual translators (Bosseaux 2007, Chiu 2000, Goethals 2007), situational factors such as audience design (Mason and Serban 2003), (unspecified) cognitive or psychological factors (Chiu 2000, Cuenca and Ribera 2010) and combinations thereof. However, the explanation that has most immediately apparent relevance to the present study is what Bosseaux (2004b, 2007) terms “a loss of deictic anchorage”. The notion that translation entails a shift in the deictic centre (origo) also finds mention in a number of other studies that examine perspective phenomena in translated texts.

While not addressing ‘distancing’ directly, there are a number of studies that examine translator position by comparing indicators of perspective in translations and their source texts. For example, shifts from the adoption of an internal to external vantage are observed by Tabakowska, who notes that the locus of focalisation adopts a “bird’s eye view” in translation (1993: 46), and also by May, who notes a shift from a limited (embodied) narratorial vantage to one of “greater omniscience” (1994a: 84). The oft-cited example of the opening passage of Kawabata’s (1948) *Yuki Guni* ‘Snow Country’ reveals a similar shift from an internal, experiential viewpoint to an external, observational position in translation.

---

20 Kruger (1999) and Goethals and De Wilde (2009) also describe instances of shift from internal to external focalisation in translation.
Where Kawabata’s original opens with *Kunizakai no nagai tonneru o nukeru to yukiguni deatta*, which might be glossed, ‘Coming out of the long border tunnel, there was snow country’, Seidensticker’s (1956) translation describes the scene from an external perspective, ‘The train came out of the long tunnel into the snow country’.

Examining ‘subjectivity’ as a perspective phenomenon, Tabakowska (1993), May (1994a, 1994b), and Jonasson (2001) all report instances of shifts from a relatively subjective to objective narrative stance in translation, in what May (1994b) identifies as an ‘erasure of subjectivity’. Shifts from an internal to external vantage and from a subjective to objective presentation might both reasonably be related to a change in the locus of the deictic centre. Indeed, both Tabakowska (1993) and May (1994a) point to a wandering deictic centre, manifest in the lack of continuity in maintaining perspective, which resonates with Bosseaux’s (2004b, 2007) identification of a ‘loss of deictic anchorage’ in translated texts.

It is intuitively obvious that the act of (re)telling a story about events that were experienced by another person involves a shift in deictic relations. Since the original story is further removed in time and space from the reteller than from the original experiencer-teller, it is natural that the retelling will be characterised by deictic relations which are relatively distant in terms of spatio-temporal and interpersonal marking. Schiffrin’s (1993) examination of the features of everyday conversational narratives demonstrates that, when relaying (mediating) a story that was experienced by someone other than the SELF, conventions dictate that:

*we are required to use a wide array of devices (grammatical and/or paralinguistic) to show displacement in person, space, and time from the ‘I’, ‘here’ and ‘now’ of the current situation.*

(1993: 233)

However, it is not only spatio-temporal orientation and person marking that changes in retellings. According to communicative norms, speakers persistently indicate the basis from which they speak, e.g. whether they are speaking on the basis of observation or hearsay (see Grice 1975, Chafe 1986). That is, speakers signal their epistemological (or, more specifically, evidential) position in relation to a story using a range of reportive and modal devices, such as *apparently, I heard, it*
seems that and so on. Reflecting the contrasting relationships between the current reteller (reporter) vs. original teller (experiencer) and the events being narrated, it is expected that a narrative retelling will reveal the current speaker’s ‘distance’ from (the source of) the knowledge being conveyed. Indeed, Mushin’s (2001, 2006) examination of narrator stance in the intralingual mediation of personal narratives finds this to be the case.

Mushin’s (2001, 2006) investigation of narrative retellings found that, when telling the story of someone else’s personal experience, narrators not only effect spatio-temporal re-orientation but also employ a range of modal and evidential devices to indicate a ‘reportive stance’, i.e. to signal that the story is recounted on the basis of hearsay rather than direct experience. Although Mushin observes variation in the degree to which such strategies are employed, which is attributed to individual preference among other things, she concludes that a tendency to present “psychological distance” between the current narrating SELF and the original experiencing OTHER is common to speakers of English, Macedonian and Japanese (2001: 163). The intralingual mediation situation described by Mushin is helpful in two ways: firstly, it provides evidence of an “overall preference for distancing oneself from someone else’s experience” (ibid. 164) and, secondly, it clarifies that the ‘distance’ in question here pertains to the relationship between the narrator and the experience/knowledge being narrated. Thus, although not concerned with translation per se, Mushin’s account of narrator position in mediated discourse lends support to a hypothesis of (epistemological/evidential) distancing in translation.

The types of mediated discourse described by both Schiffrin and Mushin – in which the narration of a story experienced by an OTHER gives rise to changes in deictic and modal/evidential stance marking – share some clear similarities with translation. However, there is one obvious and significant difference. That is, unlike the situations described by Schiffrin and Mushin, in which a third person narrative position is adopted (and narrators are free to signal a reportive stance), the conventions of translation are such that the translator is required to adopt the same discursive position as the original experiencer (Hermans 2007, Pym 2004).

According to Goethals and De Wilde (2009), in appropriating the discursive position of an OTHER, the translator is compelled to undergo the “complex cognitive
task of re-adopting the vantage point(s) of the ST”, effecting a “cognitive deictic centre shift” (ibid. 791). That is, rather than reorienting the deictic coordinates (to ‘he/she-there-then’) in accordance with the conventions of everyday narrative retelling, as in the forms of mediated discourse described by Schiffrin and Mushin, the translator is constrained by particular discursive conventions to project him or herself into the position (‘I-here-now’) of the original author/narrator. Assuming the complexity of this cognitive operation, it is not surprising that the literature reports evidence of wandering deictic centres and variable focalisation, likely reflecting the translator’s on-going negotiation of the occupation of a discursive position that is not his or her own.

A final point of interest in relation to accounts of ‘distancing’ in translation, is that, within discussions of the cognitive, psychological, and emotional factors that might influence translator positioning (Chiu 2000, Cuenca and Ribera 2010), there are mentions of a dialectic of ‘involvement’ vs. ‘detachment’ (Mason and Serban 2003, Bosseaux 2004a, 2004b, 2007; May 1994a, 1994b) and also of ‘empathy’ (Jonasson 2001, 2003). The co-occurrence of tropes of ‘distancing’ and ‘identification’ in these accounts lends support to the characterisation offered in 1.1.3., where the position of the translator was envisaged as a function of a complex duality based on separate identities (difference) vs. degrees of identification (similarity). The following section examines the ways in which ‘empathy’ features elsewhere in the discourse on translation.

1.2.3. Empathy in translation
The terms ‘identification’, ‘involvement’, ‘affinity’ and ‘alignment’ feature regularly both in the literature discussing distance in translation, as mentioned above, and positionality in general. Although all of these descriptive terms can readily be interpreted with reference to empathy, with the exception of Jonasson (2001, 2003), the phenomenon has not been subject to explicit attention in empirical studies of translation such as those mentioned above.

21 These descriptive terms are found even more frequently in the literature on positionality in interpreting, in which empathy relations feature more prominently than in the literature on translation (cf. Hale 1997, 2007; Rodica 1997, Harvey 2003). Rodica (1997), for example, considers empathy a skill to be cultivated, and explores the benefits of immersion in a source culture as a means of promoting identification (rather like a method actor’s preparation for a role).
Adopting a hermeneutic approach, Gadamer (1960/2004) suggests that the relationship between SELF and OTHER implied in all aspects of our interaction with the world is particularly salient in the process of translation. According to Gadamer, “however much the translator may have dwelt with and empathised with his author, [a translation] cannot be simply a re-awakening of the original process in the author’s mind” and, therefore, “inevitable distance” remains (ibid. 387-8). The fact that Gadamer discusses the communion between the self and other in terms of both empathy and distance highlights the dialectical relationship in which these two exist (as was also observed in empirical studies of ‘distance’).

A number of other scholars of translation have, directly or indirectly, raised the issue of translator-author empathy as an aspect of translator competence. Nida (1964), for example, agrees with Anderton’s suggestion that a competent translator must have the same “empathetic spirit” as the author (1920: 66). Similarly, Lefevere cites Humboldt’s identification of a need for translator-author empathy (1977: 40). Newmark also deems translator-author empathy to be a prerequisite for successful translation: “A successful translation is probably more dependent on the translator’s empathy with the writer’s thought than an affinity of language and culture” (1981: 54). Finally, Quine (1990: 42) describes empathy as a translation strategy, advocating a motivated cultivation of professional empathy, rather like that practised by the clinician or method actor.

From the point of view of the practising translator, Jean Starr Untermeyer suggests that a translator must position him or herself with the author, in an alignment that enables him or her to see the world through the same eyes. According to Untermeyer, the necessary ‘vision’ to translate requires an emotional commitment – “the translator really has to identify with the work he is translating” (1965: 253) – that renders translation, not “merely a linguistic exercise” but “an adventure in empathy” (1948: 162). The translator Eirin Mouré’s preface to her translation of Pessoa’s poem O Guardador de Rebanhos alludes to similar relationships. In this instance, the translator refers to her identification not with the work but rather with its author: “Alberto Caeiro came with me. I translated Pessoa by responding to him as a person. I, a person, and Pessoa, a person” (2001: viii).²²

²²Alberto Caeiro is one of the many alter egos adopted by Fernando Pessoa.
From his position as both a theorist and practitioner of translation, Venuti (1991) explores a particular relationship of ‘affinity’ between translator and author – which he describes as simpatico – whereby translator-author identification allows the translator to become “of the same mind” as the author (ibid. 4). Venuti argues that, when simpatico is achieved,

the translator is assumed to participate vicariously in the author’s thoughts and feelings, [and] the translated text is read as the transparent expression of authorial psychology or meaning. The voice which the reader hears in any translation made on the basis of simpatico is always recognised as the author’s, never as a translator’s, not even as some hybrid of the two. (1991: 4)

Although, later in his essay, Venuti rejects the very possibility of simpatico, with its assumption of the ellision of the voices of the author-subject and translator-subject, the notion remains relevant to the present discussion. That is, although Venuti regards simpatico as the full coincidence of the voices of translator and author, and therefore rejects it as an impossibility, given the non-coincidence of the identities of translator and author, if simpatico is interpreted as a matter of degree – a similarity relation based on a shared “historical moment” and “common sensibility” (1991: 3) amongst other things – it can be understood to function very much as (empathetic) identification. Recalling Langacker’s empathy hierarchy, since maximal empathy is with the self, complete identification (Venuti’s simpatico) is an impossibility in (other-)translation. However, that is not to say identificational relationships are not operational or that degrees of proximation are not achieved.

Hermans’ body of work on (the ontology of) translation also demonstrates an on-going concern with empathy and identification. In explicating the development of a metalanguage for literary translation, for example, Hermans (1993) refers to the work of the seventeenth century translator George Chapman. Recounting Chapman’s stated aim to “reach the spirit that was spent” in the original text, Hermans argues that the “sense of spiritual communion between translator and writer” described by Chapman “come[s] more sharply into focus if

23 For a critique of Venuti’s application of the notion of simpatico see Strowe (2011).
we narrow down Chapman’s sense of empathy with the author he is translating” (ibid. 34). Elsewhere, Hermans discusses the possibility that the adoption of the discursive position of an Other, in particular the first person position in interpreting, may even give rise to translator-author identification: “the use of the first person in particular may bring about a degree of identification with the anterior speaker’s position that affects the translator emotionally” (2007: 57). Hermans cites the case of a Tswana interpreter, traumatised by his work at hearings of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee in South Africa, who recalled the emotional burden of adopting the discursive position of a victim: “because you use the first person all the time. I have no distance when I say ‘I’” (Krog 1999: 195 in Hermans 2007: 57). More recently, Hermans has suggested that a translator’s “affinity” with an author and “identification with the body of ideas they translate” may influence their choice of material to translate (2010: 74). Although he describes this situation in terms of sympathy relations – “both Ten Kate and Winkler translated writers they sympathised with” (ibid.) – sympathy, as an ‘other-oriented emotion’, can be regarded as one manifestation of empathy (Batson 2009: 8).25

Finally, the literature describing conceptualisations of translation is also illuminating in relation to the role empathy might play. A number of discursive and representational practices have been offered as analogies for translation – including biography (Tymoczko 2006a, 2006b, Nikolaou 2006), acting (Benshalom 2010)26 and creative writing (Loffredo and Perteghella ed. 2006). These are among a substantial body of work engaging with the role of identification, empathy, and


25 Such accounts find resonance with Wechsler’s portrayal of identification in translation: “The feeling of affinity with an author can … lead a translator to feel that he is as singular as the author” (1998: 36). Wechsler goes on to cite the Earl of Roscommon’s poetic depiction of ‘unification’ between translator and author by a ‘sympathetic bond’ (ibid.).

26 Although space prevents extended discussion, acting is a form of representation that has much in common with translation, and which foregrounds the role of empathy. Acting entails adoption of the first person position of an Other (a form of ‘mimicry’) which recalls the hypothesis that mimicry may be both an indicator of empathy and a means of stimulating empathy (Hatfield et al 2009: 20-22). An extreme case of interpreter empathy – manifest as mimicry, or what might be termed the adoption of a “performative mode” (Benshalom 2010) – can be seen in the case of Kunihiro Suzuki, the long-standing interpreter for Zico, the Brazilian manager of Japan’s national football team. Zico trained Suzuki to reenact his words, to the extent of haranguing players during half-time dressing room talks (Moffett 2003: 38), a practice that eventually extended to Suzuki receiving a touchline ban for abusing match officials (Japan Times 22/10/2004).
‘transference’ in translation.\(^{27}\) Since the present study takes autobiographies as its object of investigation, biography is of particular interest here.

In her essay *Becoming the Other*, Frank (1985: 198) describes a “mode of consciousness”, characterised by empathetic identification, through which biographers interpret their subjects’ experiences. Based on an examination of biographical paratexts and the testimony of biographers, Frank suggests that the biographer “assume[s] the place of the other person as the ‘I’ at the centre of his or her world, orienting toward the same objects in the same way” (ibid. 195) and, further, that adopting this position allows the biographer to become “closer” to the subject’s experiences (ibid. 196).\(^{28}\) Schepeler (1990) also refers to the extensive body of literature analysing the relationships between biographer and subject, focusing on identification and empathy, as evidenced in the choice of biographical subject, paratextual devices accompanying a biography, and retrospective accounts of biographers’ feelings towards their subjects (see also Candido 1993). The similarities in the processes of biographical and translational interpretation/mediation are marked.\(^{29}\)

Yet, as mentioned in the introduction to this section, despite the pervasiveness of references to empathy and related phenomena in the discourse on translation, interpreting and analogous forms of mediation (e.g. biographical), there has been relatively little extended discussion or formal engagement with the mechanism by which empathy might function in the translation process. Furthermore, with the exception of Jonasson (2001, 2003), there are no known studies that make generalisations about empathy in translation on the basis of empirical investigation, either with reference to translators’ retrospective accounts (protocols) of their relationships with authors/texts or examination of translator/interpreter output. The only known empirical investigation of empathy

\(^{27}\) A number of studies of translation from a psychoanalytical perspective have engaged with ‘transference’, a phenomenon that has links to empathy (cf. Ingram 2001, Quinney 2004, Arrojo 2004).

\(^{28}\) In contrast to an empathetic response, Frank also acknowledges the possibility that a biographer may feel “apathy” towards their subject (1985: 198). This recalls O’Sullivan’s suggestion that a translator may adopt a stance of “antipathy” towards an author/subject (2011: 186).

\(^{29}\) The similarity between biographical and translational mediation is apparent in Arabic, where the same term, *tarjama*, is used to refer to both (Tymoczko 2006b: 22). Indeed, cases in which an author’s translator is also his or her biographer are not uncommon: David Bellos is just such a mediator for George Perec, Maurice S. Friedman for Martin Buber, Edward March for Jean Anouilh, and Walter Lowrie for Søren Kierkegaard.
phenomena in translated texts to date is the work of Jonasson (2001, 2003). However, Jonasson focuses on the way in which empathy markers (as described by Banfield 1982) direct the reader’s identification with characters in translated fiction, rather than, as is the case in the present discussion, on identifying indicators of the translator’s empathy with the autobiographical subject/narrative.

1.2.4. Summary
This select review of the substantial body of work in translation studies engaging with the question of translator ‘position’ demonstrates the variety of approaches to the subject. Significantly, the descriptive tools of ‘distance’ and ‘empathy’ figure pervasively in all of these accounts, from studies that examine individual translator position with a focus on ideological position, to those that attempt to characterise position in translation in general. It was also noted that distance and empathy feature in discussions of positionality in interpreting and other forms of intralingual mediated discourse, including conversational narrative retellings, biography, and acting.

Although there is variation in the theoretical and methodological approaches adopted in respective accounts – in relation to what is meant by distance and empathy, between which discourse participants and entities these relationships pertain, in what dimensions of meaning/experience they exist, and in what linguistic structures they may be manifest – collectively, these accounts suggest that the notions of ‘distance’ and ‘empathy’ are extensively operational (either explicitly or implicitly) in conceptualising translation, and provide grounds for assuming that these concepts are likely to be revealing in attempting to elucidate translation.

1.3. The Epistemology of Translated Autobiography
Since translator position is interpreted, in the present thesis, as an epistemological function – i.e. grounded in the relationship between a translator and the knowledge being communicated – and, since the basis of the epistemological contrast assumed between original and translated texts lies is characterised by a SELF-as-source vs. OTHER-as-source contrast, an analytical framework is required that is able to probe such relations. While epistemological aspects of language
encompass a range of meanings, including speaker assessment of likelihood or certainty as indicated by epistemic modal marking, it is the construal of evidential relations that are of particular significance here. This section provides an outline of a research design for the empirical investigation of evidential stance in non-translated and translated autobiographical narratives.

1.3.1. Research Questions

In brief, the research entails an analytical framework for the quantifiable description of ‘evidential stance’: the indication of relationship between narrator and knowledge based on source and mode of acquisition of the knowledge. The framework focusses on (1) the report of memories in ‘REMEMBER-constructions’ incorporating verbs of recollection such as remember in English and oboeru in Japanese, and (2) the description of memories in ‘SEE‐constructions’ incorporating the verb seem in the English data, and a range of grammatical particles used to indicate seeming (sou, you, mitai, and rashii) in the Japanese data (see Chapter 2). The analytical framework will be applied to two purpose-built comparable corpora of contemporary autobiographies in English and Japanese: (1) the English Comparable Corpus (ECC), comprising the EE sub-corpus of non-translated autobiographies in English and JE sub-corpus of Japanese-English translations, and (2) the Japanese Comparable Corpus (JCC), comprising the JJ sub-corpus of non-translated autobiographies in Japanese and EJ sub-corpus of English-Japanese translations.

Working from the premise that evidential stance-taking is manifest in subtle ways at a textual level, the framework examines patterns of use of evidential strategies that can be interpreted as revealing either an experiential (‘immediate’) or non-experiential (‘mediate’) stance in relation to the knowledge being conveyed. It is hoped that the patterns of experiential vs. non-experiential stance-taking in original and translated autobiographies will provide an index of author/translator position that can then be interpreted with reference to the relative distance between a translator and autobiographical author/narrative.

---

30 Chapter 3 describes the composition of the corpora; Appendix B lists the reference identifier (e.g. EJ3) and other information for each of the texts included in the ECC and JCC.
By applying the analytical framework to the ECC and JCC data, the study aims to address the following question.

(1) To what extent does the construal of evidential stance in the narration of memories, as reported by REMEMBER-constructions and described by SEEM-constructions, in comparable corpora of original and translated autobiographies in English and Japanese, reveal a contrast in the position adopted by the author/translator in relation to the knowledge being communicated?

This over-arching question is separated into three descriptive and interpretive sub-questions, which will be addressed in turn as the analysis is reported and discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 6 respectively.

(2) How are REMEMBER-constructions used to report memories in original vs. translated autobiographies?

- Can a difference be observed in the patterns of use of object complement structures in REMEMBER-constructions? In particular, can a difference be observed in the relative frequency of object complements that construe memories as being ‘experiential’ vs. ‘non-experiential’ in character?
- If a difference is observed, is it apparent in both English and Japanese comparable corpora?

(3) How are SEEM-constructions used to describe memories in original vs. translated autobiographies?

- Can a difference be observed in the patterns of use of object complement structures in SEEM-constructions? In particular, can a difference be observed in the relative frequency of object complements that construe memories as being ‘experiential’ vs. ‘non-experiential’ in character?
- If a difference is observed, is it apparent in both English and Japanese comparable corpora?
(4) To what extent do the patterns of evidential stance-taking observed in original vs. translated autobiographies in English and Japanese reveal a contrast in author vs. translator position? Can the patterns of evidential stance-taking observed be explained by the contrasting evidential bases of translated vs. non-translated autobiographies? To what extent can variation in the patterns of evidential stance-taking observed be explained by variable degrees of translator-author identification?

1.3.2. Why autobiography?
In 1.1.1., it was suggested that the relationship between a translator and the knowledge being translated might be characterised by relative ‘distance’ as compared to that between an author and the knowledge being communicated. It was hypothesised that this distance arises from the separation between the translator and author and, by extension, the source of the knowledge being translated. While this is assumed to be characteristic of all (other-)translation, the contrast is likely to be more apparent in some text types than others.

The case of autobiographical writing may offer the clearest exemplification of the contrasting epistemological (evidential) character of original and translated texts. The genre of autobiography is one that, by its very nature, is characterised by self-representation and self-reference and, as such, presents particular challenges for the translator in negotiating his or her position with respect to the original author and the knowledge being narrated. This section describes some of the salient narrative and epistemological (evidential) characteristics of original and translated autobiographies, and makes some suggestions about the role that empathy might play when translating the experiences of an other.

The narrative and epistemological character of autobiography
According to the theorist of autobiography, Philippe Lejeune, an autobiography is a “retrospective prose narrative produced by a real person concerning his own existence, focussing on his individual life” (1975/1989: 4). Furthermore, such a narrative is constituted as an autobiography only when it is stated as being such, thereby invoking particular conventions which Lejeune refers to as the ‘autobiographical pact’. This pact, which exists between an author and reader, and
directs the adoption of a particular “mode of reading”, “supposes that there is identity of name between the author ... the narrator of the story, and the character who is being talked about” (ibid. 12 emphasis in the original).31

Thus, an autobiography is regarded as a non-fictional, retrospective narrative of the experience of the self, and is characterised by the coincidental identities of the narrating ‘I’ and the experiencing ‘I’, i.e. defined by the following relationships:

\[
\text{AUTHOR} = \text{NARRATOR} = \text{EXPERIENCER}
\]

Autobiography is often understood in contrastive relation to biography, in which the narrator is not the experiencer, i.e. the narrator is telling the story of an other:

\[
\text{AUTHOR} = \text{NARRATOR} \neq \text{EXPERIENCER}
\]

It is widely accepted that definitions of the literary genres of autobiography and biography rest on the coincidence or non-coincidence of identities of the author/narrator and experiencer: these relationships also underpin the narrative character of the respective text types.

That is, it is obvious although not trivial to note that an autobiographical narrative is narrated in the first person, whereas a biography is narrated in the third person. This is a direct consequence of the coincidence/non-coincidence of the identities of experiencer and narrator. While the contrast in auto/biographical narrative situations is most obviously manifest in a difference in person referents, it also affects other aspects of the representation of experience. For example, different reporting strategies are employed in autobiographical and biographical narratives, reflecting the fact that, while an autobiographical narrator knows the story by direct personal experience, a biographical narrator knows the story by other, indirect, means. It is therefore natural that, while biographical narratives utilise a range of reportive structures (cf. Mushin 2001, 2006), autobiographies are characterised by a high frequency of first person verbs of cognition, emotion and perception (Semino and Short 2004).

31 Although the terms ‘autobiography’ and ‘biography’ are readily accepted in general use, their generic definitions present some theoretical problems. Since space prevents an in-depth discussion of the boundaries of these genres it may suffice to say that the present discussion focuses on what might be commonly accepted as a ‘prototypical’ autobiography.
Lejeune’s (1975/1989) observation that autobiographies typically maintain a focus on the private world of the autobiographical subject, revealing aspects of experience – thoughts, beliefs and emotions – that are typically inaccessible for anyone other than the experiencer, is of significance when considering translation. The representation of private experiences requires the kind of unrestricted access which, according to Semino and Short, is typically afforded only to omniscient fictional narrators and autobiographical authors (2004: 62). In an autobiography, the AUTHOR=NARRATOR=EXPERIENCER relationship provides maximal access to memories of entities and events, replete with sensory perceptual, emotional and conceptual details. However, in translating an autobiography, the extent to which the translator acquires access to the consciousness of his or her subject is unclear.

The narrative and epistemological characteristics of autobiographies outlined above present theoretical and methodological advantages for the current investigation. Firstly, the qualitative difference between the source/mode of acquisition of knowledge in an autobiography and its translation is marked. Although the hypothesis elaborated in 1.1 is assumed to apply to all types of (other-)translation, it seems likely that the translation of knowledge acquired by direct, personal experience, such as in an autobiography, will reveal a more apparent difference than, say, the translation of knowledge that was acquired from indirect sources (i.e. of mediative character). Secondly, unlike many other text types – including scientific, journalistic, legal and historical texts, which typically synthesise knowledge obtained from a range of sources including observation, inference, literature review, eye-witness accounts, artefacts and so on – the source of knowledge in an autobiographical narrative is assumed to be primarily the ‘autobiographical memory’ of the author. Finally, autobiographical narratives are presented from the consistent point of view of a single focalising subject (Bal and Tavor 1981, Jahn n.d.). This is particularly helpful when applying an analytical framework that interrogates the relationship between author/narrator and knowledge.32

32 In 1.2.2., it was mentioned that accounts of translation that discuss distance and empathy exhibit variation as to between which discourse participants and entities the distance/empathy relations are assumed to function. In the case of autobiographical translation, since the author/narrator/protagonist/life story are facets of one entity, the discussion is somewhat simplified.
In addition to their epistemological (evidential) character, autobiographies are also an ideal testing ground for developing hypotheses about translator empathy. Given their focus on the interior life of the subject and the promise of a ‘true story’, autobiographical narratives are often emotionally compelling and, perhaps more prominently than some of the other genres mentioned above, empathetic identification is assumed to play a significant role both in a reader’s selection of a particular autobiography and his or her response to it. A significant pleasure of reading autobiographies is in noticing and measuring the (variable) extent to which the reading SELF identifies with the autobiographical OTHER and his or her experiences (Keen 2006). As with the autobiographical reader, it may be the case that a translator’s empathy with an autobiographical subject influences his or her choice of material to translate (cf. Hermans 2010: 74), and the formation of an identificational relationship with the subject during the process of translation.

**Autobiography in Translation Studies**

While the generic characteristics mentioned above are the primary motivations for selecting autobiographical narratives, there are additional benefits of engaging with this data set, which derive from the importance of the genre and the relative lack of attention it has received in the field of translation studies.

Autobiography can be considered an important genre for various reasons. Autobiographies function as a medium for identity formation, representation and transfer, as tools of protest, resistance, and activism (Beard 2009), and historical documents and sources of knowledge about other cultures (Olney 1980). Whitlock’s (2007) examination of contemporary autobiographical discourse in the Middle East, for example, characterises autobiographies as “soft weapons” that, while allowing individuals who otherwise might remain unheard, these narratives may also readily be “co-opted into propaganda” (ibid. 3). Baker (2006) regards ontological narratives – that is, ‘narratives of the self’ – as important subjects of

---

33 It is clear from publishers’ blurbs accompanying texts included in the ECC that they appeal to an emotional response in the reader (moving, harrowing, heartrending) that is afforded by unrestricted, intimate access (unflinching, candid, revealing, affording a rare glimpse) to a particular self (personal, private, own voice).

34 While comparison of SELF and OTHER may give rise to an empathetic response arising in the perception of similarity, other responses, such as feelings of Schadenfreude (especially in the case of so-called ‘misery memoirs’) are also possible.
enquiry in translation studies since,

[s]ociety as a whole has a considerable stake in the stories and roles we construct for ourselves, because personal narratives can enhance or undermine the narratives that underpin the social order and hence interfere with the smooth functioning of society.

(2006: 29)

Baker also argues that the translation of ontological narratives presents particular problems, not least in the emotional challenge of interpreting the personal experiences of others, particularly in cases where the narrative is that of a perpetrator or victim of crime (ibid. 32) (see also 1.2.3).

Judging purely on the scale of consumption of autobiographies, the potential influence of autobiographical narratives is assumed to be significant. Autobiographies have an extensive readership internationally, regularly featuring in bestseller lists. According to retail sales figures published by Nielsen BooksScan for 2011, in excess of 1 million books in the sub-category of ‘arts autobiography’ alone were sold in the UK. Furthermore, a survey of on-line bookseller, publisher and library resources reveals that a significant proportion of autobiographies in circulation are translations.

Yet, as Winters (2011) points out, the fact that many of even the most famous autobiographies have been circulated in translation often goes without comment and, until recently, autobiography has been subject to relatively little attention in translation studies (cf. Nikolaou and Kyritsi ed. 2008). Where autobiography has been investigated, it has tended to be an examination of the self in transit from an ideological perspective (Ingram 1996, 1998; Besemer 2002, Rooke 2004, Whitlock 2007, Meng 2010, Dalziel ed. 2002). With the exception of Winters’ (2011) examination of translator style, there are no known studies of the

---

35 Although translation has been relatively little discussed in the field of auto/biographical studies, following the International Auto/Biography Association (IABA) conference Life Writing and Translations (2008), emergent interdisciplinary dialogue is in evidence in work such as Karpinski (2012), a monograph describing the application of theoretical models taken from translation studies to autobiographical narratives.

36 As already mentioned, there are very few studies of self-translations of autobiographical narratives. Exceptions include Munday (2008: 206-216) and Abdó (2009), which examine the ways in which the self is presented in an auto-biography and its auto-translation, and offer explanations for differences identified in terms of the author/translator’s perceived expectations of different audiences.
linguistic character of translated autobiographies and, with the exception of Deane-Coxe (2011), there are no known studies of autobiographical translation that engage with cognitive aspects of autobiographical memory.

It is noticeable from the literature that there are many shared concerns in the discourses on translation and autobiography; including the quest for and problematisation of authenticity and ‘truth’, an interest in ‘voice’ and ‘access’, and perhaps most importantly here, the position and narrative representation of the self. Indeed, recent studies advocate that the juxtaposition of autobiography and translation as metaphors for each other may be illuminating both in relation to the respective processes themselves, and in terms of aspects of human cognition in general (Wilson 2009, Nikolau 2006). While such aims are beyond the scope of the present research, the potential collective significance of studies of autobiographical and translational data, separately and in conjunction, is clear.

1.3.3. The paradoxical character of a translated autobiography

“How would you translate a signature?”

(Derrida 1985: 205)

In whatever mode or style an author chooses to depict his life – straightforwardly, metaphorically or even deceptively – his final product is an intimate one, irreproducible by any other hand. In theory, the author reflects upon the past, and relates his inner narrative – the story only he knows.

(Flynn 2005: 1, emphasis added)

The character of a translated autobiography is most readily conveyed with reference to that of an original autobiography which, as already discussed, is

37 A search of the established journal of life-writing, Biography, reveals a marked overlap in the concerns of (auto)biographical writing and translation: questions of authority, authenticity, integrity, neutrality, accountability, faithfulness, reliability, access, evidence, ‘voice’, error and misrepresentation, a search for ‘truth’ and a skepticism/suspicion (of being passed off a simulacrum) are prevalent in the discourse on both.
defined by the coincidence of identities of the author, narrator, and experiencer. In contrast, a translated autobiography can be defined thus:

\[
\text{TRANSLATOR}=\text{NARRATOR}\neq\text{EXPERIENCER}
\]

From an epistemological perspective, the translation of autobiography presents a peculiar case. The fact that the identities of the translator and autobiographical subject are non-coincidental throws into disarray the indexical relationships between the experiencing-I, the narrating-I and the experience being narrated, that constitute the very definition of an autobiography. Recalling Lejeune’s (1975/1989) autobiographical pact, it might be argued that a translated autobiography is no longer an autobiography.

Yet, translated autobiographies abound; they are accepted unproblematically, their origins and epistemological character remaining unremarked upon. Indeed, as mentioned above, their very status as translations often goes unnoticed. Thus, it appears that the special conventions attendant to translation allow the reader to accept a translated autobiography as an autobiography. Pym describes these translational conventions:

> Whenever a translating translator or interpreter says “I”, the discursive conventions of our cultures allow that this first person does not refer to the translator or interpreter: its vector is towards the author of a previous “source” text of some kind.

(2009: 33)

Thus, just as the stating of an autobiography to be an autobiography invokes an ‘autobiographical pact’, giving rise to particular expectations in the reader and directing their ‘mode of reading’, so too, the stating of a translation to be a translation invokes the particular conventions – which might be considered a ‘translational pact’ – described by Pym. These conventions are so engrained as to pass without comment most of the time. Yet, in the case of autobiography, a paradox arising from the mis-match between the discursive position adopted by the translator and the evidential basis from which he or she speaks, is thrown clearly into relief. The simultaneous invocation of autobiographical and
translational pacts presents a peculiar dialectic which is apparent in the contradiction between their narrative and epistemological (evidential) character.

Translation as Interlingual Ghost-writing
A mentioned in 1.2.3., the relationship the translator of an autobiography has with the source of the knowledge being narrated might be said to resemble that of a biographer. Both narrate the life story of an OTHER that came to be known by indirect means – rather than by direct experience – and both cases may involve the development of identificational relationships with their subjects. However, there remains a key difference. Unlike the biographer, the translator occupies a first person discursive position, presenting the experience as though it were his or her own: in terms of both its epistemological and discursive character, the translation resembles a ghostwritten autobiography.

In the literature on conceptualisations of translation, ghostwriting has not yet been explored at length. Although Mossop (2003) mentions ghostwriting as a possible analogue for translation, he rejects it on the grounds that ghostwritten texts do not have a source text (rather, the ghostwriter avails of a range of source materials). While it is true that a ghostwritten text does not have a source text as such, the mediate mode of acquisition of the knowledge being narrated bears a resemblance to the translation situation. Although Lejeune does not mention the translation of autobiographies, except in a single footnote, he does address the phenomenon of ghostwriting at length in his essay *The Autobiography of Those Who Do Not Write* (1975/1989). For Lejeune, the “stereographic, and both auto- and heterobiographical” ghostwritten text is problematical, since the signatory of the autobiographical contract becomes unclear (1975/1989: 190). This characterisation has clear resonance with the translated autobiography.

Interestingly, the discourse on ghostwriting reveals a similar set of concerns as that on translation. Although the practice of ghostwriting perhaps enjoys less visibility than translation, paratextual materials (marketing blurbs, forewords) and

---

38 Ulrych and Murphy (2008) also mentions ghost-writing in passing as an example of intralingual mediated discourse.
39 Lejeune recalls a dialogue in *La Quinzaine Littéraire* (1977) between publisher Francois Maspero and autobiographical ghostwriter Annie Mignard in which Maspero likens the role of ghostwriter to that of a translator, declaring “A life has only one author”, while Mignard argues her role to be more akin to that of the biographer (1975/1989: 185).
essays recounting the experiences of ghostwriters allude to a similar engagement with questions of transparency, position, voice and visibility. The claims that ghostwriters and translators make for their work in terms of authenticity, accuracy, integrity and so on bear a striking resemblance, as do retrospective accounts of the working practices of individual ghostwriters.

For example, a prolific ghostwriter of more than 50 autobiographies, Andrew Crofts’ (2009) description of his selection of subjects and creation of a suitable narrative voice and persona shares much with accounts of the experiences of translators of autobiographies (cf. Brierley 2001, Harcourt 2000). In relation to the relationship between ghostwriter and autobiographical subject, Strickland’s (1995) elaboration of the negotiation of ‘detachment’ vs. ‘identification’ is particularly illuminating. More so than in biographical writing which, Strickland maintains, “calls for a certain detachment”, whereby the writer is positioned “outside the subject” (1995: 66), ghostwriting is characterised, in much the same way as acting, by a “performative state of mind” that allows the mediator to project into the same experiential position as the subject:

the writer must identify with the subject, so immerse himself in the life of a complex individual, his character, personality, family, friends, associates, and geography, that he becomes the person, lives the role, sees with his eyes, reasons with his mind, feels with his hands and his heart.

(1995: 67)

Thus, it appears that, for both readers and mediators (biographers and ghostwriters) of life narratives, to a greater or lesser extent, identificational relationships tend to develop with the subject. It therefore seems reasonable to suppose that the translation of an autobiography will give rise to a similar identificational response in a translator. Since the translator, like a ghostwriter, adopts a first person discursive position, it may be the case that a particularly strong identificational mechanism (perhaps more so than biographical and other

---

40 A search for ‘ghostwriting’ in the journal Biography (which deals with both autobiographical and biographical life writing), in print since 1978, returns only eight articles (other titles reveal a similar dearth).
third person forms of mediated discourse) allows the projection of the translator-
SELF ‘into character’ (voice, position) of the autobiographical-OTHER.⁴¹

While the present study will not pursue further a comparison of the
epistemological and narratological character of the various forms of intralingual
and interlingual SELF-mediation (autobiography, self-translation) and OTHER-
mediation (biography, ghostwriting, translation) introduced here, it is hoped that
the discussion of salient points of similarity and dissimilarity is helpful in identifying
the kinds of discursive, evidential and identificational relationships that are
operational, and which constitute the focus of the present investigation.

1.4. Overview of Thesis
This chapter opened by introducing the key premises and assumptions on which
the present research is based. It was argued that the source of the knowledge
being communicated in a translated text always differs from that of its original
(source text). In the case of autobiographical translation this is particularly
apparent: the source of the knowledge conveyed in a translation is the source text,
whereas the source of the knowledge in the source text is the personal experience
of the autobiographical subject. Assuming that human cognition differentiates
knowledge on the basis of its source and mode of acquisition (i.e. evidential basis),
and that this might be manifest in the adoption of a particular evidential stance in
relation to the knowledge, the present thesis aims to investigate whether subtle
traces of stance-taking apparent at a textual level reveal a difference in the ways in
which authors/translators position themselves in relation to the knowledge they
narrate. The analysis will examine the extent to which translators adopt an
experiential or non-experiential (mediative) stance, and offer an explanation in
terms of the translator’s negotiation of the contrasting evidential bases of original
and translated autobiographies, and the variable identificational relationships
between translators and authors/autobiographical subjects.

⁴¹ There is a suggestion in accounts found in various fields of enquiry from acting methodology to
clinical psychology that the adoption of a first person position may stimulate empathy, which
resonates with a biologically-grounded explanation that mimicry is linked to empathetic response in
a number of animal species (De Waal 2008).
In order to address the specific research questions that direct this investigation, the thesis will proceed as follows:

**Chapter 2** elaborates a framework for investigating evidential stance in autobiographical narratives, based on the assumption that certain grammatical features can be interpreted as revealing the relationship the narrator has with a particular memory in terms of whether it is ‘immediate’ or ‘mediate’ in character. The framework has two parts: the first entails the examination of memories that are explicitly reported as such using verbs of recollection, such as English *remember* and Japanese *oboeru*. Particular attention is paid to the grammatical character of the object complements occurring with these verbs. The second focuses on descriptions of remembered experiences, in particular, of how an experience *seemed* to the autobiographical subject. This entails the analysis of descriptions of ‘seeming’ that are realised by the descriptive perception verb *seem* and its complement clauses (*as if, like, that* and so on) in the English data, and a range of grammatical particles used to indicate seeming (*sou, you, mitai and rashii*) in the Japanese data.

**Chapter 3** describes the data set to which the framework will be applied, and the method of its application. By describing the structure, contents and method of construction of the ECC and JCC comparable corpora of contemporary popular autobiographies translated between English and Japanese, and method of application of the analytical frameworks described in Chapter 2, the purpose of this chapter is to ensure that the study is replicable and the object of investigation is clearly defined.

**Chapters 4 and 5** respectively report the analysis of reported memories, focusing on *remember* in the English data and *oboeru, omoidasu* and *kioku suru* in the Japanese data, and analysis of descriptions of remembered experiences, focusing on *seem* in the English data and *sou, you, mitai and rashii* in the Japanese data. In each case a detailed discussion of each analytical category precedes the presentation of quantitative data for the English and Japanese comparable corpora. Each of the analytical chapters concludes with a summary that compares the findings for the two data sets and identifies shared directional tendencies.
Chapter 6 concludes the thesis by re-stating the findings of the analytical chapters, noting correlations between the two phases of analysis, and offers an interpretation for the patterns of similarity and difference observed in relation to translator/author-knowledge and translator-author relations. Finally, avenues for further work are identified, and the implications of the present research and its relationship with current research in translation studies are considered.
Chapter 2. A Framework for Investigating Evidential Stance in Original vs. Translated Autobiographies

In order to address the research questions posed in Chapter 1, it is necessary to operationalise the theoretical construct of translator position, interpreted here as an epistemological function, i.e. one which is grounded in the relationship between a translator and the knowledge being communicated, vis-à-vis its source and mode of acquisition. This chapter elaborates an analytical framework that is able to probe such relations, by examining subtle traces of author/translator position as manifest in strategies of evidential stance-taking in the narration of autobiographical memories. Specifically, the analysis will focus on the narration of memories that are (1) reported using verbs of recollection, and (2) represented in descriptions of seeming.42

2.1. What is evidential stance?

Evidentiality – the indication of the source of knowledge – can be signalled in various ways. In Japanese, a grammatical system is used to indicate how knowledge was acquired (Aoki 1986), whereas in English, which has no such grammatical system, various lexical means are utilised to indicate source of knowledge (Chafe 1986). For example, verbs of perception (I saw, I felt) can be used to indicate direct sensory perceptual evidence, and reportive structures (I heard, they say) can be used to indicate that information was acquired by indirect means, such as hearsay.

Aikhenvald’s (2004/2006) cross-linguistic typology of evidential systems shows that, although the ways in which evidentiality is realised and the types of evidence that are specified are subject to significant variation, a feature of evidential semantics that appears to be fundamental in all languages is the distinction between knowledge that was acquired first-hand, i.e. experienced by the SELF, and that which was acquired from an OTHER (a distinction that might be described in terms of ‘immediate’ vs. ‘mediate’ sources of evidence). According to Aikhenvald, “experiences undergone by ‘self’ and ‘other’ consistently require

42 The terms ‘reported’ and ‘represented’ have been adopted from Brinton’s (1980) framework for the analysis of the narration of perception which draws on the work of Kuroda (1973, 1976) and Banfield (1973, 1978) investigating the narration of consciousness and the epistemological/evidential bases of different narrative modes.
different evidential choices” (ibid. 329). Even in languages that do not have a grammatical requirement for evidential marking, speakers persistently make use of a range of linguistic resources to indicate the evidential basis for what they say, demonstrating a pervasive sensitivity to evidentiality that suggests that it is a key conceptual category (cf. Ekberg and Paradis eds 2006).

As mentioned in 1.2.2., Mushin’s (2001, 2006) analysis of intralingual conversational retellings of the experiences of others demonstrates how consistent speakers are in signalling a ‘reportive stance’, making it clear that they are “engaged in retelling the story of someone else’s personal experience, as it was told to them” (2001: 95). Although, as Mushin concedes, this kind of ‘biographical’ retelling situation “is a context in which a strong preference for the adoption of a reportive epistemological stance was expected” (ibid.), similar strategies can also be observed in first-person mediated discourse. For example, in interpreting, a discursive context in which the mediator is not expected to signal a separation between SELF and OTHER, Bot (2005) identifies strategies that interpreters use to mark their adoption of a reportive stance.

In the case of translation, more so even than interpreting, convention does not permit the translator to introduce reportive structures into the body of the translation (although, as mentioned in 1.2.1, translators may do so in paratextual interventions). Therefore, when comparing evidential stance-taking in original vs. translated autobiographies, it is unlikely that looking for explicit indicators of a reportive stance in the body of a translation will be a productive enterprise. For this reason, it is necessary to develop an analytical framework that allows the identification and differentiation of subtle traces of evidential marking, implicated in choices of certain lexico-grammatical structures. The framework developed here for this purpose draws on the literature on evidentiality in English and Japanese; in particular, accounts that make connections between patterns of certain

---

43 Although Aikhenvald’s account posits a SELF-OTHER contrast as being fundamental in evidential systems, SELF-OTHER empathy is also noted as being of potential significance. According to Aikhenvald, “the degree of proximity and empathy between the speaker and the ‘other’ may influence the evidential choice” (2006: 361, emphasis in original). Links between evidential marking and empathy relations can also be found in Kamio’s (1997: 165-171) exposition of empathy and the expansion of a speaker’s ‘territory of information’, allowing the adoption of an evidential stance that would otherwise be impossible in Japanese, and in Floyd’s (1999: 179) analysis of the evidential system in Wanka Quechua.
grammatical features – here the focus will be on complement structures – and the construal of evidential stance.

The notion of ‘stance’ – “the lexical and grammatical expression of attitudes, feelings judgements, or commitment concerning the propositional content of a message” (Biber and Finegan 1989: 93) – has been interpreted in relation to various dimensions of meaning and utilised in the description of discourse in a range of communicative situations.44 Stance has been used as an approach to the study of conversational interaction, in order to investigate politeness relations (Brown and Levinson 1987) or social orientation (Labov 1984), fictional narrative (Fowler 1977, Simpson 1993), and genre/register analysis (Biber 1995), among other things. Stance-taking behaviour has also been examined from a cross-linguistic perspective (Berman et al 2002, Berman 2005) and, as already mentioned, in intralingual narrative retellings of stories of personal experience (i.e. mediated discourse) in English, Japanese, and Macedonian (Mushin 2001).

According to Biber and Finegan (1989), stance is apparent in a range of textual features, including adjectival, verbal and modal markers, which can be attributed either affective or evidential meaning. Affective stance-taking concerns “the expression of a broad range of personal attitudes, including emotions, feelings, moods, and general dispositions” (ibid. 94), and is potentially useful in describing translator position (in terms of ‘involvement’). However, since the present thesis aims to investigate the position occupied by authors/translators in relation to the knowledge being conveyed, in terms of the source of that knowledge and mode of its acquisition, the framework outlined here focuses only on the evidential aspect of stance-taking, which “refer[s] to the speaker’s expressed attitudes towards knowledge” (ibid. 93).

In considering a working definition of evidential stance as it is to be applied in the present study, it is necessary to clarify what is meant by “attitudes towards knowledge”. The applications of an evidential stance analysis reported in Biber and Finegan (1989) and Mushin (2001), for example, follow Chafe (1986) in adopting a

44 | In the Japanese context, the study of discourse stance focuses on the expression of chinjutsu, which is defined, in very similar terms to ‘stance’, as “a relational function that the speaking self finds existing between himself or herself and the description completed ... meanings that realise the function of chinjutsu include speakers judgement, questioning, [and] exclamation” (Watanabe 1971: 106-7, translated by Maynard 1993: 32). An overview of the forms and functions of chinjutsu can be found in Maynard (1993), Larm (2008) and Narrog (2009).
broad definition of evidential meaning, which incorporates the indication of both evidential and epistemic attitudes – that is, the indication of both the source of knowledge and the attribution of judgements of certainty/commitment to that knowledge. However, for the purposes of the present study, a narrow definition of evidential stance is adopted. Following De Haan (1999, 2001), a distinction is made between ‘epistemological stance’ – the marking of the degree of confidence or commitment the speaker has in the proposition – and ‘evidential stance’, the latter pertaining only to the indication of the type of evidence on which the knowledge being communicated is based. The final choice of targets for the analysis of evidential stance in the present data is guided by the characterisation of autobiographical memory provided in the cognitive psychology literature, which demonstrates important links between the evidential character of memories and their narrative representation.

Before proceeding, it should be noted that, while there is a growing number of studies engaging with various aspects of modality in translation (see Skrandies 2007, Abdul-Fattah 2010, Kranich 2011, Ramón 2009, Al Mukhaini 2008, Winters 2009, 2010), and modality has been flagged as an area of particular interest for investigating translator stance/position (Winters 2009, 2010; Hermans 2010), there is very little specific mention of evidentiality with reference to translation. With the exception of Helin’s (2006) examination of evidential stance as inferred from tense and mood marking, and Makartsev’s (2010) analysis of direct and indirect evidentiality in Albanian-Bulgarian translations of a folkloric text, there are no known studies of evidentiality in translation.

Earlier studies of evidentiality typically infer a relationship between the source of knowledge and its reliability, attributing respective types of evidence differing positions on an epistemic scale of certainty/likelihood (see Frantzinger 1985, Chafe 1986, Palmer 1986). However, more recent accounts of evidential semantics tend to differentiate between evidential and epistemic modal meaning (see De Haan 1999, 2001; Nuyts 2001, Faller 2002, Aikhenvald 2004/2006, and Cornillie 2009a, 2009b). Thus, while it is acknowledged that there is often interaction between evidential and epistemic aspects of meaning, it is by no means clear that there is an a priori link between the source of evidence on which a proposition is based and its certainty or reliability. Plungian (2001), for example, demonstrates that, while certain languages, such as Bulgarian, seem to endorse the assumption that “the less direct the information, the less reliable it is likely to be”, other languages, including Tibetan, “lack this pairing of indirectness and lower certainty” (ibid. 354-5).

Using a uni-directional parallel corpus approach, Helin (2006) observes that students translating from German to Finnish choose ‘remote’ tense marking, passive forms and other lexical indicators, which are interpreted as having evidential import, to “create an interval between the information and him or herself” (ibid. 285). Helin interprets this as an indication of the translator’s unwillingness to take responsibility for the content.
2.2. Evidential Stance and Autobiographical Narration

Although there are no known empirical studies of evidential stance-taking in autobiographies, it is obvious that narration on the basis of ‘memory evidence’ (Jacobsen 1957/1971: 135) is likely to play a central role. Yet, although the knowledge conveyed in an autobiography is assumed to have been sourced in the author’s memory, respective memories may differ in their original source and mode of acquisition. On this basis, two types of memory, which can be differentiated with respect to their phenomenological, evidential and narrative character, are identified.

In the cognitive psychology literature, the characterisation of autobiographical memories differentiates between two types of memory: ‘episodic’ and ‘semantic’ (Tulving 1972, Conway 2005). Episodic memories are memories of experiences that are indexically linked to the ‘rememberer’ – they entail “autobiographical reference” – and are integral to the rememberer’s personal identity (Tulving 1972: 389). This type of memory is necessarily acquired by direct (perceptual) experience and is “predominantly represented in the form of (visual) images” (Conway 2005: 613). Episodic memories are organised thematically as ‘life-time periods’ (such as ‘childhood’, ‘when I was at school’, ‘after I got married’ and so on) within which are significant milestones (such as ‘first-times’, ‘success/failure’ and ‘turning-points’), in addition to a collection of less significant memories (Conway and Pleydell-Pearce 2000). Semantic memories, in contrast, are memories of “concepts, relations, quantities, events, facts, propositions, and so on, detached from autobiographical reference” (Tulving 1972: 389) which are not necessarily accompanied by an indication of their mode or context of acquisition, and may be ‘learnt’ either by direct or indirect means. According to Conway, semantic memories are stored as “conceptual (gist) representations” without accompanying ‘event specific knowledge’ (2005: 608).

By examining elicited life-narratives, psychologists have inferred the phenomenological characteristics of the two types of memory based on their narrative characteristics. For example, episodic memories are typically accompanied by descriptions of spatial imagery, sensory perceptual detail, and

---

47 A parallel distinction can be found in philosophical accounts of remembering. Ryle, for example, identifies two types of recollection: one that can be paraphrased as ‘knowing’, and another as a form of imagining, or ‘picturing’ of “what I myself have seen, heard, done and felt” (1949: 258).
emotional intensity that are collectively referred to as ‘event specific knowledge’ (ESK) (Rubin 2006, Conway 2005). A tendency for episodic memories to exhibit ‘narrative coherence’ and reflect an internal vantage (Heaps and Nash 2001) have also been noted.\(^48\) Although the descriptions of autobiographical narration in the psychology literature do not engage directly with the notion of evidential stance, it is clear that the basis on which the two types of autobiographical memory are differentiated reflects a contrast that is also fundamental in evidential semantics. Indeed, the key characteristics of episodic and semantic memories are précised by the terms ‘remember’ and ‘know’ memories adopted by Hyman et al (1988) and Rajaram (1993), which infer the fundamentally evidential grounds for their differentiation.

This body of work is of particular interest when considering the contrast between the evidential character of original vs. translated autobiographies hypothesised here. That is, if it is assumed that the memories narrated in original autobiographies comprise (predominantly) ‘remember’ memories, whereas the memories narrated in translated autobiographies resemble ‘know’ memories, and given that the two types of memory have been found to exhibit qualitatively different narrative characteristics (in terms of ‘event specific knowledge’, coherence and vantage), it seems reasonable to suggest that textual analysis of original vs. translated autobiographies might reveal contrasting narrative characteristics that correspond to the ‘remember’ vs. ‘know’ distinction.

As an aside, it is also of interest to note that there is a suggestion that ‘acquired’ memories – that is, memories that have been imaginatively reconstructed on the basis of hearsay or other evidence (such as photographs) but which are believed by the narrator – tend to share the same narrative characteristics as ‘true’ memories. However, ‘false’ memories, known to their narrator to be false, tend to reveal themselves as such by an absence of detailed event specific knowledge and narrative coherence (Johnson et al 1988, Heaps and Nash 2001, Rubin et al 2003).\(^49\) It has also been hypothesised that instances of ‘confabulation’ are indentifiable by the adoption of an ‘observer’ rather than

\(^{48}\) Similar characteristics are also identified in Ryle’s epistemologically-grounded account of recollection, in which he notes that experiential memories can be recalled “relatively vividly, relatively easily and relatively connectedly” (1949: 258).

\(^{49}\) Such research has applications in forensic linguistics, for example in analysis that aims to determine the veracity of witness statements (Olsson 2004: 121).
‘experiencer’ vantage (Heaps and Nash 2001). Although these are preliminary observations, such research is of potential interest in considering whether the translator of an autobiography entertains the memories as ‘knowledge’, ‘acquires’ the memories through a kind of imaginative projection (based on an identifying mechanism), or undergoes a psychological process that resembles ‘confabulation’.

However, the first step towards such enquiry is to develop a framework that will facilitate the empirical observation of relations between author/translator and narrated memories in original vs. translated autobiographies. From a methodological point of view, while any of the features of episodic memories mentioned above are potential targets, an exhaustive analysis of manifestations of ‘event specific knowledge’, which is not typically associated with any uniquely identifiable grammatical or lexical instantiation, is impracticable. For this reason the analysis will be limited, in the present thesis, to two types of construction: those that report memories explicitly as such, using verbs of recollection (termed REMEMBER-constructions), and those that describe how a remembered experience seemed to the autobiographical subject (SEEM-constructions). There are theoretical and methodological reasons for this selection.

Firstly, the report of memories and description of how remembered experiences seemed are regarded as the archetypal components of an autobiographical narrative. Examples taken from the ECC data illustrate the interaction of these two key facets of autobiographical narration.

(1) I can clearly remember wanting to have a hundred pounds when I was young. It seemed like a good amount to be aiming for. [EE1]

(2) I remember, years ago, how natural it seemed to me that our family should be a hub of activity, and that it should go on like that forever. [JE7]

In (1) and (2), the SEEM-construction describes aspects of the remembered experience introduced by the REMEMBER-construction, as it was apprehended by the experiencing self, thereby supplying the ‘event specific knowledge’ that is

---

50 The texts included in the English Comparable Corpus (ECC) and Japanese Comparable Corpus (JCC) are listed in Appendix B.
characteristic of episodic autobiographical memories, rather than ‘gist’ representations (cf. Conway 2005).\textsuperscript{51}

Secondly, acts of remembering and judgements of seeming are private, unknowable and externally imperceptible, their use typically presupposes privileged access to the consciousness of the experiencer and, therefore, their use is strongly associated with the first person (Brinton 1980: 370, Bal 1985: 111). Since remembering and seeming are indexed to an experiencing self, it is not usually possible to talk about what other people remember or how things seem to someone else.\textsuperscript{52} Therefore, the narration of experiences of remembering and seeming of an OTHER is regarded as an epistemically complex situation in which a translator’s negotiation of position may be foregrounded.

Thirdly, a preliminary search of the data confirms that both REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions occur frequently in autobiographies and therefore provide a substantial yield of data (cf. Semino and Short 2004). Both types of construction are readily identifiable in both English and Japanese and therefore easily retrieved using corpus-browsing software.

However, mindful of the particular constraints operational in translation – i.e. the translator is required to adopt the discursive position of the autobiographical subject, and is not free to signal an explicitly reportive stance within the body of the translation – it is unlikely that a simple comparison of the frequencies of REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions will, in itself, prove a fruitful undertaking. Thus, the present framework aims to exploit subtle indicators of evidential stance-taking by examining patterns of complementation in REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions. In this regard, a final benefit of working with constructions used to narrate remembering and seeming, is that they allow a significant degree of flexibility in terms of the complement structures they accept, and therefore allow subtle variations in the construal of author/translator’s relationship with the remembered experience.

\textsuperscript{51} Wierzbicka’s observation that a key feature of an experiential memory is knowledge of ‘what it was like’ (2007: 24), also suggests that descriptions of how a remembered experience seemed can be considered an archetypal form of ‘event specific knowledge’.

\textsuperscript{52} Exceptions may occur where particular discoursal conventions allow; for example in the case of omniscient fictional narration or translation. It may also be possible to talk about the memories of others where special access is assumed on the grounds of physical proximity (e.g. co-habitating family members), or expertise (e.g. authorised biographer), as described by Kamio (1997).
2.3. Evidential Stance and Complementation

Although evidential stance-taking prototypically entails explicit grammatical or lexical indication of the specific source (I read in the newspaper, My friend told me) or mode of acquisition of knowledge (I saw, I dreamt), Aikhenvald (2004/2006) observes that “meanings to do with how people know things may [also] be expressed in ... indirect way[s]” by non-evidential categories including tense, mood, voice, demonstratives, complementation, nominalisation and person-marking, which “frequently acquire evidential extensions” (ibid. 11). Aikhenvald does not regard such extended uses as part of an ‘evidential system’ proper, but rather as an ‘evidential strategy’ (ibid.). In relation to complementation, for example, Aikhenvald observes that in certain languages “the choice of a complementation strategy correlates with the expressions of ways in which information was obtained” (ibid.).

Thompson (2002) concurs that complementation can function as an indicator of evidential stance: “what has been described under the heading of complementation can be understood in terms of epistemic/evidential/evaluative formulaic fragments expressing speaker stance toward the content of a clause” (ibid. 125). The way in which complementation functions as a stance-taking strategy is apparent in cases where a verb allows speakers to choose between more than one possible complement clause. As Verspoor puts it:

within the functionalist/cognitive paradigm it is generally accepted that if one verb can be followed by more than one type of complement clause, there must be some meaning difference between the sentences, usually with pragmatic effect.

(2000: 202)

---

53 The term ‘complement’ is interpreted variably in the literature, and there is a lack of consensus regarding what the category refers to (see Thompson 2002). Although Dixon’s definition of complements as clausal elements that occur in an object position – “a complement construction involves two verbs ... the complement-taking verb, in the main cause [and] the verb in the complement clause” (2008: 9) – is applicable to the English data, a somewhat flexible approach to the possible realisations of an ‘object complement’ will be adopted in relation to the Japanese data, in which stance-marking may be realised by patterns of nominalisation in the object (Narrog 2009: 211). As Achard suggests: “the eclecticism of its possible forms indicates that the definition of a complement clause needs to remain independent from any specific morphosyntactic realization” (2007: 783-4).
That is, reflecting the human capacity to structure, or construe, a given experience in alternate ways, “when we use a particular construction or grammatical morpheme, we thereby select a particular image to structure the conceived situation” (Langacker 1991: 12). In the case of complement structures, for example, Langacker argues that they are “meaningful and contribute to the conceptual import of the constructions in which they occur” (1995: 5). The present study, following the cognitivist principle that grammatical structure reflects conceptual structure (Langacker 1987, 1991, 2008), shares the assumption that complement choice is meaningful and, on this basis, interprets respective complement forms as having particular ‘conceptual import’, particularly in the evidential relations in which they position the speaker with respect to the content of the complement clause.  

In the analysis of REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions in original and translated autobiographies, particular attention will be paid to object complements which construe either an ‘experiential’ vs. ‘non-experiential’ stance with respect to the memory being reported/described. For example, in English, ing-complements (as in I remember thinking) are considered to construe an experiential stance, whereas that-complements (as in I remember that) construe a non-experiential stance. In Japanese, the nominalising complements no and koto are considered to mark experiential and non-experiential stances respectively. The basis for this characterisation is elaborated below, with reference to the literature on complementation in general and autobiographical recollection in particular.

There is a significant number of studies characterising the conceptual import of complement constructions in English, often using binary oppositions to describe the contrast effected by the choice of one complement versus another. For example, Vendler (1967) distinguishes between ‘event’ vs. ‘proposition’ and, further, between ‘directly perceived’ vs. ‘indirectly perceived’ events (a distinction also made by Borkin 1973 and Langacker 1991). Bolinger (1974) offers a characterisation in terms of a ‘percept’ vs. ‘concept’ contrast, whereas Givón  

---

54 With the exception of Olohan and Baker (2000), there has been little attention paid to complementation structures in translation, and no known interpretation of complementation strategies in translation in terms of evidential stance.  
55 In the particular case of verbs of perception, Langacker concurs with Borkin (1973) that the choice of complementiser is related to whether the stimulus entity or event was directly perceived or not (1991: 450).
interprets patterns of complementation in terms of “quotation under speaker’s perspective” and “quotation detached from speaker’s perspective” (1993: 23-27). Other accounts interpret complement choice as a perspectival phenomenon, making reference to ‘subjectivity’ (Vesterinen 2010), ‘vantage’ (Achard 1998, 2002, 2007; Langacker 2008) and ‘distance’ (Borkin 1973, Verspoor 2000). Langacker, for example, suggests that “constructions differ as to which vantage point is reflected in the form of the complement clause” (2008: 447), an interpretation developed at length by Achard (1998, 2002, 2007). Borkin argues that complement choice is linked to the ‘directness’ of an experience and can therefore also be linked to relative conceptual distance (1973: 46).

Synthesising these accounts, the contrast between an *ing* vs. *that* complement in structuring a proposition can be summarised thus: an *ing*-complement, being durative in character, is associated with directly perceived events and implies an indexical (evidential) relationship, between the speaker and the proposition being expressed, which is characterised by physical and conceptual proximity (Langacker 2008: 443-4). A *that*-complement is associated with indirectly perceived events, implies detachment from the speaker, and situates the speaker and the event in a relatively distal relation (ibid.). As Verspoor summarises, the choice of a *that*-clausal complement

serves to objectify the conception of the proposition expressed (Langacker 1991: 447) and is therefore the most conceptually **distant** of the complement constructions ... therefore, when using a sentence with a *that* clause, a speaker construes the main event as an event in which the subject does not directly interact with the event or the state of affairs itself, but with the symbolic representation thereof.

(2000: 217)

Although the focus here is primarily on evidential aspects of stance-taking, it is also of interest to note that Storms (1966: 262) attributes the respective complement forms meanings that can be considered affective in character, suggesting that *that-

---

56 Revealingly, Quirk et al note a correlation between the progressive aspect and “vividness of description, emotional colouring, and emphasis” (1972: 93), the very characteristics that, in the cognitive psychology literature, are associated with the narration of episodic autobiographical memories.
clause complements are “less personal, less familiar ... less emotive” than ing-complements, and may therefore be associated with lesser speaker ‘involvement’.

Accounts of complementisers in Japanese are based on similar contrasts (Horie 1993, 2000; Suzuki 2000b, Ono 2004, Shinzato 2004 among others). Horie’s account of perception verbs in English and Japanese, for example, confirms that similar iconic principles motivate the use of complementisers “to encode the ontological distinction between Directly Perceived Events and Indirectly Perceived Events” in both English and Japanese (1993: 225). The difference between the clausal nominalisers no and koto, which are of particular interest here, is summarised by Narrog (2009):

Modern Japanese has two major forms that serve to nominalise, and make complements of, non-nominal propositions, namely the particle no and the noun koto ‘thing’ ... The standard view is that no involves direct experience, while koto is used for complements of indirect experience, indicating psychological distancing from the proposition by the speaker.

(2009: 211)

However, as in the case of complementation in English, the circumstances in which one or the other of these nominalisers is selected is not straightforward, and there is a substantial body of literature that attempts to describe the core contrast expressed by no vs. koto (see Kuno 1973, Josephs 1976, Akatsuka-McCawley 1978a, 1978b; Horie 1993, 2000; Suzuki 2000b, Ono 2005).

In his exploration of the semantic basis of complementation from a cognitive/functional perspective, Horie (2000: 11) observes that the dichotomies of percept vs. concept (Bolinger 1968, 1974) and event vs. proposition (Vendler 1967), which are in evidence in English complementation, can also be used to interpret nominalised complement clauses in Japanese. According to Horie, no is used to construe a (concrete, directly perceived) event and koto a fact or (abstract, indirectly perceived) proposition. The contrast between no and koto has also been described in relation to first-person vs. third-person evidential bases (Josephs 1976, Suzuki 2000b, Ono 2005) and the distinction between self vs. other-oriented knowledge (Akatsuka-McCawley 1978a, 1978b; Maynard 1997). The parallels
between these accounts and those of English *ing* vs. *that* complementation are clearly evident.

An additional point of convergence in accounts of the meanings of *ing*/*that* and *no*/*koto* complements is in the types of verbs with which they typically occur. In English, *ing*-complements are strongly associated with verbs of perception such as *see*, whereas *that*-complements are strongly associated with verbs of cognition such as *know* (Langacker 1991: 440-2). Similarly, in Japanese, the verb *miru* ‘see’ is strongly associated with *no*-complements, whereas *shiru* ‘know’ is prototypically accompanied by a *koto*-complement (Horie 2000: 15). While verbs of perception and cognition demonstrate strong co-occurrence correlations with the respective types of complement – recalling the fact that memories can be either perception-based (episodic) or knowledge-based (semantic) – verbs of recollection such as English *remember* and Japanese *oboreru* can take both *ing*/*that* and *no*/*koto* complements (Van Valin and Wilkins 1993, Kuno 1973: 221).

In selecting between complements, as suggested by the accounts cited here, evidential relations play a significant role. However, it is important to bear in mind that an ‘experiential’ vs. ‘non-experiential’ construal effected by the structure of an object complement does not necessarily reflect the actual evidential basis or mode of acquisition of the memory being reported. That is, in both English and Japanese, an autobiographical memory that was acquired by direct perception can be reported using either an experiential or non-experiential (or, ‘propositional’) construal (Lyons 1982: 107-8). The choice of a non-experiential construal to frame an experiential memory may be, suggests Kuno (1973: 218), linked to a range of “idiosyncratic” factors, including rhetorical, interpersonal, psychological and other influences that motivate the speaker to adopt a position of relative distance (cf. also Suzuki 2000b).57

On the other hand, a memory acquired by indirect, non-experiential means, such as hearsay, cannot, in normal circumstances, be construed using an experiential complement structure. To illustrate, it is feasible that an elderly person might recall when they were born – a semantic (‘know’) memory, acquired after the event by hearsay and unaccompanied by ‘event specific knowledge’ – using a

57 Ono’s (2005) examination of *no* and *koto* in third-person fictional narratives leads him to conclude that psychological factors such as narrator-character empathy are a contributing factor in complement selection.
propositional construal such as I remember that I was born in 1919. However, an experiential construal, such as I remember being born in 1919, while grammatically acceptable, is pragmatically illogical. The same asymmetry is also apparent in Japanese. Knowledge that was acquired by direct perceptual, experiential means can be construed by either a no or koto nominaliser, whereas knowledge that was obtained by non-experiential means cannot be construed by an experiential construction (Suzuki 2000b: 1611-2).

2.4. Analysis I – Reported memories: REMEMBER-constructions

The first part of the framework proposes the analysis of memories reported in ‘REMEMBER-constructions’, constructions that are indexed to the autobiographical subject’s narrating self (i.e. reflecting a present temporal vantage) and which comprise a verb of recollection and its object. The present analysis will examine REMEMBER-constructions that incorporate the most frequently used verbs of recollection in the present data set: the verb remember in the English data, and the verbs oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru in the Japanese. Although a verb of recollection always frames the knowledge it reports as having been sourced in the memory of the narrator, as discussed above, the structure of the object of the verb, which conveys the content of a particular memory, may construe aspects of the narrator’s relationship with the memory in ways that are potentially significant when considering translation. Some salient features of REMEMBER-constructions incorporating the verb remember in English and oboeru in Japanese, are provided below.

(a) remember

While an analysis of all verbs of recollection in the English Comparable Corpus (ECC) is desirable, in order to allow a more in-depth treatment, the analysis here focuses

---

58 The difference in these two types of memory is described by Hyman et al (1998) as the difference between a “personal memory” and “self-knowledge”.

59 Since REMEMBER-constructions are less frequently found in the Japanese Comparable Corpus (JCC) than the ECC, the analysis reported in Chapter 4 examines all three of these verbs in order to ensure that a similar volume of data is examined in both cases.
exclusively on the most frequently occurring verb of recollection in the ECC, *remember*.\(^60\)

*Remember* is the most frequently occurring verb of recollection in English – a class of verbs that includes *remind, recall, recollect* and *forget* (Amberber 2007b) – and one of the most frequently occurring of all types of verbs, featuring in the list of 100 most common verbs found in the British National Corpus (BNC) (Leech et al 2001). An examination of its distribution in various sub-corpora of the BNC reveals that while *remember* occurs more than twice as frequently in spoken as in written discourse, it shows a markedly high frequency of occurrence in biographical texts and, as might be expected, a higher frequency still in autobiographies.\(^61\)

Although the literature on verbs of recollection is less comprehensive than that relating to verbs of cognition (*think, know*) and sensory perception (*see, hear*), *remember* has been discussed at some length. Referred to variously as a “retrospection verb” (Quirk et al 1985: 1193), “private verb” of cognition or mental process (Quirk et al 1985: 1181, Biber 1988: 242), and verb of “mental” or “retrospective perception” (Fanego 1996, Santos 1998), *remember* has been much investigated from the point of view of its conceptual semantics (Lakoff 1990), in terms of the relationship between memory and language from a cross-linguistic perspective (Pishwa ed. 2006, Amberber 2007a) and, of particular interest here, its complement-taking behaviour (Wierzbicka 1972, 2007; Jørgensen 1990, Van Valin and Wilkins 1993, Tao 2001, 2003 and Zalizniak 2007).

*Remember* has been much investigated from the point of view of its complement-taking behavior, perhaps as a consequence of the variety of object complements it accepts.\(^62\) According to Dixon, it can take either a noun phrase (NP)/pronoun or one of three complement clauses as its object:

---

\(^60\) There are 632 instances of *remember*, 128 of *remind*, 78 of *recall*, 5 of *recollect*, and 166 of *forget* in the ECC.

\(^61\) A search for all word forms of the verb *remember* in the spoken sub-corpus of the BNC returned a frequency of 540 instances per million words, but only 228 per million words in the written sub-corpus. However, when examining biographical texts in isolation from other written genres, *remember* occurs with a frequency of 429 per million words. Although the BNC does not code biographical and autobiographical texts separately, in a manually defined sample sub-corpus of autobiographical texts, *remember* occurs with a frequency of 642 per million words, a higher frequency than in biographical texts, and even higher than in spoken discourse.

\(^62\) Although *remember* accepts all three types of complement described here, other verbs of recollection, such as *recall*, accept only *that* and *-ing* complements, precluding the interpretation of *recall* with an intention; hence the unacceptability of *I recall to lock the door*. 
One can remember (or forget) just the fact that something happened, or else the details of the activity involved; for example I remembered that I have visited Paris (but couldn’t recall anything I did there) and I remembered visiting Paris (and had a clear recollection of every part of the holiday). English is perhaps unusual in also permitting a potential complement clause, as in I remembered to lock the door.

(2008: 28)

Although remember accepts what Dixon terms ‘fact’ (that), ‘activity’ (ing) and ‘potential’ (to) complements, potential complements are not relevant in the framework developed here since the present study examines only recollective uses of remember. Of key significance to the present enquiry are ‘activity’ and ‘fact’ complements whose character, as Dixon’s description above suggests, corresponds to characterisations of episodic vs. semantic autobiographical memories: the memory of a visit to Paris construed by an ing-complement is associated with “a clear recollection of every part of the holiday”, i.e. ‘event specific knowledge’. Wierzbicka (1988) makes a parallel observation about the contrast between what she terms ‘experiential’ and ‘factual’ uses of remember:

if I remember THAT I did something I know that I did it but I do not necessarily have a mental picture of myself doing it; if, however, I remember DOING something, then I have a mental picture of myself doing it.

(1988: 71)

The contrast in the way in which recalled memories are construed by ing vs. that complements has been explored in a number of other studies (Lyons 1982, Van Valin and Wilkins 1993, Tao 2001, 2003 and Zalizniak 2007). Lyons (1982) characterises the distinction between the two complements as a ‘non-propositional’ (incorporating ‘experiential’ and ‘observational’ construals) vs. ‘propositional’ contrast. Zalizniak (2007) similarly interprets the contrast between a participial ing-complement vs. that-clause complement in terms of an ‘experiential’ vs.

---

63 Lyons’ (1982) account draws on Kuroda’s (1973) distinction between the adoption of an ‘experiential’ and ‘non-experiential’ point of view in Japanese.
Van Valin and Wilkins’ (1993) approach to the characterisation of the syntax and semantics of remember argues that the object complement directs the interpretation of the verb, such that an *ing*-complement indicates a ‘perceptual’ interpretation of remember which is associated with the semantic primitive SEE – *John saw/remembered Fred leaving the party early* (ibid. 517) – and a *that*-complement directs a ‘cognitive/propositional’ interpretation that is associated with the semantic primitive KNOW – *John knew/remembered that he had closed the door* (ibid.) These accounts of the complement-taking behaviour of remember provide a linguistically-grounded explanation for the contrast described in the cognitive psychology literature between ‘remember’ vs. ‘know’ memories, and concur with interpretations of *ing*/*that* complements provided in 2.3.

Thus, drawing on accounts of complementation in general and remember-complementation in particular, the present framework proposes the comparison of patterns of use of object complements in REMEMBER-constructions in original vs. translated autobiographical data, suggesting that *ing*-complements offer a construal of the relationship between the narrator and the memory that is ‘perceptual’, or more broadly-speaking, ‘experiential’ in character, whereas *that*-complements construe a memory as being ‘propositional’ or ‘non-experiential’ in character. Examples (3) and (4), taken from the ECC data, illustrate this contrast.

(3) I remember feeling a tingle in my spine, but I was too drugged to really feel the pain. [JE5]

(4) I remember that it was cool but bright, incredibly bright. [JE2]

In both (3) and (4), the reporting clause I remember indicates that the content being narrated is sourced in the narrator’s memory, and as such both examples might be regarded as expressing the same evidential stance: i.e. ‘memory evidence’ (Jakobson 1957/1971). However, the choice of object complement reveals a contrast in the narrator’s construal of the memory being reported. Although the mode of acquisition of the memories reported in (3) and (4) is the same – both are

---

64 Interestingly, Zalizniak also characterises this contrast, in passing, in terms of the adoption of an autobiographical vs. biographical stance (2007: 104).
based on sensory-perceptual experience – in (3), the participial ing-complement directs the focus of the description to the narrator’s sensory perceptual experience of a tingling sensation. This type of memory is strongly indexed to the experiencing-self, and is considered to reflect the adoption of an experiential evidential stance.

In (4), although the memory of weather conditions was acquired by direct perceptual experience (the context in which this construction occurs strongly suggests an experiential basis), the that-clausal complement frames the memory of the weather conditions as a fact-type proposition, and as such is considered to reflect the adoption of a non-experiential stance. In (4), the focus is not on the experience of ‘coolness’ or ‘brightness’, but rather on the knowledge that it was cool but bright.

In addition to experiential and propositional/non-experiential object complements, which are the most immediately interesting in terms of tracing the author/translator’s evidential stance, remember also occurs with other objects, including noun phrase (NP) and wh-clausal objects. Indeed, according to Tao’s examination of remember in a corpus of spoken English, such cases – which he terms ‘non-complements’ – are in the majority (2001: 127). (5) and (6) exemplify these.

(5) I remember the women’s gym [EE5]

(6) I don’t remember why Graham punched me [EE2]

NP objects, such as in (5), have received little attention in accounts of the syntactic behaviour of remember, perhaps because their grammatical structure does not construe a particular relationship between the narrator and the memory. Zalizniak notes that the relationship between NP objects and the main verb is somewhat “vague” as compared to object complements whose structure directs a particular interpretation (2007: 105). However, while the NP object in (5) effaces the relationship between the narrator and memory, its selection is nonetheless regarded as a potentially significant choice, and patterns of use of this type of

---

65 This characterisation of the perceptual quality associated with recollection resonates with characterisations of remember as a verb of ‘mental perception’ (Rogers 1971, Fanego 1996, Santos 1998).
object will also be explored in detail in Chapter 4. Finally, wh-clausal objects, such as in (6), which are most often associated with negative REMEMBER-constructions, will also be examined.

(b) oboeru
Although three Japanese verbs of recollection will be examined in Chapter 4, oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru, the discussion here will focus on oboeru, the most frequently used, for reasons of brevity. The types of object that occur with oboeru are similar to those described for remember: two complement structures that are interpreted with reference to an experiential vs. non-experiential/propositional contrast, NP objects and an equivalent to the wh-clausal object. (7) to (10) are examples of no-clause, koto-clause, NP and wh-clausal objects.

(7) 父が爆笑したのを覚えている [EJ6]
   Chichi ga bakushou shita no o oboeitiru
   I remember my father burst out laughing

(8) 一時はてんやわんやだった事を覚えている [EJ2]
   Ichiji wa tenya wa nyanyan datta koto o oboeitiru
   I remember that at one time things were chaotic

(9) かびくさい臭いを覚えている [EJ5]
   kabi kusai nioi wo oboeitiru
   I remember a musty smell

(10) 総会が何時間続いたのか覚えていない [EJ2]
   soukai ga nanjikan tsuzuita no ka oboeinai
   I don’t remember how many hours the general meeting went on for

In (7), the no-clause object directs the focus of the description to the narrator’s perception of her father bursting out laughing, whereas in (8), the koto-clause object reports a memory of the knowledge of a chaotic family situation, rather than the narrator’s experience of it. Although both (7) and (8) report memories that

---

66 A more detailed treatment of each of the three verbs can be found in Chapter 4.
were presumably acquired by direct personal experience, (7) effects an experiential construal whereas (8) effects a non-experiential construal. In the case of (9), although the memory of a smell is highly likely be experiential, the NP object construal effaces the experiential link between the narrator and the memory, instead focusing attention on the remembered *phenomenon*. In (10), the *wh*-clause object is linked to the negated reporting clause *don’t remember* and therefore not regarded as optional.

Other possible objects in *REMEMBER*-constructions with *oboeru* include the complementiser *tokoro* – a relatively infrequently used form that specifies that the object was visually perceived (Horie 2000: 17) – and the quotative complementiser particle *to*, which is typically found with verbs of speaking (*iū*, ‘say’) and thinking (*omou* ‘think’) (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 478-480) but can also be used with verbs of recollection. Although infrequent, the particles *you ni* and *to shite* may also be found in the object of verbs of recollection, used to indicate a similarity relation which might be glossed as ‘as’. These object types will be discussed as they arise in Chapter 4.

2.5. Analysis II – Represented memories: *SEEM*-constructions

The second part of the analytical framework focuses on the representation of memories by ‘*SEEM*-constructions’: inferential descriptions of how a remembered experience seemed to the autobiographical subject’s experiencing self (i.e. reflecting a past temporal vantage).

Descriptions of seeming are very interesting from a philosophical point of view. Because it is not possible to know how things seem to another person, *SEEM*-propositions are non-verifiable and non-falsifiable (Viberg 2005), and, if seeming is considered in terms of qualia, *SEEM*-propositions can be regarded as intrinsic to the very instantiation of a self (cf. Nagel 1974). Seeming is predicated on judgements of similarity and therefore always presupposes the presence of a judging subject (cf. Kuroda 1973: 388). For this reason, Brinton ascribes particular significance to *SEEM*-constructions in her analysis of the narrative representation of perception:

---

67 The term ‘represented memories’ is an adaptation of Brinton’s term ‘reflective represented perception’, which refers to a mode of consciousness in which perceptions and ‘reflective thoughts’ merge, and which is narrated by verbs of seeming and complementisers such as *like* and *as if* (1980: 377).
“because of its essential link with the subject of consciousness ... something must ‘seem’ to someone; it cannot just ‘seem’” (1980: 375-6). In terms of a link to the qualities of autobiographical memory, as mentioned in 2.2., seeming can be interpreted as an archetypal form of ‘event specific knowledge’, augmenting a narrative with perceptual, emotional and other details. It is therefore unsurprising that autobiographies exhibit a markedly high frequency of the verb seem (Semino and Short 2004, Leech et al 2001), suggesting how integral descriptions of seeming are in narrating the self.

Descriptions of seeming have interested linguists in both English and Japanese (cf. Kuroda 1973, 1976; Kuno 1973), and comparisons of seeming in the two languages have proved illuminating, not least in relation to contrasting the boundaries of selfhood as conceptualised in English and Japanese (Kamio 1994, 1995, 1997; Quinn 1994). The functions of seem-constructions have been examined with reference to particular discourse contexts, predominantly as ‘metadiscourse’ in scientific and academic writing (Swales 1990, Hyland 1998, Biber 2006) and in literary fiction (Genette 1972/1980, Rimmon-Kennan 1983). With particular reference to translation, although there has been little work that specifically deals with seem-constructions from the point of view of speaker stance, notable exceptions include studies of hedging in academic and scientific discourse (Skrandies 2007, Kranich 2011). However, it is interesting to note that Johansson (2007), Aijmer (2009) and Mushin (2006) observe in passing that seem-propositions tend not to be retained in translation / retellings (see 5.1.3.).

Considering the translation of seeming from the point of view of evidential pragmatics, since descriptions of seeming are indexed to the original author, it might be suggested that seem-constructions present an intricate epistemological nexus in relation to which the translator’s negotiation of position involves a particularly “complex cognitive task” (Goethals and De Wilde 2009). That is, since

---

68 Whitt also suggests that, since the indication of the evidence on which the seem judgement is indexically linked to the speaker, verbs of seeming can be attributed deictic character (2009: 1086).
69 In the case of literary narratives, Genette describes how, when representing the psychological state of a character other than the narrating self, frequent use is made of “modalising locutions (perhaps, undoubtedly, as if, seem, appear) that allow the narrator to say hypothetically what he could not assert without stepping outside internal focalisation” (1972/1980: 202-3), an observation that is repeated by Rimmon-Kenan (1983: 81).
we only know how things seem to ourselves, descriptions of seeming are, like reports of remembering, strongly associated with the first person and, in normal discursive contexts, possible only when the identities of the speaker and the experiencer of the seeming coincide (implying a ‘to me’ relation).

Thus, when a speaker wishes to report how things seem to someone else, certain conditions must be fulfilled. In English, it is pragmatically required that the basis on which the report is made (hearsay or inference) is indicated, unless it is obvious from the context or sanctioned by particular generic conventions (such as in omniscient fictional narration) (cf. Banfield 1981, 1982). In Japanese, it is impossible to make unequivocal statements about how things seem to an OTHER, and there is a grammatical requirement to mark it as outside of the speaker’s personal experience (Kuroda 1973, 1976). Therefore, it is likely that analysis of seem-constructions may throw into relief aspects of the translator’s negotiation of the competing imperatives of everyday evidential norms and the particular discursive conventions of both autobiography and translation. Although translation requires the adoption of the discursive position of the original experiencer, it will be of interest to investigate whether the translated texts in the ECC and JCC construct the kind of “single-consciousness narrator who identifies psychologically and grammatically with the hero” (Fowler 1992: 31, emphasis in original) typical of the shishousetsu fictional autobiographical narrator, or reveals ‘distance’ from the experiencing consciousness.

In the case of remember-constructions, it was argued that, although they are obviously associated with ‘memory evidence’, the structure of the object allows scope for the narrator’s evidential stance in relation to the memory to be revealed in subtle ways. Similarly, while all seem-constructions are associated with ‘inferential evidence’ (Floyd 1999), they allow variable construal of the speaker’s stance with respect to the source and mode of acquisition of the knowledge upon which the seem judgement is based. The verb seem and its respective object complements as found in the English data are described in brief here, and elaborated in detail in Chapter 5. In the Japanese data, the focus will be on the use of a set of evidential clitics – or ‘inferential auxiliaries’ (Riggs 2006: 239) – sou, you, mitai and rashii, all of which have seem-like meaning but subtly differ in their construal of evidential stance.
In English, descriptions of seeming are most often realised using a finite set of verbs, including *look, sound, appear* and *seem*, in conjunction with an object complement clause (Rogers 1970). In this case, *seem* has been selected as the target of analysis since it is the prototypical verb of seeming, can be used to describe experiences based on a wide range of evidential bases (rather than being associated with one sensory modality), is almost always used with the sense of *seem* (unlike verbs such as *look* and *sound* which are frequently used with other, extended meanings), and, importantly, accepts the largest range of object complements of the class.

Widely regarded as “a complex and interesting verb” (Aijmer 2009: 65), *seem* has been discussed at length from the point of view of its epistemic modal (Aijmer 1980, 2009; Usoniene 2000, 2001) and evidential meaning (Chafe 1986, Mithun 1986, Aijmer 1980, 2009; Johansson 2007), and syntactic behaviour (Quirk 1985, Dixon 1991, Olsen 1981, Seppanen 1986). Although *seem* is attributed epistemic modal meaning – it is often used as a hedge (particularly in parenthetical and comment clauses) indicating the speaker’s incomplete commitment to a proposition (Mithun 1986, Aijmer 2009) – in the present analysis, the evidential import of *seem*-constructions is of primary interest.

According to accounts of the evidential import of *seem*, it can describe a speaker’s inference based on direct (visual or other sensory perceptual) observation, indirect (mental/conceptual) perception, or hearsay (Johansson 2007, Aijmer 2009). Reflecting the variety of sources on which *seem*-propositions can be based, *seem* accepts the widest range of complements of the English descriptive perception verbs (*look, sound, feel* and so on) (Whitt 2010). In the ECC data, four types of complementiser are used to introduce the object of *seem*-constructions – *to, that, as* and *like* – as exemplified by (11) to (14) below.

(11) It was very rare to have a cell phone in Japan at that time, but Kuramochi didn’t seem to be remotely bothered about the cost, and he talked to me all the way to his office on the other side of Osaka. [JE6]

---

71 *Seem* has been referred to variously as a ‘descriptive perception verb’ (Rogers 1971), a ‘copulative verb of perception’ (Viberg 1983), ‘evidential perception verb’ (Whitt 2009), and a verb of ‘reflective represented perception’ (Brinton 1980).
He would swagger among the tenements, exposing his tattoos to the world, and it seemed that many of those who saluted him, young and old alike, also had tattoos of some kind. [JE4]

My childhood had gone by without my knowing, and it seemed as if my heart had frozen. [EE4]

The more I worked with Dick Donner, the more he seemed like a fifty-year-old kid in a candy store. [EE3]

In addition to these complement clauses, seem can also be followed directly by an adjective phrase (AP) or NP object, as illustrated by examples (15) and (16), which can be interpreted as zero-to be and zero-that constructions respectively.

My newfound friends seemed high-spirited and daring. [EE2]

In America, it seemed a band could sell a billion records but most people would still have never heard of them. [EE1]

In Chapter 5, the respective complement structures will be discussed in detail with reference to the way in which they construe the narrator/experiencer’s position with respect to the remembered entity or event described in the seem-construction. Particular emphasis will be placed on the construal of the evidential basis (source) of the description; again, particularly in terms of an ‘experiential’ vs. ‘non-experiential’ dichotomy.

A second area of interest in the analysis of seem-constructions in the ECC is the indication of the identity of the experiencer through explicit self-reflexive reference such as to me, as in (17).

It seemed to me that his battle against the state was his way of confirming his raison d’être as a yakuza. [JE4]

Assuming the cognitive complexity of inhabiting the first-person discursive position of an OTHER, patterns of explicit vs. effaced self-reference in seem-constructions in original vs. translated texts are regarded as potential sources of insight into the translator’s negotiation of the position of the experiencing-I. It is possible, for example, that an increased instance of overt self-reflexive reference could reflect
explicitation of the identity of the experiencer motivated by the translator’s fictive/imaginative adoption of the position of that experiencer.

(b) *sou, you, mitai, and rashii*

In Japanese, *SEEM*-constructions are most often realised using grammatical particles rather than lexical verbs. Although verbs such as *niru* ‘resemble’ and *(ni) mieru* ‘look (like)’ can be interpreted as having *seem*-like meaning, the most frequently used indicators of seeming are a set of evidential clitics, including *sou, you, mitai* and *rashii*, all of which are regularly translated into English as *seem* (Asano-Cavanagh 2010: 154, Riggs 2006: 239). Although definitions offered for the respective particles in bilingual dictionaries often overlap, the particles report inferential judgements based on a range of sensory modalities and sources of evidence, and effect subtle differences in the construal of speaker’s evidential stance.

As mentioned already, Japanese has a grammaticalised system for encoding evidentiality that requires speakers to persistently and systematically indicate the evidential basis from which they speak, e.g. whether they speak on the basis of direct perception, perception-based inference, conjecture or hearsay (Aoki 1986, Kamio 1997). Although, as with *seem*, the evidential basis may not be made explicit in constructions using *sou, you, mitai*, and *rashii* (and may or may not be recoverable from context), the respective particles position the speaker and the experience being reported in relation to each other, indicating variable degrees of directness and indirectness in the sources of evidence, and variable degrees of speaker subjectivity (Riggs 2006, Asano-Cavanagh 2010). Just as the constructions *seem to be, seem as if, seem that* and so on construe various conceptualisations of the relationship between narrator and description, *you, mitai, sou*, and *rashii* also point to contrasting stances.\(^2\) The four grammatical particles are exemplified in (18) to (21).

---

\(^2\) *Mitai* is an informal alternative to *you* and therefore, while differing in register, is regarded as reflecting the same evidential stance.
(18) 作曲者として返礼する時、光は心から嬉しそうだった。[JJ7]
Sakkyokusha to shite hanrei suru toki, Hikari wa kokoro kara ureshisou datta.
When he returned the favour as a composer, Hikari seemed really happy.

(19) 僕の身体の芯に、何かしら見慣れないものが腰を据えたようだった。[JJ2]
Boku no karada no shin ni, nanikashira minarenai mono ga koshi o sueta you datta.
Somehow it seemed like something unfamiliar in the core of my body had settled me.

(20) わたしを地面に結びつけていた何かが、ほどけてしまったみたいだった。[EJ5]
Watashi o jimen ni musubitsuketeita nanika ga, hodoketeshimatta mitai datta.
It seemed as though whatever had been tying me to the ground had come undone.

(21) 実績評価はとても重要で秘密のことであるらしかった。[EJ2]
Jisseki hyouka wa totemo jyou de himitsu no koto de aru rashikatta.
It seemed that performance evaluation was very important and secretive.

Although no one-to-one translational correspondence is assumed between, for example, sou constructions and seem + adjectival phrase (AP), or rashii and seem that (as the glosses for the examples might imply), there are noticeable correspondences between the evidential stances construed by certain seem-constructions in English and Japanese.

Ogata (2005) provides a useful overview of the types of evidence upon which seem-constructions using the inferential evidential markers sou, you and its colloquial equivalent mitai, and rashii can be based. Considering eight types of evidential basis – from direct visual, through other sensory perceptual and inferential modalities, to hearsay – Ogata shows that, in the majority of cases, speakers can choose between more than one evidential particle, and in some cases, all four are possible. Assuming that, when there is more than one possible complement clause, there must be a difference in the meaning of each (cf. Langacker 1991), Riggs (2006) and Asano-Cavanagh (2010) attempt to explicate a contrast with reference to the situational and psychological factors that might influence the selection of one or another particle, and the way in which respective particles construe a relationship between the speaker and the seem-proposition,
figured in terms of ‘distance’ and ‘subjectivity’. In Chapter 5, the accounts provided by Ogata (2005) Asano-Cavanagh (2010), and Riggs (2006) are used to highlight salient differences between the four types of construction.

2.6. Application of the Framework
This chapter has outlined the principles of a framework that is designed to probe the translator’s position in relation to the autobiographical narrative. Since the point of departure for this research project is an interest in the epistemology of translated texts in general and autobiographical narratives in particular, the basis of the framework is the examination of the narrator’s relationship with recalled knowledge that originated in “perceivings”, “rememberings”, “imaginings” and “inferrings” (Ryle 1949: 13), in particular, the rememberings and inferrings narrated in original vs. translated texts.

Although the targets of analysis are restricted only to REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions, it has been argued that, in these constructions, various competing conventions converge in a particularly complex and, potentially, particularly illuminating way. That is, when translating the rememberings and seemings of an OTHER, the translator is at once subject to three competing conventions, each of which is assumed to inform his or her adoption of a position: (1) the everyday (cognitively grounded) convention associated with the indication of the evidential basis of knowledge whereby “experiences undergone by ‘self’ and ‘other’ consistently require different evidential choices” (Aikhenvald 2006: 329), (2) the conventions of LeJeune’s autobiographical pact which require the coincidence of the identities of the narrating-I and experiencing-I, and (3) the discursive conventions of translation, which require the translator to adopt the discursive position of the autobiographical subject.

Of particular interest in examining REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions is the relative frequency of constructions that construe a memory from either an ‘experiential’ evidential stance – indexed strongly to the experiencing-self, and ‘immediate’ in character – or a ‘non-experiential’ evidential stance, that may either suggest indirect modes of acquisition, such as hearsay (and therefore ‘mediate’ in character), or the adoption of a relatively ‘distant’ stance in relation to a memory that was acquired directly. Clausal objects occurring in memory-reporting
constructions in the ECC have been differentiated as experiential (ing-clause) vs. non-experiential (that-clause) objects, which parallels the abstract vs. concrete and concept vs. percept dichotomies used to characterise no vs. koto nominalisation. While it should be noted that there is no intention to suggest that there is a direct parity between an ing-clause in English and a no-clause in Japanese, or a that-clause and koto-clause, nor to imply that a no-clause should be translated by an ing-clause or vice versa, it is argued that the similarities in the interpretations of the respective experiential and non-experiential forms are sufficient for the comparison of the relative frequencies of these forms in the ECC and JCC data to be a meaningful index for comparing the profiles of translated vs. non-translated texts in English and Japanese.\footnote{73}

In addition to the examination of complements that are commonly associated with ‘experiential’ vs. ‘non-experiential/propositional’ stances, the analysis will also comment on the frequency and character of NP, wh-clausal, and other objects in the ECC and JCC data, noting patterns of use that may be interpreted vis-à-vis the author/translator’s position in relation to the memories being reported. In the course of applying the framework, comment will also be made on other relevant features of the REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions, such as tense, negation, interaction with auxiliary verbs (can, do), self-reference (to me), and adverbial qualifications describing the clarity of memories (clearly, vaguely, vividly) or emphasising their duration (to this day, even now, still).

The framework will be applied to two comparable corpora – non-translated and translated autobiographies in English (the ECC data) and non-translated and translated autobiographies in Japanese (the JCC data) – and the findings in each case then compared. In preparation for this, Chapter 3 describes the data comprising the respective corpora in detail, and provides an outline of the bi-directional comparable corpus design.

\footnote{73 Although both the lexico-grammatical realisations and norms of use of SEEM-constructions in English and Japanese are significantly different (cf. Kuroda 1973, Iwasaki 1998, Kamio 1994), there are clear parallels in the types of evidential bases and stances construed by SEEM-constructions in the two languages (Achard 2007: 794, Maynard 1996b).}
Chapter 3. A Bi-directional Comparable Corpus of Contemporary Autobiographies in English and Japanese

This procedural chapter describes the design and composition of a purpose-built corpus of original and translated autobiographies in English and Japanese, and a method for applying the analytical framework described in Chapter 2. It addresses some key methodological considerations – such as data selection criteria, comparability and representativeness – and practical issues – including copyright permissions and corpus building – in order to ensure replicability of the study and clarity in relation to the object of investigation.

3.1. Corpus-based Methods in Translation Studies

Computational methods for analysing electronic corpora of texts have been used by linguists for a range of purposes, including the description of naturally occurring language (Sinclair 1991, Biber at al 1998), features of spoken vs. written discourse (Carter and McCarthy 1997) and specific genres (Biber and Finnegan 1989), and diachronic language change (Facchinetti and Rissanen eds. 2006). Such research has been applied in the compilation of usage grammars (Quirk et al 1985) and dictionaries (Sinclair 1995), in the field of language teaching (McCarthy 1998, Aston et al 2004, Granger et al ed. 2003, Sinclair 2004), literary stylistics (Semino and Short 2004, Toolan 2009) and forensic linguistics (Coulthard 1994). Corpus-based methods have also been applied in contrastive studies, where multilingual corpora have been used to identify and describe patterns of similarity and difference between languages in terms of their lexico-syntactic (Aijmer 1998, Johansson and Oksefjell 1998, Johansson 2007a) and generic (Biber 1995) character.

In translation studies, parallel corpora comprising source text (ST) and target text (TT) pairs have been utilised for, among other things, describing patterns of shift in translation. For example, Mason and Serban’s (2003) empirical investigation of ‘distancing’, mentioned in 1.2.2., adopts a parallel corpus approach to identify shifts (from proximal to distal demonstrative relations and vice versa) between ST and TTs. However, as already noted, basing observations on uni-directional parallel data fails to control for the effects of source language (SL) –
target language (TL) transfer, and therefore limits the claims that can be made for translational effects, rather than contrastive differences between languages. Addressing this limitation, bi-directional parallel corpus designs, such as adopted by Goethals (2007) and DeFrancq and Demol (2010), allow the researcher to examine the tendencies observed in each direction of translation and infer, from patterns of a/symmetry, the extent to which they are explained by SL/ST influence vs. translational phenomena.

An alternative approach to the description of translational data using corpus-methods, first advocated by Baker (1993), involves the use of comparable corpora, defined as “two separate collections of texts in the same language: one corpus consists of original texts in the language in question and the other consists of translations in that language from a given source language or languages” (Baker 1995: 234). Multi-source language comparable corpora are particularly useful in identifying features of translations – “patterns which are either restricted to translated text or which occur with a significantly higher or lower frequency in translated text” (ibid. 235) – that are not attributable to “interference from specific linguistic systems” (1993: 243). These patterns can then be used as a basis for making generalisations about the nature of translated texts or, at least, generating hypotheses about the nature of the process and product of translation.

Most notably, the Translational English Corpus (TEC), an on-line, multi-source language corpus of translations in English, has been utilised by a number of researchers seeking to investigate hypothesised translation ‘universals’. Baker (1995), for example, describes the use of corpus analysis software to generate statistical profiles for translated and non-translated texts, using such indices as type-token ratio and lexical density, to explore, among other things, simplification in translation. Subsequently, studies of lexico-grammatical features as diverse as the optional that connective (Olohan and Baker (2000), contracted forms (Olohan 2003) and idiomaticity (Baker 2007) have been successful in describing patterns of similarity and difference in translated vs. non-translated texts. While Baker cautions that “the same surface expression may point to different features or
tendencies” (1995: 180), these studies also offer tentative explanations for the patterns observed.\(^{74}\)

However, multi-source language comparable corpora, such as TEC, have certain limitations. The first pertains to the question of whether, by not controlling for source language, the researcher is prevented from engaging with the possible effects of interference by respective source languages (Pym 2008: 322, Becher 2010: 12). Although large-scale corpus resources such as TEC are able to mitigate this problem by including translations from a number of source languages (currently 40 languages) from unrelated language families, thereby minimising the influence of any one source language (Baker 1993: 245), the possibility that the patterns observed have arisen from the collective influence of the respective source languages and texts comprising the corpus cannot be discounted. In the case of smaller scale corpus studies, which do not contain such a range of texts, this limitation is particularly salient. Studies investigating the features of translated text using mono-source language translational data are especially limited as to what claims they are able to make in relation to translational effects.

For example, Meldrum (2009a, 2009b, 2010), the only known study of the features of translated Japanese using comparable corpus methods, while making claims to have identified ‘translationese’, simultaneously acknowledges that what is being referred to reflects the “specific characteristics of translationese in English-Japanese translation” (2009b: 111). Similarly, Xiao et al (2008) and Xiao’s (2010) study of a corpus of translated Chinese which, in order to “mirror the reality of the world of translations in China” (ibid. 13) comprises 99% English-Chinese translations and 1% translations from other languages, concludes that the features of translational Chinese identified are likely to reflect shifts that are specific to English-Chinese translation, rather than a ‘third code’ (ibid. 29).

A second limitation of multi-source language (mono-target language) comparable corpora is that, even if source language/source text influence is assumed to be largely accounted for by the inclusion of a broad range of source languages, the possibility remains that the patterns observed reflect norms of translation that are specific to the target language. In the case of TEC, for example,

\(^{74}\) For an overview of the use of corpus methods in Translation Studies see Olohan (2004) and Laviosa (2002).
although the translated texts are produced by a large number of translators (more than 200), resident in diverse geographical locations, translating from 40 source languages, it may be that the translations, in sharing the same target language, reflect norms of translation into English rather than translation effects that apply irrespective of the languages involved.\(^7\)

A third limitation arises in the question of the extent to which a reference corpus can be considered comparable. As discussed at length by Laviosa (1997), when comparing translated texts with non-translated texts in the same language, the strength of the findings relies on the degree of comparability of the two data sets, which can be evaluated with reference to a combination of features of the texts themselves (genre, register), biographical details of their authors (gender, age, nationality) and circumstances of production (year and place of publication) amongst other things. When defining what Laviosa terms a ‘translation-dependent comparable corpus’, in which “the non-translational component is modelled on the composition of the translational set” (1997: 293) – for example, TEC is most often used in conjunction with a sub-set of the British National Corpus (BNC) – the researcher aims for comparability of data. However, this is an imprecise science which involves a number of competing variables, the relative significance of each being judged by the researcher.

While it may be unrealistic to suggest that such limitations can be eliminated by careful corpus design alone – hence the argument for replication studies (see Chesterman 2000) – the present study aims to address the points raised above by using a bi-directional mono-source language comparable corpus design, which offers significant potential for the generation of robust findings, and allows a range of permutations of analysis for confirmation and cross-checking in future extensions of the study.\(^7\)

---

\(^7\) In the case of translation into Japanese, for example, a tradition which has historically privileged a style of translation that draws attention to itself as translated Japanese, particular characteristics of honyakugo or honyakuchou ‘translation language’ (often glossed as ‘transationese’) have been identified (see Furuno 2005, Cockerill 2006, Wakabayashi 2005).

\(^7\) The only other known use of a bi-directional comparable corpus to date is Konšalová’s (2007) investigation of explicitation in translation. Aiming to account for SL/ST interference, Konšalová’s research design combines analysis of shifts in Czech-German and German-Czech translations (i.e. bi-directional parallel analysis) with the comparison of the translated and non-translated texts in the respective languages. Although, in this case, limited in terms of the number and length of texts comprising the respective sub-corpora (two texts of approximately 5000 words in each), the
3.2. Corpus Design

3.2.1. A Bi-directional Mono-Source/Mono-Target-language Comparable Corpus

Since the present research project aims to investigate whether there is any textual evidence of a difference in the positioning of an author vs. translator of an autobiography, linked to differences in the author/translator’s relationship with the knowledge being communicated (in terms of its source and mode of acquisition), rather than interlingual transfer between specific languages, a comparable corpus design appears to offer the most potentially productive approach. By comparing patterns of representation of autobiographical experiences in translated autobiographies against a reference corpus of non-translated autobiographies, it may be possible to move towards a distillation of the patterns that are attributable to the mediative process of translation per se, rather than to interlingual transfer. However, given the limitations of multi-source language/mono-target language comparable corpora mentioned above, a bi-directional mono-source language/mono-target language comparable corpus design is proposed.

The bi-directional comparable corpus design proposed here incorporates four sub-corpora: non-translated English texts (EE sub-corpus), Japanese-English translations (JE sub-corpus), non-translated Japanese texts (JJ sub-corpus), and English-Japanese translations (EJ sub-corpus). The JE translational data and EE reference data together comprise the English Comparable Corpus (ECC); the EJ translational data and JJ reference data comprise the Japanese Comparable Corpus (JCC). Importantly, the source texts for the JE and EJ translations comprise the JJ and EE sub-corpora respectively. Fig. 1 shows the four sub-corpora and the relationships between them.

permutations of enquiry facilitated by such a corpus design are likely to be productive in differentiating contrastive linguistic vs. translational effects.
In the present study, the JE and EJ (mono-source language, mono-target language) translational data will be described with reference to EE and JJ comparable data respectively, as indicated by the large arrows, i.e. bi-directional comparable analysis. There are a number of advantages to this approach.

Although beyond the scope of the present study, this corpus design also supports other permutations of analysis, for example, building in the possibility of source text consultation, either for quick reference purposes or extended bi-directional parallel analysis (as the dashed arrows indicate). The respective translational sub-corpora can also be compared with existing corpora such as the newly developed multi-source language autobiographical sub-corpus of TEC, or a manually defined sub-corpus of autobiographies translated into Japanese in the Kotonoha Balanced Corpus of Contemporary Written Japanese (BCCWJ), a 30 million word sample of which is accessible on-line.
Firstly, having carried out analysis on both the English (ECC) and Japanese (JCC) data, the patterns observed for respective data sets can be compared. Examining a/symmetry in the findings may help to differentiate the specific effects of English>Japanese or Japanese>English transfer from translational effects per se. That is, if similar tendencies are evident in both cases, it may point towards an explanation in terms of some aspect of the process of translation, rather than either ST/SL influence or target language norms, or, at least, assist with the development of hypotheses to this effect for further testing.

Secondly, using mono-source mono-target language translational data allows better understanding of the possible influence of the source language (Laviosa 1997: 294) and the norms of translation in the target language in each case. Furthermore, because the source texts for each translational sub-corpus are also incorporated into the corpus, the influence of particular STs (in terms of content, author style and so on) is also accounted for.

Thirdly, this design addresses the issue of comparability, since the reference corpora are purpose-built (as opposed to a selection from existing corpus resources) and incorporate texts that are subject to the same selection criteria as the translated texts (see 3.3.1.).

3.2.2. Corpus Size
Digitising the data allows predetermined search targets (REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions) to be retrieved efficiently using the search and sort capabilities of corpus-analysis software. Removing the potential for human error associated with manual searching ensures that all instances of a particular search term are retrieved and, importantly, allows a much larger quantity of data to be processed than would otherwise be the case.

In order to make meaningful generalisations, it is necessary to ensure that each sub-corpus contains a sufficiently large amount of data. However, there is no bench-mark in the literature regarding the minimum recommended size of a corpus, since the frequency of occurrence of different targets of investigation will affect the minimum size required in any one case. For example, when examining lexical

Purpose-built corpora of self-translated autobiographies or ghostwritten autobiographies would further exploit the potential of the present data set (see 6.2. Further Work).
patterning, idiomaticity or collocation, a relatively large corpus is required to
observe patterns (Biber et al 1998: 249). Conversely, when examining common
grammatical structures or very frequently occurring lexical items, a smaller corpus
will yield substantial data. Therefore, while it might be assumed that ‘bigger is
better’ as far as size of corpus is concerned – since increasing the size of a corpus
allows for greater confidence in the significance of observations, and might be
linked to improved ‘representativeness’ (Biber 1993) – it can also be argued that a
smaller, robustly-designed corpus is preferable in cases where an excessive number
of search results would compromise the level of detail of analysis. In addition to the
time taken to analyse search results, the further practical constraint of the time
taken to prepare texts for inclusion in a corpus is also a limiting factor.

Since the search targets specified in the analytical frameworks to be applied
here are high frequency items – for example seem occurs at a rate of approximately
1 instance per 1,000 words in both the BNC (Leech et al 2001: 260) and the English-
Norwegian Parallel Corpus (Johansson 2007b: 117) – and the methodology requires
detailed manual analysis of concordance lines (rather than computational
measures that can be calculated instantaneously), a corpus of one million words of
English (distributed evenly between the translated and non-translated sub-corpora),
and an equivalent sized Japanese corpus, is considered to be a suitable size. In the
case of seem, for example, it might be expected that a corpus of one million words
will yield in the region of 1,000 instances, a figure which is deemed sufficiently
large to allow meaningful observation and comparison of patterns of use, and yet
small enough to allow detailed analysis of every instance. Therefore, nominally, a
corpus of one million words of English and an equivalent amount of Japanese data
is deemed to be the optimum target size.

3.3. Data Collection

3.3.1. Selection Criteria
In the case of comparable corpora, a key design consideration is the maximisation
of comparability (cf. Laviosa 1997) and, to this end, Baker suggests that “both
corpora should cover a similar domain, variety of language and time span, and be
of comparable length” (1995: 234). Since the respective translational and reference sub-corpora in the corpus design proposed here comprise ST-TT pairs, it is assumed that the question of comparability has been addressed to a satisfactory extent. However, in selecting the texts for inclusion it is necessary to define carefully the population from which sample texts are to be drawn.

Sinclair emphasises the need for considered corpus design criteria, suggesting that the quality of results emerging from any study is directly related to the quality of the corpus design (1991: 13). Halverson (1998) also argues that a prerequisite for any corpus-based investigation is the explicit description of the object of study through the “careful and rigorous selection of the criteria used for the construction of the corpora [which], in turn, entails a clear articulation of the basis on which construction criteria are selected” (ibid. 2). With this in mind, this section describes a set of definitional parameters for the population from which texts are to be selected.

A rationale for the selection of the genre of autobiography was provided in Chapter 1 and, as has already been mentioned, only texts translated between English and Japanese are used for the practical reason of researcher competence. The total population of ‘autobiographies translated between English and Japanese’ were further narrowed down using the controls listed below.

**Epistemological Character of Source Text**

As was mentioned in 1.3.2., an autobiography is understood to be the true story of a single individual, told by that individual (Lejeune 1975/1989). However, in practice, the question of what constitutes an autobiography is not always clear-cut, with cases of fictional autobiography, autobiographical fiction, ghostwritten and co-written autobiography, and collections of group autobiographical experiences complicating the picture. As far as possible, only texts that correspond closely to the prototypical definition of an autobiography were included in the ECC and JCC corpora, for the reason that the other autobiographical forms mentioned above have differing epistemological character, a factor that is of key significance in this research project. Furthermore, since only narratives that were written for the purpose of publication as an autobiography were to be included, autobiographical accounts based on testimonies, diaries, and letters were rejected.
Epistemological Character of Translation

Given the hypothesis developed in Chapter 1, which assumes a difference in the epistemological character of a translation vs. self-translation, no self-translations were included. For similar reasons, no translations by groups of translators were included.\(^{78}\)

Synchronicity

To control for the continuous process of change in language use, styles of autobiographical writing / translation, and so on, a synchronic corpus of contemporary work is proposed. ‘Contemporary’ is defined here as referring to the period between 1990 and 2010: all texts in the corpus list a date of first publication as 1990 or later. This constraint also ensures that the time lapse between the publication of source texts and translations is limited to a maximum of twenty years. Working with contemporary texts has the additional benefits of reflecting a current rather than historical situation in autobiographical writing and translation, and allows the possibility of making contact with authors and translators.

Competence

To control for competence, only authors writing in their native language or a language of habitual use were included. Similarly, only translations by a translator working in his or her native language or a language of habitual use were considered. Although it is acknowledged that definitions of ‘native language’ and ‘language of habitual use’ are problematic, and such information is not always available in any case, this was controlled as far as possible.

Balance

Questions regarding the extent to which any data set can be regarded as being representative of a larger population have been raised in relation to the use of corpora in translation studies (Halverson 1998, Kenny 2001). Kenny, for example,\(^{78}\)

---

\(^{78}\) This variable was controlled to the extent that it is possible, although it is acknowledged that translations attributed to a single translator may have been produced with substantial consultation with other translators, contributions from editors and so on. While beyond the scope of the present thesis, it is anticipated that exposition of author-translator relationships may be of particular significance in the case of autobiographical translation. See 6.2. for a proposed investigation of degrees of author-translator collaboration (cf. Hermans 2007: 22, Munday 2008: 198) and roles of various participants in the translation process.
argues that the statistical definition of ‘representativeness’ cannot be applied to natural language corpora because many variables act on any set of linguistic data: while the data might be considered ‘representative’ of a given population in terms of one variable, this is unlikely to be the case in terms of all variables (2001: 106). Indeed, Sinclair has previously rejected the usefulness of the notion of representativeness in favour of the careful documentation of the texts comprising a corpus, so that users can make their own judgements as to its fitness as a model for extrapolation (1991:13). However, following Baker’s advice that “the translation corpus should be representative in terms of the range of original authors and of translators” (1995: 23), only one text attributable to a given author or translator was included, in order to avoid over-representation of any one author or translator, and a resulting imbalance in the influence of any one individual on the findings.

The above list of key controls narrowed the definition of the population from which data were selected from an initial specification of ‘autobiographical narratives translated between English and Japanese’. A number of other variables that are not controlled but which are acknowledged to be of potential significance include the following:

- Gender and age of author / translator
- Experience of author / translator
- Nationality and domicile of author / translator
- Regional Englishes (e.g. British English, American English)
- Length of text
- Publishing house

Where available, this information is recorded for individual texts in the ECC and JCC (see Appendix B).

3.3.2. Identification of Texts

Having defined the population from which texts were to be selected, a method was required to identify members of that population. In the first instance, members of the smaller set of translated texts were found by searching two databases of
translations; the UNESCO *Index Translationum* and the Japan Foundation’s *Japanese Literature in Translation Search*. Using the databases’ search tools with a range of queries, two partially overlapping lists of texts were extracted. As neither database is complete, additional searches were also carried out on three major library catalogues – the British Library, US Library of Congress, and Japanese National Diet Library catalogues – and the COPAC catalogue of national and university libraries in the UK. Following consultation with a specialist librarian at the British Library regarding cataloguing conventions for translated texts, a set of search terms was devised in order to identify as many texts fitting the selection criteria as possible. However, as cataloguing conventions are not uniformly applied, not all members of the target population could be retrieved using library catalogues. Finally, the commercial databases of Amazon US, Amazon UK and Amazon Japan were searched using the ‘advanced search’ function with a range of search queries. Long-lists of English-Japanese and Japanese-English translations were compiled from the results of all searches, and their source texts were then identified.

More detailed examination of the listed source texts and translations was then undertaken in order to identify and exclude those that did not conform to all of the controls listed in 3.3.1. Since the bi-directional comparable corpus design requires the use of pairs of texts and translations, only cases in which both source text and translation are compliant were retained. A large number of texts was discounted after closer inspection revealed that the translator was a non-native speaker of the target language, the source text of a recent translation was first published prior to 1990, or the source text was ghost-written (or suspected of being so). Texts were also removed from the list for the following reasons:

- the source text was already translated from another language
- the translation was substantially abridged
- either the source text or translation was out of print or unavailable

---

79 It is accepted that the contribution of editors, co-writers and amanuenses is not always acknowledged in texts, and it is not possible to control for the degree of autonomy of an author/translator. However, to the extent that examination of paratextual material and other research allows, instances of ghostwriting are excluded from this selection of texts.
Having carefully examined the eligibility of each text on the list, 13 pairs of texts translated from Japanese into English, and 17 pairs of texts translated from English into Japanese (a total of 60 texts) were short-listed for inclusion in the corpus.

3.3.3. Copyright Permission
Information regarding the copyright holders of the short-listed texts was obtained and requests for permission to scan and hold electronic copies of the full texts for the purpose of research were made in writing, either using application forms provided by copyright holders or by letter (see Appendix A). Where more than one possible copyright holder was identified, each was approached separately. Where no response to a request was received within a six-week period, a follow-up request using a different means of communication (either e-mail or FAX) was sent.

Permission was granted for 36 out of 60 texts: 11 pairs of texts had permission for both source text and translation granted, the remaining 14 texts had permission for either the source text or translation granted. Of these 14, permissions had been received for the Japanese text but not the English translation in 12 cases, and permission had been received for the English text but not the Japanese translation in two cases. Since Japanese copyright law allows for the reproduction of works for non-profit educational purposes without limitations on length, it was deemed acceptable to retain these two texts in the final list. Finally, a total of 13 pairs of texts (total 26 texts) were to be included in the corpus; six English-Japanese pairs, and seven Japanese-English pairs.

3.3.4. Composition of Corpus
The titles and other details of the 26 texts included in the corpus are listed in Appendix B. Each text has been given an identifier for ease of reference. The text identifier indicates (1) whether the text is an original or translated text, (2) the language of the text, and (3) its corresponding source text/translation. For example, text EE1 is the English source text for the Japanese translation EJ1; JE5 is a Japanese-English translation of the non-translated Japanese text JJ5. The same conventions are also used to refer to sub-corpora: the ECC comprises the EE non-translated English and JE translated English sub-corpora, the JCC comprises the JJ non-translated Japanese and EJ translated Japanese sub-corpora. The length of
each text (indicated in Appendix B) refers to the length of the portion of the text that was to be analysed – that is, the narrative itself – omitting all front and back matter.⁸⁰ Fig. 2 (below) depicts the contents of the ECC and JCC corpora, collectively titled the ‘Bi-directional Comparable Corpus of Contemporary Autobiographies in English and Japanese’ (BCCCAEJ), indicating the total size of each sub-corpus.⁸¹

⁸⁰ The length of English texts was calculated by the TEC Tools corpus analysis software (and is approximately 10% less than the word count given by Microsoft Word). Character counts for Japanese texts are as given in the localised Japanese edition of Microsoft Word.

⁸¹ In Fig. 2 the image of the texts comprising the JJ sub-corpus does not show text JJ1: this was the only text acquired on loan, and was returned prior to these images being taken. However, the cover image for JJ1 can be found in Appendix B.
Figure 2. Contents of Bi-directional Comparable Corpus of Contemporary Autobiographies in English and Japanese (BCCCAEJ)
Since the number of eligible texts was relatively small it was possible to include full-length texts in the corpus without having excessive data to analyse. Indeed, it was necessary to include all eligible texts in order to reach the target corpus size of 1,000,000 words of English, and a comparable amount of Japanese. The use of full-length texts is also methodologically preferable since, as Kenny argues, “linguistic features are rarely distributed evenly throughout texts and an extract can thus misrepresent the overall text” (2001: 110). It may be the case that the position of the author/translator changes over the duration of the autobiographical narrative and in order to capture the full extent of the relationships in question it is necessary to have access to the full text (see 6.1.2.).

Although the final number of texts in each sub-corpus is relatively small – six or seven texts in each case – each is by a different author and translator, and therefore the sub-corpora are deemed to be well-balanced in that regard. Due to the relatively small number of texts in each sub-corpus, the profiles of individual texts (whether that be a function of the style of each author or a result of their subject matter) will have a significant impact on the overall character of sub-corpora and variation between texts must be taken into consideration (see 6.1.2.).

3.3.5. Summary of Thematic Content

It is likely that the content of a narrative will influence patterns of representation of the experiences being narrated; for example, in terms of temporal setting and the degree of identification between the present narrating-self and past experiencing-self, the extent to which a narrative entails accounts of public/private and physical/cerebral experience, and the degree to which biographical descriptions are embedded in the autobiographical account. Some potentially relevant aspects of the thematic content of the texts are summarised here.

All of the texts in the corpus can be considered popular autobiographies which have been ‘licensed’ either by the celebrity of the author [EE1, JJ2], an experience (often of hardship) that is notably out of the ordinary [JJ3, JJ6], or a combination of both [EE3, EE6]. Broadly speaking, the narratives can be regarded

---

82 During the process of identifying texts for inclusion in the long-list, it became apparent that a number of thematic clusters are in evidence in translations between English and Japanese.
as having either ‘aspirational’ [EE1, EE2] or ‘inspirational’ [EE3, EE4, JE1, JE7] appeal, and it is noticeable that in almost all cases, there is a very clear transformational aspect to the narrative. Examples include the transformation from ‘superman’ to spinal injury victim [EE3], from child soldier to college student and advocate [EE4], and from businessman to monk [JJ3]. In many cases the transformation is a redemptive one, for example, recovery from mental illness [EE5], rehabilitation following addiction [EE3], or reformation after renouncing criminal activity [JJ6].

The narratives included in the corpus place differing emphasis on the representation of physical and cerebral experience. That is, accounts of illness, disability and physical hardship (including armed combat, marathon training, and ascetic practice) tend to have a significant amount of narration of physical sensation, whereas accounts of political and business life tend to narrate reasoning, opinion and so on. The extent to which the public vs. private self is the focus of the narrative also differs by text, and this is assumed to influence the balance of representation of a private self, close personal relationships and emotional responses vs. the representation of a public self, social position and opinions.

While the narration of the self is a defining characteristic of the genre, narratives differ in the extent to which they incorporate descriptions of the experiences of others – i.e. biographical elements. Of the texts included here, some are somewhat introspective and tend to focus on the self [EE3, EE5, JJ2, JJ3], whereas in other cases the description of the actions, words, mental states and opinions of others forms a substantial part of the narrative [EE2, JJ4, JJ7]. It is also of interest to note that certain texts appear to have an educational objective, suggested by the inclusion of afterwords referring the reader to recommended translations from English to Japanese include a preponderance of celebrity memoirs (footballers, musicians, actors) and politicians (including Barack Obama, Nelson Mandela, and Margaret Thatcher). From Japanese into English there are many manifesto memoirs by businessmen and heads of corporations, and archetypes of Japanese culture (gangsters, geisha and monks). In both directions, there are a number of autobiographies that recount inspirational stories of overcoming illness and disability, in particular experiences of the Second World War, including hibakusha atomic bomb survivors and prisoners of war or internment.

Although Pascal points to a contrast between autobiography and memoir such that, in autobiography “attention is focussed on the self, in the memoir or reminiscence on others” (1960: 8), the present study does not differentiate between the two text types. This is because the category of memoir is problematic to define and, in any case, the key epistemological and narratological characteristics of a memoir are assumed to be the same as an autobiography. However, it is acknowledged that there is variation in the autobiographical narratives included here in relation to the extent to which they narrate the personal/private experience of the self vs. the actions and words of others.

Translators from English to Japanese include a preponderance of celebrity memoirs (footballers, musicians, actors) and politicians (including Barack Obama, Nelson Mandela, and Margaret Thatcher). From Japanese into English there are many manifesto memoirs by businessmen and heads of corporations, and archetypes of Japanese culture (gangsters, geisha and monks). In both directions, there are a number of autobiographies that recount inspirational stories of overcoming illness and disability, in particular experiences of the Second World War, including hibakusha atomic bomb survivors and prisoners of war or internment.

Although Pascal points to a contrast between autobiography and memoir such that, in autobiography “attention is focussed on the self, in the memoir or reminiscence on others” (1960: 8), the present study does not differentiate between the two text types. This is because the category of memoir is problematic to define and, in any case, the key epistemological and narratological characteristics of a memoir are assumed to be the same as an autobiography. However, it is acknowledged that there is variation in the autobiographical narratives included here in relation to the extent to which they narrate the personal/private experience of the self vs. the actions and words of others.
reading, websites and organisations, or a subject index. Examples include narratives that are concerned with eating disorders, Parkinson’s disease, spinal injury and the use of child soldiers [EE3, EE4, EE5, EE6]. While the inclusion of such paratextual material does not affect the analysis of the narrative itself, these texts tend to incorporate sections reporting from literature on a subject, i.e. material that is not based on personal experience, but rather reports other sources. However, the data analysis reported in Chapters 4 and 5 examines only (first person) REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions that are indexed to the autobiographical subject; narration that is ‘non-autobiographical’ in character is excluded.

3.3.6. Summary of Header Information

Tymoczko advocates the careful “encoding of metatextual information about translations and texts” to facilitate the interpretation of quantitative data with an accompanying detailed examination of contextual factors (1998: 2). Baker reiterates that “figures and frequencies are only a starting point” which require close examination of the text and the circumstances and participants in its production in order to move towards “situated explanations” for the textual patterns observed (2004: 183). To the extent that it is available, supplementary metatextual data has been retained for each text, to enable potential possible correlations between textual character and contextual factors to be explored (see Appendix B). The type of contextual information that has been noted for each text includes those variables such as author/translator gender, publisher, and region mentioned in 3.3.1, a selected summary of which is provided here.

Gender

Ten of the 13 original autobiographies were written by male authors, and three by female. Five of the 13 translations are by male translators, and eight are by female translators. The author and translator share the same gender in eight cases; in all five cases where the gender of the author and translator are different, the author is male and the translator is female.\(^{84}\)

\(^{84}\) As an interesting aside, a brief survey of author-translator gender in 157 short stories published in anthologies of fiction translated from Japanese into English showed that ‘same gender translation’ is more common than ‘different gender translation’, a correlation that is particularly marked in the case of first-person narratives. Similarly, in the TEC corpus, although 73 of 102 fictional texts are
Regional English/Japanese

Nine of the 13 English texts are written in US English, two in UK English, and one in each of Sierra Leone and New Zealand Englishes. All Japanese authors are from Honshu, although there may be regional variation between, for example, Kanto and Kansai dialects.85

Author/Translator Experience

All of the English source texts are the first publications of the respective authors, although all have since published further works. Of the Japanese source texts, three out of seven are by previously published authors, and of the other four, three have since gone on to publish again. All the translators are professional translators (in some cases, award-winning), and some are writers in their own right. In three cases, the translator has translated subsequent texts by the same author.

Publisher

The texts in the corpus are published by a range of publishing houses, although four publishing houses account for 14 of the 26 texts: six texts were published by Kodansha and Kodansha International, three by Shinchosha, three by Random House and their imprints, and two by Harper and their imprints.

Year of Publication

Within the specified range of date of first publication, i.e. 1990-2010, the earliest source text was published in 1990, six texts were published between 1995-2000, two between 2000-2005, and a further four between 2005-2010. Ten of the 13 translations were first published within two years of the source text, with the remaining three cases having a gap of between eight and 15 years between the publication of the source text and its translation.

85 ‘same gender translation’, a more pronounced tendency can be observed in the (auto)biographical sub-corpus, in which 17 of 21 texts are ‘same gender translation’. Although beyond the scope of the present study, examining gender relations between translators / ghostwriters / biographers and their subjects may be of interest when addressing questions of identification, voice, and transference.

86 Haruki Murakami’s [JJ2] Japanese prose style is widely regarded as being heavily influenced by his reading and translation of English literature, a fact that he also acknowledges himself (Rubin 2005: 36).
A header file summarising relevant information accompanies each of the texts included in the corpus (see Appendix C). The header file allows sub-corpora to be defined on the basis of author/translator gender, nationality, dates of publication and combinations thereof.  

A final note about the texts pertains to paratextual materials. Because paratexts are not to be subject to textual analysis here they are not included in the ECC and JCC corpora. However, all paratextual materials were scanned and retained for reference purposes (see 6.1.2.). It was noticeable that there is substantial variation in the type of paratextual materials found in the 26 texts in the corpus. A particularly marked contrast was noted in the extent to which paratextual devices are found in Japanese and English translations. All of the Japanese translations (EJ texts) include a short biographical introduction about the original author, five of the six also have a translator biography (typically indicating age and professional experience), and five of the EJ translations are accompanied by an extended yakusha atogaki ‘translator’s afterword’. Although five of the seven English translations (JE texts) contain a brief author biography, none contains a translator biography, and only one contains a translator’s foreword.

3.4. Corpus Building

Having selected the texts for inclusion in the corpus, data was prepared for processing using corpus analysis software. The method of preparation for both English and Japanese texts was the same, although the Japanese data presented some specific problems, which are mentioned as they arise.

3.4.1. Digitising Texts

Hard copies of the texts were obtained, selecting either hardback or tankoubon large-format softcover editions where possible, since higher quality paper is less prone to “show-through” than paperback (and bunkobon small-format) editions, and therefore produces better results when scanning for Optical Character Recognition.

---

86 It was not possible to include all types of information, since the header file is based on a template originally created for use with the TEC corpus.

87 The difficulties of building corpora using non-Latin alphabet languages, such as Japanese, are discussed in Xiao et al (2004), Maekawa (2008) and Scott (2010).
Recognition (OCR). As a high volume of data (around 8,000 pages) was to be processed, pages were removed from their bindings using a guillotine and scanned using a Kodak i1660 commercial scanner with document feed tray, rather than a flat-bed scanner. In order to maximise accuracy of OCR output, pages were scanned at a resolution of 300 dots per inch (dpi), using colour scanning for pages with images and greyscale for others. The resulting images were saved in PDF format.

The PDF images were checked for quality before being processed using OCR software. A number of OCR software packages were tested and compared with samples of English and Japanese text, using a range of settings in each case. Optimisation options such as dual-page scanning, hieroglyphic text direction and autocorrect deskew (to correct minor rotations to pages) were selected where available. In the case of the English texts, it was found that Abbyy Finereader 10 was capable of producing very high accuracy output, although texts using unusual typefaces required more clean-up. Quality control at this stage included searching for randomly selected words known to appear in the hard copy, and checking output text using the Microsoft Word spellcheck tool.

Japanese OCR is generally less successful than English, since written Japanese is a double-byte language that uses kanji glyphs and both hiragana and katakana syllabaries, sometimes in combination with yomigana (superscript phonetic guides), and may be written horizontally or vertically. From a short-list of seven OCR software packages that can recognise Japanese, four were tested. Three of these are extended versions of English-language programs and intended for use with an English operating system (Abbyy Finereader 10, Iris Readiris Corporate Asian 12, and Adobe Acrobat Pro 8 for Mac), the other one is a native Japanese package designed for use with a localised Japanese edition of Windows (Panasonic Yomitorikakumei 14). OCR was carried out on the same PDF document using each of the four applications, and the output compared for accuracy and formatting.

First, a number of phrases incorporating various orthographic forms (i.e. using kanji, hiragana, katakana and combinations of these) were used as search targets using the ‘Find’ function within a PDF viewer, and the success rates noted. Second, the OCRd (i.e. searchable) PDF was exported to plain text and the numbers

---

88 The software developer and commercial scanning services using Abbyy software claim 99.9% accuracy for English OCR.
of occurrences of 15 frequently occurring Japanese words (again including various orthographic combinations) found in each text file were compared. It was found that Acrobat and Yomitorikakumei performed equally well, with Readiris and Finereader returning a lower amount of approximately 97% and 90% of those results respectively. A third phase of testing of the best-performing two applications involved searching for Latin alphabet in the text output. Since the scanned texts did not contain alphabet characters (exceptions include copyright pages), the presence of alphabet in the exported text was interpreted as evidence of OCR error. In this test, Acrobat returned a significantly higher number of alphabet characters.

The final phase of comparison of the two entailed examining the formatting of the plain text for similarity with original text layout. In this respect also Yomitorikakumei performed better than Acrobat. Based on these tests, it was decided that Yomitorikakumei would be used to carry out OCR for the Japanese data. Although the Japanese OCR output does not have the same level of accuracy as for the English data, the majority of errors appear to arise in complicated kanji characters and katakana, neither of which is the target for the current analysis. Therefore, the slightly lower OCR accuracy rate is not anticipated to affect the application of the analytical frameworks.

Once all scanned English and Japanese PDF image files had been processed using the respective OCR softwares, searchable PDF files were generated. From these, searchable and editable plain text was then exported.89

3.4.2. Preparing Text and Header Files

Before raw data can be processed by corpus analysis software, pairs of text files and corresponding header files must be prepared. Text files contain the data for analysis, while header files contain a range of metadata including title, year of publication, language, and author/translator information. The information listed in header files is used by the corpus analysis software to identify texts and define subcorpora for searching. A sample header file can be found in Appendix C.90

89 All images were removed and the placement of images noted.
90 In order for the TEC Tools software to process text files, a set of XML conventions and requirements are defined in a Document Type Definition (DTD) file that lists the elements, attributes, values and tag set for the corpus. In this case, the DTD schemes that were originally developed for
Preparation of text files requires the clean-up and mark-up of data. In order to ensure that the same procedure was followed for each of the 26 texts in the corpus, a checklist was drawn up of all necessary steps. The main steps in the text preparation process are summarised here.

Text clean-up primarily involved finding and correcting errors resulting from OCR inaccuracies. The Word spellcheck tool was used to locate isolated and repeated OCR errors, such as outputting “Tm” for “I’m”, which were corrected using the ‘Find and Replace’ tool. Prior to mark-up, which uses XML (eXtensible Mark-up Language), it was also necessary to remove or substitute any characters occurring in the texts that have specific meanings in XML – such as “&”, “<” and “>”. The data was then saved as plain text in UTF-8 encoding.

Text mark-up involved the annotation of text with XML tags using the open-source text editor jEdit. Since the corpus software is to be used only for KWIC searches and the generation of concordance lines for manual analysis, part-of-speech (POS) tagging was not necessary. However, tags were added to mark the start and end of the text, paragraph, section and chapter boundaries. Parts of the text that were not to be included in the analysis were also tagged for omission. Once mark-up was complete, each file was checked for errors using the jEdit Errorlist plugin, then saved using its text identifier as a filename with an .xml extension (e.g. EE1.xml).

Corresponding header files were created for each text file, including information such as described in 3.3.4. Header files were given the same filename as their corresponding text file, but saved with a .hed extension (e.g. EE1.hed).

3.4.3. Corpus Browsing Software
The KWIC search and concordance retrieval functionality required for this research project can be found in many corpus software packages, an often used example

---

use with the TEC corpus were used. Although these were designed specifically for use with translated texts in English, they were readily adapted to cater to non-translated texts and non-English-translations with the help of filename conventions that supplement information not specified in the DTDs.

91 Omitted sections include: front matter (copyright information, acknowledgments, forewords, and contents), back matter (bibliographies, indexes, and afterwords), images and captions, footnotes, chapter headings, and lengthy quotations from other sources embedded in the narrative.

92 All text files were placed in a folder with the DTD file in order that the TEC corpus browser can access both the text file and the DTD that defines its syntax.
being Wordsmith Tools (Scott 2012). Having compared the various applications available, it was decided that the TEC Tools corpus software (Luz 2011), designed for use with the on-line TEC corpus, and the AntConc 3.3.1.m concordance program (Anthony 2011) would be used.

The main reasons for this selection include the availability and compatibility of the software: both TEC Tools and AntConc are freeware, multiplatform softwares that can be downloaded freely and used with Windows, Mac and Linux operating systems. Both softwares offer some Japanese language support, and, as the developers are actively engaged in developing enhanced usability with non-alphabet languages, they kindly agreed to engage in personal correspondence regarding any technical problems, actively engaged with trouble-shooting, and welcomed feedback on the functionality of the software with Japanese text. It is hoped that providing the developers with feedback will contribute to the development of corpus tools which have previously been limited for Japanese and other non-alphabet languages.

After downloading and installing the TEC Tools suite, the indexer and corpus browser modules were set up and tested. The English and Japanese text and header files were added to separate data and metadata folders, creating two independent corpora (the ECC and JCC corpora). To enable the corpus browser to search data and retrieve concordance lines efficiently, data was then tokenised and indexed by the Indexer module, implementing a different tokeniser for English and Japanese. Once indexes had been compiled, the index files were stored separately.

---

93 Wordsmith Tools is able to process Japanese that has already been segmented by a separate parser such as Chasen, but is only compatible with a Windows operating system.
94 TEC Tools was originally developed for use with English data (and European languages using Latin alphabet) but is currently being extended for use with languages that use other character sets. A beta version of TEC Tools, which can process Japanese, is currently available and was tested during the course of this research project. The AntConc software was developed specifically for non-European languages and is also in the process of continual development with the aim of facilitating the processing of all languages, including right to left languages such as Arabic.
95 For a full description of the process of installing, setting up and using TEC Tools please see the tutorial document Corpus Building with TEC Tools which was created during the process of building the corpus used here and is available on-line at http://www.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/medialibrary/llc/files/ctis/TECToolsTutorial.pdf [accessed 27 February 2013].
96 The developer adapted a simple Japanese tokeniser originally written in the programming language Perl for integration into the TEC Tools architecture, TokeniserJP. The tokeniser is capable of enabling concordance searches but the frequency lists it generates require some additional manipulation by the researcher to remove items listed that are not tokens. However, the performance of TokeniserJP appears to be on a par with established Japanese tokenisers (e.g. Chasen, MeCab).
for the respective corpora. A similar process was repeated to instal and test AntConc. Having tested both softwares with English and Japanese data, it was decided that TEC Tools would be used to search the ECC, and AntConc to search the JCC, since the AntConc software has a convenient means of switching between word/character as the unit for searching (‘character’ is toggled when searching Japanese) which gives a 100% return rate independent of tokeniser success rates.

3.5. Application of the Analytical Framework

The application of the analytical framework to the ECC and JCC involved the identification and extraction of all instances of candidate REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions, exclusion of examples that do not correspond to the defined object of investigation, manual encoding of REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions by grammatical features (e.g. object complement) that are linked to evidential stance construal, and comparison of the relative frequency data for each sub-corpus. A brief overview of the procedure is provided here, with a detailed description accompanying the analysis of REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions in Chapters 4 and 5 respectively.

3.5.1. Concordance Generation

In order to identify all possible instances of REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions in the ECC and JCC, a number of search queries were applied using the corpus browser software. In the case of the ECC, TEC Tools was used to generate concordance lines using the non-case sensitive, wildcard keyword searches “remember*” and “seem*” to retrieve all word-forms of the respective search terms (seem, seems, seemed, and so on). This was carried out text by text, using the sub-corpus selection function to specify the text to be searched. The resulting concordance lines were right-sorted for convenient identification of object complement structures. Fig. 3 shows the TEC Tools user interface for a search of “seem*” in text EE6.
In the JCC, a number of search queries were applied using AntConc to generate concordances for each of three verbs of recollection – *oboeru*, *omoidasu*, and *kioku suru* – and four types of grammatical particles encoding seeming – *sou*, *you*, *mitai*, and *rashii*. Where alternative orthographic realisations of a particular search term were possible, searches were carried out separately for all variations. For example, *omoidasu* can appear using different combinations of kanji and hiragana as 記憶している, 記憶しである or 記憶である. Since the verbs and evidential particles in question inflect for tense, aspect and negation, searches were also carried out for all possible conjugations in order to ensure all relevant instances were identified. The JCC data was searched using AntConc (Fig. 4).
Appendix D lists the raw frequency data for the number of concordances retrieved using each of the search queries applied for REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions for individual texts and sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC.

3.5.2. Annotation of Concordances

Having generated concordances for all search queries in all texts, the output was exported as plain text, reformatted using a text editor, and then imported to purpose-built spreadsheets in MS Excel for manual analysis. The concordances for each text were exported to separate spreadsheets and numbered for easy reference. The spreadsheet template incorporated a number of pre-determined category headings and sub-headings in order to enable potentially significant features to be noted and any patterns to be observed. The template was adjusted accordingly to accommodate analysis of REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions in the English and Japanese data respectively.97

Figure 4. AntConc User Interface: Text EJ1, search ようだった
Of the total number of instances of each of the search targets, only a certain proportion constitute targets for analysis, as defined in the analytical framework. Therefore, during this phase of analysis, each concordance was evaluated in terms of the definitions of REMEMBER-constructions – memory reporting constructions that are indexed to the autobiographical subject’s narrating-self (i.e. reflecting a present temporal vantage) and which comprise a verb of recollection and its object – and SEEM-constructions – inferential descriptions of how a remembered experience seemed to the autobiographical subject’s experiencing self (i.e. reflecting a past temporal vantage) – and exclusions marked as such, in order to isolate the target of analysis specified in the framework. (The types of exclusions made in each case are summarised in Chapters 4 and 5). The concordances were then sorted to delineate clearly the exclusions from concordances that would be subject to further analysis. Fig. 5 shows a (simplified) sample worksheet.
I thought. Once I had decided to leave, my presence in Eiheiji seemed all the more precious, and I felt a growing desire to use my re...

The asphalt road in front of the monastery seemed like something furtive and dirty. Unable to content ourselves with limits and learn who they are, Choshu been a baldheaded monk. He seemed far more mature than I'd been at his age, yet he cut an oddly p...s an odd item to sell to monks in...and blueberry

The unfolding of events thus far had made him appear to have no ambition or selfish desire, and carried out whatever...and other tradespeople also freely came and went. Men, it seems to me, are always seeking a mother figure, and all of us adored Tsubo...
Concordance lines were then examined individually, with a system of tallies being used to annotate the salient grammatical features. In a final column, notes were taken in particularly interesting or problematic cases; for example, notes about ‘event specific knowledge’ (ESK) (including the presence of adverbial qualifications indicating the clarity/vagueness of the memory, perceptual details and so on), and the type of memory being reported (perception, sensation, action, emotion, fact and so on). In ambiguous cases, extended textual fragments were consulted using the concordance browser extract function to assist with classification (Fig. 6).¹⁸⁸

In such cases, supplementary notes were also added to record the reasoning for decisions made in marginal / problematic cases.

Having completed the analysis, tallies for individual texts were totalled and then collated to provide frequency data for respective sub-corpora. This data, recorded in Appendix D, was then used as the basis for profiling patterns of narration in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora, reported in Chapters 4 and 5.⁹⁹

---

¹⁸⁸ None of the texts included in the corpus has been read in its entirety, and all analysis has been carried out only on the basis of the content of concordance lines (and consultation of extracts where necessary).

⁹⁹ The analysis reported in Chapters 4 and 5 compares non-translated vs. translated data at the sub-corpus level, aiming to identify general tendencies characterising the respective data sets. Chapter 6 addresses the significance of variation between individual texts comprising the respective sub-corpora. Frequency data for individual texts is tabulated in Appendix D.
Chapter 4. An Analysis of Reported Memories in Non-Translated vs. Translated Autobiographies

Based on the assumption that memories of personal experience are qualitatively different from knowledge acquired by other means and, further, that this difference is likely to be manifest in grammatical structure (specifically, in the type of complement chosen to describe the memory being narrated), Chapter 2 described the general principles of a framework for the analysis of autobiographical memories narrated in non-translated vs. translated autobiographies that is designed to probe the positions of the author/translator vis-à-vis the evidential basis from which they narrate. This chapter reports the application of the first part of that framework: the analysis of memories that are explicitly indicated as being based on ‘memory evidence’ using reporting clauses with verbs of recollection – i.e. REMEMBER-constructions – in the English and Japanese comparable corpora.

As mentioned in 2.4., REMEMBER-constructions can be interpreted as expressing two layers of evidential meaning. The first, associated with the verb of recollection itself, indicates that the proposition introduced by the object of the verb is sourced in the memory of the speaker. The second is associated with how the object of the verb construes the phenomenological character of the memory, for example, as being either ‘experiential’ or ‘non-experiential’. The core of the analysis reported in this chapter examines the types of object occurring in the REMEMBER-constructions identified in the ECC and JCC, reporting their relative frequency of use, and offering an interpretation of the contrasting construals effected by respective objects with reference to this experiential vs. non-experiential distinction.

Prior to this, 4.1 describes the identification of REMEMBER-constructions in the ECC and JCC corpora, indicating the frequencies of these constructions in non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora.
4.1. Identification of REMEMBER-constructions

Having extracted all instances of the uses of the target verbs of recollection – *remember* in the ECC and *oboeru, omoidasu* and *kioku suru* in the JCC data – using corpus browsing software (see 3.5.1.), the resulting candidate concordances were examined manually in order to identify and extract those uses that correspond to the definition of REMEMBER-construction as applied here: that is, memory-reporting constructions that are indexed to the narrator, and which incorporate a verb of recollection and its object. Not all uses of the target verbs of recollection in the ECC and JCC data correspond to this definition, and exclusions were made where the verb of recollection is not used

- to report a memory,
- by a first person singular grammatical subject,
- from a present tense temporal position.

In the case of English *remember*, REMEMBER-constructions are prototypically realised by the first person present tense reporting clause *I remember* in a sentence-initial position. In the case of Japanese, a pronoun-drop language, REMEMBER-constructions are typically realised by a present progressive form such as *oboeteiru* in a sentence-final position. Therefore, it might appear that restricting corpus searches to extract only such present tense first person uses would be the most efficient method of extracting concordance lines that correspond to the defined object of investigation. However, this approach risks excluding some target constructions and it was decided that corpus searches should remain broad so as to capture all possible cases, which would then be subject to manual examination.¹⁰⁰

A total of 626 concordance lines incorporating the verb *remember* were extracted from the ECC, and a total of 1186 concordance lines incorporating the verbs *oboeru, omoidasu* and *kioku suru* were extracted from the JCC.¹⁰¹ Following initial manual analysis, exclusions were made on the following four bases:

---

¹⁰⁰ This approach also provides an opportunity to examine the circumstances in which verbs of recollection are used in autobiographical narratives, thereby developing an empirical understanding of the character of these verbs as used in the present data set that complements the theoretical characterisations offered in the literature.

¹⁰¹ As already mentioned, memory-reporting constructions using verbs of recollection occur frequently in the ECC, and the majority of these constructions incorporate the verb *remember*; other verbs of recollection (*recall, recollect*) are found very infrequently. However, in the JCC data, memory-reporting constructions do not display such a marked preponderance of one verb of recollection. Rather, three verbs – *oboeru, omoidasu* and *kioku suru* – are used regularly to report
Exclusions were made where verbs of recollection are not used to report memories. Such cases include the use of verbs of recollection to describe acts of intentional remembering, which is future-oriented rather than retrospective. In the case of *remember*, for example, an ‘intention’ interpretation is indicated where the verb is followed by an infinitival to-complement (Van Valin and Wilkins 1993), as in *remember to get the audience to laugh* [JE2] and *remember to drink some water* [JE2]. Other indicators of intentionality include future tense constructions (*will remember*) and those occurring in conjunction with verbs of volition (*want to remember*) or modal auxiliaries indicating necessity (*must remember, should remember*). In the case of the Japanese data, *oboeru* and *kioku suru* can describe intentional acts of remembering; *omoidasu* is only used to report acts of recollection.

Since memory-reporting uses of verbs of recollection are necessarily declarative, exclusions were also made of imperative and interrogative constructions. Interrogative uses were typically found in reported speech – “Don’t you remember me from college?” [EE1], “Tell me what you remember about the party.” [EE1] – and are therefore also excluded as non-first person subject uses (see (b) below). Instances of imperative constructions being used to address the reader directly – *remember how hard I’d trained for this* [JE2], *Remember that bachelor pad in Laurel Canyon?* [EE6] – were also excluded.

Additional exclusions include concordances in which the search term is used with adjectival meaning (*well-remembered, omoidebukai* ‘memorable’), as a noun (*omoide* ‘(a) memory’, *omoidebanashi* ‘reminiscences’, *kioku* ‘memory’) or compound noun (*kiokuryoku* ‘powers of memory’, *kiokusoushitsu* ‘memory loss’). Idiomatic uses, such as *she asked me to remember her to you* [JE5], and uses of verbs of recollection with extended meanings, such as the use of *oboeru* with the meaning of ‘sense, feel’ – as in, *kyoumei o oboeru* ‘feel sympathy’ [JJ4] – were also excluded.

Therefore, it was decided that the analysis of memory-reporting constructions in the JCC should incorporate all three of these verbs of recollection.
(b) Non-first person singular subject
As expected, the majority of uses of verbs of recollection are attributed to the first person singular in both the ECC and JCC. However, non-first person singular uses are found in certain circumstances, such as when the report incorporates some kind of indication of its evidential basis (hearsay or conjecture) – as in *haha wa kono toki no koto o kou iu fū ni oboeteiru to iu* ‘my mother says she remembers the time like this’ [EJ6] – or when making generalisations which are assumed to be shared knowledge – as in *such girls always remember a debt of gratitude* [EE2]. Such non-first person uses were excluded. Since the analysis is concerned only with the narration of memories attributable to the autobiographical subject, first-person memory-reporting constructions occurring in direct and indirect reported speech and thought – as in “Yes, I remember. Everyone was upset with us for bringing the bees to the village.” [EE4] and “Anata ga watashi ni kou keikoku shita no o oboeteiru wa” “I remember you warned me about this” [EJ6] – were also excluded since such uses are not indexed to the current narrator.\(^{102}\)

(c) Non-narrator-perspective constructions
The final stage in the isolation of memory reporting constructions that reflects the temporal position of the current narrator entailed the differentiation between those uses that reflect a present temporal vantage (i.e. of the narrating subject) and those that reflect a past temporal vantage (i.e. of the experiencing subject). Since dual incarnations of the autobiographical self – experiencer and narrator – are associated with contrasting temporal positions – past and present – memory reporting constructions that reflect either an experiencer or narrator perspective can be differentiated on the basis of tense. (22) and (23) illustrate the contrast between the adoption of an experiencer vs. narrator vantage with the verb *remember*.

(22) As Allie and I walked, I *remembered* when I used to go dancing back in secondary school with friends. It seemed so long ago, but I still recalled the different names of the dance nights. [EE4]

\(^{102}\) The quotation of words spoken by the autobiographical subject him or herself were also excluded since the past, experiencing and present, narrating selves are regarded as having distinct narrative identities (cf. Maynard 1996a: 210).
While (22) describes a previous experience of recollection from the perspective of the past, experiencing self, (23) describes an experience of recollection from the perspective of the present narrating self.

In the English data, present and past tense constructions are readily identified by the conjugation of the main verb in most instances. However, it is not necessarily the case that experiencer and narrator perspective constructions can be differentiated on this basis. For example, reporting clauses that incorporate auxiliary verbs must be classified on the basis of the tense of the verb phrase as a whole: i.e. couldn’t remember is regarded as expressing an experiencer vantage whereas can’t remember expresses narrator vantage. In order to differentiate correctly between the two types of construction, it was therefore necessary to examine concordances manually, rather than by using tense-inflected corpus searches. Manual analysis revealed examples of future tense (I will always remember [EE3]), ‘future in the past’ tense (I would remember this later [EE2]) and historical present tense (I can feel the warmth of my AK-47 barrel on my back; I don’t remember when I last fired it [EE4]) constructions. All present (except historical present) and future tense REMEMBER-constructions are interpreted as reflecting a narrator perspective; all past and historical present tenses are interpreted as reflecting an experiencer perspective. The same procedure was followed for the Japanese data.

(d) Non-main verb constructions
Finally, exclusions were made of instances in which the verb of recollection occurs, not as a main verb, but in either a ‘parenthetical’ position or subordinate clause. Parenthetical uses – as in We must have been walking for days, I do not really remember, when suddenly two men put us at gunpoint [EE4] and As far as I remember, this happened around 1980 [JE4] – do not have an object and typically function as hedging devices rather than memory-reporting structures. Instances of
verbs of recollection occurring in subordinate clauses – such as *It’s a moment that I remember very clearly* [EE1] – were also excluded.

In relation to negative REMEMBER-constructions, although it might be argued that the narration of what is *not* remembered should be excluded from an analysis of the narration of autobiographical memories, both successful and unsuccessful (or partial) recall are regarded as involving similar cognitive processes (cf. Amberber 2007b). That is, assessing the limits of one’s personal recall and knowing what cannot be remembered is an aspect of recollective experience and, as is the case with successful recall, presupposes privileged access to memory that is ordinarily exclusively associated with the first person. Therefore, in the present analysis, negative REMEMBER-constructions are also regarded as instances of reported recollective experience and retained for analysis.

### 4.1.1. Frequency of REMEMBER-constructions in the ECC and JCC

Having examined all the concordance lines extracted from the ECC and JCC, and made exclusions as described above, the remaining concordances constitute the object of investigation, as indicated by the definition of REMEMBER-constructions in the analytical framework.

An initial comparison of the raw frequency of occurrence of REMEMBER-constructions in the sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC suggests a contrast in the norms of autobiographical narration in English and Japanese (Fig. 7).

---

103 The comparison of frequencies of REMEMBER-constructions (using *remember* in the ECC and *oboeru*, *omoidasu* and *kioku suru* in the JCC) focuses only on a sub-set of all the possible memory-reporting constructions that might be found in the texts and does not claim to represent an exhaustive portrayal of the memory reporting structures in the data.
Firstly, comparing non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora in the ECC and JCC it is apparent that the EE (non-translated) sub-corpus has a higher frequency than the JE (translated) sub-corpus, while the JJ (non-translated) sub-corpus has a lower frequency than the EJ (translated) sub-corpus. The opposing directional tendencies observed for the ECC and JCC data may reflect differing strategies for evidential marking in English and Japanese, and point to differing norms of autobiographical narration in relation to the use of reporting structures to indicate explicitly that a proposition is based on ‘memory evidence’. That is, the data suggest that English autobiographies make more frequent use of REMEMBER-constructions to indicate explicitly that a particular memory is sourced in the memory of the narrator (i.e. explicit indication that the evidential basis of the report is ‘memory evidence’) than Japanese.

Since there are 243 memory-reporting constructions using remember in the EE sub-corpus, but only 132 memory-reporting constructions using oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru in the EJ sub-corpus (i.e. their Japanese translations), it
suggests that a significant proportion of REMEMBER-constructions in the English STs were either translated by alternative memory-reporting/evidential structures or omitted from the translation, possibly in order to accommodate target language norms. Similarly, although there are only 61 instances of REMEMBER-constructions using the verbs oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru in the JJ sub-corpus, there are 98 instances of memory reporting constructions using remember in the JE sub-corpus (i.e. their English translations). This suggests that either a range of alternative memory reporting constructions, not using oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru, found in the Japanese STs have been translated into English using a remember reporting construction, or that the translator has supplemented the translation with additional reporting clauses in order to conform to target language norms.

Indeed, the asymmetry in the degree to which a difference in frequency is observed for the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC suggests that both target language (TL) norms and source text (ST) influence act upon translated texts. That is, the translated texts in the ECC have a lower frequency than the non-translated texts (suggesting SL/ST influence) but a higher frequency than the JCC non-translated texts (suggesting TL influence). Similarly, the translated texts in the JCC have a higher frequency than the non-translated texts (suggesting SL/ST influence) but a lower frequency than the ECC non-translated texts (suggesting TL influence).

To summarise, having identified all instances of REMEMBER-constructions indicated by the analytical framework in the ECC and JCC data, the resulting frequency data suggests that English autobiographical narratives tend to make use of REMEMBER-constructions to indicate explicitly that a proposition is based on ‘memory evidence’ more frequently than Japanese autobiographical narratives, and that translations of autobiographies between the two languages reflect these differing norms. However, rather than comparing the frequency of occurrence of memory-reporting constructions per se, the present analysis is primarily concerned with how these REMEMBER-constructions construe the memories that they report. To this end, sections 4.2 and 4.3 report detailed analysis of the REMEMBER-constructions extracted from the ECC and JCC data, commenting on the relative frequency of various types of object and their interpretation in terms of the adoption of an experiential vs. non-experiential stance.
4.2. Analysis of REMEMBER-constructions in the ECC

4.2.1. Relative Frequency of Objects of Recollection with remember

A total of 341 REMEMBER-constructions extracted from the ECC were subject to further analysis, which involved examination and categorisation of the type of object following remember. In all cases the object was found to be one of the four types – -ing complement, that complement, NP object or wh-clausal object – identified in the analytical framework.

Since the raw frequency of occurrence of respective complement types reflects the variation in the overall number of REMEMBER-constructions in the respective sub-corpora, the comparison of EE and JE data made here will be based on the relative frequencies of each type of object, expressed as a percentage of the total number of REMEMBER-constructions (Fig. 8).\(^\text{104}\)

\(^{104}\) Frequency data for individual texts is recorded in Appendix D.
Fig. 8 shows that, while there is no significant difference in the proportion of NP objects between the EE and JE data, the proportion of -ing complement objects is markedly higher in the EE data, and the proportions of that-clause and wh-clause constructions are higher in the JE data. In the following sections, each of the complement types will be discussed with reference to their narrative and evidential character, and the way in which they construe the position of the narrator vis-à-vis the memory being reported.
4.2.2. -ing complements

In both sub-corpora of the ECC, -ing complements, which are associated with the report of perception-based memories (cf. Van Valin and Wilkins 1993), are the most common object of REMEMBER-constructions, occurring in 54.0% of cases in the EE data and 37.8% in the JE. This is unsurprising since autobiographical narratives are prototypically based on memories acquired by the personal experience of the autobiographical subject, rather than memories of facts, general knowledge and so on.

Of the -ing complement constructions found in the data, a number of subtypes can be identified. The first distinction is between ‘same-subject’ and ‘different-subject’ constructions, as illustrated by (24) and (25).

(24) I remember practising one evening in the rotunda at Kessler [EE3]
(25) I remember one of the movie guys wistfully watching a commercial [JE4]

In (24), the subject of the main verb has the same identity as the subject of the complement clause, and the subject of the complement clause is therefore omitted (Dixon 2008: 25). In (25), the subject of the main verb does not have the same identity as the subject of the complement clause and, therefore, the subject of the complement clause is specified. While both same-subject and different-subject participial -ing-complements construe a memory as being based on experience, Lyons (1982) suggests that they reflect contrasting experiential vantages. That is, same-subject -ing-complements describe an experience from an internal vantage, reflecting “the subjective, experiencing, internal self”, whereas different-subject constructions describe the experience of the “observing self” (ibid. 107). Considered in terms of an autobiography vs. biography distinction, same-subject constructions might be regarded as being ‘purely’ autobiographical in character whereas different-subject constructions have a biographical quality (due to the embedded third person report).105

---

105 Although same-subject constructions (with private verbs) are unobservable, different-subject observational memories are, by nature, potentially observable to others than the narrating self. In this regard, from the point of view of evidential pragmatics, same-subject constructions (with private verbs) are linked exclusively to the experiencer and, in normal discourse situations, their use presupposes unrestricted access to the consciousness of the experiencer. Different-subject
While Lyons’ distinction between narration from an experiential vs. observational vantage is interesting when considering the character of autobiographical narratives, it will not be applied as a means of comparing the EE and JE data here. There are two reasons for this. The first is that, while different-subject experiential constructions narrate from an observational rather than ‘experiential’ vantage, the act of observation is, itself, considered to be an experience. Therefore, both types of construction are interpreted as construing an experiential memory. Secondly, it is assumed that narration by a same-subject or different-subject construction is determined by the type of experience that was remembered and is not subject to variable construal: that is, it is not possible to narrate a same-subject experience using a different-subject construction or vice versa. Thus, the use of same-subject vs. different-subject constructions is assumed to reflect the content of the memories, rather than the narrator’s choice of construal of the experience.

Considering the character of -ing complement clauses found in the ECC in more detail, the same-subject constructions (26) to (29) illustrate the types of usage that are most commonly found in the data.

(26) I remember being delighted that I was precisely the right size [EE5]
(27) I remember being carted home by the arm and spanked [EE5]
(28) I remember practicing one Friday afternoon in the rotunda at Kessler [EE3]
(29) I remember seeing a club snap in half as it made contact with a demonstrator [JE4]

(26) to (29) exemplify four forms of -ing complement: constructions that entail the copula being vs. constructions that entail verbs of doing; copular constructions can then be sub-divided into adjectival constructions vs. passive constructions, and ‘doing’ constructions can be sub-divided into constructions using public verbs vs. private verbs.\(^{106}\)

\(^{106}\) Quirk et al describe the contrast between ‘public’ and ‘private’ verbs thus: ‘private’ verbs express ‘states and acts [that] are ‘private’ in the sense that they are not observable: a person may be observed to assert that God exists, but not to believe that God exists. Belief is in this sense ‘private’” (1985: 1181).
Adjectival copular experiential constructions, such as (26), most often describe the emotional state of the subject: other examples from the data include *very frightened, unsettled, particularly fascinated, delighted, at once afraid and ashamed, contemplative, and utterly pleased*. The narration of memories of emotional states is interesting in two regards. Firstly, it presumes access to the consciousness of the experiencer, since emotional states are only accessible to the experiencer and are non-observable (cf. Kuroda 1973). Secondly, from a psychological point of view, the recall of emotional states is characteristic of the recall of ‘true’ memories (cf. Tulving 1972, Conway and Pleydell-Pearce 2000).

Passive constructions, such as (27), include such examples as *being driven, being surrounded, being coached, and being carted off*. As mentioned above, in relation to the contrast between experiential vs. observational memories, the difference between adjectival vs. passive copular constructions can be understood with reference to an autobiographical vs. biographical contrast: that is, adjectival constructions might be regarded as more ‘purely’ autobiographical than passive constructions which, like observational constructions, entail the perception of another participant and, as such, have a ‘biographical’ aspect.

Experiential constructions incorporating ‘doing’ verbs describe actions that are either observable (public) or non-observable (private). Examples of public verbs found in the data include verbs of physical action (*walk, sit, dance, flee*) – as in (28) – speaking (*say, tell, say, ask*) and active perception (*look, watch, stare*). Examples of private verbs include verbs of cognitive perception (*see, hear*) – such as (29) – cognition (*think, wonder*), sensation (*feel*) and emotion (*want, feel*).  

The use of private verbs is of potential interest when considering the question of access to consciousness. That is, in terms of the psychology of autobiographical memories, while all participial complements are associated with memories that were acquired by personal experience (typically direct perceptual experience), rather than those acquired by indirect means (such as inference or hearsay), it might be suggested that narratives that contain a high frequency of verbs of perception and emotion exhibit a high degree of clarity of recall and ‘perceptual specificity’ which is particularly associated with the narration of ‘true’ memories.

---

107 According to Brinton (1980), acts of ‘active perception’, as described by verbs such as *look* and *watch*, are externally observable whereas acts of ‘cognitive perception’, such as *see*, are not (see also Chun and Zubin 1995, Bal 1985, Edmiston 1989).
rather than ‘false’ memories (Tulving 1972, Conway and Pleydell-Pearce 2000).\textsuperscript{108} However, since it is also the case that the relative frequency of public or private verbs in the (translated) JE data may simply reflect the content of the ST, rather than a matter of variable construal, this will not be pursued as a means of comparing the EE and JE data.\textsuperscript{109}

Having examined some of the general characteristics of memories reported by \textsc{remember}-constructions with -\textit{ing} complements, the key finding is that, although they are the most frequent object complement type in both sub-corpora of the ECC, the proportion of memories reported using the experiential -\textit{ing} complement is higher in the EE (54.0\%) than the JE (37.8\%) data. Given that a participial complement construal can only be used to report a memory that was acquired by experience – unlike a \textit{that}-clause complement, for example, which can describe a memory that was either acquired by perceptual experience or indirect means of acquisition (hearsay, general knowledge and so on) (Lyons 1982: 108) – an -\textit{ing} complement construal is interpreted as reflecting the adoption of an experiential stance.

In this sense, \textsc{remember -ing} constructions are strongly autobiographical in character, and their use to report the remembered experiences of an \textsc{other} (i.e. a biographical mode of narration) is usually only possible with additional evidential marking to indicate the source of the knowledge being reported, or the acceptance of some situational factors or generic conventions that allow its unqualified use. Such a situation may arise, for example, in the case of an (authorised) biography where the author has been granted privileged access to the biographical subject (and this is indicated in paratextual material).\textsuperscript{110} Alternatively, the generic conventions of translation, where the translator’s adoption of the first person

\textsuperscript{108}As mentioned in 2.4., this characterisation is supported by Dixon’s argument that participial complements are associated with clarity of recall, exemplified thus; “I \textit{remembered that I have visited Paris} (but couldn’t recall anything I did there) and \textit{I remembered visiting Paris} (and had a clear recollection of every part of the holiday)” (2008: 28).

\textsuperscript{109}In the JE translations, it was noted that there is a greater predominance of descriptions of ‘internal’ or ‘private’ experiences than in the EE texts. This might suggest a tendency to narrate cerebral and emotional (vs. physical) experiences in Japanese autobiographies, or may simply reflect the actual life experiences of the JJ text authors examined here, and their selection of what types of experiences to narrate. See Walker (1994) for a comparative approach to English and Japanese autobiographical narratives.

\textsuperscript{110}An example of such a case is Andrew Morton’s (1992) biography \textit{Diana: Her true story} in which Morton reports his subject’s recollections without additional qualification – e.g. “she remembers thinking” (ibid. 49) – but sanctioned by the claims made in paratextual materials of the access afforded to the biographer which enables him to channel “her own words”.}
discursive position is accepted by the reader, sanction the unqualified use of an experiential stance.

Although it might be the case that the lower frequency of experiential -ing complements in the JE (translated) data simply reflects the content of the JJ source texts, considered in the light of the autobiographical vs. biographical distinction elaborated above, it also seems reasonable to hypothesise that this is a manifestation of the translator’s stance in relation to the memories being narrated, reflecting the real-world situation (the memories are not based on the translator’s first-hand experience but were acquired by hearsay) and concomitant cognitively-grounded resistance to adopting an infelicitous experiential stance to narrate such memories. This question will be revisited in the light of the analysis of REMEMBER-constructions reflecting an experiential stance in the JCC data (4.3.), where it is hoped that the bi-directional comparable corpus design may either lend support to or contradict such a hypothesis.

4.2.3. that complements

That-clause complements are the least frequent complement type occurring with remember in both the EE and JE sub-corpora, occurring in 4.1% and 12.2% of constructions respectively. The low frequency of occurrence is unsurprising, comparing the types of recollection that predominate in autobiographical narratives against the character of that-clause objects, which are associated with memories of propositional knowledge (Van Valin and Wilkins 1993, Lyons 1982) or ‘fact’ (Dixon 2008).

While that-clause complements are prototypically associated with the report of information, knowledge or facts, including memories acquired by indirect means such as hearsay, this does not preclude their use in reporting memories of experiences acquired directly. For example, in (30) an olfactory memory is reported using a that-clause complement.

---

111 When examining concordances manually, it was noted that not all instances of remember+that are that complements; for example, demonstrative uses such as I remember that relief [EES], I remember that meal [EES] were classified as NP objects.
In (30), although the memory being reported was presumably acquired by the autobiographical subject’s direct sensory perceptual experience, it is construed by the use of a *that*-clause as ‘knowledge’. Similarly, in (31), a memory acquired by visual means is reported using a *that*-clause construal, thereby shifting the focus of attention away from the act of perception by which the knowledge was acquired.

In such cases, Zalizniak suggests that the non-experiential, propositional construal incorporates the experiential memory by means of some such mental processing as: “I remember my doing it, therefore I conclude that I have done it, and I remember this fact” (2007: 105).

Examination of the 22 *that*-clause complements found in the ECC reveals that all instances narrate memories that appear to have been acquired by direct experience. It is therefore assumed that all of the non-experiential *that*-clause construals in the data could optionally have been narrated using experiential *-ing* complements. Since a memory acquired by experience can alternatively be construed using an experiential *ing* complement (e.g. *I remember talking to him*) or a non-experiential *that*-clause (e.g. *I remember that I talked to him*), with the respective forms construing a contrasting relationship between the narrator and memory being narrated, the use of a non-experiential construal is regarded as a significant, and possibly marked, choice.

Of the *that*-clause complements found in the ECC, two sub-types were identified: the *that* and zero-*that* forms. In contrast to (30) and (31) above, where *that* is retained, in (32) and (33) the *that* complementiser is omitted.

---

112 In one case it appeared that the proposition expressed in the complement clause might be based on knowledge rather than experience: *I remember that Yasuda was pitching for the Swallows* [JE2]. However, upon examining the immediate context in which this occurs, it became apparent that the narrator is recalling a baseball match at which he was present, and therefore the memory of Yasuda’s pitching is assumed to be based on personal (perceptual) experience rather than hearsay.
I remember one day they lashed into us backfielders for sloppy heading [JE5]

I remember she was eating a carton of yogurt [EE5]

Although it has been suggested that the retention or omission of optional that has minimal semantic contrast – Elness notes that in most cases that and zero-that forms can “seemingly be used interchangeably, with no apparent difference in meaning” (1984: 519) – a substantial number of accounts infer a contrast between that and zero-that based on the circumstances in which retention/omission is likely (Bolinger 1972, 1977; Thompson and Mulac 1991, Dixon 2005, 2008; Yaguchi 2001).\(^\text{113}\) The various correlations that have been identified between contextual factors and patterns of retention or omission of that – for example, the retention of that is associated with particular genres (e.g. scientific) and formal registers (Storms 1966), third person subjects (Elsness 1984) and grammatical explicitness (Rohdenburg 1996) – suggest that the that vs. zero-that contrast is pragmatically grounded and, therefore, meaningful. Olohan and Baker’s (2000) identification of markedly different patterns of use of that vs. zero-that with verbs of speech and through report in translated vs. non-translated texts strengthens the claim that the that vs. zero-that contrast is meaningful, although explanations for the reasons underlying this difference have proved more elusive (cf. Becher 2010).

Deriving from observations of the correlational tendencies of the omission of that and contextual factors such as those mentioned above, a number of accounts have developed arguments to suggest that the use of a that subordinating conjunction reflects ‘conceptual distance’ and ‘indirect experience’ (Borkin 1973,

\(^{113}\) There is a substantial body of literature discussing patterns of omission of the ‘optional that’ complementiser, and debating the circumstances in which this is likely to occur. Thompson and Mulac (1991) summarise a number of these accounts, amongst which are McDavid’s suggestion that “the conditions under which that may be omitted seem partly stylistic and partly grammatical” (1964: 113), Elness’ (1984) identification of a number of factors “including style, potential ambiguity, structural complexity, weight, and closeness of clause juncture” (ibid. 519) that appear to influence the omission of that, and accounts that consider the role of the semantics of the main verb (Hooper and Thompson 1973, Underhill 1988). Of potential relevance to the present discussion is Bolinger’s (1972) suggestion that that omission is linked to “subconscious factors such as the attitude of the subject of the main verb towards the content of the complement clause and the extent to which its content is known information” (Thompson and Mulac 1991: 238). On the basis of these respective accounts, Thompson and Mulac conclude that that omission represents “genuine choices of the speaker based on such factors as attitude, emotional stance, information flow, and discourse structure” concluding that, not least, that omission is a function of ‘epistemicity’ (ibid.).
Lakoff and Johnson 1980, Underhill 1988), or objectivity and distance (Storms 1966, Langacker 2008). The omission of that is therefore associated with less pragmatic strength and diminishing of the effects mentioned above. Langacker summarises the contrast thus:

[that] explicitly marks the proposition expressed as an object of conception – that is, as being construed objectively rather than subjectively. Reinforcing its objective construal has the effect of more clearly differentiating the proposition from any conceptualizer who entertains it ... The omission of that tends to correlate with a number of factors implying lesser distance between the conceptualizer and complement proposition: first person, present tense, opinion, simplicity, and informality.

(2008: 444)

In both in the EE and JE data, that is retained more often than it is omitted: in approximately 60% of cases in both sub-corpora (Table 1).

Table 1. Frequency of that and zero-that remember complements in the ECC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>that-complement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>that</td>
<td>zero-that</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>6 (60.0%)</td>
<td>4 (40.0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE</td>
<td>7 (58.3%)</td>
<td>5 (41.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the small number of examples of this type of complement in the ECC limits the conclusions that can be drawn in relation to that omission in memory-reporting constructions with remember, there does not appear to be a significant difference in the frequency of that omission in the non-translated vs. translated data.114 Further, since all of the examples narrate memories that are based on

114 Based on the findings of Olohan and Baker (2000), which observed a significantly higher frequency of use of optional that with verbs of speech and thought report in translated texts than non-translated texts, it might have been expected that the JE data would show a greater tendency to retain that than the EE data.
experience, it is not possible to infer a relationship between a that vs. zero-that construal and the evidential basis of the memory (experience vs. knowledge) in the present data set.\textsuperscript{115} Therefore, for the purposes of the present analysis, that and zero-that will be considered examples of the same type of complementation strategy; both are associated with the report of a memory as a proposition and adoption of a non-experiential stance. However, it is acknowledged that pragmatic strength of a zero-that construction may be weaker than that effected by a construction in which that is retained.

To conclude the discussion of that-clause complements in the ECC data, it may be useful to restate the major findings. It was observed that the number of instances of REMEMBER-constructions occurring with a that-clausal object is relatively small, suggesting that this is a marginal complement form in autobiographical narratives. Given that, in the case of the examples examined here, all of the memories reported with a non-experiential that construal appear to have been acquired by direct experience, and could therefore optionally have been realised by a more frequently occurring experiential -ing complement (or NP object), their use might be considered as marked, and possibly indicative of ‘distance’.\textsuperscript{116} Significantly, such constructions occur in the JE (translated) data approximately three times more frequently than in the EE (non-translated) data (12.2\% vs. 4.1\%). While it might be suggested that this difference simply reflects ST content (e.g. a higher proportion of non-experiential construals in the JJ texts), it might also be interpreted as revealing something of the psychological stance adopted by the translator in relation to the memories being narrated. This discussion will be resumed in 4.4, following the analysis of the JCC data in 4.3.

\textbf{4.2.4. NP objects}

Approximately 35\% of REMEMBER-constructions in both the EE and JE sub-corpora have a NP object, which may be either a simple NP or a NP with relative clause as shown in (34) and (35) respectively.

\textsuperscript{115} There are no known explanations of that omission that examine evidential basis as a possible factor.

\textsuperscript{116} Underhill (1988) suggests that that is used when the speaker attributes the proposition expressed in the complement to someone else.
(34) I can still remember the faintly sweet taste of the porridge and the tang of the salty plum [JE6]

(35) I remember the women’s gym that my mother carted me along to [EE5]

Since the memories reported in these constructions appear to have been acquired by experience – a gustatory experience in (34) and a general perceptual experience in (35) – they could alternatively have been construed using an *ing*-complement (such as *I can still remember tasting*, *I remember visiting*). However, by using a NP object, the focus of the description is placed on the remembered phenomenon itself, rather than the experience of that phenomenon, i.e. on the phenomenon of taste rather than the experience of tasting. Examination of the data suggests that all the memories reported using NP objects were acquired by direct experience and therefore could optionally have been narrated using an experiential (*-ing complement) construal.

As mentioned previously, existing accounts of the types of elements that occur as the object of *remember* tend to focus on *ing*, *that* and to *to* complements with relatively little comment on the report of memories by NP objects and how they structure a relationship between the narrator and the memory being reported.\(^{117}\) With reference to complement-taking cognitive verbs in general, Langacker observes that, when a verb is followed by a nominal object complement, a “mental relationship” is profiled between the conceiver and the object of conception (2008: 432). However, the exact nature of this relationship is not specified and, unlike *-ing* and *that*-clause complements, NP objects do not have grammatical instantiations that point to a particular type of relationship. With particular reference to *remember*, Zalizniak simply notes that the relationship between the narrator and the memory construed in a NP is somewhat ‘vague’ (2007: 105).

Observing that, with *remember*, “NP objects allow the same range of interpretations as the different syntactic complement types” Osswald and Latrouite

\(^{117}\) As mentioned in 2.4., Van Valin and Wilkins (1993) do not offer an interpretation for the semantics of *remember* when it occurs with a NP object and, while Tao (2001, 2003) observes that NP objects are found in a significant proportion of cases, he does not offer an interpretation of the semantics of such constructions.
(2009) suggest that a NP construction such as I remember the stairwell can be interpreted as having experiential character, as in I remember seeing the stairwell, or propositional character as in I remember that there was a stairwell. However, since neither interpretation is indicated by the form of the original NP construction itself, it remains unclear as to how the various interpretations should be differentiated. Osswald and Latrouite’s observations resemble those of Goddard’s (2007) study of the object-taking behaviour of forget, which also suggests that NP objects can be interpreted with reference to one of the syntactic complements – to, that, and wh-clause complements – accepted by forget. Goddard argues that

different clausal complement types ... can be correlated with certain NP-complement examples which can be semantically analysed along similar lines. For example, I forgot the beer can mean, on one reading ‘I forgot to bring the beer’ (to-complement type); I forgot my appointment can mean roughly ‘I forgot that I had an appointment’ (that-complement type); and I forgot her address can mean roughly ‘I forgot where her house was’ (wh-complement type).

(2007: 120)

However, he goes on to acknowledge that each of the interpretations provided is only “one reading” and that in each case alternatives are possible. The accounts offered by Osswald and Latrouite (2009) and Goddard (2007) tend to support Zalizniak’s (2007) assessment that, in NP constructions, the narrator’s stance with respect to a memory being recalled is ‘vague’ or obscure.

Examining the character of REMEMBER-constructions with NP objects in the ECC, a number of characteristics can be observed. Firstly, NP objects are predominantly found in affirmative constructions. There are only four negative NP object constructions in the data, in each case the entity described in the NP being introduced by the indefinite article ‘a’ – I can’t remember a time [EE5], I can’t remember a thing [EE1], I can’t remember a childhood [EE5], and I don’t remember a word [EE5]. Secondly, although NPs using the indefinite article are also found in affirmative constructions in five cases – including, I remember a burst of laughter [EE6], I remember a slight vibration [EE6], I remember a warmth [EE5] – the vast majority of affirmative NP constructions incorporate the definite article – as in the words, the drive, the trip, the pizza, the gym, the day, the specific crush, the desire
and so on. It might be suggested, therefore, that NP objects are associated with qualities of ‘definiteness’, as might be expected given that they recall a specific remembered phenomenon.

It is also noticeable that memories reported using a NP object (with a definite article) are usually accompanied by detailed descriptions of the remembered phenomenon. For example, as in (34) above, NPs may be modified by adjectives describing visual, spatial and other sensory perceptual details – such as the wide open sky, the scent of perfume, the sweetness in my mouth, and the heat of the tears – or emotional states and reactions – such as the relief, the dizzying panic, the unexpected pleasure, the strange sense of disembodiment, and the powerful impression. NPs may also be accompanied by adverbial qualifications – such as (very) clearly, well, especially, particularly, specifically and in particular – which indicate the clarity and ease of recall of the memory. As mentioned in 2.2., perceptual specificity and emotional intensity are characteristic attributes of memories based on direct personal experience (rather than either false memories, or memories acquired by indirect means), as are qualities of vividness of recall (Tulving 1972, Conway and Pleydell-Pearce 2000).

Thus, the character of the NP object constructions in the ECC data is suggestive that the relationship between the narrator and the remembered phenomenon is based on direct (perceptual) experience. Therefore, it might be argued that the NP constructions carry an implication of an omitted experiential participial of perception or sensation – such as I can still remember (tasting) the faintly sweet taste of the porridge or I remember (feeling) the heat of the tears on my cheeks. However, since such a participle is absent in a NP construal, the focus of the report is not placed on the experience itself but on the experienced phenomenon, and, as such, the evidential relationship between the experiencer and the memory is effaced.

To summarise, approximately one third of all REMEMBER-constructions in both the EE (34.6%) and JE (34.7%) data take a NP object, although the memories that they narrate appear to have been acquired by direct experience and therefore could optionally have been narrated using an experiential construction. From a syntactic point of view, the choice of an NP construal has been interpreted as obscuring the experiential relationship between the narrator and memory, while in
terms of the lexical resources used to supply ‘event specific knowledge’, the experiential basis of the memory often remains clearly in evidence.118

4.2.5. wh-clausal objects

Wh-clausal objects also receive relatively little attention in the literature, although some interpretations of wh-clause objects have been offered with reference to (in)determinacy, based on contrasts with both NP and that-clause objects.

Grimshaw (1979), for example, notes the interchangeability of NP and wh-clause object complements in negative remember constructions such as (36).

(36)  a. I can’t remember the kind of beer John drinks.
      b. I can’t remember what kind of beer John drinks.

(ibid. 299)

Grimshaw argues that, while both (a) and (b) are acceptable, indeterminate objects such as (b) are more natural in negative constructions than NP objects (incorporating the definite article the). Thompson (2002) notes that a contrast between that- and wh-clauses can also be described in terms of determinacy: that is declarative in character and signals what is known, whereas an wh-clause is interrogative in character and indicates enquiry about knowledge and, as such, is associated with a lack of knowledge, or indeterminacy (see also Dixon 1991: 215-6, Quirk et al 1985: 1184). This contrast is attested by the observation that that-clause complements in the ECC are found only in affirmative constructions, whereas wh-clauses occur most often (although not exclusively) in negative constructions.119

In the ECC, REMEMBER-constructions with a wh-clause object are found in 7.4% of cases in the EE sub-corpus and 15.3% in the JE sub-corpus. These constructions incorporate a range of interrogative pronouns (what, why, who, where, when and so on), as exemplified by (37) and (38).120

118 Although the present study focusses on grammatical construal, it is acknowledged that there may be a conflict between the grammatical structure and lexical features that direct either an experiential or non-experiential interpretation.
119 Unsurprisingly, wh-clause complements are frequently found with the verb forget (Cf. Goddard 2007).
120 Whether, if and how are also included in this category. If is interpreted as a wh-type relativiser used with the meaning ‘whether’: for example, I tried to remember if i’d ever met anyone under the age of seventy who might have been afflicted, and only one came to mind [EE6].
I cannot remember what prompted the lieutenant to make this speech [EE4]

I do not remember who it was among us that whispered [EE4]

These examples illustrate the strong correlation between the occurrence of wh-clause objects and negative constructions. Indeed, wh-clause complements using the interrogatives why, who, when, and whether are found only in negative constructions in both the EE and JE sub-corpora and may not, therefore, be subject to variable construal.121

A small number of affirmative constructions with a wh-clausal object were also found in the ECC data: one instance with the interrogative what, in (39), and a small number with how, such as in (40).

I remember what my hands were like: birdlike, papery, blue and numb [EE5]

I can still remember how pathetic it made me feel by comparison [JE2]

In (39), the wh-clause could optionally have been replaced by a that-clause construction, such as I remember that my hands were birdlike, papery, blue and numb, or possibly an experiential construction, such as I remember my hands being birdlike, papery, blue and numb. Therefore, it might be suggested that affirmative constructions with wh-clausal objects are subject to variable construal.

How-clause objects, such as (40), are also found with remember in a small number of cases. These adjectival constructions, which Grimshaw describes as ‘concealed exclamations’ (1979: 287) – other examples include how peculiar, how nervous, and how natural – have affective character, and describe the narrator’s internal (emotional or sensory) state, thereby supplying ‘emotional intensity’ to the narration of the memory; a characteristic of the narration of memories based on actual personal experience (Tulving 1972, Conway and Pleydell-Pearce 2000).

However, since the majority of wh-clause objects in the ECC data occur in negative constructions (as do all of the wh-clause objects in the JCC), in general, the

121 The wh-clause in constructions (37) and (38) could theoretically be replaced by a NP with the definite article the (such as the reason or the person). However, as observed by Grimshaw (1979), this is somewhat unnatural in negative constructions.
wh-clause category is not subject to variable construal and is therefore unlikely to provide a useful indicator of narrator stance when comparing non-translated vs. translated texts.

4.3. An Analysis of Reported Memories in the JCC

4.3.1. Relative Frequency of Objects of Recollection with oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru

Prior to the examination of respective objects found with REMEMBER-constructions in the JCC, the three verbs of recollection that are subject to analysis here – oboeru, omoidasu, and kioku suru – are described briefly, indicating their individual characteristics, relative frequency of use in the corpus, and patterns of complementation.

As already mentioned, while REMEMBER-constructions are found relatively frequently in the ECC, this kind of construction is less common in the JCC data. Furthermore, while almost all memory-reporting constructions in the ECC use the verb remember (626 examples), the JCC data does not display such a marked preponderance of one verb. Rather, three verbs of recollection – oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru – are used to report the recollection of past experiences. Therefore, in order to maximise the number of examples available for analysis, REMEMBER-constructions using all three of these verbs were examined.

As mentioned in 4.1.1, a total of 193 REMEMBER-constructions were identified in the JCC. Table 2 provides a breakdown of these constructions for each of the three verbs of recollection under consideration, listed in order of frequency.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{122} Frequency data for individual texts can be found in Appendix D.
Table 2. Frequency of REMEMBER-constructions using oboeru, omoidasu and kioku suru in the JCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verb of Recollection</th>
<th>JJ sub-corpus</th>
<th>EJ sub-corpus</th>
<th>JCC Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oboeru</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>omoidasu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kioku suru</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total REMEMBER-CONSTRUCTIONS</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 2, in both the JJ and EJ sub-corpora, memory-reporting constructions using oboeru are the most frequently occurring, followed by those using omoidasu, and then those using kioku suru. Although each of the verbs has the basic meaning ‘remember’, there are some differences in the semantic and pragmatic features of the three verbs that can be linked to the circumstances of their use.

As mentioned already, English remember (unlike, for example, recall), can be used to report the recollection of experiential (episodic) and non-experiential (semantic) memories, which may occur spontaneously or with effort, as well as intentional, future-oriented acts of remembering. However, none of the Japanese verbs of recollection is used with the full range of meanings that can be attributed to remember (perhaps accounting for the use of three verbs of recollection in the autobiographical narratives in the JCC). According to the definitions provided in the Koujien and Meikyo monolingual dictionaries and Shougakukan Japanese-English bilingual dictionary, the most frequently used verb of recollection, oboeru, has the following meanings: (1) remember, (2) memorise, (3) learn, understand, and (4) feel or sense. The meaning of oboeru as it is used in REMEMBER-constructions in the JCC pertains to (1), as in haha no okotta kao o ima demo oboeteiru ‘Even now I remember my mother’s angry face’ [EJ6]. The definition for the verb kioku suru bears a close resemblance to that of oboeru, indeed, both monolingual dictionaries appear to equate oboeru and kioku suru by citing each in

---

123 Horn notes that many English cognitive verbs, including remember, do not have direct cognates in Japanese (2008: 36).
124 Oboeru can also be used to report intentional remembering but, as with English remember to, this usage is excluded from the analysis as it is not used in memory-reporting constructions.
definition of the other. *Kioku suru* is used in REMEMBER-constructions such as *Touha o koete, Soudai no katsudouka no subete ga shukufuku shiteita no o kioku shiteiru* ‘I remember all the Sodai activists celebrated, irrespective of their faction’ [JJ4].

When used to report memories, both *oboeru* and *kioku suru* occur in the present progressive forms *oboeteiru* and *kioku shiteiru*, suggesting the durative character of the act of remembering.

While the verbs *oboeru* and *kioku suru* can be regarded as largely synonymous, the circumstances in which one or the other is selected vary. As a native Japanese word (*wago*), *oboeru* tends to be used in informal, interpersonal contexts, such as everyday conversation, and expressive literary forms including, for example, poetry (Maynard 1998: 14-15). *Kioku suru*, on the other hand, as a Sino-Japanese word (*kango*) – *kango* are characterised as “precise and analytical” and often used to express abstract and scientific concepts – is found more frequently in impersonal, formal registers, including academic discourse (ibid. 15). It is therefore unsurprising that *oboeru* is used significantly more frequently than *kioku suru* in popular autobiographical narratives, which typically narrate memories acquired by personal experience, rather than facts, and are relatively informal in register.126

In contrast to *oboeru* and *kioku suru*, *omoidasu* refers specifically to (spontaneous or intentional) acts of ‘bringing to mind’ and is therefore close in meaning to English *recall*. The meaning of *omoidasu* accounts for its aspectual character in REMEMBER-constructions in the JCC; while *oboeru* and *kioku suru* appear in the present progressive, *omoidasu* is used in the simple present tense

125 See Maynard (1998: 16) and Smith and Schmidt (1996: 60) for a discussion of the diachronic, ideological, and biographical factors that influence the choice of *wago/kango* and orthographic preference.

126 In establishing a semantic contrast between the two verbs, their orthographic realisations are illuminating. *Oboeru* is usually written as 見える, using a character which is used with such meanings as ‘perceive’, ‘sense’, and ‘sensation’, suggesting a sensory perceptual (experiential) aspect to the core meaning of *oboeru* (Halpern 1999: 614). On the other hand, *kioku suru* is written as 記憶する, using two kanji characters which mean ‘record’ and ‘infer’ or ‘conjecture’ respectively, suggesting a conceptual interpretation of remembering (ibid. 198). The kanji characters used to write *oboeru* and *kioku suru* may point to a connection between the choice of *oboeru* to report memories based on experience (i.e. episodic memories) and *kioku suru* to report remembered factual information (semantic memories). Anecdotal evidence from Japanese native speaker informants confirms that *kioku suru* is associated with the report of memories that are shared with other people rather than known only to the speaker. It was also suggested by informants that the two verbs indicate a different physical locus of remembering, such that memories reported by *oboeru* are stored in the ‘heart’ (chest) whereas memories reported by *kioku suru* are stored in the ‘mind’ (head).
(omoidasu) – as in shokei no koukei o omoidasu ‘I remember the spectacle of the executions’ [EJ4] – thus reflecting the discrete rather than continuous character of the cognitive activity it describes. Since the focus of REMEMBER-constructions using omoidasu is on an experience of recollection, its use in the JCC data is often accompanied by adverbial qualifications describing the ease/difficulty and quality of recall, for example ari ari to ‘vividly’ [EJ5] and totsujo toshite ‘suddenly’ [EJ5]. Omoidasu also occurs in a number of negative REMEMBER-constructions describing partial or failed attempts at recall, such as itsu nuketa no ka, seikaku na jiten wa omoidasenai ‘I can’t remember the exact moment I overtook’ [JJ2]. Thus, it might be suggested that while oboeru and kioku suru focus on the retention of a memory from the time of its acquisition to the present moment of its narration, the focus of omoidasu is on a present act of recollection.

Considering the characteristics of oboeru, kioku suru and omoidasu, the relative frequencies of use of these verbs in autobiographical narratives of personal experience is unsurprising. As already mentioned, the order of frequency of use of the three verbs is the same in both sub-corpora (oboeru > omoidasu > kioku suru). However, their relative frequencies of occurrence exhibit variation between the two data sets (Fig. 9).
Fig. 9 shows that in both the JJ and EJ data, approximately 28% of REMEMBER-constructions use omoidasu to report memories with a focus on the act of recollection, and the remaining 72% use either oboeru or kioku suru to report memories with a focus on the duration of their retention in memory. However, a noticeable difference in the JJ and EJ data is that while approximately one in four of the ‘durative’ constructions use kioku suru in the JJ data, this verb is found in only one case in the EJ data.\textsuperscript{127} This may be explained by the lack of a similar pair of synonyms to oboeru and kioku suru in English, thus, translators into Japanese may have chosen the most commonly used verb oboeru by default, rather than kioku suru which is perhaps less associated with autobiographical narration. Having

\textsuperscript{127} Kioku suru is found in only three texts in the JJ sub-corpus (JJ2, JJ4 and JJ7) (see Appendix D).
commented on the respective meanings and relative frequency of occurrence of 
oboeru, kioku suru and omoidasu in the JCC, the range of entities that appear in
object position with these verbs is now considered.

As is the case with English remember, the Japanese verbs oboeru, omoidasu
and kioku suru accept a range of nominal and clausal elements in object position,
thereby allowing various possible construals of the memories being reported. There
are four frequently found types of element that occur in object position in the JCC
data – complement clauses nominalised by no, complement clauses nominalised by
koto, NP objects and wh-clausal objects – each of which is illustrated below using
examples from the ECC data.

(41) ずいぶん大人に見えるなと思ったのを覚えている [EJ5]
zuibun otona ni mieru nā to omotta no o oboeteiru
I remember thinking how grown up I looked

(42) 満足を感じたことを覚えている [EE6]
manzoku o kanjita koto o oboeteiru
I remember that I felt satisfaction

(43) そこにあるくぼみや段差のひとつひとつを記憶している [JJ2]
soko ni aru kubomi ya dansa no hitotsu hitotsu o kioku shiteiru
I remember every single hollow and difference in level there

(44) 母が何と答えたか思い出せない [EJ5]
haha ga nan to kotaeta ka omoidasenai
I can’t remember what my mother replied

The examples above illustrate the typical tense/aspectual character of the three
verbs of recollection mentioned previously: oboeru and kioku suru are conjugated
in the present progressive form teiru in (41), (42) and (43), whereas omoidasu is
found in the simple present tense in (44). The syntactic relations between the
object and the verb in each example are indicated by case-marking particles,
including o to indicate a direct object in (41) and (42), the topic marker wa to
indicate a contrast or add emphasis in (43), and ka which is used with a wh-clause to indicate an interrogative in (44).

Table 3 shows the raw frequency of occurrence of each of the four main types of object introduced above, and for infrequently found non-nominalised complements (‘Other’), for each of the three verbs of recollection.

Table 3. Raw frequency of object types with oboeru, kioku suru and omoidasu in the JCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-corpus</th>
<th>Verb</th>
<th>no-clause</th>
<th>koto-clause</th>
<th>NP</th>
<th>wh-clause</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JJ</td>
<td>oboeru</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kioku suru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omoidasu</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>oboeru</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>kioku suru</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>omoidasu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC</td>
<td>JCC TOTAL</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While it is difficult to posit correlations between the verb of recollection used in a reporting construction and the type of object complement with which it occurs based on the data in Table 3 (particularly in the case of the less frequently found verbs kioku suru and omoidasu), it is noticeable that 71 out of the 85 nominalised clausal objects (38 no-clause and 47 koto-clause objects) occur with oboeru. Indeed, 34 of the 38 constructions in which the object is a no-clause occur with oboeru. In contrast, use of the verb kioku suru appears to correlate with the use of non-nominalising complements, with 5 of the 6 examples of this object type occurring with kioku suru. This suggests that there is a correlation between the semantics of the verb and the type of object with which it is likely to appear, which resonates with the findings of studies of complementation with English remember (cf. Van Valin and Wilkins 1993).
Having reviewed the character and frequency of occurrence of the three verbs and their objects individually, the remainder of the discussion will focus on the relative frequency of occurrence of the various types of object occurring in all REMEMBER-constructions in the JJ and EJ data (Fig. 10).

![Figure 10. Relative Frequency of Object Complements in REMEMBER-constructions in the JCC](image)

Comparing the profiles of the JJ and EJ sub-corpora, Fig. 10 shows that the relative frequencies of certain types of objects, such as wh-clause and no-clause objects, are similar in both the JJ and EJ data, whereas other objects display markedly different frequencies: there is a higher proportion of NP objects and (non-nominalised) ‘other’ objects in the JJ data, and a higher proportion of koto-clause in the EJ data. In the following sections, each type of object will be discussed in detail,
commenting on salient features of the REMEMBER-constructions in which they occur and how the grammatical structure of the object construes the memory being reported, with particular reference to the construal of the memory from an experiential or non-experiential stance.

4.3.2. no-complements
As discussed in 2.3., in general, no-complements are associated with events and activities that have been directly perceived (experienced) by the speaker (see Kuno 1973, Horie 2000, Suzuki 2000b, Akatsuka-McCawley 1978a). Therefore, in the case of REMEMBER-constructions, clausal complements nominalised by no indicate that the memory being reported was acquired as a result of the narrator’s direct (perceptual) experience and, as such, reflect an experiential stance. In the JJ sub-corpus 21.3% and in the EJ sub-corpus a slightly lower proportion of 18.9% of REMEMBER-constructions occur with a no-complement. (45) to (47) are examples of no-clause complements with each of the three verbs of recollection.

(45) 美容業界はなかなか楽しいところだと思ったのを覚えている [EJ2]

Biyougyoukai wa nakanaka tanoshii tokoro da to omotta no o oboeteiru
I remember thinking that the beauty industry was a pretty fun place to be

(46) 退オマギョのやりとりがあったのを記憶している [JJ4]

manzai modoki no yaritori ga atta no o kioku shiteiru
I remember we had Manzai-esque banter

(47) よくこんな軽口をたいたのを思い出す [EJ3]

Yoku konna karukuchi o tataita no o omoidasu
I remember we often cracked jokes like this

These examples show that, as was the case with ing-complement constructions in the ECC, the memories reported in a no-clause can incorporate private verbs such as omou ‘think’, as in (45), or public verbs such as karukuchi o tataku ‘crack jokes’, as in (47). Additionally, the no-clause object may be a same-subject construction, in

---

128 Although no examples are found in the JCC, the nominaliser, tokoro, which is specifically associated with visual perception (Horie 2000: 18-9) and therefore regarded as experiential in character, is also a possible alternative complement with Japanese REMEMBER-constructions.
which the subject of the verb in the no-clause is the same as the subject of the reporting clause, as in (45) *omotta no o oboetteiru* ‘I remember thinking’, or a different-subject construction, as in (46) and (47) (in which the subject of the verb in the no-clause is not the same as the subject of the reporting clause).

However, irrespective of whether the experience being remembered is knowable only to the narrator or not (i.e. entails public or private verbs), or reflects an internal or external (observational) experiential vantage (i.e. same-subject or different-subject constructions) (cf. Lyons 1982), these constructions share the same key characteristic. That is, the selection of a no-clausal object construes the adoption of an experiential stance in relation to the experience being reported. As was noted in relation to the ECC data, since an experiential construal cannot, in normal circumstances, be used to narrate a memory that was not acquired by the speaker’s direct experience, their use in translated autobiographies presents a somewhat complex situation in terms of the conflict between the conventions of translation and normal conventions of evidential construal.

4.3.3. koto-complements

In the JCC, koto-clausal objects are found in REMEMBER-constructions with *oboeru* and *omoidasu*, as exemplified by (48) and (49), but not *kioku suru*.129

(48) 満足を感じたことを覚えている[EJ6]
    manzoku o kanjita koto o oboeteiru
    I remember that I felt satisfaction

(49) むずかしい本を読みながら彼女を思い出す[EJ3]
    muzukashii hon o yomitagatteita koto o omoidasu
    I remember that she wanted to read difficult books

Although, as described in 2.3., the nominaliser *koto* is associated with conceptual knowledge (of facts, states, propositions) rather than perceptual experience (cf. Kuno 1973, Horie 2000, Suzuki 2000b, McCawley 1978 inter alia), examples (48)

---

129 On one hand is the absence of koto-clausal complements with *kioku suru* is somewhat surprising given the character of the verb, but on the other hand perhaps understandable given the relative paucity of examples of memory-reporting constructions using this verb.
and (49) show that a koto-clause can be used to report memories that have been acquired by direct perceptual experience.

In (48), the verb kanjita ‘felt’ describes a memory acquired by the narrator’s direct emotional/sensory experience. Similarly, in (49) the memory being reported incorporates the verb yomitagatteita – consisting of the verb yomu ‘read’ conjugated as the auxiliary adjective yomitai ‘want to read’ and modified by the auxiliary verb garu ‘show signs of’ in the past progressive aspect -gatteita – meaning ‘showed signs of wanting to read’, which can only be used where the speaker has directly perceived something (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 443). The verb yomitagatteita therefore describes the narrator’s perception of the situation/event being reported and clearly indicates that the memory being reported has an experiential basis.

In the JCC data, all of the memories reported using koto-clause objects could alternatively have been construed using a no-clause, since they describe memories acquired by the narrator’s personal experience. When reporting a memory that was acquired by direct perceptual experience, it might be suggested that a no-clause construal is the norm, and the use of a koto-clause is marked. Therefore, where a koto-clause is used to report a memory that was acquired by direct (perceptual) experience – construing it as conceptual knowledge rather than perceptual experience – this can be regarded as a significant indicator of narrator position, specifically, of greater distance.

The high relative frequency of REMEMBER-constructions with a koto-clause in the EJ (translated) sub-corpus (30.3%) – as compared with 11.5% in the JJ (non-translated) sub-corpus – could, therefore, be interpreted either as a function of the ST content (i.e. the JJ data), or as being indicative of a tendency for translators to adopt a non-experiential evidential stance. Section 4.4. will revisit this point in the light of the analysis of the ECC data.

---

310 As mentioned in 2.3., in Japanese, when reporting the internal (emotional, mental or perceptual) states of an OTHER, speakers are, in most circumstances, obliged to indicate the source of evidence on which the report is based; for example, by a marker of hearsay or perception-based inference. Exceptions to this include when describing the inner states of close family members (Kamio 1997).
4.3.4. NP objects

NP objects are the most frequently occurring type of object of REMEMBER-constructions in both the JJ and EJ sub-corpora, occurring in 47.5% and 34.8% of cases respectively. Three types of NP object are found in the data – simple NP, NP with relative clause, and anaphoric pronominal – each of which is exemplified below.

(50) かびくさい臭いを覚えている [EJ5]
    
kabi kusai nioi o oboeteiru
    I remember a musty smell

(51) 見守る仲間の前でなぜかひどく緊張し当惑もしていた自分を覚えている [JJ5]
    
mimamoru nakama no mae de nazeka hidoku kinchou shi toouwaku shiteita jibun o oboeteiru
    I remember myself for some reason being tense and confused in front of the friends who were looking after me

(52) これも覚えている [EJ5]
    
kore mo oboeteiru
    I remember this too

NP objects are not only found in affirmative constructions, but also occur in negative constructions as illustrated by (53), which has a simple NP object, and (54), which has an indefinite pronominal object.

(53) 名前すらひとつ思い出せない [EJ5]
    
namae sura hitotsu mo omoidasenai
    I can’t even remember a single name

(54) この後は何も覚えていない [JJ3]
    
kono ato wa nanimo oboeteinai
    I don’t remember anything after that

As was found to be the case in the English data, many memories reported by NP objects are accompanied by detailed adjectival and adverbial descriptions of
the entity being remembered and/or of the quality of the recall of the memory. For example, (55) and (56) include both perceptual and emotional details associated with the remembered entity and descriptions emphasising the clarity of the memory being reported.

(55) 出された食事をひとつひとつ完璧に覚えている [EJ5]

Dasareta shokuji o hitotsu hitotsu kokumei ni oboeteiru
I remember in detail every single thing I was given to eat

(56) その印象の強烈さを今でも覚えている [JJ5]

Sono inshou no kyouretsusa o ima demo oboeteiru
Even now I remember the intensity of that impression

Where NP objects are accompanied by descriptions of perceptual and emotional details it suggests that the memories being reported were acquired by personal experience. However, in REMEMBER-constructions with a NP object, the focus of the reported memory is on the remembered entity rather than on the experience of that entity.

That is, in (50), while the memory being reported is of a nioi ‘smell’, and therefore assumed to have an experiential basis, the NP construal focuses on the smell (entity) rather than of the experience of smelling (as might be construed by a no-clause object) and the relationship between the narrator and the experience by which the memory was acquired is effaced. Thus, while all of the memories reported in REMEMBER-constructions with NP objects appear to have an experiential basis – that is, they were acquired by the sensory-perceptual experience of the autobiographical subject – the grammatical structure of the NP object does not construe an experiential stance.

A further distinction can be made between two types of NP object in the JCC data that is not found in the ECC data. In the Japanese data, two types of NP object are differentiated: unmodified NPs such as those exemplified above, and modified NPs that have koto attached (taking the form NP-no koto), as in (57).

(57) いまでもあのときの電話のことは覚えている [EJ6]

Ima demo ano toki no denwa no koto wa oboeteiru
Even now I remember the phone call that time
Makino and Tsutsui paraphrase NP-no koto as ‘(things) about-NP’ (1995: 304). Thus, in (57), denwa no koto ‘phone call-no koto’ might be glossed as ‘(things) about-phone call’. Although the modification of a NP object by no koto is obligatory with certain verbs, its use with verbs of recollection such as oboeru is optional (Takubo 2007: 2). Although Takubo describes optional no koto as “semantically vacuous” (ibid. 3), it is assumed here that there is some contrast in the construals effected by NP vs. NP-no koto forms. Two possibilities are discussed below.

Firstly, Karafuji (1998) suggests that no koto identifies a unique/particular/specific referent and therefore has qualities of ‘definiteness’. Hara et al (2010) concur, suggesting that this function may be exploited to resolve potential ambiguities between definite and indefinite interpretations of NPs in Japanese, which has no definite article (ibid. 5). Takubo illustrates such a function using the following examples.

(58) a. Tarou wa oyomesan o sagashiteiru
   Taro is looking for a wife / Taro is looking for his wife

   b. Tarou wa oyomesan no koto o sagashiteiru
   Taro is looking for his wife

(2007: 7)

In (58a), the object of the verb sagasu ‘look for’ is an unmodified NP, which can be interpreted as having either a definite or indefinite referent; that is, it does not presuppose that Taro has a wife. In contrast, the object of the verb in (58b) is modified by no koto and therefore allows only a definite interpretation, that is, Taro must have a wife to whom the NP refers.

A second interpretation, based on Sasaguri’s (1996, 2000) argument that, optional no koto has a modal function motivated by the “speaker’s psychological attitude” or “stance”, may be more applicable to the present data. According to

---

131 According to Takubo’s analysis of the NP-no koto construction, no koto literally means “things, events or facts related to (the referent of) the NP” (2007: 1). This interpretation is derived from the individual meanings of koto and no: koto, used independently, is a noun meaning ‘thing’, ‘event’, ‘fact’ or ‘proposition’ and no is a genitive case marker (ibid.).

132 For verbs that accept only abstract NPs as their objects – for example, verbs of ‘information transfer’ such as hanasu ‘talk’, omou ‘think’, and setsumei suru ‘explain’ – the addition of no koto is obligatory (Takubo 2007: 2). However, with ‘psychological predicates’ such as suki ‘like’ and kirai ‘dislike’ and ‘intentional predicates’ such as sagasu ‘look for’, which accept both concrete and abstract objects, the use of no koto is optional (ibid.).
Sasaguri, while *no koto* does not change the meaning of the NP, it “abstracts the entity” referred to in the NP. That is, it “changes a concrete noun phrase into an abstract one” (Takubo 2007: 1). This suggests that, when a NP is modified by optional *no koto*, the referent of the NP is entertained as a concept, rather than as a perpect.

In order to assess the usefulness of the two explanations in interpreting the present data, it may be helpful to compare two similar REMEMBER-constructions found in the JCC – examples (59) and (60) both recall a *yūjin* ‘friend’ – one of which entails an unmodified NP object and one the modified NP-*no koto* form.

(59) 私は死んだ懐かしいあの友人を思い出す [JJS]

\[ watashi wa shinda natsukashii yūjin o omoidasu \]

I remember my friend who died

(60) わたしはよく、ティム・マレーという友人のことを思い出す [EJ3]

\[ watashi wa yoku, Timu Marē to iu yūjin no koto o omoidasu \]

I often remember my friend Tim Murray

In both (59) and (60) the description of the *yūjin* ‘friend’ is sufficient to indicate a specific referent – in (59) the friend is specified as being a friend who has died, in (60) the friend is named – therefore the function of *no koto* modification is unlikely to be ambiguity resolution, as suggested by Karafuji (1998). Following Sasaguri (1996, 2000), the NP in (59) refers to a concrete entity *yūjin* ‘friend (concrete)’ whereas NP-*no koto* in (60) refers to the abstraction *yūjin no koto* ‘friend (abstract)’.

In this case, the optional *no koto* is interpreted as an indicator of the speaker’s conceptual or psychological stance in relation to the entity being described, one aspect of which might correspond to an experiential vs. non-experiential contrast. That is, the unmodified NP object refers to the (concrete/physical) friend as met and interacted with by the narrator – and therefore the memory entails an experiential aspect – whereas NP-*no koto* refers to an abstract conceptualisation of the idea/fact of the friend, not linked to specific episodic memories, and therefore reflecting a non-experiential stance.

---

333 This explains why verbs that accept only abstract NPs as their objects (such as *hanasu* ‘talk’, *shiru* ‘know’ and *giron suru* ‘discuss’) require NP objects to be modified by *no koto* (Takubo 2007: 2). The use of *no koto* shares some similarities with English *about* when used with verbs such as *talk*. 
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Considering the relative frequency of the two types of NP object in the JJ and EJ data, it is interesting to note that of the 75 NP object constructions in the JCC, 22 take the form NP-no *koto*: 7 of these are found in the JJ sub-corpus, and 15 in the EJ sub-corpus. Thus, a higher proportion of NP objects in the EJ translated data are modified by the optional no *koto* (Fig. 11).

![Figure 11. Proportion of NP vs. NP-no koto in the JCC](image)

Although there is a relatively small number of examples of optional NP-no *koto* in the JCC data overall, the higher relative frequency of their use in the EJ (translated) data – which is not readily attributed to ST influence, since a parallel structure does not exist in English – might be interpreted as an indication of the contrasting positions of the author/translator in relation to the memories being reported.\(^{134}\)

\(^{134}\) While there are insufficient examples to draw any firm conclusions based on the memory-reporting constructions in the JCC data, the observations made here are sufficient to indicate that further investigation into the relative frequency of NP vs. NP-no *koto* objects in translated vs. non-translated texts might be productive.
4.3.5. *wh-clusal objects*

Adopting the same terminology as was applied to the ECC data, *wh*-clause objects refer to constructions that incorporate an interrogative pronoun (such as *nani* ‘what’, *dare* ‘who’, *doko* ‘where’ and so on) and have an indefinite referent. In the JCC, *wh*-clause objects are found exclusively in negative constructions, as in (61) and (62).

(61) 総会が何時間続いたのか覚えていない [EJ2]

*soukai ga nanjikan tsuzuita no ka oboetainai*

I don’t remember how many hours/how long the general meeting went on for

(62) 母が何と言えたか、思い出せない [EJ5]

*haha ga nan to kotaeta ka, omoidasenai*

I can’t remember what my mother replied

As (61) and (62) show, *wh*-clause constructions reporting partial or failed acts of remembering contain an interrogative pronoun plus the interrogative particle *ka* in place of the object marking particle *o* (which is typically found in affirmative constructions). The relative frequency of occurrence of *wh*-clause objects is approximately the same in both the JJ and EJ sub-corpora, 13.1% and 14.4% respectively, and mirrors exactly the frequency of negative *REMEMBER*-constructions in the respective sub-corpora.\(^{135}\) Since the occurrence of *wh*-clause objects is linked directly to the occurrence of negative constructions, this type of construction is not deemed to be a useful indicator of stance in the report of memories.

4.3.6. *Other*

A small number of objects of *REMEMBER*-constructions do not fit into any of the four major categories of object type discussed above. These include objects that are introduced by the non-nominalising complementisers *to, you ni* and *toshite*. Each of these is mentioned briefly here.

\(^{135}\) It was noted in the analysis of the ECC that there are more negative constructions in the EE than JE data, and in the JCC there are more negative constructions in the EJ than JJ. This suggests that differences in the frequency of negative constructions reflect ST-TT relationships.
to-clause

The particle to is a quotative complementiser which is used for both direct and indirect quotation and is typically found with verbs of speaking (iu) and thinking (omou) (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 478-480). According to Yamanaka’s (1976) dictionary of etymology, to was originally a demonstrative meaning ‘that’, which has come to be used as a quotative complementiser. As such, the use of to is prototypically associated with secondhand, or indirect sources of information (Kirsner et al 1976, Suzuki 2000a). However, although to was originally used to report the speech of others, in modern Japanese it has developed extended uses to include the quotation of thoughts of others and of the self (Coulmas 1986: 164). In the JCC data, to is used in REMEMBER-constructions to ‘quote’ the memory of the narrator, as in (63).

(63) 合数以上かかったと記憶している [EJ2]

Nijikan ijou kakatta to kioku shiteiru

I remember that it took more than two hours

Since the memory being reported in (63) could optionally have been construed using one of the other major object types, it is of interest to establish how the use of the quotative to affects the interpretation of the relationship between the narrator and the memory being reported.

Maynard suggests that the act of quotation, even self-quotation, “involves, by definition, the voice of another” (1996a: 210). Therefore, even when quoting the words or thoughts of the self, distance is created between the quoting and quoted selves. Suzuki agrees that to can effect a distancing stance, and therefore may be used to report something to which the speaker is not fully committed (2000a: 39-40). Contrasting the use of to and no complementisers with the perception verb miru ‘see’, Suzuki suggests that “the complement marked by to is considered to refer to inferred information whereas the complement marked by no is interpreted to represent an actual event” (ibid. 37). Based on these accounts, to may be associated with the ‘quotation’ of the speaker’s inference or judgement in relation

---

136 Frajzyngier’s observation that “if a language has a complementizer derived from a demonstrative, such a complementiser will mark the complements of saying and thinking, etc” (1991: 225) appears to apply to both English that and Japanese to. (See also Suzuki 2000a: 35).
to a prior perceived event, rather than reporting the perceived event itself. Thus, in (63) the memory being reported is of the narrator’s judgement that the meeting lasted more than two hours, rather than the fact (koto) or experience (no) of the duration of the meeting.

In the JCC, to non-nominalised clausal object complements occur only three times, twice in the JJ and once in the EJ sub-corpus, in each case with the verb *kioku suru*. Given the very small number of occurrences it is not possible to infer a pattern of occurrence in original vs. translated texts. Nonetheless, it is of interest to note the function of this complement in REMEMBER-constructions.

**you ni**

*You ni* is an auxiliary adjective expressing similarity and used with the meaning ‘as’ or ‘like’ (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 555-6). In the JCC data there are two examples of a reported memory being introduced by *you ni*, one case in the JJ sub-corpus and one in the EJ sub-corpus.

(64) 「俺はこっちでやるから、お前もそっちで闘え。条約なんかぶっつぶそうや」とハッパをかけたように記憶している。[JJ4]

“Ore wa kocchi de yaru kara, omae mo socchi de tatakae. Jouyaku nanka buttsubusou ya” to happa o kaketa you ni kioku shiteru

I remember it like I fired him up saying “I’ll do over here and you fight over there. Let’s wreck the treaty!”.

(65) 自分で自分自身を観察していたように覚えている [EJ5]

*Jibun de jibun jishin o kansatsu shiteita you ni oboeteiru*

I remember it as though I was observing myself.

In (64), *you ni* can be interpreted as a quotative particle, similar to *to*, which ‘quotes’ the narrator’s judgement of how the event unfolded. As mentioned in Suzuki (2000a) in relation to *to*, such uses may indicate reduced speaker commitment to the veracity of the account: indeed, accounts from forensic...
psychology indicate that verbatim speech recall is often reconstructed (cf. Conway 2010: 232). In (65), which reports a non-literal experience (the narrator is describing an out-of-body experience), you ni is used with the meaning of ‘as’ to indicate that the description of the remembered experience is counterfactual.

*toshite*

*Toshite* is a “compound particle which indicates the capacity, role or function” of the preceding NP, which can be paraphrased as ‘in the capacity of’ or ‘as’ (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 501). In the JCC data there is one example of an object introduced by the particle *toshite*, (66), occurring in the JJ sub-corpus.

(66)  阪東妻三郎主演のこの映画のシナリオ・ライターとして記憶している [JJ7]

Bandou Tumasaburou shuen no kono eiga no shinario raita toshite kioku shiteiru

I remember (him) as (being) the scenario writer for this movie starring Bando Tumasaburo

Although the three ‘minor’ complement forms discussed here are so infrequent in the JCC as to preclude meaningful comparison individually in terms of narrator stance, it is of note that collectively they are more frequent in the JJ sub-corpus (five instances) than the EJ sub-corpus (two instances). This may indicate that non-translated texts exhibit a greater range of complement structures, including ‘minor’ forms, than translated texts.\(^\text{139}\)

4.4. Summary: Experiential vs. Non-experiential stance in the translation of reported memories

The analysis of memory reporting structures in the ECC and JCC data revealed a number of differences in the relative frequency of *remember*-constructions construing either an experiential or non-experiential stance in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora. Concluding this stage of the data analysis, the findings for

\(^{139}\) A similar observation is made in relation to the use of the ‘minor’ complement forms *as if*, *as though* and *like* in *seem*-constructions in the ECC which, although relatively infrequent overall, are more frequent in the EE sub-corpus than JE sub-corpus (see 5.2.4.).
the ECC and JCC data are compared, in the expectation that the bi-directional comparable corpus design will throw into relief those differences that are likely to be functions of (E/J) interlingual transfer and those that may point to translational effects.

In the general principles of the analytical framework set out in Chapter 2 it was suggested that the syntactic character of elements occurring in object position with verbs of recollection reveals something of the way in which a narrator positions him or herself in relation to the memory being reported; in particular, whether the object of recollection (memory) is construed from either an experiential or non-experiential stance. Interpreting REMEMBER-constructions in terms of this binary, the relative frequencies of *ing* vs. *that* complements in the ECC data and *no* vs. *koto* in the JCC data have provided the focus for characterising the non-translated vs. translated data. However, the possible significance of the selection of other types of object, including NP and *wh*-clause complements, was also considered.

Comparing the relative frequencies of the respective construals of reported memories in the ECC and JCC corpora reveals a number of areas of potentially significant difference.

**Experiential constructions**

In both the ECC and JCC data, constructions with an *ing*-complement – which presuppose the narrator’s direct perception (experience) of the remembered entity or event, and as such reflect an experiential stance – are less frequent in translated texts than in non-translated texts. Although the difference in the frequency of experiential *no*-clause complements JCC data is much less marked than in the case of the ECC data, the same directional tendency can be observed in both data sets, suggesting that this may be a function of the process of translation, rather than of particular ST influence or English-Japanese / Japanese-English interlingual transfer.

**Non-experiential constructions**

In both the ECC and JCC, non-experiential constructions (with *that* and *koto* respectively) – which structure the reported memory as propositional knowledge and, in the cases examined here, construe memories that were acquired by
experience from a non-experiential stance – are significantly more frequent in the translated data than in the non-translated data.\textsuperscript{140} The difference is pronounced in both corpora, and the observation of the same directional tendency in both cases is again suggestive of a function of the cognitive/psychological processes involved in the mediative process of translation, rather than the effects of the particular STs or languages involved.

NP objects

NP objects are frequently found in both the ECC and JCC; in the ECC data there is no difference in their frequency of use in the non-translated vs. translated data, although in the JCC they are less frequent in the translated sub-corpus. While NP constructions are typically accompanied by lexical indications of an experiential evidential basis, the grammatical structure of a NP object does not profile a relationship between the narrator and the memory being narrated, and as such effaces the narrator’s relationship with the remembered phenomenon, maintaining a focus on the phenomenon itself. In this regard, NP objects do not effect either an experiential or non-experiential stance.

However, it may also be pertinent to reiterate an additional contrast that was observed between two types of NP object identified in the JCC data: simple NPs and NPs modified by no koto. It was found that, in the EJ sub-corpus a higher proportion of NP objects are modified by optional no koto than in the JJ sub-corpus.\textsuperscript{141} The two types of NP were respectively characterised as reflecting a perceptual vs. conceptual construal of the remembered entity, and therefore possibly linked to the experiential vs. non-experiential dichotomy. Given that the higher proportion of use of optional no koto in the EJ data cannot readily be attributed to ST influence, since a parallel structure does not exist in English, their use may therefore point to a ‘psychological stance’ of distance (Sasaguri 1996, 2000) that is linked to the process of translation.

\textsuperscript{140} Although it is acknowledged that the pragmatic force of the non-experiential construal may be less in the case of zero-that than in a construction in which that is retained, since that-omission rates do not differ between the EE and JE data, the category of that complements here includes zero-that clauses for convenience.

\textsuperscript{141} Since a grammatical distinction between abstract vs. concrete NP forms is not found in English, it was not possible to investigate a parallel of the NP vs. NP-no koto contrast in the ECC data.
‘wh’-clausal objects

There is no difference in the relative frequency of use of wh-clausal objects in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora of in the JCC, although they are more frequent in the translated than the non-translated sub-corpus of the ECC. Since these objects are so strongly associated with negative REMEMBER-constructions – with the exception of a small number of ‘exclamatory’ uses occurring in affirmative constructions in the ECC data, all instances occur in negative REMEMBER-constructions – they are not subject to variable construal and therefore not regarded as an indicator of author/translator stance.

Other

Finally, a small set of ‘minor’ complement forms introduced by to, you ni and toshite, were found in the JCC data. Although no interpretation is offered in terms of an experiential vs. non-experiential contrast, and the individual frequencies are too small to allow meaningful comparison of the non-translated vs. translated data, it was noted that, collectively, these constructions are found more frequently in the JJ than the EJ data, suggesting that non-translated texts may exhibit greater variation in their patterns of complementation than do translated texts. Although the number of examples of these complement forms are so few as to preclude the drawing of firm conclusions, this observation recalls the reported “tendency of translated text to gravitate towards the centre of a continuum”, a tendency that has been termed ‘levelling out’ (Baker 1996: 184). 142

Overall, the analysis of REMEMBER-constructions in non-translated vs. translated data found that translated texts in both the ECC and JCC corpora have a lower relative frequency of constructions reflecting an experiential stance, and a higher relative frequency of constructions reflecting a non-experiential stance in relation to the autobiographical memories being reported. This tendency was evidenced in clausal objects (-ing vs. that and no vs. koto) in both the ECC and the JCC, and nominal objects (i.e. NP vs. NP-no koto) in the JCC. Since the same directional tendencies are

142 A similar observation is made in relation to the use of ‘minor’ complement forms with seem in the ECC (see 5.2.4.).
apparent in both the ECC and JCC data, the findings suggest that the differing patterns of construal are not attributable to ST influence, nor a function of linguistic transfer between English and Japanese. Rather, it is suggested that the difference in the profiles of the non-translated vs. translated data may be interpreted as an indicator of the contrasting evidential relationships between an author/translator and the memories being narrated.
Chapter 5. An Analysis of Represented Memories in Non-Translated vs. Translated Autobiographies

Following the analysis of the report of autobiographical memories using explicit reporting constructions, such as *I remember*, the present chapter examines ‘represented memories’ – identified in descriptions of how remembered experiences *seemed* to the experiencer – in original and translated autobiographies.

As mentioned in the analytical framework set out in Chapter 2, experiences of seeming are intimately linked to the instantiation of a SELF, and therefore unsurprisingly feature prominently in autobiographical narratives. Descriptions of seeming can also be considered as constituting a kind of ‘event specific knowledge’ (ESK) that augments the narration of a remembered experience (see 2.2.). From an epistemological point of view, descriptions of seeming have “an essential link with a subject of consciousness” (Brinton 1980: 375), and are therefore regarded as a type of indexical construction that requires the translator to undergo a particularly “complex cognitive task” in negotiating the experiential position of the autobiographical subject (Goethals and De Wilde 2009).

In order to investigate whether descriptions of how remembered experiences seemed to the autobiographical subject change in translation, the analysis reported in this chapter examines objects occurring in SEEM-constructions in the ECC, reporting the relative frequency of use of various object complements, and interpreting them in relation to the narrator’s adoption of an experiential vs. non-experiential stance. In the case of the JCC data, a set of four evidential markers that are used in SEEM-constructions in Japanese, and which collectively construe judgements of seeming from various evidential bases, will be examined. In preparation for this, 5.1 describes the identification of SEEM-constructions in the ECC and JCC corpora, and compares their frequencies of occurrence in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora.

5.1. Identification of SEEM-constructions
This section describes the process of extraction of SEEM-constructions – constructions that describe how remembered experiences seemed to the narrator’s past, experiencing self – from the ECC and JCC, and identification of
those constructions that constitute the object of investigation as defined in the analytical framework. Since descriptions of seeming are realised differently in English and Japanese, the process is described for each case separately.

5.1.1. Extracting SEE-M-constructions from the ECC
Instances of seem in all its word-forms were identified by entering the wildcard search seem* into the TEC Tools corpus browser, generating a total of 1,043 concordances for seem* – 557 in the EE sub-corpus and 486 in the JE sub-corpus. Exclusions were then made sequentially of the following types of usage:

(a) Reported Speech/Thought
Since the analysis focuses only on the description of remembered experiences narrated by the autobiographical self, instances of SEE-M-constructions occurring in reported speech/thought (and therefore attributable to other voices) were excluded. These included direct and indirect speech report – such as First they just whispered in my ear that I seemed to be hard up [JE4] – which reflect judgements of seeming of someone other than the current narrator.

(b) Adjectival and Adverbial seem
Although adjectival and adverbial forms such as seeming and seemingly can be used to describe aspects of the autobiographical subject’s remembered experiences, they do not constitute SEE-M-constructions as defined in the analytical framework. On this basis, adjectival and adverbial uses of seem, such as the seeming capriciousness behind this latest transfer deal [EE6] and this seemingly effortless beauty of movement [JE3], were excluded.

(c) Non-first person uses
Descriptions of how things seem are always indexed to a cognising individual, and, unless otherwise indicated, SEE-M-constructions are assumed to reflect the judgement of the current speaker. However, it is possible to describe how things seem to another person in certain circumstances. For example, an omniscient narrator may describe how things seem to a fictional character (Aijmer 2009: 84). In

\footnote{143 Frequency data for individual texts can be found in Appendix D.}
real-world situations, a speaker may describe how things seem to another person in cases where the evidential basis for this knowledge is either indicated (for example by evidential markers of conjecture or hearsay) or readily retrievable context. For example, where the other person is a family member or close friend, a speaker may describe how things seemed to that person on the assumption that the hearer will infer that this knowledge was acquired by hearsay or close observation (see Kuroda 1973, 1976; Kamio 1997).144

In English, SEEM-constructions can be accompanied by a ‘to + experiencer’ prepositional phrase, which is usually omitted where the judgement of seeming is attributable to the speaker, i.e. to me (Johansson 2007, Aijmer 2009). However, when describing how things seem to someone other than the speaker, the identity of the experiencer of the seeming is always made explicit. Examples from the data include My father was an intellectual, and business didn’t seem very intellectual to him [EE2], my needs seemed to her only an extension of his [EE5], and To us at that point, eating did indeed seem like something furtive [JE3]. In order to limit the analysis to the description of how things seemed to the autobiographical SELF, SEEM-constructions attributed to an OTHER (by a to + experiencer prepositional phrase) were excluded.

(d) ‘Parenthetical’ seem
Cases in which seem occurs in a parenthetical position were also excluded from the analysis. ‘Parenthetical’ uses of seem do not have an object, and therefore do not construe a relationship between the narrator and the entity or event described in the object complement, but rather function as comment clauses (Quirk et al 1985: 1112) and have modal auxiliary-like function, typically indicating a lack of speaker commitment (Aijmer 2009: 64). Examples include it seemed, found in both mid-sentence and sentence-final positions — Everyone, it seemed, was waiting for my response [EE4], they were all being fed and milked, it seemed [EE1] — where it appears to function as a hedging device, and or so it seemed, found in sentence-final position — My mind had ... stopped making remorseful records, or so it seemed

144 In the ECC data, judgements of seeming attributed to a person other than the autobiographical subject occur only where the other person is a close family member or in-group member.
and girls I met knew everyone I knew, or so it seemed [EE1] – used to indicate a counterfactual situation.

(e) Verbs of effort/desire + seem
Almost without exception, the SEEM-constructions extracted from the ECC describe an experiencer’s response to some stimulus entity or event. However, two cases were identified in which seem is used to describe a conscious and motivated attempt to display certain characteristics or external behavioural cues, in order to stimulate a particular response in another person. These constructions incorporate verbs of effort (try to) with seem. The two examples of this type of usage in the ECC – I was in such a hurry to seem grown up [JE6] and I did my best to seem completely calm [JE6] – both occur in the same text in the JE sub-corpus, and were excluded from analysis.

(f) Narrator-perspective SEEM-constructions
Finally, since the analysis focuses on how remembered experiences seemed to the past experiencing autobiographical subject, SEEM-constructions were differentiated between those that reflect a past, experiencer perspective and those that reflect the perspective of the present narrator. Constructions were differentiated on the basis of temporal positioning, as indicated by the tense of the SEEM-constructions (and other lexical means). (67) incorporates two SEEM-constructions that illustrate these contrasting temporal positions.145

(67) Life seemed rather daunting. It seems so to me even now. [EE5]

The past tense seemed reflects the position of the experiencing-self, whereas the present tense seem (in conjunction with the lexical marking even now) reflects the position of the narrating-self. In the case of (67), the first SEEM-construction is retained for analysis, and the second is excluded from further consideration.

In the majority of cases, examining the conjugation of the main verb seem is sufficient to differentiate between experiencer- and narrator-perspective SEEM-

145 Example (67) illustrates the way in which autobiographical narratives frequently switch between the adoption of contrasting experiencer and narrator vantages for rhetorical purposes.
constructions. However, since classification relies on the tense of the verbal construction as a whole, it was necessary to examine concordances manually, taking into consideration the tense of matrix verbs (began to seem, came to seem), auxiliary verbs (had seemed, would seem, didn’t seem) and other lexical indicators of temporal positioning (at the time, still, looking back, in hindsight). Manual examination also identified uses of the historical present tense – such as, after what seems like ages, a fishing boat comes along [JE5] and the finish line doesn’t seem to get any closer [JE2] – which reflect an experiencer-vantage.

Examination of the temporal positioning of seem-constructions in the data revealed that narrator-perspective seem-constructions are used with a range of rhetorical and functional purposes: to express hindsight – I seem to have lived my life not as “a disabled person” but just as “a person” [JE1] – to indicate a contrast in the circumstances of the past experiencing-self vs. present narrating-self – in comparison, today’s showbiz personalities seem positively dull [JE4] – to describe the continuation of an experience – Her inner strength and ability to cope with the situation still seem amazing to me [EE3] – or to make generalisations – To a spinal cord victim, this can seem like a cruel joke of nature [EE3]. On the other hand, experiencer-vantage seem-constructions are used exclusively to describe impressions of remembered stimulus events and entities as they were experienced.

Having made the above exclusions manually, a set of 774 concordances (from the total of 1,043 concordances extracted) remained.

5.1.2. Extracting seem-constructions from the JCC

The approach to the extraction of concordances from the JCC differs somewhat from that for seem in the ECC. In the case of the ECC data, only one search term – seem* – was used to retrieve inferential constructions from the corpus, with manual analysis subsequently being carried out to isolate those examples that are regarded as the object of investigation. In the case of the JCC data, since the seem-constructions to be investigated incorporate four distinct evidential particles – sou, you, mitai and rashii – corpus searches for all of these were carried out using the AntConc corpus browser. Since these grammatical particles comprise short hiragana strings which also occur frequently with other meanings, preliminary
searches for all instances of these grammatical particles returned an excessive amount of results – a total of more than 12,000 concordances – the majority of which were non-‘seem’ uses.\footnote{As short hiragana strings, そう sou, よう you, みたい mitai, and らしい rashii occur as other parts of speech and with meanings that are not relevant to the current analysis. For example, mitai is found as the auxiliary adjective meaning ‘want to’ (nomitai ‘want to drink’, yotte mitai ‘want to try’) and you occurs as a volitional verb inflection (neyou ‘let’s sleep’, miyou ‘let’s watch’). Other exclusions include the use of you to mean ‘purpose’ or ‘way’, sou as a demonstrative pronoun (sou ‘like that’) or part of an adjective (kowaisou ‘pitiful’), and rashii as part of an adjective (subarashii ‘excellent’, ariashii ‘lovely’, hokorashii ‘arrogant’ and mottomorashii ‘plausible’).} Therefore, a set of search terms was required that, while ensuring relevant examples would be extracted, would restrict the number of irrelevant uses returned as far as possible, thereby generating a manageable volume of concordance lines for manual examination.\footnote{Initial searches for the four particles returned 3,039 uses of sou, 7,845 uses of you, 572 uses of mitai, and 860 of rashii (including past tense and negative inflections), giving a total of 12,316 concordances.}

To this end, corpus searches for sou, you, and mitai were limited to copular uses, which are readily identifiable by the presence of a copula, and almost always used with inferential, seem-like meaning. Searches were carried out for each of these particles in conjunction with the plain copula da and its formal counterpart dearu, inflected for present/past tense and affirmative/negative constructions.\footnote{It was noted that mitai does not necessarily occur with a copula in sentence-final seem-uses, so an additional search for mitai followed by the kuten (ideographic period) was also carried out. Furthermore, since mitai is by nature an informal marker and so does not occur with the formal copula dearu, only searches with the plain da form were carried out.}

In Japanese, different copula forms are associated with different communicative situations: the plain da and formal dearu forms are commonly found in narrative contexts, whereas the polite form desu is typically found in conversational discourse. Although the polite copula may be used to characterise a narrative voice, or for reader-oriented interactional purposes, the texts in the JCC do not appear to use such a stylistic device. By omitting the polite copula (and its past tense and negative forms) from the search queries with sou, you and mitai, therefore, automatically excludes instances of inferential constructions occurring in reported speech, which had to be removed manually in the case of ECC data (see 5.1.1.). Examples of such cases include “\textit{anata gata wa tadashii you desu}” ‘you seem to be correct’ [EJ2] and\textit{ umi ni ochita you desu to tsugeraretara} ‘after being informed that he seemed to have fallen into the sea’ [JJ5].

Table 4 lists the searches that were carried out in the case of you.
Table 4. Corpus search queries for you*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Register</th>
<th>Tense</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Search Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plain</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>ようだ youda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>ようじゃない youjanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>ようだった youdatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>ようじゃないかった youjanakatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>ようである youdearu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>ようではない youdewanai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
<td>Affirmative</td>
<td>ようであった youdeatta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>ようでなかった youdewanakatta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth particle under investigation, rashii, has somewhat different grammatical character to sou, you and mitai. Rashii does not occur with a copula, although it is attributed copula-like function (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 373-5). In the case of rashii, searches were carried out for the inflected forms listed in Table 5.

Table 5. Corpus search queries for rashii*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rashii*</th>
<th>Plain</th>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Affirmative</th>
<th>Rashii</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>らしい rashii</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>らしくて rashikute</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>らしくない rashikunai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Past</td>
<td></td>
<td>らしかった rashikatta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>らしくなかった rashikunakatta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Limiting the set of search terms in this way reduced the total number of concordances generated to 1,848, a large proportion of which are assumed to be relevant for the current analysis. Manual examination was then carried out and exclusions made of the following types of usage:

(a) Speech/Thought report
Although the majority of instances of seem-constructions occurring in speech/thought report had already been excluded by not searching for instances occurring with the polite copular form desu, some instances occurring in speech/thought report remained. Direct speech/thought presentation was
identified either by the use of *kagikakko* quotation marks or the quotative marker *to* with a verb of speech or thought report. Indirect speech/thought presentation was identified by a range of features of spoken register including personal pronouns (*watashi* ‘I’, *anata* ‘you’) and sentence-final markers (such as *ne*, *yo*, *sa* and so on) that are associated with interactional discourse.

(b) Adjectival and adverbial uses

Searching for the particles *sou*, *you* and *mitai* followed by a copula automatically removed their adjectival and adverbial forms, such as *you na* and *you ni*. However, since *rashii* does not occur with a copular, it was necessary to remove adjectival and adverbial uses of *rashii* manually. Examples include *HP rashii yarikata* ‘a (typically) Hewlett Packard way of doing things’ [EJ2] and idiomatic phrases such as *undo rashii undo* ‘exercise-like exercise’ (or, ‘proper’ exercise) [JJ2]. Although such uses do reflect an autobiographical subject’s judgement of similarity and have *seem*-like meaning, they do not correspond to the definition of *SEEM*-constructions applied here.\(^{149}\) Adjective-like occurrences of the inferential particles in subordinate clauses modifying NPs, such as *tenisu o hajimeta bakari rashii kanojo* ‘girl who seemed as though she had just started playing tennis’ [JJ5] were also excluded.

(c) Narrator-perspective constructions

Since the examination of *SEEM*-constructions is limited to descriptions how a remembered experience seemed to the past, experiencing self, narrator-perspective constructions were excluded. As in the ECC data, narrator-perspective descriptions include present tense constructions that comment on past experiences with the benefit of hindsight, describe current states of affairs, and make ‘generalisations’. Generalisations include reports of widely accepted knowledge or expert opinion that is not indexed to the autobiographical subject; in the JCC data these most commonly make reference to medical problems – spinal injury,

\(^{149}\) When *rashii* is used with *seem*-like meaning, it is considered to be a type of *chijnutsu* – the expression of a speaker’s subjective judgement – which, according to Larm (2008), is realised by elements occurring in a sentence-final position, such as copula constructions (*you da*) and markers of external evidence (*rashii*) (ibid. 103). Such uses of *rashii* in the JCC are found in either sentence-final or clause-final positions. See also Maynard (1993) and Narrog (2009) for a discussion of *chijnutsu* and its relationship with modality.
Parkinson’s disease, alcoholism, and anorexia – afflicting the autobiographical subject. Examples include *chūou no shinkeikei no kinoufuzen to kankei ga aru you da* ‘it seems that it is related to impaired function of the central nervous system’ [EJ6], and *noukan ga sonshou o ukeru to, hyoujou ga nakunatteshi maw rashii* ‘It seems that if the brain stem is damaged it can cause loss of facial expression’ [EJ3].

Although the examples given here are present tense constructions, not all present tense constructions reflect a narrator-perspective. That is, unlike in English, a close correlation between experiencer/narrator perspective and past/present tense is not assumed in Japanese narrative stylistics. Soga (1983: 46), for example, notes that non-past forms are used more freely in Japanese than in English narratives of reminiscence and, in translation, it is common to translate such non-past tense forms in Japanese with past tense forms in English.\(^{150}\) Fowler (1992: 38) similarly observes a sharper distinction between past/present tense and character/narrator consciousness in English fictional narratives as compared to Japanese, a situation that he suggests is even more pronounced in the case of *shishousetsu* fictional autobiographies. Kodama (2007) repeats Fowler’s observation of a correspondence between such tense patterning and autobiographical narrative, noting that the tendency in Japanese to use non-past tenses to describe past events is especially pronounced in first-person narration, and particularly when describing ‘impressions’ – i.e. how things seemed.

Therefore, when differentiating narrator- and experiencer-perspective SEEM-constructions in the Japanese data, present tense constructions were only interpreted as reflecting a narrator-perspective when temporal marking (*ima demo* ‘even now’, *imanimo* ‘still now’) explicitly indicates this to be the case – as in *saikin wa yakuza ga morikaeshiteiru you da* ‘It seems that recently the yakuza are making a comeback’ [JJ4].

\(^{150}\) Yeung’s (2011) case study of the translation of tense, voice and focalisation in Murakami’s quasi-autobiographical *Norwegian Wood*, notes that in some cases present tense constructions in Japanese are translated as past tense in English (ibid. 5). Yeung suggests that Murakami’s manipulation of tense reflects two narrative positions: one in which the narrator identifies with his past experiencing self, and one in which he distances himself from his past self, suggesting that identification relationships between narrator and experiencer influence tense patterning (ibid. 31).
(d) Non-inferential uses of sou

Finally, exclusions were made of uses of sou that are not considered to fulfil the definition of SEEM-construction applied here. Of the total of 261 sou-constructions identified in the JCC, two distinct types of sou were identified: inferential sou (sou_i) and hearsay sou (sou_h). Although sou_h marks a proposition as being based on hearsay, this is not in itself necessarily grounds for excluding it from analysis. After all, rashii, which can be used to report on the basis of hearsay, is included in the present analysis (as was seem that in the ECC analysis). However, unlike rashii, which reports speaker inference based on a range of possible sources of information including hearsay, there is no implication of speaker inference entailed in the use of sou_h. According to Makino and Tsutsui, sou_h is used “when the speaker conveys information obtained from some information source without altering it” (1986: 409 emphasis added), and the information source is always known (even if it is not specified). For this reason, in the literature, sou_h is grouped with quotative markers such as tte (Aoki 1986, Ogata 2005).

Thus, while both types of sou have an evidential function, sou_i is a marker of inference, prototypically based on the speaker’s observation of a particular entity or event whereas sou_h does not include the speaker’s inferential contribution (Ogata 2005). Since the focus of the present analysis is on constructions which are assumed to involve some kind of inferential contribution from the speaker, rather than examining various kinds of evidential construction including quotatives / reporting structures, only inferential uses of sou are considered to fulfil the definition of SEEM-construction applied here. Sou_h-constructions were therefore identified for exclusion.

Since the object complements accepted by sou_i and sou_h have distinct grammatical character, it is straightforward to differentiate the two forms (Makino and Tsutsui 1992: 409). Examples of sou_h-constructions identified in the JCC data, occurring with adjectival, nominal and clausal complements, include, Hitori wa arukeru you ni natta ga, mou hitori wa dame datta sou da ‘I heard that one of them was able to walk again but the other couldn’t’ [EJ3], Furyou shounen no doukei no

151 In contrast, the inferential evidential rashii is often used in situations where the source of the hearsay is unclear or unknown (for example, in the case of general knowledge or a rumour) (Iori et al 2000: 131).
152 The accounts of inferential evidentials provided by Ogata (2005), Riggs (2006) and Asano-Cavanagh (2010) also exclude hearsay sou.
mato datta sou da ‘I heard that that it was the target of delinquent aspiration’ [JJ4] and shujutsu ga seikou shita sou da ‘I heard that that the operation was successful’ [JJ5]. Having examined the grammatical character of the object complements of the 261 sou-constructions extracted from the JCC, 151 souₜ-constructions were identified and excluded from further examination.

After making the above exclusions manually, a set of 861 concordances (from the total of 1,848 concordances extracted) remained. These concordances constitute the object of detailed investigation in the following sections.

5.1.3. Frequency of SEEM-constructions in the ECC and JCC

Having isolated the SEEM-constructions that correspond to the target of analysis described in the analytical framework, the frequency of occurrence of the constructions in the non-translated and translated sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC was compared (Fig. 12).

 Following the conventions of grammars such as Makino and Tsutsui (1992: 407-8), souₜ is glossed by ‘I heard that’ to indicate the difference between hearsay evidential reports using souₜ and hearsay-based inferential reports using rashii, which are glossed as ‘It seems that’.
Figure 12. Raw Frequency of SEEM-constructions in the ECC and JCC

Comparing the non-translated and translated sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC, it is somewhat surprising that, in the ECC, the non-translated (EE) sub-corpus has a higher frequency of SEEM-constructions than the translated (JE) sub-corpus, and that in the JCC, the non-translated (JJ) sub-corpus has a lower frequency than the translated (EJ) sub-corpus. That is, based on the norms of evidential stance marking in the two languages – Japanese grammar requires speakers to mark the evidential basis from which they speak more frequently than is the norm in English, which does not have a grammaticalised system for marking evidentiality (Kamio 1995, 1997) – and assuming that the content of STs is likely to influence TTs, at least to a certain extent (see Toury 1995, Chesterman 2004a), it might be expected that Japanese-English translations would have a higher frequency of SEEM-constructions than English originals, reflecting the high frequency of evidential marking of
seeming in Japanese, and English-Japanese translations would have a lower frequency of *seem*-constructions than Japanese originals, reflecting the lack of a grammatical requirement for evidential marking of seeming in English.  

Since the frequency of *seem*-constructions in the JE sub-corpus is actually lower than that in the EE sub-corpus, it may be the case that evidential marking using *seem*-like clitics in the JJ source texts was translated using other means than *seem*-constructions in the JE translations, or that, in order to accommodate English evidential norms, translators omitted the persistent evidential marking that is characteristic of Japanese. Although there are many possible reasons for the lower than expected frequency of *seem*-constructions in the JE texts, a contributing factor might be a function of the NARRATOR≠EXPERIENCER relationship in translation, a relationship in which the translator does not have privileged access to the consciousness, and therefore to the *seem* experiences of the autobiographical subject. Indeed, the observation of a lower than expected frequency of *seem*-constructions in the JE translations resonates with the findings of other studies – namely Aijmer (2009), Johansson (2007) and Mushin (2001, 2006) – that have examined the translation (or mediation) of descriptions of *seeming*.

Aijmer (2009), for example, gives examples in which, when translated from English into Swedish, German, French and Norwegian, the perception-based inferential (experiential) meaning of *seem* is lost. According to Aijmer’s data, *seem* tends to be translated by hedging devices, despite the availability of alternative translations that retain its perception-based inferential sense (ibid. 74-5).

Johansson’s (2007) study of Norwegian-English translation reports that “*seem* is more commonly used in original texts than in translations” in both fiction and non-fiction (ibid. 118). Although Johansson explains this as a function of systemic and normative differences between the two languages, it is nonetheless of interest to note that *seem*-constructions were less frequently found in Norwegian-English translations than in English originals, an observation that is consistent with the present data set.

---

154 Marshall’s (2007) uni-directional parallel analysis of inferential evidential markers in six English translations of a short fictional text in Japanese found that evidential marking was frequently omitted in all of the translations.

155 This might be interpreted as a ‘normalisation’ behaviour, defined by Baker as “a tendency to conform to patterns and practices which are typical of the target language, even to the point of exaggerating them” (1996: 176-7).
Although not dealing with interlingual translation, Mushin’s (2006) investigation of the intralingual mediation of autobiographical narratives indicates that retellers are particularly at pains to indicate that a story is not an ‘original production’ when narrating “information that represents the original teller’s subjective judgements” (ibid. 397). Significantly, Mushin’s data, comprising six retellings of the same anecdote, revealed that, although retellers adopted either an ‘experiential’ or ‘imaginative’ stance for the majority of the retelling, in five out of six cases the reteller shifted to adopt a ‘reportive’ stance when narrating a description that entailed a seem-like description using the verb look like (ibid.). According to Mushin, retellers feel particularly compelled to communicate that the events they narrate are acquired from external sources when conveying such seem-like judgements (ibid. 406). Mushin concludes that, in such cases, retellers “were loath to transfer the source of evaluation from its actual source” and were inclined to “distance themselves from the information and represent it as the product of what someone else said” (ibid. 398).

Although the observations made by Aijmer (2009) and Johansson (2007) regarding the interlingual (translational) mediation of seem-constructions might, at least in part, be explained by comparative language differences, Mushin’s examination of intralingual mediation cannot be attributed to such factors, thereby suggesting that conceptual/psychological factors are likely to play a part in the way descriptions of seeming are mediated.

Returning to the present data, if the frequencies observed for the ECC and JCC comparable corpora are considered in parallel, i.e. considering bi-directional ST-TT sub-corpora, Fig. 12 shows that English to Japanese translation (i.e. EE > EJ) is characterised by an increase in the frequency of seem-constructions (or at least of the types of seem-constructions examined here), and Japanese to English translation (i.e. JJ > JE) is characterised by a decrease in the frequency of seem-constructions. This would appear to reflect the norms of evidential stance marking in English and Japanese, rather than point to translational effects. However, it is acknowledged that various factors – including ST influence, SL norms, TL norms, and the relationship between the mediator and the seem-proposition – are likely to interact in complex ways which may, ultimately, be impossible to trace.
The remainder of the analysis reported in this chapter entails a detailed examination of the SEEM-constructions extracted from the ECC and JCC data, commenting on the relative frequencies of the types of object with which they occur, and offering an interpretation in terms of the type of evidential stance they construe.

5.2. Analysis of Represented Memories in the ECC

5.2.1. Relative Frequency of Objects of Recollection with seem
A total of 774 SEEM-constructions extracted from the ECC were subject to further analysis, which involved examination and categorisation of the type of object following seem. As predicted by the literature on seem complementation, four main types of object complement were identified – seem to, seem as (if/though), seem like and seem that. Initial frequency data for these four types is shown in Fig. 13 below.\(^{156}\)

\(^{156}\) In order to account for variation in the raw frequency of SEEM-constructions in the respective sub-corpora, the comparison of EE and JE data is based on the relative frequencies of each type of object, expressed as a percentage of the total number of SEEM-constructions. Frequency data for individual texts is recorded in Appendix D.
Fig. 13 shows a similar overall profile of the distribution of object complements in *seem*-constructions in the EE and JE sub-corpora: *seem to*-type complements are by far the most frequent in both data sets, occurring in 80.0% and 85.4% of constructions respectively, with the other three types constituting ‘minor’ forms in this data. The order of frequency in both sub-corpora is the same: i.e. *seem to* > *seem like* > *seem that* > *seem as*. However, as was noted in relation to *remember*-constructions, ‘minor’ object forms occur more frequently in the non-translated data than the translated data in both the ECC and JCC, whereas the translated data shows a greater tendency towards use of ‘major’ complement forms.

Before attempting to interpret the significance of the distribution of complement types, their respective characteristics as evident in the data are discussed in detail in 5.2.3. and 5.2.4., examining patterns of use and the way in which they position the narrator with respect to the memory being described. Prior
to that, the frequency of occurrence of the optional prepositional phrase \textit{to me},
used to identify the experiencing ‘whom’, is examined.

5.2.2. Optional experiencer indication: \textit{to me}
Experiences of seeming are intrinsically private and individual, and given, as Brinton
(1980: 376) notes, that things can’t just ‘seem’, they must seem \textit{to someone}, their
descriptions are indexically linked to a particular experiencing individual. The
present section examines the use of the optional first person singular dative \textit{to me}
to explicitly identify the experiencing ‘whom’ in the \textit{SEEM}-constructions in the ECC.

\textit{SEEM}-constructions usually incorporate a pronominal, nominal or dummy
subject (such as \textit{it}), the main verb (\textit{seem}) and an object. Generally speaking, the
grammatical subject refers to the entity or event that is the stimulus for the
speaker’s experience of ‘seeming’, and the object complement describes some
aspect of that stimulus entity or event. For example, in (68) the object complement
\textit{to be standing still} describes an aspect of the grammatical subject \textit{the boat}, as
apprehended by the experiencer.

(68) On board, the boat seemed to be standing still, but from the water I could
see right away that she was definitely moving. [JE5]

Unless otherwise indicated, the identity of the experiencer is assumed to be the
current speaker, as is the case in (68). However, \textit{SEEM}-constructions may optionally
also include the first person prepositional phrase \textit{to me} (Dixon 1991: 92, 132; Quirk
1985: 746).\textsuperscript{157}

\textsuperscript{157} As mentioned in 5.1.1., where the identities of the speaker and experiencer do not coincide, the
use of a prepositional phrase identifying the experiencer (\textit{to him, to her}) is not optional. However, such
cases have already been excluded from the present analysis.
In (69), for example, to me emphasises a contrast between the experience of the speaker and that of other people.\textsuperscript{159}

(69) It seemed to me an obvious question they should have expected, but they all seemed surprised [EE2]

Alternatively, explicit self-reference may effect a contrast between the experience of the past experiencing self and the current narrating self, as in (70).

(70) I remember, years ago, how natural it seemed to me that our family should be a hub of activity, and that it should go on like that forever; but now I can see that time has passed, that life and liveliness have dwindled, and occasionally I feel a wave of depression tinged with nostalgia sweep over me [JE7]

Although individual instances of to me can be interpreted in relation to their particular narrative context, as in (69) and (70), for the purposes of comparing patterns of use in the present data, it is necessary to consider how optional experiencer identification might relate to the construal of a relationship between the narrator and the seem-proposition in general, and how this might be linked to the epistemological/evidential character of original vs. translated texts. In this regard, Aijmer (2009) offers a potentially illuminating interpretation.

Aijmer argues that explicit mention of an experiencer has implications for the interpretation of seem-constructions in terms of “certainty, type of evidence and above all subjectivity” (2009: 82). Her argument centres on the presupposition that seem can have both subjective and intersubjective readings, depending on the construal of the evidential basis of the seem-proposition (ibid. 78).\textsuperscript{160} That is, where


\textsuperscript{159} The position in which the dative subject is found is variable; it may occur immediately preceding or following the seem verb, in a sentence-initial, sentence-final or parenthetical position. Two such possibilities include: The awful paradox is that, to me, it seemed that my emotional survival, my basic personal integrity, was dependent upon my mastery, if not total erasure, of my physical self [EE5] and I suppose he had full faith in his companions, but even so it always seemed pretty gutsy to me [JE5]. Although the position in which to me occurs may have implications for shifting emphasis and focus, the present analysis comments only on its presence or absence.

\textsuperscript{160} Aijmer uses the term ‘intersubjective’ in the sense of Nuyts (2001), i.e. meaning that a proposition is based on evidence that is (potentially) shared with others.
a seem-proposition is based on the experiencer’s perception-based inference or
deductive reasoning, seem is attributed a subjective reading but, where the current
speaker’s judgement is based on “shared or general knowledge”, seem is attributed
an intersubjective interpretation (ibid.). According to Aijmer,

the impersonal meaning resulting from the loss of the agent or the
experiencer ... is a precondition for the inter-subjective reading ...
[Seem] is never inter-subjective when it occurs with an experiencer
as in it seems to me John is tired. However in experiencer-less
constructions it can be either inter-subjective (shared information
or evidence) or non-shared (speaker bases him/herself on their own
data).

(2009: 69)

Thus, although to me can be interpreted with reference to particular rhetorical
effects, such as mentioned in relation to (69) and (70), following Aijmer, its function
might be summarised more generally to be in blocking an intersubjective
interpretation of seem-propositions.

This function is particularly evident in the ECC data in constructions with a
that-clausal complement. Since that constructions typically construe a proposition
as being based on knowledge acquired by hearsay, or objective ‘fact’, and therefore
potentially shared, rather than on experience for which the experiencer has “sole
authority” (Aijmer 2009: 82), seem that constructions are associated with an
intersubjective reading. However, when the dative subject to me is inserted – as
in, it seems to me that – it functions as a ‘subjectifier’, and the intersubjective
interpretation is blocked (ibid. 78).

Having examined the ECC data, it was found that, as expected, the use of
the dative subject to me is found in a minority of seem-constructions in both the EE
and JE data (Fig. 14).

161 This recalls Langacker’s argument that, when marked by that, finite clauses have the potential for
“conceptual reification, giving rise to an abstract thing ... existing independently of any particular
conceptualiser” (2008: 433 emphasis added).

162 NB. In examples such as He seemed particularly eager to show her off to me [EE2], and It seemed
like the most fantastic thing that had ever happened to me [EE4], the prepositional phrase to me
does not identify the experiencer. Such examples illustrate the importance of carrying out manual
data analysis, rather than simply using electronic corpus searches.
Figure 14. Frequency and Proportion of SEEM-constructions with Optional to me in the ECC

However, it is noticeable that the raw frequency of to me usage in the EE sub-corpus (34 instances) is three times that in the JE sub-corpus (11 instances). Expressed as a proportion of the total number of SEEM-constructions in each sub-corpus, the relative frequency of occurrence in the EE data (7.6%) is more than double that in the JE data (3.3%). Thus, although SEEM-constructions incorporating to me comprise a small minority in both sub-corpora, there is a marked difference in their frequencies of use. Indeed, the proportion reported for the non-translated data, 7.6%, resembles the occurrence of slightly less than 10% reported by Johansson (2007) and Aijmer (2009), while the 3.3% found in the translated data is significantly lower. To reiterate Aijmer’s (2009) argument, these findings indicate that SEEM-constructions in the non-translated data are more likely to construe a
seem proposition as being attributed solely to the experiencer/narrator (i.e. a subjective reading) than in the translated data.

When interpreting this difference, it may be suggested that the NARRATOR≠EXPERIENCER relationship implied in translation influences patterns of self-reference, such as the explicit reference to me. That is, the difference in the frequency of explicit experiencer identification in the non-translated vs. translated data can be interpreted as a manifestation of the contrasting evidential/indexical relationships between the author/translator and the experience of seeming. In the EE data, the judgement of seeming originated in the author and, as such, was acquired by direct experience. In contrast, in the JE data, the judgement of seeming is not attributable to the translator; rather, knowledge of the judgement of seeming was acquired indirectly from the ST (a form of hearsay). In this sense, patterns of use of optional to me might be regarded as an indicator of the translator’s negotiation of a position in relation to the autobiographical subject, in a discursive situation in which the conventions of self-referentiality/evidentiality and the conventions of translation clash in such a way as to give rise to a complex psychological situation, which might be linked to resistance of the explicitation of (false) identification of the experiencing ‘whom’.

On the other hand, it should be acknowledged that there are other possible explanations. For example, it might be suggested that a difference in relative frequency in the EE and JE sub-corpora is linked to differing frequencies of that-clause complements with seem, since there is a strong correlation between the occurrence of to me and that-clause objects (Aijmer 2009: 82). However, as the relative frequency of that-clause complements is similar in both data sets (5.2.4.), this explanation is unlikely to be pertinent here. It might also be the case that the lower frequency of use of to me in the translated English data simply reflects the content of the Japanese originals: there is no equivalent construction in SEEM-constructions in Japanese, and therefore its use in the JE translations would have required the translator to make an addition. Since observations of optional to me in the EE vs. JE sub-corpora cannot be cross-referred against the frequency of a parallel structure in the JJ vs. EJ sub-corpora, further enquiry is necessary in developing a thesis in relation to patterns of explicit self-referentiality in translation.
5.2.3. Non-finite complements: seem to
This section discusses seem to constructions, of which two sub-types can be identified in the ECC: (a) copular uses (seem to be) and (b) those incorporating other verbs (seem to-infinitive).

(a) Copular seem to be
Copular SEEM-constructions introduce one of three types of object complement: an adjective or adjectival phrase (AP) – as in seemed to be fascinated [JE7], didn’t seem to be remotely bothered [JE6] – a noun phrase (NP) – as in seemed to be quite a serious newspaper [EE1], seemed to be a burden [EE5] – or a participial phrase – such as seemed to be pondering [JE5], seemed to be moving [EE2]. Copular SEEM-constructions can also occur in which to be is omitted. Seem zero-to be constructions occur either with an AP – seemed surreal [EE3], seemed distinctly underwhelmed [EE6] – or a NP object – seemed an ill omen [JE5], seemed a trivial matter [JE4]. The literature indicates that there is a significant difference in the construal effected by seem to be AP vs. seem zero-to be AP constructions, which may be of relevance when interpreting the present data.

Borkin’s (1973) examination of the copular complement to be with perception verbs such as see, suggests that the retention or omission of to be is related to evidentiality: i.e. whether an entity was directly perceived or not. She cautions against dismissing to be deletion as a “stylistic” matter (ibid. 44), rather suggesting that “personal experience is important in deleting to be” (ibid. 48). In the particular case of seem, Mithun (1986) and Aijmer (1980, 2009) concur with Borkin that seem zero-to be AP construes the seem-proposition as having a direct perceptual basis. Aijmer argues that a seem zero-to be AP construction describes the speaker’s “subjective impression” of a directly perceived stimulus phenomenon (2009: 69), an interpretation that corresponds with Mithun’s assertion that the evidential basis of seem zero-to be AP is actual observation + inference (1986: 90). A particularly detailed explication of the seem to be AP vs. seem zero-to be AP contrast is provided by Usoniene (2000).

Usoniene (2000) reports an analysis focusing on the copular to be AP vs. zero-to be AP contrast in relation to seem and other descriptive perception verbs (look and appear). Drawing on the literature on complementation in general and
perception verbs in particular (Borkin 1973, Duffley 1992), Usoniene argues that the difference in the construal effected by *seem to be* AP vs. *seem zero-to be* AP pertains to the contrast between indirect vs. direct perception. According to Usoniene’s characterisation, *seem zero-to be* AP constructions provide “descriptions of appearances in general (both concrete looks and abstract impressions) based on sensory data or experience” that were apprehended directly by the speaker (2000: 190), and are therefore attributed ‘experiential’ character (ibid. 174). In contrast, in *seem to be* AP constructions, *to be* functions as a “proposition-marker” which “blocks the perceptual reading of verbs of seeming” (ibid. 191). Thus, although a judgement of seeming may actually be based on the speaker’s perceptual experience, a *seem to be* AP construal profiles the propositional content rather than its experiential basis. For this reason, Borkin (1973) positions *seem to be* constructions intermediately in relation to *zero-to be* and *that*-clause complements in terms of their perceptual/propositional character, since they construe the basis of the complement as ‘indirect perception’ (Usoniene 2000).

Examining these constructions in the ECC data illustrates the contrast described in the literature; (71) and (72) are examples of *seem to be* AP and *seem zero-to be* AP constructions respectively.

(71) Kuramochi seemed to be as overwhelmed as I was [JE6]

(72) The agent in the chair across from me seemed distinctly underwhelmed at the prospect of representing me [EE6]

Both of these copular *seem*-constructions describe the narrator’s impressions of the private, internal emotional state of another person, based on direct perception. However, according to the interpretation offered by Usoniene (2000), based on Borkin (1973), the *seem zero-to be* construction in (72) focuses on the speaker’s

---

163 Borkin’s account of the use of *to be* vs. *zero to be* with cognitive perception verbs draws on a distinction between the description of things that have been “directly experienced” vs. “a proposition based on conjecture from indirect evidence” (1973: 47). In a similar vein, Duffley’s examination of passive constructions with verbs of perception leads to the conclusion that *to be* marks “a subtle shift of the perceptual verb into the conceptual field with the consequent evocation of an inference and not just something directly perceived” (1992: 47).
perception of the agent’s appearance or behaviour, adopting an experiential stance, whereas the *seem to be* AP construction in (71) is ‘proposition-like’ – the focus is on the proposition elaborated by the speaker on the basis of perception – thereby effacing the experiential aspect.\(^{164}\) A point of key significance when considering the translation of *seem* descriptions is that, while *seem to be* AP constructions, such as (71), do not necessarily require the speaker’s direct observation of the stimulus entity or event, *seem zero-to be* AP constructions, such as (72), presuppose direct sensory perception.

Before comparing the frequency of the respective forms in the ECC data, mention should also be made of copular *seem*-constructions occurring with NP and participial complements. The literature on copular *seem*-constructions focuses almost exclusively on adjectival uses, possibly because this is by far the most frequently found type of copular construction (see Johansson 2007, Aijmer 2009 and present data set).\(^{165}\) However, Aijmer does note in her discussion of *seem zero-to be* AP constructions that “similar meanings are found with *seem* followed by a noun” (2009: 81). Thus, a similar experiential vs. non-experiential contrast is assumed to apply to copular *seem* constructions with NP complements.

Copular *seem*-constructions with participial complements have received even less attention in the literature, possibly because the focus of discussion of copular *seem*-constructions is on the contrast between *be* vs. *zero-to be* forms, and participial cases do not allow *be* deletion. Since the durative aspectual character of the present participle implies perception (as mentioned in relation to *ing* complements with *remember*), it might be argued that such *seem*-constructions – including *he seemed to be thinking carefully* [JE7], *the Queen seemed to be really enjoying herself* [EE1] and *something seemed to be moving around* [JES] – should be interpreted as reflecting an experiential evidential stance. On the other hand,

\(^{164}\) Contrary to expectation, although neither of the examples provided here incorporates optional *to me*, in the ECC *to me* occurs with 15 *seem zero-to be* AP constructions (10 in the EE and 5 in the JE data), but never in a *seem to be* AP construction. This is contrary to expectations since, according to the characterisations offered by Borkin (1973) and Usoniene (2000), *seem zero-to be* AP constructions are inherently associated with the self, in which case the identification of the experiencer (*to me*) is expected to be superfluous.

\(^{165}\) Copular constructions with an AP object are more common than those with a NP in both data sets. In the EE sub-corpus there is a total of 208 AP objects, but only 42 NP objects; in the JE sub-corpus, there is a total of 124 AP objects, but only 27 NP objects. This suggests that copular *seem* constructions are predominantly used with APs to attribute descriptions to remembered entities and events.
since these constructions to do not support variable construal, such as is the case with seem zero-AP vs. seem to be AP, they are perhaps less useful indices of stance-taking.

Considering the frequency data in Fig. 13 above in the light of these characterisations, it becomes clear that, within the category of seem to constructions, there are variations in construal and a further breakdown of frequencies is therefore required in order to make a meaningful comparison of the EE and JE data. Copular seem to be constructions are found with almost identical relative frequency in the EE (13.0%) and JE data (13.4%). However, seem zero-to be constructions, which presuppose a ‘direct perceptual’ evidential basis (Borkin 1973, Usoniene 2000) and are ‘subjective’ in character (Aijmer 2009), are more prevalent in the EE than JE data, occurring in 207 (46.5%) and 124 (37.7%) of cases respectively.

Of these, seem zero-to be NP constructions comprise a small proportion, and account for a similar number in both data sets (22 and 17 cases). Seem zero-to be AP constructions are in the majority (185 and 107 cases). Seem zero-to be AP is the most frequent form of SEEM-construction in the EE data, accounting for some 41.6% of the total of 445 SEEM-constructions: in the JE data, seem zero-to be AP is the second most frequently found type of SEEM-construction, accounting for 32.5% of the total of 329 cases. Given the high frequency of seem zero-to be AP constructions in the ECC, the difference in their relative frequency in the non-translated vs. translated data is regarded as significant.

The lower frequency of use of experiential seem zero-to be AP constructions in the JE data does not have an obvious explanation in terms of ST/SL influence, but it may be possible to elaborate an explanation in terms of the evidential character of translated vs. non-translated autobiographies.166 That is, following Usoniene’s assertion that “the more dependent a description is on direct experience, the more appropriate is to be deletion” (2000: 187), it can be argued that, since the seem descriptions in the EE texts are based on the narrator’s direct experience, they are more appropriately construed by seem zero-to be AP constructions.

166 Although there is no immediately apparent reason to suppose that the lower relative frequency of use of seem zero to be AP constructions in the JE sub-corpus is a vestige of SL influence, this might be confirmed having examined the JCC (see 5.4.).
constructions than the experiences described in the JE texts, which are based on indirect evidential sources and therefore less appropriately construed by *seem zero-to be* AP constructions. Since, as was mentioned above, the use of *seem zero-to be* AP constructions is restricted to descriptions of directly perceived (actually experienced) entities and events – it is not possible to index a *seem zero-to be* AP construction to someone other than the current speaking SELF – hence the unacceptability of *It seems strange to him* – their use in mediating the experiences of an OTHER is typically precluded.

Considered from the point of view of the conventions of evidential pragmatics, since *seem zero-to be* AP constructions are not sanctioned for the description of entities and events that were not directly experienced (as is the case in translated autobiographies), it is unsurprising that the JE sub-corpus shows a lower proportion of use of *seem zero-to be* AP constructions than the EE sub-corpus. The lower relative frequency may be interpreted as evidence that the source (evidential basis) of the knowledge being narrated influences the translator’s construal of narrated memories as being non-experiential.

(b) Infinitival *seem to*

Within the category of *seem to* constructions, a second type is identified in addition to the copular *seem to be*. *Seem to*-infinitive constructions occur frequently in both the non-translated and translated sub-corpora, being the most commonly found *SEEM*-construction in the JE data, found in 34.3% of cases, and the second most frequently found in the EE data, found in 20.4% of *SEEM*-constructions.

Infinitival *seem to* constructions in the ECC are used with two notable types of description. Most frequently, they are used to describe the cognitive and emotional states of others. The following examples all occur with an animate third person grammatical subject (*he, she* and so on): *seemed to tolerate* [JE4], *seemed to understand* [JE1], *seemed to enjoy* [EE3], *seemed very excited* [EE2], *seemed to regard* [JE4] and *seemed to have some frustrations* [EE2]. This type of use is unsurprising since, when describing the cognitive and emotional states of others, the framing of descriptions as *seem*-propositions is, from the point of view of evidential pragmatics, required since the private, internal states of others are unknowable. However, there is a difference in the extent to which English and
Japanese require such framing devices. As mentioned already, in Japanese, descriptions of the private, internal states of others must be marked by evidential clitics that indicate that the description is based on (usually) observation-based inference (Kuroda 1973, Kamio 1995). In contrast, in English, while such descriptions may be framed using descriptive perception verbs such as seem or other similar evidential marking (apparently), it is not a requirement for grammatical well-formedness. Thus, the relatively high proportion of seem to-infinitive constructions in the JE sub-corpus may, at least in part, be attributed to a high frequency of descriptions of the cognitive and emotional states of others, which are necessarily framed using seem-constructions in the JJ texts.

*Seem* to-infinitive constructions are also often used to introduce non-literal descriptions of experiences, such as a silent roar seemed to reverberate through the air [JE5], all the blood in my veins seemed to rush to one spot [JE6], time seemed to speed up [JE3], All the heat seemed to vanish in an instant [JE4], and The entire sequence seemed to unfold in slow motion [JE5]. The use of seem to-infinitival constructions in non-literal descriptions is particularly prevalent in the JE data (although examples can also be found in the EE texts). The high frequency of this type of description in the JE texts might be linked to ST influence.

That is, according to comparative studies of autobiography, Japanese autobiographical forms – which incorporate the shishousetsu fictionalised memoir, niki diary, kikou travel writing and zuihitsu observational essay forms – have, historically, not been as clearly differentiated from fictional genres as is the case in ‘Western’ traditions (Walker 1994). As a result, authors may draw on both imagination and memory to construct an autobiographical narrative, making freer use of poetic and lyrical devices to style themselves and their experiences without fear of being criticised as being ‘false’ or ‘fictitious’ (ibid. 217-8). Given the differing generic assumptions – that Japanese autobiographical writings do not privilege the narration of ‘truth’ or ‘fact’ so emphatically, and are not regarded as being clearly distinct from other poetic/lyrical literary forms – it is not surprising that the stylistic conventions associated with respective autobiographical traditions also differ. Keene (1993), for example, has written of the high regard for ‘suggestion’ in Japanese literary and artistic aesthetic, and the preeminence of metaphorical description, which “allow[s] the imagination room to expand beyond the literal
facts” (ibid. 9). Although metaphorical descriptions are by no means excluded from Western autobiographical writing, an imperative towards narrating ‘truth’ perhaps explains a lower proportion of such descriptions in the EE data, as compared to the JE translations.

Thus, it appears that the high proportion of seem to-infinitive constructions in the JE sub-corpus might be explained, at least in part, by the grammatical requirement for evidential marking and the stylistic conventions of Japanese autobiographical narratives (i.e. the influence of the JJ source texts), rather than as a function of translator position.

5.2.4. Finite complements: that, as, and like
In contrast to the non-finite (to and zero-to) complements discussed in 5.2.3., which account for approximately 80% and 85% of the seem-constructions in the EE and JE texts, and might therefore be considered the ‘major’ complement forms, finite complements – comprising that-clause complements (and the zero-that form) and the so-called ‘comparative complements’, as (if/though) and like, collectively account for only approximately 20% and 15% of cases in the EE and JE sub-corpora, and might therefore be considered ‘minor’ forms. However, it is interesting to note that the frequency of each of the ‘minor’ complement constructions is higher for the EE data than the JE data, suggesting a general tendency for the JE data to exhibit less variation in complement choice than does the EE data, rather gravitating towards the selection of major complement forms. This repeats a similar observation made in relation to ‘minor’ complement forms with remember.

(a) that-clause complements
As already mentioned in relation to remember, in general, that-clause complements are attributed propositional rather than experiential character (cf. Langacker 1991, 1999 among others). Since seem is a verb that is primarily associated with the report of personal impressions of entities and events that were directly experienced by the speaker, it is therefore unsurprising that that-clause complements are relatively infrequent in the seem-constructions in the ECC.

167 The term ‘comparative complementiser’ is from Rooryck (2000: 48).
In the literature on *seem* complementation, a number of interpretations of *that*-clause complements have been offered. Chafe (1986), for example, regards *seems that* as a marker of hearsay, “qualifying knowledge as having been acquired through language” (1986: 268). Aijmer (2009) concurs that in *seem that* constructions, “the speaker is not the sole authority for the truth of what is said but the evidence is corroborated by what the hearer and/or people in general think” (ibid. 76). However, *seem that* constructions are not necessarily based on hearsay, and can also be used to effect a non-experiential construal of knowledge acquired by direct perceptual experience. In this regard, Aijmer notes that *seem that* constructions are “ambiguous” and can have “either a subjective or intersubjective reading” (ibid.).

*Seem that* propositions in the ECC demonstrate this ambiguity, allowing interpretations based either on the speaker’s observations (direct experiential source) or hearsay (indirect, non-first hand), as in (73).

(73) There were piles of bundles outside every house. It seemed that the rebels were getting ready to move out of the village [EE4]

The *seem that*-proposition in (73) can be interpreted as being based on hearsay or, perhaps more likely in the light of the information supplied in the preceding sentence, on the narrator’s direct observations. It is unclear as to whether the judgement related in the *that*-clause is attributable solely to the current speaker, and therefore purely ‘subjective’, or is shared, and therefore ‘intersubjective’. Since the narrator in (73) was accompanied by fellow soldiers, an observation-based *to us* interpretation is also possible. Example (74) reveals a similar ambiguity.

(74) He would swagger among the tenements, exposing his tattoos to the world, and it seemed that many of those who saluted him, young and old alike, also had tattoos of some kind. [JE4]

As discussed in 5.2.2., unless otherwise indicated, *seem*-propositions are prototypically assumed to be indexed to the current speaker (i.e. *to me*). However, when *seem* occurs with a *that*-clausal complement, as in (73) and (74), an intersubjective interpretation becomes available: an ambiguity arises as to whether
the *seem*-proposition is indexed only to the narrator, or potentially accessible to others too.

An examination of patterns of co-occurrence of optional *to me* with *seem that* constructions supports an interpretation of *seem that* as being potentially intersubjective. That is, since explicit reference to the experiencer is typically superfluous, optional *to me* appears in only a minority of cases (7.6% of *SEEM*-constructions in the EE and 3.3% in the JE data). However, when examining *seem that*-constructions in isolation, a much higher incidence of *to me* is observed – 66.7% in both the EE and JE data – than for *SEEM*-constructions in general. In contrast, *to me* is almost always omitted (as superfluous) in copular zero-*to be* AP constructions, which are strongly associated with the narrator’s direct perceptual experience and therefore already point to a ‘subjective’ reading. The clear correlation between *that*-clause complements and the incidence of optional *to me* supports Aijmer’s argument that *seem that* constructions are ambiguous and can have either subjective or intersubjective import.

Thus, it might be said that *seem that* constructions have two significant characteristics. Firstly, irrespective of their actual evidential basis (direct observation or hearsay), *seem that* constructions offer a non-experiential (proposition-type) construal. Secondly, they are ambiguous as to whether the *seem* judgement is attributable solely to the narrator or shared by others (intersubjective), and therefore do not entail an implication of exclusive indexicality to the narrator, unless accompanied by *to me* which blocks an intersubjective reading.

As mentioned already, *seem that* constructions are, as predicted by the semantics of *seem* and the character of autobiographical memories, infrequent in the ECC data. However, counter to expectations, they are more frequent in the EE data (4.0%) than in the JE (2.7%). If cases with optional *to me* are excluded from the total, the number of maximally ‘propositional’ *seem* constructions is reduced to EE (1.3%) and JE (0.9%) respectively, but still reflects a slightly higher relative frequency in the non-translated data.

---

168 In the EE data, a dative subject was found in 12 out of 18 *that*-clause *seem*-constructions, and 6 out of 9 cases in the JE data.
169 A relationship between the occurrence of *that*-clause complements and optional *to me* is also noted by Aijmer (2009: 82) and López-Couso and Méndez-Naya (2011: 17).
(b) **zero-that**

In the ECC data, SEEM-constructions with a clausal object are also found with zero-complementiser. Theoretically, in these cases it is not possible to be certain which of the finite complementisers has been deleted. For example in (75), where *seem* is followed directly by a clausal complement, any of the finite complementisers *that*, *as if*, *as though* or *like* is acceptable.\(^{170}\)

(75) In America, it seemed [that / as if / as though / like] a band could sell a billion records but most people would still have never heard of them [EE1]

However, although zero-complementiser finite *seem*-constructions could theoretically incorporate a comparable complementiser (*as, like*), the literature does not indicate that comparable complementisers are subject to optional omission. Therefore, finite zero-complementiser constructions are assumed to be zero-*that* constructions.

Considering the contrast between *seem that* vs. *seem zero-that*, as was mentioned in relation to *remember that* vs. *remember zero-that* in 4.2.3., it might be argued that the narrator’s stance in relation to the object of the SEEM-construction is somewhat ‘vague’ as compared with *that*-clause complements, and that the pragmatic force of *that* (in effecting a non-experiential construal) is lessened. However, since the relative frequency of *seem zero-that* constructions is almost identical in the EE (3.6%) and JE (3.3%) data, and the ratio of *that* vs. zero-*that* construals is similar in both sub-corpora, no contrast is evident between the two sub-corpora in this regard.

(c) **Comparative Complements**

The comparative complementisers *as (if/though)* and *like* have received less attention in the literature on complementation than ‘major’ forms such as *to* and *that*-clause complements. Notable exceptions include Bender and Flickinger (1999)

\(^{170}\) This is only the case for *seem*-constructions that have the impersonal (or ‘dummy’) subject *it*, as illustrated by the unacceptability of *Ed seemed as if / *that he was trying to hide his true identity* (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 962).
and López-Couso and Méndez-Naya’s (2001) diachronic studies of the development of *as if, as though and like* as complementsers, and López-Couso and Méndez-Naya’s (2012) corpus-based examination of their use in contemporary English. Of particular relevance here is López-Couso and Méndez-Naya (2012), which makes specific mention of the interaction of comparative complementisers with descriptive perception verbs such as *seem*.\(^{171}\)

According to López-Couso and Méndez-Naya, the comparative complementisers *as if, as though and like* express cognitively complex relations which are based on comparisons and judgements of similarity (2012: 3). A declarative clause introduced by a comparative complementer describes the speaker’s comparison of the current stimulus event or entity with previously experienced events or entities, and expresses the speaker’s resulting attribution of a similarity relation. López-Couso and Méndez-Naya suggest the meaning of *as if* and *as though*, which can be paraphrased ‘X is like Y but is not Y’, is apparent in their composition which “combine[s] an element of similarity *(as)* with an element indicating hypotheticality *(if, though)*” (ibid.).

The elements of hypotheticality and counter-factuality – what Aijmer (2009) terms ‘irrealis’ – associated with *as if and as though* are in evidence in the ECC data, where the majority of uses introduce either non-literal descriptions – *it seemed as if my heart had frozen* [EE4] and *making it seem as though the walls were tilting* [EE5] – or counterfactual situations – *I had been shot, but it seemed as if it had happened to someone else* [JE4]. The complementer *like* is also used to introduce similar descriptions, such as *it seemed like a sign from the gods* [EE3] and *the more I worked with Dick Donner, the more he seemed like a fifty-year-old kid in a candy store* [EE2].\(^{172}\)

However, not all comparative complementisers in the ECC data describe ‘irrealis’. Examples such as *He seemed like quite a nice bloke* [EE1], *Three days seemed like the right amount of time* [EE2], and *it seemed as though I had exposed so much already* [EE6] are not obviously metaphorical nor counter-factual. Rather they describe the narrator’s impression of an experience based on a judgement of

---

\(^{171}\) Interestingly, Bender and Flickinger’s diachronic survey indicates that *seem* and *look* were the first verbs to accept *as if and though* as complements (1999: 13).

\(^{172}\) Quirk also notes that where the *seem*-complementiser is followed by a NP – *seemed to be a burden* [EE5], *seemed to be the fashion* [JE4] – it is possible to replace to be with the complementer *like*, which is less formal (1985: 1173).
similarity, and can be paraphrased as meaning simply ‘X is like Y’ (cf. López-Couso and Méndez-Naya 2012: 3).

Considering the epistemological character of comparative complementisers, López-Couso and Méndez-Naya suggest that they have both an epistemic modal function, in lessening speaker commitment, and evidential import, framing the proposition they introduce as being based on (unspecified) evidence + speaker inference (2012: 12). Comparing comparative and that-clause complements, López-Couso and Méndez-Naya argue that that-clauses indicate higher speaker commitment than comparative complements, an epistemic modal contrast that they trace to the evidential basis implied by the respective complement types: that-clauses construe the evidential basis of the proposition as being based on some belief or knowledge, whereas comparative complements construe a proposition as being based solely on the speaker’s inference (ibid. 17). In this regard, unlike that-clause complements, which may be subjective or intersubjective, the seem-proposition introduced by a comparative complement is assumed to be indexed solely to the current speaker and as such is attributed subjective character.\[173\]

Again, the co-ocurrence correlation of optional to me with respective complement types provides a useful indicator of the character of comparable complements vis-à-vis their subjective/intersubjective character. Unlike that-clause complements, which have a rate of co-occurrence with to me of 66.7%, only 3 of the total of 83 seem-constructions with a comparative complementiser in the ECC occur with to me. All three instances were found in the EE sub-corpus, and all entail the complementiser like – seemed almost like a movie to me [EE2], seemed like such serious business to me [EE2], and seemed to me more like an abiding doubt [EE5]. This observation agrees with López-Couso and Méndez-Naya’s report of a very low instance of comparative complements being used with to me (2012: 17). That comparative complements rarely occur with the intersubjectivity blocker to

\[173\] After examining the types of experiences reported in finite seem constructions in a diachronic corpus of literary texts, López-Couso and Méndez-Naya conclude that comparative complementisers tend to be selected in preference to that-clause complements when expressing an “emotional reaction” (2001: 100). This reinforces the claim that comparative complementisers are associated with subjective, personal, experiential descriptions. Since, from the point of view of the psychology of autobiographical narration, descriptions of memories accompanied by ESK that reveals ‘emotional intensity’ are associated with the narration of true, actually experienced events (Conway and Pleydell-Pierce 2000, Conway 2005), it may be the case that the relative frequency of comparative complementisers in general (not only with seem) may be a useful indicator by which to compare NTT vs. TT autobiographies.
me, suggests they are more closely indexed to the experiencer than are that-clause complements.\textsuperscript{174}

In terms of the variation between the three comparative complementisers, and the factors that may influence the selection of one over another, the literature suggests that register and regional variation may play a role. López-Couso and Méndez-Naya ascribe comparative complementisers positions on a cline of formality – \textit{as if} > \textit{as though} > \textit{like} – with \textit{like} being the least formal (2012: 14-5). Grammars of English point to differing frequencies of their use in spoken vs. written discourse and in American vs. British English: \textit{like} is more frequently found in spoken discourse than written and, historically, more common in American than British English (Quirk 1985: 1173). In both sub-corpora of the ECC, \textit{like} is found more frequently than \textit{as (if/though)}, perhaps reflecting the informal register of popular autobiographies. However, since both \textit{like} and \textit{as} complements are interpreted as effecting the same construal of evidential stance – they both reflect a judgement that is attributed solely to the speaker, based on a perceived judgement of similarity (López-Couso and Méndez-Naya 2011: 18) – for the purposes of the current analysis, no distinction will be made between the selection of one or another of these complements, and they are considered to be members of one category.\textsuperscript{175}

In the EE data, comparative complements were found in 55 cases (12.4% of SEEM-constructions), whereas in the EJ data a lower number of 28 cases (8.5%) were identified. Although comparative SEEM-constructions are relatively infrequent in both sub-corpora, the difference between EE and JE frequencies appears to be quite significant, particularly considering that there is no immediately apparent explanation for a lower frequency in the translated texts in terms of SL/ST influence.

\textsuperscript{174} It is suggested in the literature that, at least in the case of seem, comparative complementisers and that-clause complements can be regarded as ‘counterparts’ (López-Couso and Méndez-Naya 2011: 18, Quirk 1985: 1175 footnote a) which can be interchanged “without any perceptible change in meaning” (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 962). Aijmer (2009) also infers a close relationship between that and the comparative complementisers on the basis that seem that constructions were often translated by comparative clause structures in her Swedish, Norwegian and German translational data (ibid. 77-8). However, since the present study subscribes to the view that complement choice is meaningful and reflects the speaker’s variable conceptualisation of a situation, a contrast is inferred from the choice of that-clause vs. comparative complementiser choice which pertains, among other things, to evidential positioning and degree of subjectivity.

\textsuperscript{175} López-Couso and Méndez-Naya also note that \textit{as if} may be more likely to be used in descriptions that have negative or unfavourable connotations than \textit{as though} (2001: 102). Although the present analysis will not examine the nature of the descriptions supplied in the complement clause, it is noted that semantic prosody (vis-à-vis ‘distancing’) may explain complement choice in some cases.
Furthermore, the findings echo Mushin’s (2001, 2006) observation of the omission of a comparative construction (looks like) in intralingual narrative mediation.\textsuperscript{176} The possible significance of the difference in frequency of comparative complementisers in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora will be revisited in 5.4. in the light of analysis of similar constructions in the JCC data.

5.3. Analysis of SEEM-constructions in the JCC

5.3.1. Relative Frequency of SEEM-constructions with sou, you, mitai and rashii

This section examines patterns of use of the set of evidential particles that indicate ‘seeming’ in the JCC. Unlike the SEEM-constructions in the ECC, which are categorised by the complement of the verb seem – i.e. seem to, seem like, seem as, and seem that – the total of 861 SEEM-constructions extracted from the JCC are already differentiated by the evidential particle that introduces the seem-proposition – i.e. sou, you, mitai and rashii. The relative frequencies of each type of construction, expressed as a percentage of the total number of SEEM-constructions, provides the starting point for a comparison of the JJ and EJ sub-corpora (Fig. 15).\textsuperscript{177}

\textsuperscript{176} Although beyond the scope of the present discussion, the literature describing patterns of translation of metaphors (cf. Schäffner 2004) may be illuminating when considering the translation of as and like complements.

\textsuperscript{177} Frequency data for individual texts is recorded in Appendix D.
Fig. 15 shows a similar overall profile for the relative frequency distributions of the four types of SEEM-construction in the JJ and EJ sub-corpora, and the order of frequency is the same in both cases: i.e. you > rashii > sou > mitai. The most obvious difference is in the frequency of you constructions, which are more frequent in the JJ data. However, the frequencies of sou and the informal counterpart to you, mitai, also show variation. The frequency of rashii-
constructions is the same in both data sets. Before attempting to interpret this frequency data further, the following sections examine the patterns of usage of each of the four evidential particles in detail, commenting on the types of descriptions they report, and the construals effected of the relationship between the narrator and the judgement of seeming vis-à-vis its evidential basis. Their relative frequencies of use in the JJ and EJ sub-corpora are then interpreted in the light of these characterisations.

5.3.2. sou
A total of 110 inferential sou-constructions – 34 in the JJ and 76 in the EJ data – were subject to detailed examination. It was noted that they occur with adjectival and clausal objects, as exemplified in (76) and (77), and, infrequently, with nominal objects.

(76) いかめしい裁判官でさえ愉快そうだった [EJ2]

ikameshii saibankan de sae yukai sou datta
Even the stern judge seemed happy

(77) うまくいきそうだだった [EJ5]

Umaku ikisou datta
It seemed as though it would go well

As in (76) and (77), the sou + copular verb structure typically occurs in a sentence-final position, although there are a small number of clause-final instances. Sou constructions are affirmative in all but one case – sobo wa amari ureshisoudewanakatta ‘My grandmother did not seem very pleased’ [EJ6] – although elements of negation are found in the object complement in a number of instances. Examples include kanojo wa chīzu niwa amari kuwashikunasasou datta ‘She seemed not to be very knowledgeable about cheese’ [EJ1] and Furina ten wa nasasou datta ‘There seemed not to be any disadvantages [EJ1].

Examining the tense of these constructions, it was noted that while there is a similar number of present tense sou constructions in the JJ data (17 instances) and EJ data (20 instances), there are significantly more past tense constructions in the EJ data (56 instances) than in the JJ data (17 instances). This tense patterning
resembles that observed for other inferential constructions extracted from the JCC, and corresponds with contrastive accounts of narrative tense in Japanese and English (cf. Fowler, 1992, Kodama 2007).

Examining register, as apparent in the choice of copula, it was noted that *sou* constructions are predominantly found with the plain copula *da* in both sub-corpora. In fact, only four cases were found with the formal *dearu*, all of which are in the EJ corpus. This is in contrast with observations made in relation to *you* and *mitai* (see 5.3.3. and 5.3.4.) to the effect that formal constructions (*you dearu*) are more frequently occurring in the JJ than EJ data, and informal constructions (*mitai*) are more frequently occurring in the EJ than JJ data. However, a detailed examination of patterns of register is beyond the scope of the present study.178

Proceeding to an examination of the character of the object complements of *sou*-constructions, three main types of description were identified. These can be summarised as descriptions of the inferred (a) (internal) character of entities, (b) the existence or non-existence of an entity and (c) the potential of something to occur; all of which are based on observation of the appearances of an entity. These types of description correspond with characterisations of *sou*-constructions offered in the literature (Asano-Cavanagh 2010, Iori et al 2000, Makino and Tsutsui 1986).

The first type of description, of the inferred character of entities, is limited to characteristics that are not (visually) obvious. For example, while the adjective *oishii* ‘delicious’ can be used with *sou*, as *oishisou* ‘looks delicious’, *kirei* ‘beautiful’ cannot be used in a *sou*-construction such as *kireisou* ‘looks beautiful’ (Iori et al 2000: 128). In the JCC data, these adjectival *sou*-constructions frequently describe the internal (cognitive, emotional and sensory) states of others: for example, *akirakani kare wa ureshisou deatta* ‘He clearly looked happy’ [EJ2], *kanojo wa totemo igokochi ga yosasou datta* ‘She looked very comfortable’ [EJ1] and *kare wa doumitemo ie o uritakunasaoudatta* ‘However you looked at it, he didn’t seem like he wanted to sell the house’ [EJ1]. Since *sou* describes states on the basis of inference, rather than things that are obvious or known, *sou*-constructions are not usually associated with descriptions of the self. However, there is one example in which object of description is the autobiographical subject himself – *boku wa*

**imanimo nakidashisou datta** ‘I felt like I was about to burst out crying at any moment’ [EJ6] – suggesting a dissociation between a physical, experiencing self and observing self.

The second type of description is of the inferred presence or absence of an entity. These **sou**-constructions are characterised by NP objects with the existential verb **aru** ‘have, be’ (conjugated as **arisou**) or its negative form **nai** ‘have not, be not’ (conjugated as **nasasou**). These constructions comment on whether a particular entity appears to exist or not, and are frequently negative. In addition to the examples given above, such cases include **amari kouka wa nasasou datta** ‘there seemed to be no benefit’ [JJ5].

The third type of description is predictive in character, inferring the future potential of something to happen, based on observation of its current state. These types of description entail clausal complements with a variety of verbs conveying ability or potential: commonly found examples include **narisou** ‘look like becoming’, **dekisou** ‘look able to’ and other verbs conjugated in their potential form **konasesou** ‘look able to handle’ and **hairesou** ‘look able to enter’. The descriptions can be literal – as in **hantai jinmon ni roku, nana jikan wa kakarisou de aru** ‘It looked like the cross-examination would take six or seven hours’ [EJ2] – or metaphorical, as in **Me ga ōkikute, imanimo kao kara tobidashisou da** ‘His eyes were so big they seemed like they were going to jump out of his face at any moment’ [EJ4]. These descriptions, which pertain only to predictions in the near future, have a sense of immediacy, and in several cases are accompanied by adverbial qualifications such as **imanimo** ‘at any moment’.

Since all three types of description introduced by **sou** are based on direct perception, it is unsurprising that no indication is given as to the evidential basis of the speaker inference in the majority of cases. There are four exceptions to this: two instances of the marker of unspecific evidence **douyara** ‘somehow’, and two instances of specific evidence markers **mirukaranı** ‘from looking at it’ [EJ4] and **funiki kara shite** ‘from the atmosphere’ [JJ4].

Considering the character of **sou**-constructions, it is contrary to expectations that they are more frequently found in the EJ data (76 cases) than in JJ (34 cases). Given that **sou** is prototypically restricted to situations in which the current speaker has directly observed a situation (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 411) –
i.e. presupposing NARRATOR=EXPERIENCER coincidence – its use is not, from the point of view of normal evidential conventions, sanctioned when mediating the experience of an OTHER.

5.3.3. you
A total of 452 you-constructions were identified in the JCC: 212 in the JJ sub-corpus and 240 in the EJ sub-corpus. Typical examples include (78) and (79).

(78) 私をチクッた者の数は相当なものだったようだ。[JJ4]

Watashi o chikutta mono no kazu wa soutou na mono datta you da
It seems there were quite a number of people who informed on me

(79) 自分たち自身のことがかなり好きなようだったが、客はあまり入っていなかった。

[jibun tachi jishin no koto ga kanari suki na you datta ga, kyaku wa amari haitteinakatta
They seemed to like themselves rather a lot, although there were not many people there watching

In the majority of cases, including (78), the you + copula construction occurs in a sentence-final position, although a small number occur in a clause-final position followed by a clausal connective such as ga ‘but’, kara ‘because’ or shi ‘and’, as in (79). Although affirmative constructions such as (78) and (79) are in the majority, negative you-constructions of two types were also identified. The first type, in which the main (copular) verb is negative, occurs in only one case: karera no kokoro ni hibiita youdewanakatta ‘It did not seem to touch their hearts’ [EJ2]. A second type, in which the clausal complement preceding the you + copula contains elements of negation, are found more regularly. Examples include shinken ni kangaete wa inai you datta ‘(He) seemed not to be thinking very seriously’ [EJ1] and gyanburu kuse wa naotteinai you da ‘His gambling habit seemed not to have been cured’ [JJ6].

The you-constructions under examination occur with both present and past tense copulas: as in (78) with the present tense da, and in (79) with the past tense datta. Although interpreted as reflecting an experiencer-perspective, a significant proportion of the you-constructions extracted from the JCC occur with a present
tense copula: as explained in 5.1.2., use of the present tense to describe the ‘impressions’ of a past experiencer is a norm of Japanese narrative style. In terms of register, you-constructions occur with both the plain copula da and the formal dearu and, while the plain form is more frequent than the formal in both sub-corpora, there is a contrast in the extent to which formal register is used in the two sets of data. In the JJ sub-corpus there are 169 plain and 43 formal you-constructions, whereas in the EJ sub-corpus there are 232 plain but only 8 formal. This might be interpreted as pointing to a contrast in the register adopted in translated vs. non-translated texts, or simply as reflecting ST influence.

Although both tense and register are potentially interesting indices for comparing non-translated vs. translated texts, since the present study does not engage systematically with the analysis of tense or register in the ECC and JCC data, and these are not assumed to impact on the evidential or epistemological import of you-constructions (and other seem-constructions examined here), no further comment will be made.

Having made some initial general observations, the discussion will now focus on the types of experiences described in the you-constructions, paying particular attention to the types of object with which they occur. You-constructions extracted from the JCC are preceded by a variety of objects: adjectival, nominal (and pronominal) and clausal complements, as exemplified by (80) to (82).

(80) ほかの仲間たちよりうまいようだった [EJ4]

Hoka no nakama tachi yori umai you datta
It seemed that (he) was more skillful than the others

(81) 巨大なバンドのようだった [EJ1]

Kyodai na bando no you datta
It seemed (to be) a huge band

\[179\] Comparing the relative frequency of present vs. past tense (experiencer-perspective) you-constructions in the respective sub-corpora, in the JJ sub-corpus there are more present tense you-constructions (132 instances) than past tense (80 instances), whereas in the EJ sub-corpus the converse is true (105 present tense, 135 past tense). It is likely that this is attributable to the differing norms of tense patterning in English and Japanese narratives: i.e. the lower frequency of present tense / higher frequency of past tense constructions narrating an experiencer-perspective in the EE source texts may have influenced the tense patterning in the EJ translated texts.
Examples (80) to (82) illustrate that you-constructions can be used to describe the narrator’s ‘impression’ of a range of remembered entities and events.

You-constructions in the JCC frequently describe the cognitive or emotional states of others: for example, *kare wa watashi ni sono shikaku ga nai to omotteiru you da* ‘He seems to think I’m not qualified’ [EJ2] and *minna wa sore o kiku to gakkari shita you datta* ‘When they heard that, everyone seemed disappointed’ [JJ1]. Although the inference of internal states based on external appearances is prototypically associated with sou-constructions, as in *tanoshisou* ‘look like enjoying’ [EJ1], the judgement of seeming described by you-constructions construes the evidential basis as the observation of external appearances, behavioural clues or other indicators (cf. *tanoshindeiru you* ‘seem to be enjoying’ [EJ3]).

In (82), for example, it may be that the inferred client satisfaction was based on direct visual (facial expressions) or auditory (hearing murmurs of approval) evidence, assumption (receiving a generous tip), or a combination of these. Contrasting the evidential character of you and sou: where sou is based only on perceptible characteristics, inferential judgements introduced by you can also be based on a range of observational data and other information. Iori et al contrast *kono kēki wa oishiyō desu* ‘this cake seems to be delicious’, a judgement based on observation of the cake selling well or customers’ reactions when eating it, with *kono kēki wa oishisou desu* ‘this cake looks delicious’, based on the external appearance of the cake (2000: 134). In this sense, the contrast been AP-sou vs. AP-you appears to have parallels with the distinction between seem AP vs. seem to be AP.

A second type of description commonly conveyed using you-constructions entails the imaginative, metaphorical description of an experienced entity or event. These ‘counterfactual’ descriptions – ‘X is like Y but is not Y’ (Asano-Cavanagh 2010: 154) – are frequently accompanied by *marude* ‘as though’ (found in 26 cases) and/or the interrogative particle *ka* (17 cases) which emphasises that the
description is counterfactual/non-literal (Makino and Tsutsui 1986: 549). Such metaphorical descriptions may be used to paint a vivid picture of the autobiographical subject’s physical surroundings – *rosanzerusu wa marude tamanegi no you datta* ‘Los Angeles was just like an onion’ [EJ1] – or to describe abstract or intangible things that would otherwise be difficult to convey, such as complex emotional or physical states of others – *marude jibuntachi no seishi ga kimaru saiban ka nanika o matteiru ka no you da* ‘It seems as though they are waiting for a judgement on whether they will live or die’ [EJ4] – or of the autobiographical subject him or herself – *boku no kokoro wa kōri tsuite shimatta you datta* ‘It seemed like my heart had frozen’ [EJ4]. These examples support the characterisation offered in the literature that *you* involves the comparison of a current situation (as observed by the speaker) with some other previously acquired knowledge or experience (Asano-Cavanagh 2010: 168, Makino and Tsutsui 1992: 547, Aoki 1986, Martin 2003 among others).

Although the present analysis does not attempt to surmise the actual evidential basis for individual *you*-constructions, it is useful to examine co-textual and contextual clues when building a characterisation of the functions of *you*. For example, while *you* is prototypically associated with direct sources of evidence (observation), there are examples in the JCC in which the *you* judgement appears to be based on information acquired by hearsay.\(^\text{180}\) Such cases typically describe early childhood experiences that the autobiographical subject is unable to recall: for example, *moutou kangaete inakatta you na tokoro ni, boku no jinsei no saisho no go nen wa atta you da* ‘It seems that the first five years of my life were spent in the kind of place I never imagined’ [EJ6] and *watashi ga umareta koro ni wa kigyou wa junchou datta you dearu* ‘It seems that at the time I was born the business was doing well’ [JJ4]. Particularly in the second example, chronological logic strongly suggests that the experience being recalled by the autobiographical subject is not a direct experiential memory, and therefore was acquired later, most likely by hearsay, or perhaps other sources (such as the discovery of photographs, documents and so on). In such cases, the *you*-construction is based on non-experiential, relatively distal sources, but presents the proposition as relatively

\(^{180}\) Ogata (2005) indicates that the use of *you* to report hearsay-based inference is only marginally acceptable, although its use in academic writing to report literature has been documented.
proximal (as compared to say, a rashii-construction) (cf. Asano-Cavanagh 2010), and might be perhaps interpreted as describing an ‘acquired’ memory (cf. Johnson et al 1988).

Thus, while most strongly associated with joukyou kara no jibun no handan ‘judgement of the self on the basis of (direct perception of a) situation’ (Iori et al 2000: 129), you-constructions can be used to report inferential descriptions on the basis of various types of evidence, and itself does not specify the type of evidence upon which the inferential judgement has been made. Of the 452 you-constructions examined, only three examples are accompanied by a specific indication of the source of evidence – yousu o miru to ‘looking at the appearance’ [EJ6], tokei o miru to ‘looking at the clock’ [JJ3], and choubo o miru kagiri dewa ‘looking at the accounts’ [JJ4]. Conversely, there are a number of you-constructions accompanied by qualifications such as douyara ‘somehow’, nandaka ‘somehow’, nankashira ‘somehow or other’, and doumo ‘somehow’ which suggest that the narrator cannot identify the specific evidence on which the you-proposition is based.

As is the case with (80) to (82), since the vast majority of you-constructions in the JCC are not accompanied by any (explicit) indication of the evidential basis, in most cases more than one possible interpretation is possible. Indeed, the data examined here suggests that you can be used with meanings that resemble seem to be AP (as in tanoshindeiru you, ‘seem to be enjoying’ [EJ3]), seem as/like (as in rosanzerusu wa marude tamanegi no you datta ‘Los Angeles was just like an onion’ [EJ1]) and seem that (as in moutou kangaete inakatta you na tokoro ni, boku no jinsei no saisho no go nen wa atta you da ‘It seems that the first five years of my life were spent in the kind of place I never imagined’ [EJ6]). Since it is not possible to differentiate between these types of construal from the grammatical structure of the you-construction alone, the relative frequency data presented in Fig. 15 (59.1% in the JJ and 47.8% in the EJ data) is, as it stands, limited in the extent to which is can be interpreted as an indicator or narrator stance.

5.3.4. mitai
A total of 71 mitai-constructions were identified in the JCC: 18 in the JJ sub-corpus and 53 in the EJ sub-corpus. As with sou- and you-constructions, these occur
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predominantly in a sentence-final position, with a small number of clause-final uses followed by the connectives *ga* ‘but’ and *keredo* ‘but’. It was noted that copular-like uses of *mitai* are not always accompanied by a copular verb, and a small number of sentence-final uses of *mitai* immediately followed by a *koten* ideographic period were also identified. (83) and (84) are examples of *mitai*-constructions with and without a copula.

(83) 彼女の歩きかたは独特で、優雅だった。地上を進む帆船 みたいただ。[EJ4]

*Kanojo no arukikata wa dokutoku de, yūga datta. Chijou o susumu hansen mitai da.*

Her way of walking was unique, it was elegant. She looks like a ship sailing across the ground.

(84) 目はでたらめに塗ったみたい。[EJ5]

*Me wa detarame ni nutta mitai*

The eyes seemed like they were painted haphazardly

Tense patterning of *mitai*-constructions closely resembles that of *you*-constructions. In (83), for example, although the first sentence describing the woman’s gait uses the past tense *yūga datta* ‘was elegant’, the subsequent *mitai*-construction uses the present tense copula *da* ‘seems/looks like’. Such tense switching may be interpreted as reflecting a shift in focus from the (finite) act of perceiving the walk, to the (enduring) character of the walk.\textsuperscript{181} Similar patterns of past/present tense narration of remembered experiences can be observed elsewhere: *jouryū kaikyū no nekki ni afureteita. Sēru no shonichi no harozzu mitai da* ‘It was overflowing with upper class excitement. It is like the first day of Harrods’ sale’ [EJ1]. However, in both sub-corpora, past tense *mitai*-constructions are used more frequently than present tense uses: in the JJ data there are 7 present tense and 11 past tense constructions, and in the EJ data there are 20 present tense and 33 past tense constructions.

*Mitai*-constructions extracted from the JCC occur with either a nominal or clausal object complement, each of which is exemplified below.

\textsuperscript{181} Example (83) resonates with Kodama’s (2007) suggestion that, in Japanese narrative, finite actions are likely to be narrated using the past tense, whereas ‘impressions’ of characteristics that are assumed to endure are often narrated using the present tense.
As is the case in (85) and (86), the copular verb phrase is affirmative in all 71 mitai-constructions. However, a small number of cases were found in which the clausal complement entails an element of negation: for example, *Dare mo ki ni shiteinai mitai datta* ‘It seemed that nobody was bothered’ [EJ1], and *saisho no toki to marude henka shiteinai mitai da* ‘It seems as though it hadn’t changed since the beginning’ [JJ2].

As was seen to be the case with *you*-constructions, *mitai* introduces inferential descriptions that have a range of possible evidential bases which are not indicated by the *mitai*-construction itself. In (85) and (86), alternative interpretations are possible for the basis of the inferential process that might have taken place. (86), for example, could have been based on hearsay or on the observation of situational clues. While none of the examples found in the JCC specifies explicitly the basis on which an inferential judgement is made, as was the case with *you*, there are a number of examples in which qualifications such as *nandaka* ‘somehow’ or *douyara* ‘somehow’ indicate a vagueness in the evidential basis or reasoning process.

In general, the *mitai*-concordances extracted from the JCC share similar patterns of use with *you*-constructions. In many cases the autobiographical subject describes general impressions of things by reporting an inferred resemblance, often based on perceptible characteristics, as in *mukashi no shirokuro eiga mitai* ‘looks like an old black and white movie’ [EJ1], *gero mitai* ‘looks like sick’ [EJ5], and *sanpauro wa uta to bichi no na i rio mitai da* ‘San Paulo is like Rio without the beach and the music’ [EJ1]. A second common pattern of use reports inferred judgements of the inner states of others, such as *kyûni omoiatatta mitai datta* ‘It seemed like he had suddenly thought of it’ [EJS] and *sayounara o iitakatta mitai datta* ‘It seemed like she wanted to say goodbye’ [EJS]. A third noticeable pattern of use
involves the use of counter-factual, metaphorical analogy. As was the case with you-constructions, such descriptions are often accompanied by the adverbial qualification marude ‘as though’ which indicates that ‘X is like Y but is not Y’ (Asano-Cavanagh 2010: 154). Such uses often describe the complex internal states of the autobiographical self: for example, boku no naka de betsu no ikimono ga katteni ugoki mawatte iru mitai datta ‘It seemed like another creature was moving around inside me’ [EJ4] and karada ga nanka toketeiku mitai datta ‘It seemed like my body was melting’ [JJ5].

As mentioned already, mitai is usually regarded as an informal counterpart to you, having the same evidential import but contrasting register (Makino and Tsutsui 1986, Iori et al 2000).\(^1\) Given the difference in register between you and mitai, it is interesting to note the markedly higher frequency (more than twice) of use of mitai-constructions in the EJ than the JJ sub-corpus, particularly since the relative frequency of formal copular verbs with seem-constructions is higher in the JJ than EJ data. It may be the case that patterns of register marking in the EJ texts are largely a function of ST style, or are used as part of a characterisation strategy by EJ translators.\(^2\) However, since register is not of primary concern here, the interpretation of mitai-constructions retains a focus on their evidential character and the relationship they infer between a narrator and the judgement of seeming. Therefore, in the final comparison of the types of seem-constructions found in the non-translated and translated sub-corpora of the JCC, mitai- and you-constructions will be considered as members of the same category (see 5.4.).

5.3.5. rashii

A total of 228 rashii-constructions were found in the JCC: 95 in the JJ sub-corpus and 133 in the EJ. (87) and (88) are representative examples of these.

\(^{1}\) Martin (2003) suggests that a point of difference between you and mitai may lie in the attitudinal stance adopted by each in relation to the event or entity being described, such that, mitai can have negative connotations (‘belittling’) (ibid. 173). While semantic prosody is a potentially interesting line of enquiry when considering translation position/stance and relative distance, space prevents further investigation.

\(^{2}\) Although most commonly associated with dialogue in fictional characterisations, yakuwarigo ‘role language’ (Kinsui 2003, Teshigawara and Kinsui 2012) may be of interest when considering the creation of a ‘voice’ in translated autobiographies.
It seems that Kuborn’s powers of influence were large.

Somehow it seemed that the culprit was again the Italian postal service.

As is the case with all the seem-constructions examined here, the majority of rashii-constructions occur in a sentence-final position (followed directly by a kuten ideographic period), as in (87) and (88), with a small number occurring in a clause-final position. Present tense constructions, such as (87), constitute the majority in both sub-corpora. Past tense constructions, such as (88) – in which rashii is conjugated as the past tense rashikatta – were less frequent: only one such construction was identified in the JJ data, and 15 in the EJ data. This tense patterning mirrors that observed for you, mitai and sou, in which past tense inferential constructions are more frequent in the EJ data than JJ data. All of the rashii-constructions are affirmative, although there are cases in which elements of negation are found in the object complement: Tokyo no kensetsugaisha ya fudousanya to tsurundeiru otoko no shogyo ga omoshirokunai rashii ‘it seemed that the activities of a guy who was associating with Tokyo construction companies and estate agents were not of interest’ [JJ4].

Rashii-constructions extracted from the JCC occur with adjectival objects, as in (87), nominal objects, as in (88), and clausal object complements. Clausal objects are found both with the copula da, as in (89), and a range of other verbs, as in (90).

It seemed that any worries that the kid would fidget in front of the camera were totally unnecessary.
(90) 自ら強奪をやっていただらしい。[JJ4]

*Mizukara goudatsu o yatteita rashii*
It seems that he carried out the extortion himself

Considering the evidential basis of rashii-constructions, the majority of examples found in the JCC, including (87) to (90), do not explicitly indicate the evidential basis on which the inference is made and, since the use of a rashii-construction itself does not indicate the source of evidence, alternative interpretations are often possible. Only a small number of the rashii-constructions in the JCC explicitly state the source of information. One such example specifies a hearsay source of evidence: *Ofukuro no hanashi dewa, oyaji wa nakanaka no yakusha datta rashii* ‘From what my mother says, it seems that my father was quite an actor.’ [JJ4]. In other cases, contextual information may direct interpretation of the evidential basis one way or another. For example, chronological logic strongly directs a hearsay interpretation in cases where the narrator reports something that took place prior to their birth or during their very early years such as, *haha mo osanai koro wa amari gakkou ni ikazu, beddo de hon o yondesugoshibarashii* ‘It seems that when she was young, my mother didn’t go to school either, but stayed in bed reading’ [EJ2]. However, the majority of rashii-constructions allow various interpretations of the kind of source on which the seem-proposition is based. For example, *igirisujin no koto o baka mitai ni suki rashii* ‘It seems that they (the Swedes) are crazy about the English’ [EJ1] and *kanojo wa tachimachi kare ga ki ni itta rashii* ‘It seems that suddenly she liked him’ [EJ1] might be based on observation of circumstances, hearsay or a combination of both.

As was noted in the case of you-constructions (and other inferential markers discussed here), many uses of rashii are accompanied by adverbial qualifications such as *douyara* ‘somehow’ and *doumo* ‘somehow’ (as in (88)), indicating vagueness in relation to the inferential process and its evidential basis. Examples include *douyara sono hiniku dake wa baka shouji ni uketotta rashii* ‘somehow it seems that he took only the irony straightforwardly’ [JJ1] and *douyara Tanaka wa kono mise no jouren rashii* ‘somehow it seems that Tanaka is a regular customer of this shop’ [JJ6]. In these cases, an observation of circumstantial evidence interpretation is the most obvious.
Somewhat unexpectedly, a pattern of description frequently found in the JCC data entails the use of rashii to describe the cognitive and emotional states of others, as in rikaishita rashii ‘seem that (person) understood’ [EJ2], shinjiteita rashii ‘seem that (person) believed’ [EJ2], ureshikatta rashii ‘seem that (person) was happy’ [EJ3]. This type of description can also, as already discussed, be introduced by sou (when based on perception of external character) or you (when based on perception of circumstances). When described using rashii, the inference is construed as being based on hearsay or other circumstantial evidence, rather than direct perception of external behavioural clues and maintains some ‘distance’.

However, as Asano-Cavanagh (2010) reports, there are suggestions in the literature – in particular Hayatsu (1988) – that rashii can be used to report inference on the basis of direct experiential evidence but, when doing so, it is construed ‘distally’ (2010: 155).

A final noteworthy type of description using rashii worthy of comment is the small number of examples of the use of rashii with clausal object complements in which the grammatical subject is either the narrator’s self or a part of the self, as in (91) and (92).

(91) どうやら私はバスを待ちながら泣いていたらしい。[EJ2]
Douyara watashi wa basu o machinagara naiteita rashii
Apparently, it seems that I was crying while waiting for the bus

(92) 脚は脚で僕とはいくぶん違った考え方をしているらしい。[JJ2]
ashi wa ashi de boku towa ikubun chigatta kangaekata o shiteiru rashii
It seems that my legs had somewhat different ideas to me

Since rashii is not typically associated with the description of something that was apprehended directly by the speaker, this appears to be somewhat contrary to typical use, since something that has happened to the self can be assumed to have been apprehended directly by sensory perception. Therefore, in (91), it might be that the incident of crying at a bus stop was forgotten (or deliberately removed from memory), or not even noticed at the time due to the highly emotional state of the narrator, allowing the possibility of the subsequent acquisition of the
knowledge from a third person through hearsay.\(^{184}\) An alternative interpretation is that the autobiographical subject underwent a dissociative experience, whereby she is distanced from a prior highly emotional self. In (92), the subject of the object complement clause, the narrator’s legs, are expected to be accessible by direct sensory perception. That they are treated as a separate cognisant entity has a certain humorous rhetorical effect, and emphasises a feeling of dissociation between the narrator’s cerebral self and his physical self, possibly caused by intense endurance training.

Of the rashii-constructions found in the JCC, the majority allow alternative interpretations vis-à-vis the source of the knowledge upon which the seem-proposition is based. As was noted with *you*, it is often only possible to be sure in cases in which logic apparent from the immediate context precludes a direct perceptual interpretation, such as (93).

(93) おばちゃんが一世一代の芝居を打って泣きつつ髪したらしい。[JJ4]

*Obachan ga issei ichidai no shibai o utte naki katsu odoshita rashii*

It seems that the old lady got her way by turning on the tears in a once in a lifetime performance.

In (93), the narrator relates an event that took place in his absence, and therefore acquired knowledge of the event by hearsay. However, analysis of concordances was carried out without reference to their context of use, and no attempt was made to surmise the actual evidential basis in each case, as this would be excessively time consuming and unlikely to be productive since, in most cases, even examination of context does not guide a definitive interpretation.

As already mentioned, in general, dictionaries and grammars tend to focus on an association of rashii with evidence based on hearsay. Makino and Tsutsui, for example, argue that rashii introduces “conjecture based on what the speaker has heard or read. That is, the information his conjecture is based on is not firsthand”

\(^{184}\) Similar descriptions can be observed in the ECC data, where a SEEM-construction with a first person grammatical subject was used in cases where the autobiographical subject was in an altered cognitive state (for example, comatose, intoxicated or highly emotional), or, not quite him or herself. In these cases, it might be suggested that the autobiographical subject failed to remember the experienced events, knowledge of which was then acquired by hearsay from an OTHER after the event, or that the autobiographical subject underwent a dissociative process giving rise to a separation between the experiencing SELF and observing SELF.
In the specific case of its use in shishousetsu fictional autobiographical literature, rashii is said to identify a proposition as being “outside the speaker’s own direct experience” (Fowler 1992: 283). However, it also the case that rashii can be used to convey inferential judgements based on evidential bases other than hearsay. Ogata (2005) for example states that rashii can be used to convey inferential judgements based on auditory, sensory, and other ‘unknown’ evidence (typically indicated by douyara). Asano-Cavanagh (2010) suggests that rashii expresses the speaker’s judgement based on unspecified information and simply means that “inference is made on the grounds of ‘knowing something else’” (2010: 167). According to Iori et al, in addition to expressing judgement on the basis of hearsay, rashii also expresses joukyou kara no handan ‘judgement based on circumstances’, in a similar way to you and mitai (2000: 131).

For this reason, rashii can be used ambiguously, for example when a speaker wishes to distance him or herself from the inferential judgement introduced by a rashii- construction, to avoid taking responsibility or for other reasons. It appears that, in practice, speakers use rashii either to convey hearsay-based inference or to indicate distance from a judgement of seeming based on observation of circumstantial evidence, and in this sense has a similar effect to seem that. However, unlike in the case of English seem that, an equivalent of the intersubjective interpretation blocker to me is not available with rashii, and it is therefore not possible to compare rashii constructions in the JJ and EJ sub-corpora using such an indicator. Considering the relative frequency of use of rashii-constructions in the JJ and EJ sub-corpora – 26.5% in both cases – there is no obvious contrast between the two sets of data based on frequency alone.

5.4. Summary: Experiential vs. Non-experiential stance in the translation of represented memories

The analysis of represented memories, identified in inferential SEEM-constructions, revealed areas of difference and similarity in the respective sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC. While attempting to classify the various types of SEEM-construction found in the data as being either experiential or non-experiential in character, based on evidential categories such as direct perception, indirect perception (in which the conceptual or inferential component is greater than in the case of direct
perception) and hearsay, the notions of subjectivity and intersubjectivity also featured prominently. Indeed, during the analysis it became clear that SEEM-constructions are particularly complex in terms of their multi-dimensional – evidential, epistemic and subjective – import. This complexity, in addition to the significant differences between the realisations of seeming in the English and Japanese data, makes comparing non-translated and translated data in terms of the experiential vs. non-experiential dichotomy less straightforward than in the case of REMEMBER-constructions. However, comparing the relative frequencies of occurrence of the respective types of SEEM-constructions in the ECC and JCC, the following observations were made.

**ECC**

- The proportion of SEEM-constructions that occur with the optional experiencer identifier *to me*, which blocks an intersubjective interpretation and indexes the seem-proposition exclusively to the speaker, is approximately double in the EE non-translated data (7.6%) as compared with the JE translated data (3.3%). Although the incidence of *to me* was observed to correlate with the use of *that*-clause complements, the proportion of *that*-clause complements in the EE and JE data is approximately the same (7.6% and 6.1% respectively) and therefore does not account for the difference. Since a parallel structure is not found in the Japanese data, it was not possible to cross-reference this observation with reference to SEEM-constructions in the non-translated and translated data in the JCC.

- The frequency of copular *seem zero-to be* constructions, which presuppose a direct perceptual evidential basis, is significantly higher in the EE non-translated data (46.5%) than in the JE translated data (37.7%). The alternative *seem to be* construction, which does not necessarily require the speaker’s perception, and which Borkin (1973) positions intermediately between *seem zero-to be* and *seem that* on a cline of subjective/propositional character, occurs with almost the same frequency in both the EE and JE data (13.0% and 13.4% respectively).

- The frequency of comparative *seem as/like* constructions, which although not discussed at length in the literature in terms of their evidential basis, are
characterised by a strong indexical link to the speaker (attested by a very low rate of co-occurrence with to me), is higher in the EE non-translated data (12.3%) than in the JE translated data (8.5%).

- Finally, the frequency of seem that (and seem zero-that) constructions, which are associated with an intersubjective interpretation and which may either indicate a hearsay basis or a stance of relative distance is, as mentioned above, approximately the same in both the EE and JE sub-corpora.

**JCC**

- The frequency of seem-constructions with the evidential particle sou, which presuppose a direct perceptual evidential basis, is, contrary to expectations, lower in the JJ non-translated data (9.5%) than in the EJ translated data (15.1%).
- The frequency of seem-constructions with you (including its informal counterpart mitai), which are used with a range of meanings, incorporating senses that resemble the copular seem to be and comparative seem as/like among others, is slightly higher in the JJ non-translated data (64.1%) than in the EJ translated data (58.4%).
- The frequency of rashii-constructions, which like seem that, are associated with an intersubjective interpretation and may either indicate a hearsay basis or a stance of relative distance, is exactly the same in both sub-corpora (26.5%).

Overall, the comparison of non-translated vs. translated data in the ECC suggests a stronger tendency towards the construal of seem-propositions from an experiential or subjective stance, i.e. strongly indexed to the autobiographical subject, in the non-translated data. This supports the characterisation that emerged from analysis of remember-constructions. However, it has not been possible to confirm this tendency in the JCC data. This is due to the very similar profiles of the two sub-corpora in terms of the frequency of occurrence of the respective particles, and the substantial overlap in the interpretations of the respective evidential particles used in seem-constructions in the JCC. As a consequence of the range of meanings that can be attributed to individual particles (in particular you), it appears that
comparing frequency of sou, you (and mitai) and rashii constructions is, on its own, insufficient, and more detailed analysis of individual cases, for example, of grammatical features such as tense, aspect and so on, may be required in order to attribute evidential stance (see 6.2.).
Chapter 6. Similarities and Differences in Evidential Stance-taking: Negotiating the SELF-OTHER dialectic

This chapter begins by restating the main findings of the research. Section 6.1. comments on patterns of evidential stance-taking observed in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora, and points to variation within the respective sub-corpora. These observations, regarded as potential indicators of translator position, are interpreted as a function of both the evidential character of non-translated vs. translated autobiographies in general, and of the degree of identification between particular translators and autobiographical authors/subjects. Section 6.2. outlines a number of avenues for future work, and, finally, section 6.3. considers the implications of the present research, and its place in relation to current enquiry in translation studies and related disciplines.

6.1. Findings

In order to investigate the evidential relations between an author vs. translator and the knowledge conveyed in an autobiographical narrative, a framework was devised for the analysis of two aspects of narrated recollection, regarded as prototypical of autobiographical narration, that are indexed to the autobiographical subject. The first phase of analysis examined the explicit report of memories in REMEMBER-constructions, which, in addition to specifying that the type of knowledge being reported is ‘memory evidence’, can construe the mode of acquisition of that memory variably, adopting either an experiential or non-experiential stance. The second phase of analysis examined the description of how memories seemed to the experiencer in SEEM-constructions, which, in addition to indicating that the judgement of seeming is based on ‘inference’, can construe the basis for that inference as being experiential or non-experiential. Comparing the use of REMEMBER-constructions and SEEM-constructions in the ECC and JCC comparable corpora revealed patterns of both similarity and difference in the non-translated and translated data.
6.1.1. Similarities: Evidence of a tendency towards the adoption of a non-experiential stance in the narration of translated memories?

Addressing the first research question posed in 1.3., Chapter 4 examined the character of REMEMBER-constructions in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC. Having initially noted that the REMEMBER-constructions under investigation are found more frequently in the English than Japanese autobiographical narratives, the analysis focused on the character of the object complement structures occurring with the verb of recollection, examining the relative frequency of respective complement types.

It was observed that:

• in both the ECC and JCC data, experiential REMEMBER-constructions were more frequent in the non-translated data than the translated data. In the ECC, remember –ing constructions were significantly more frequent in the EE (54.0%) than the JE (37.8%) sub-corpus. In the JCC, REMEMBER-constructions with the experiential nominaliser no were slightly more frequent in the JJ (21.3%) than the EJ (18.9%) sub-corpus,

and

• in both the ECC and JCC data, non-experiential REMEMBER-constructions were less frequent in the non-translated data than the translated data. In the ECC, remember that constructions were significantly less frequent in the EE (4.1%) than the JE (12.2%) sub-corpus. In the JCC, REMEMBER-constructions with the non-experiential nominaliser koto were significantly less frequent in the JJ (11.5%) than the EJ (30.3%) sub-corpus.

Since the same directional tendencies were observed in both the ECC and JCC comparable corpora, the findings appear to indicate a phenomenon that is translational (mediational) in origin, rather than a function of linguistic transfer between English and Japanese, or related to individual ST influence.

An additional observation of potential relevance is that,
• in the JCC data, of the REMEMBER-constructions occurring with a NP object, the non-experiential, optional NP-no koto form is found more frequently in the EJ translated data (32.6%) than in the JJ non-translated data (24.1%). Since a parallel structure is not found in English, this difference is not deemed to be attributable to ST influence, and constitutes an addition by the translator that construes the object of recollection as being abstract/conceptual in character – i.e. with a “stronger sense of distance from the concrete event” (Maynard 2002: 155) – as opposed to concrete/perceptual. Although it is not possible to confirm a bi-directional tendency, since a parallel form is not found in in the ECC, patterns of use of NP vs. NP-no koto in non-translated vs. translated Japanese appear to be a potentially productive area for future investigation.

Addressing the second research question, Chapter 5 examined the character of SEEM-constructions in the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora of the ECC and JCC. Having initially noted that the SEEM-constructions under investigation are found more frequently in the English than Japanese autobiographical narratives, which is contrary to expectations given the norms of Japanese evidential marking, the analysis focused on the character of the inference-based description of a recalled experience, examining the construal of the basis of the inference judgement as being experiential vs. non-experiential.

It was observed that:

• in the ECC data, experiential seem zero to be constructions, which presuppose a direct perceptual relationship, were significantly more frequent in the non-translated EE (46.5%) than the translated JE (37.7%) sub-corpus. However, in the JCC, SEEM-constructions with the perceptual evidential marker sou were less frequent in the non-translated JJ (9.5%) than the translated EJ (15.1%) sub-corpus,

• in the ECC, comparative SEEM-constructions (seem as/like), typified by metaphorical descriptions strongly indexed to the subject, were more frequent in the non-translated EE (12.3%) than the translated JE (8.5%) sub-corpus. In the JCC, SEEM-constructions with you (and mitai), many of which are
comparative (metaphorical) in character, are also more frequent in the non-translated JJ (64.1%) than the translated JE (58.4%) sub-corpus,

and

• in both the ECC and JCC data, non-experiential SEEM-constructions occurred with similar frequencies in the non-translated and translated data. In the ECC, seem that constructions occurred in the EE (7.6%) with a similar frequency as the JE (6.1%) sub-corpus. In the JCC, SEEM-constructions with rashii occurred in the JJ (26.5%) with the same frequency as the EJ (26.5%) sub-corpus.

A further observation deemed to be of relevance was that,

• of the SEEM-constructions in the ECC data, optional to me explicit reference to the experiencer, which blocks an intersubjective interpretation of a SEEM-construction, is found more frequently in the EE non-translated data (7.6%) than in the JE translated data (3.3%). Although a similar structure is not found in Japanese, and therefore its use in the JE texts constitutes an addition by the translator, the markedly less frequent rate of incidence of explicit self-reference is regarded as potentially significant. While this cannot be verified as a bi-directional tendency, since a parallel form is not found in the JCC, patterns of self-reference in non-translated vs. translated texts appears to be a potentially productive area for future investigation.\footnote{In addition to the main observations listed here, which pertain directly to the research questions posed in Chapter 1, it was also noted that ‘minor’ complement forms are found more frequently in the non-translated data than translated data (noted in relation to REMEMBER-constructions in the JCC and SEEM-constructions in both the ECC and JCC), suggesting greater variation in the types of constructions used in non-translated texts, an observation that can be linked to such translational tendencies as discussed by Baker (1996) and Halverson (2003). It was also noted in relation to the JCC data that the adoption of a more formal register (as apparent in the choice of copula) was found more often in the non-translated texts than in the translated texts, although the more colloquial form of you, mitai, was found more often in the translated texts than in the non-translated texts. Although not discussed in detail, matters of register were assumed to be related to source text influence and are likely a matter of style/characterisation. Finally, in relation to tense patterning, it was noted in the analysis of SEEM-constructions that Japanese autobiographical narratives make significantly more frequent use of the present tense when describing experiences of the past self than in English (where this is very infrequent), and this was reflected in the tense patterning of translations.}
These observations provide a basis for addressing the third research question: *To what extent do patterns of evidential stance-taking suggest a contrast in author vs. translator position that can be explained in terms of the contrasting evidential bases of a translated vs. non-translated autobiography?*

Overall, the observations made in relation to reported memories in *remember*-constructions reflecting a narrator perspective – i.e. that experiential construals are less frequent and non-experiential construals are more frequent in the translated sub-corpora than the non-translated sub-corpora of both the ECC and JCC data – is consistent with the actual evidential bases of original and translated autobiographies. That is, an original autobiography is narrated on the basis of experience, whereas a translated autobiography is narrated on the basis of non-experiential (indirect, mediate) sources. It is unsurprising that memories are more likely to be reported as episodic, ‘remember’-type memories in original autobiographies than in translated autobiographies, and that memories are more likely to be reported as semantic, ‘know’-type memories in translated autobiographies than in original autobiographies. Although the conventions of translation prevent a translator from adopting an explicitly reportive (‘biographical’) stance within the body of the translation, it appears that such a stance may become evident subtly in choices of complement structure. Indeed, given the constraints operational in translation, patterns of difference that appear to be relatively minor may constitute a significant manifestation of contrasting evidential positionality: i.e. that what was a direct, or ‘immediate’, relationship in the original becomes indirect, or ‘mediate’ in the translation.

The analysis of represented memories in *seem*-constructions, which reflect an experiencer perspective, presents a less clear picture. While *seem*-constructions in the non-translated and translated sub-corpora of the ECC appear to indicate a similar tendency towards more experiential, and more self-indexical presentations in non-translated data, the comparison of non-translated and translated sub-corpora of the JCC did not confirm this.

As already suggested, the inconclusive outcome of the JCC analysis may be related to the substantial overlap and ambiguity exhibited by Japanese evidential particles of ‘seeming’, and a need for detailed analysis of *seem*-constructions that goes beyond categorisation of the evidential marker itself. However, the lack of
clarity of findings, as compared to the case of reportive constructions, may also be related to the contrasting experiential vs. narrative vantages reflected in \textsc{seem vs. remember}-constructions. That is, reportive \textsc{remember}-constructions may be more susceptible to appropriation by the translator, whose evidential position is then conveyed, than experiential \textsc{seem}-constructions, which entail adoption of the perspective of the experiencing subject, and may therefore be less likely to reveal a reportive, non-experiential stance. In this regard, further work is required to develop a clearer picture of the experiential vs. non-experiential character of \textsc{seem}-constructions in the JCC.

In the end, the patterns of evidential stance-taking by authors and translators observed here are collectively regarded as providing sufficient justification for the elaboration of descriptive and interpretive hypotheses that relate to evidential stance-taking in translated autobiographies (and potentially translated texts in general), its basis in the self-other contrast implied in (other-) translation, and the contingent evidential relations between the author/translator and knowledge being conveyed. A descriptive hypothesis may be formulated along the following lines:

\textit{Translated autobiographies tend to exhibit patterns of evidential stance-taking that are characterised by less experiential construals and more non-experiential construals than non-translated autobiographies.}

As has been acknowledged already, there are many forces that act on a translator of an autobiography, not least the competing conventions of translation (i.e. adoption of the discursive position of the ’I’) and autobiography (i.e. \textsc{narrator}=\textsc{experiencer}), which give rise to a paradox that must be negotiated in terms of positionality. Nevertheless, it is assumed that the fundamental cognitive function of differentiating between types of knowledge on the basis of its mode of acquisition – which influences the way in which the knowledge is represented in conceptual and linguistic structure – will tend to become manifest. In this regard, an interpretive hypothesis to the following effect is offered:

\textit{Patterns of evidential stance-taking in translated autobiographies are influenced by the actual evidential basis of the knowledge being translated.}
This hypothesis reflects the assumption that, although the conventions of translation sanction the translator’s adoption of a the position of an OTHER ‘I’, which entails the entertaining of alternative evidential relationships with the knowledge being communicated, since the translator remains aware of his or her position as a translator, the fundamental, cognitively-grounded conventions of evidential stance-taking are likely to remain operational in conceptual and, therefore, linguistic representation/structure. Even if the constraints of translation prevent such a stance being indicated in overt reportive structures, and the lexico-grammatical means by which evidential stance is indicated in STs have a significant influence on the TT production, a non-experiential (distancing / reportive) stance, may be construed subtly in such grammatical structures as complementation (investigated here), person, tense and aspectual marking among other things.

However, it should also be acknowledged that there are alternative possible explanations for the patterns observed, which may or may not interact with the interpretation offered here. Firstly, as reported in the substantial body of literature describing the relationships between epistemic modal and evidential meaning, evidential and other dimensions of meaning interrelate in complex ways (Nuyts 2001, De Haan 2001, Faller 2002). Indeed, the same lexical and grammatical structures may be associated with indications of evidential basis, levels of certainty or commitment, and/or politeness/register. It would therefore seem reasonable to suggest that, rather than the mode of acquisition of knowledge (i.e. evidential aspect) per se, it may be indications of reduced certainty or commitment (i.e. epistemic modal aspect) arising in indirect modes of acquisition of knowledge that are apparent in the patterns observed.

For example, as well as being a marker of hearsay-based inference or a non-experiential construal of experience-based inference, seem that can be regarded as a hedging strategy, where responsibility for a proposition is not attributed solely to the self (cf. Chafe 1986, Aijmer 2009). Such an interpretation can be linked to existing descriptions of the erasure of uncertainty in translation, motivated by a desire to appear competent and authoritative, which has been interpreted as a tendency for translators to be risk-averse (Pym 2000, 2008).

While the present analysis has focused on interpretations of the evidential import of object complement structures which, in some cases, rests on a contrast
posited between the optional deletion or retention of a complementiser, an alternative interpretation for some of the patterns observed in terms of syntactic explicitation is also possible. For example, one of the findings of the present analysis relates to optional *to be* omission in copular *seem*-constructions. Following Borkin (1973), *seem zero* *to be* AP constructions were attributed a direct perceptual (subjective) interpretation, whereas *seem to be* AP constructions were regarded as having more conceptual (intersubjective) character. However, following Olohan and Baker (2000), whose investigation of patterns of optional *that* omission with verbs of speech and thought report revealed a tendency towards *that* retention in translated texts, it might be suggested that the lower rate of optional *to be* deletion/higher rate of optional *to be* retention in *seem*-constructions in the translated data is evidence of syntactic explicitation. Nevertheless, since rates of *that* retention and omission were similar in both the translated and non-translated data (for both *remember* and *seem*) in the ECC, there is no reason to suggest that syntactic explicitation (manifest in patterns of retention/deletion of optional complementisers) accounts for the patterns observed here.

6.1.2. Differences: Evidence of variable *SELF-OTHER* identificational relationships?

While the main thrust of the research reported here has been towards making generalisations about the characteristics of translated texts, the thesis elaborated in Chapter 1 is that, as well as the *SELF-OTHER* separation implied in translation, *SELF-OTHER* identification is also likely to influence a translator’s position. The point of departure for the negotiation of position is characterised by relative distance between the translator-SELF and author-OTHER. However, it is also suggested that this distance might be attenuated by identificational alignment, a mechanism based on an array of contributory factors that collectively give rise to variable degrees of empathetic consonance between translator and author/subject, and which allows the translator to approach the discursive and experiential position of the author.\(^{186}\)

Since, in the first instance, the present thesis aims to investigate the character of translated autobiographies *in general*, the analysis has focused on the

---

\(^{186}\) Assuming that maximal identification is with the *SELF* (Langacker 1991: 307) and that complete *simpatico* with an *OTHER* is impossible (Venuti 1991), this relation is regarded as one in which relative distance always pertains.
comparison of groups of non-translated vs. translated texts (i.e. at sub-corpus level). Although this is a productive approach when attempting to make generalisations about the character of the two data sets, the profiles of respective sub-corpora reported in Chapters 4 and 5 obscure the variation in frequencies of the various types of construction between individual texts comprising those sub-corpora.

Such variation is significant in two regards. Where variation between texts is substantial, it may limit the extent to which generalisations can be made about the non-translated vs. translated sub-corpora in general, and, in that sense, might be considered a limitation. However, when considering the position occupied by individual translators in relation to a given autobiographical author/subject, descriptions of variation facilitate the elaboration of interpretations of translator position with reference to the degree of empathetic identification that is operational in individual cases. With this in mind, this section discusses variation in evidential stance-taking that exists between and within individual texts comprising the ECC and JCC, and uses this as a basis for elaborating an interpretation in terms of variable SELF-OTHER identificational relationships.

**Variation between texts**

When reporting the analysis of REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions in the ECC and JCC data, comparisons of the types of construction in the respective sub-corpora were presented with reference to their relative frequencies of occurrence (expressed as a percentage of all REMEMBER- and SEEM-constructions). For example, in the ECC data it was reported that 54.0% of REMEMBER-constructions in the non-translated EE data and 37.8% in the translated JE data occurred with an experiential ing complement. These relative frequencies were calculated using the total raw frequency data for all texts in the EE and JE sub-corpora (Fig. 16).
However, the simple contrast portrayed in Fig. 16 masks the significant variation that exists between the raw frequencies of occurrence of *remember-ing* in individual texts in the EE and JE sub-corpora (Fig. 17).
Fig. 17 shows that the frequency ranges for the texts in the respective sub-corpora are substantial; from 4 to 55 in the EE, and from 0 to 13 in JE sub-corporus. Similar patterns of variation in the frequency of occurrence of the other constructions examined are also apparent (see Appendix D).

As indicated by Baker (2004), the distribution of a particular construction in individual texts is likely to reflect the influence of a number of factors, not least author/translator style. In the case of the present data, contextual factors such as the content of the memories being narrated and whether the focus of the narrative is on the inner world of the self or on interactions with other participants are likely to play a significant role. In the case of the translated texts, although the frequency of respective constructions might be expected to be largely a function of the content of the ST, since the types of construction examined here allow a significant degree of flexibility of construal, their appearance in a translation is not assumed to be determined by its ST, but rather retains a degree of independence where individual translator stance may be revealed.

**Variation within texts**

Chapter 1 made reference to Hermans’ (2007: 53-58) description of the adoption of a stance of distancing by the translators of the US publication of Mein Kampf; a stance that is indicated in the paratextual materials, and which applies to the text as a whole. However, Hermans also observes, in relation to the translation of Boccaccio’s Decameron, that a stance of distancing might be partial, applying only to certain parts of the text (ibid. 60-2). In the case of the autobiographies comprising the ECC and JCC, it is suggested that similar variable positionality may be operational. Since the narratives occur over an extended period of time and, as mentioned in 3.3.5., many incorporate a transformational or redemptive element, it is anticipated that there will be variation in the relationships between an autobiographical author’s narrating and experiencing selves within STs, and, similarly, potential for shifting translator positionality in TTs.

As mentioned in 5.1.1., in relation to the manipulation of tense – cf. *Life seemed rather daunting. It seems so to me even now* [EES] – autobiographical

---

187 For example, the range of frequencies for *remember that* are 0 to 7 in the EE, and 0 to 5 in the JE; *seem zero to be* AP/NP is 11 to 60 in the EE, and 3 to 37 in the JE.
narratives are characterised by the presence of two distinct selves – a narrating SELF and an experiencing SELF – which are not unified or static entities and may, over the course of the narrative, come to occupy variable positions of relative separation and identification. For this reason, textual evidence of dissociation (or distance) between telling and experiencing selves in translated texts should be considered not only in relation to the position of the translator, but also as a possible distancing of the author from a past incarnation of the self.

Yet, although it is not assumed that the relationship between an author/translator and the autobiographical subject is a fixed one, the method of analysing texts adopted here is not able to trace variation in stance-taking within individual texts. While any such vicissitudes are captured in the overall profile of a given text, the lack of detailed breakdown over the course of the development of the narrative is identified as a potential limitation (cf. Goethals and DeWilde 2009). In order to gain a more fine-grained picture of changes in the relationships between an author/translator and narrating and experiencing selves, it would be necessary to engage in close textual analysis of ST and TT in parallel, or use corpus methods that are able to capture variation within long texts (cf. Stubbs 1996).

While such detailed analysis is beyond the scope of the present research, it may be useful to provide illustrative examples of instances in which a dissociative relationship with the SELF is apparent in a ST. Such examples show that, although maximal identification can only be achieved with the SELF, this does not take for granted that there is always maximal identification with the SELF. In (94) and (95), for example, the narrator’s report of her memories of psychological breakdown reflect a dissociation between what Lyons identifies as the “subjective, experiencing, internal self and objective, observing, external self” (1982: 107).

(94) I remember it now as a film clip, a voyeuristic sort of memory [EE5]

(95) I remember the whole thing as if I were watching myself: I see me being spanked from across the room, I see me hiding in the hamper from above. It’s as if a part of my brain had split off and was keeping an eye on me [EE5]

---

188 One of the reasons it was decided to include entire texts in the corpora was that any such shifts in (temporal, attitudinal or evidential) positioning would be reflected in the overall frequency data recorded for individual texts.
According to the cognitive psychology literature, the adoption of an external, observational vantage when narrating memories can either be indicative of ‘false’ memories (reconstructions, acquisitions and so on), or of a motivated dissociation/distancing, resulting from trauma or distaste for a ‘previous self’ (Conway and Pleydell-Pearce 2000). In (96), below, it may be that the narrator uses a hearsay (sou) construction in order to maintain a critical distance from a past self.

(96) 食べたあとで空き箱に吐いていた そうだ [EJS]

Tabeta ato de akibako ni haiteita sou da
Apparently, after I ate I was sick into an empty box

Thus, although the present thesis has been predicated on a SELF-OTHER contrast, which implies that the predominant mode of autobiographical narration is characterised by total identification between narrating and experiencing selves (in contrast with autobiographical translation, where the translator’s position is negotiated in relation to an OTHER), it is significant to note that dissociative relationships may also be in evidence in non-translated autobiographies, and that the SELF vs. OTHER dichotomy is, in reality, much more complex and nuanced than has been suggested here for the purposes of theoretical and methodological convenience.

Returning to the question of variation in the patterns of evidential stance-taking between individual texts comprising respective sub-corpora, despite an overall tendency towards the adoption of a non-experiential stance in translation (associated with relative distance and/or the adoption of a reportive mode) indicated by the findings reported in 6.1., the thesis elaborated in Chapter 1 also argues that empathetic identification (associated with proximity and the adoption of an experiential mode of narration) is operational. Since the scope of the present study does not allow the hypothesised influence of identificational relations to be subjected to empirical investigation, which would require the detailed description

189 Similar examples of dissociation, such as Douyara watashi ha basu o machinagara naiteita rashii ‘Apparently, it seems that I was crying while waiting for the bus’ [EJ2], were mentioned in 5.3.5.
of the variation between texts and development of principled methods for examining empathy relations, any interpretation of textual data in terms of empathy must remain speculative and a matter for future work.

However, rather than simply elaborating a hypothesis to the effect that evidential-stance taking may be, at least in part, influenced by variable identificational mechanisms, without undertaking textual analysis to substantiate such a hypothesis, a brief survey of paratextual materials accompanying the texts analysed here may be apposite. The paratextual materials consulted are limited to those that are readily accessible, and do not constitute a complete survey: they comprise five yakusha atogaki ‘translator’s afterword’, one published interview, and personal correspondence with two translators.

Although none of the Japanese-English translations contains any paratextual comment about or from the translator, five out of the six English-Japanese translations are accompanied by an extended (4 to 5 page) atogaki. These follow a formulaic pattern of introducing the autobiographical subject with a brief biography, describing the gencho ‘source text’, and acknowledgements. Within these sections, the translators incorporate descriptions of aspects of their relationship with the author and the text. Although the extent to which these atogaki reflect personal reflections on the process of translation, as opposed to the conventional rhetoric of paratexts that accompany Japanese translations, is debatable (cf. Bilodeau 2012), the appeal made to emotional and identificational connections with their subjects is clearly in evidence.\footnote{The atogaki examined here share many of the characteristics identified in Bilodeau’s (2012) study of atogaki in popular fiction translated into Japanese. According to Bilodeau, translators use atogaki to “create personae that link them closely with the author and the fictional world of the books. They present the work of translation as an emotionally involving adventure, while largely eschewing discussion of translation strategies. Their insistence on strong identification with the authors and characters can be read as an attempt to authenticate their intervention as translators.” (Ibid. 44). Examining J. K. Rowling’s Harry Potter series, Bilodeau notes that their translator, Yuko Matsuoka, is at pains to present herself as being “at one with Rowling” in terms of her personal circumstances and relationships with both the readers and the fictional world (Ibid. 50). The translator goes on to describe her identification – a “merging” (Ibid. 52) – with the character of Harry, to the extent that she describes how a personal experience of grief enabled her to achieve “sympathetic involvement” and to “draw closer” to the story world (Ibid.).}

For example, the translator of Carly Fiorina’s Tough Choices [EJ2], Akiko Murai, describes her respect and admiration for the author and, “as a woman”, an understanding of her difficulties. The translator of Christopher Reeve’s Still Me [EJ3], Yukiko Fuse, states that she was only able to translate his story because she had
carried out extensive research into quadriplegia, read the personal accounts of other sufferers and, most significantly, witnessed firsthand her own mother’s experiences as a quadriplegic. The translators of Marya Hornbach’s *Wasted* [EJ5] and Michael J. Fox’s *Lucky Man* [EJ6] both speak of how, as readers, they were moved to tears when reading the autobiography. In the case of *Wasted*, the translator, Michiko Yashiro, describes a feeling of *shitashimi* ‘intimacy’ and *kyoukan* ‘empathy’ with the author, depicting a relationship that resembles ‘sisterhood’. She also expresses a feeling of sharing the author’s situation, and adopts a position of advocacy in relation to anorexia.

Outside of the translations themselves, the translator of Hirotada Ototake’s *No-One’s Perfect* [JE1], Geraldine Harcourt, in an interview with the Japan Association of Translators, comments on the particular difficulties of translating an autobiography (as compared to fiction or other non-fictional genres), both in terms of capturing the ‘voice’ of her subject – “besides being a woman, I’m twice Oto’s age” – and in terms of the responsibility she felt when speaking for a ‘real’ person – “It keeps you honest” (Harcourt 2000). Harcourt also comments on the motivational benefits of a series of meetings with the author, “a very likeable personality” (ibid.).

In an illuminating personal correspondence, the translator of Christopher Reeve’s autobiography *Still Me* [EJ3], Yukiko Fuse, conveyed her thoughts on the question of positioning and empathy in translating autobiography, and the contrastive differences between English and Japanese: “Since Japanese prose, in contrast to English, is characterised by being written from a highly subjective position, when it comes to autobiography, the extent to which the translator is able to empathise with the author becomes a very important point” (personal communication 13/09/2010, my translation). Fuse uses the term *kanjouinyū* ‘transference’ to describe the process by which a translator transports to the emotional position of the autobiographical subject. The term is particularly
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191 Harcourt’s comments resonate with the point of view expressed by Brierley (2000), a practising translator, who describes the “special position” inhabited by the translator of an autobiography in relation to “the elusive I” of the autobiographical subject. Although beyond the scope of the current discussion, it is also interesting to consider whether a translator’s ability to adopt the position of a first person narrator is affected by his or her knowledge of whether the narrative is fiction or non-fiction. Keen (n.d.) hypothesises that the intensity of readers’ “emotional fusion” with non-fictional subjects (of autobiography, memoir, and historical narratives) contrasts with that with fictional characters.
associated with a SELF=OTHER identificational relationship (based either in kyoukan ‘empathy’ or akogare ‘aspiration, admiration’) that allows immersion in another (story)world and feeling as another.

Finally, in relation to her translation of Nonomura Kaoru’s account of his experiences as a novice monk in Eat Sleep Sit [JE3], Juliet Winters Carpenter describes the process of translation as being particularly “personally satisfying” (personal communication 21/11/2012). She describes being drawn to the book initially through an “identification” with the voice of the narrator/author, despite “not [being] a Zen Buddhist nor a man”, and, during the course of the translation, drawing on her own experiences of translating Buddhist texts: “I could relate ... to his entering a Buddhist world that was all new to him”. Carpenter also alludes to the way in which a deepening identificational relationship informed the development of the translation itself: “In the beginning I think my translation was flowery and ornate, [but] as I got to know him better, and felt closer to him, I was able to go back and streamline it”. This account suggests that translation without ‘closeness’ is one that relies more heavily on the textual artefact of the source text, whereas translation with identification allows the translator to channel a voice.

This brief examination of paratextual comments by the translators whose work has been examined here suggests that translator-author/subject identification plays a significant role in the translation of an autobiographical narrative (or at least figures prominently in translators’ understanding of their practice). Although no correlations are made between patterns of stance-taking recorded for individual texts and the accounts of identificational relationships described in the paratextual materials mentioned here, this brief survey of the kinds of imagery evoked in translators’ discourse provides further support for a hypothesis of the function of SELF-OTHER identification, and confirms that this is an area ripe for further investigation. Thus, while the interpretations offered here ultimately remain speculative, pending further investigation, and are by no means the only possible explanation nor sole factors to consider, it is perhaps reasonable at this stage to offer a hypothesis for future testing to the effect that:

*Patterns of evidential stance-taking in translated autobiographies are influenced by the degree of identification between the translator and autobiographical subject.*
6.2. Further Work
The findings reported in 6.1.1. and 6.1.2. suggest that the analysis of patterns of evidential stance-taking is potentially productive in elucidating aspects of the epistemological character of translated texts and the identificational relationships that may develop between translators and autobiographical subjects. While no firm conclusions can be drawn on the basis of these findings, the present study is regarded as a step towards the formulation of descriptive and interpretive hypotheses for future testing. It is anticipated that future extensions of the study will entail a combination of extended textual and paratextual analysis, and the triangulation of these respective strands of enquiry, in order to generate a dense set of cross-referenced findings that will provide a robust platform for testing hypotheses. This section identifies a number of such areas for further work.

(a) *Extended analysis of the ECC and JCC data*
The analytical framework applied to the ECC and JCC was developed specifically with the current data set and research questions in mind. However, it can readily be extended to include other lexico-grammatical features that can be interpreted as indicators of epistemological positioning. Retaining a focus on the existing 26 texts in the ECC and JCC, it is a relatively straightforward matter to augment the analytical framework and apply additional search queries to the data. Particularly in the case of Japanese, a language in which grammaticalised systems mean that it is impossible to “avoid expressing one’s personal attitude toward the content of information” (Maynard 1993: 4), there are many possibilities for further explicating the character of translations. Potential extensions include the analysis of:

i. *More detailed analysis of inferential evidential marking in the JCC*
As mentioned in 5.4., in order to interpret the evidential stance construed by SEEM-constructions with *sou, you (mitai),* and *rashii,* it is necessary to carry out more detailed analysis of the grammatical character of the constructions. A possible focus for such analysis might be aspectual marking, as evident in stative verb extensions (*iru, aru*). According to Shinzato (2003), Japanese stative extensions encode not only aspectual but also epistemological perspective (when used with a first person subject): stative extensions are associated with the adoption of an
observer role, and mark ‘distance’ between the speaker and the event being narrated, whereas verbs without stative extensions are associated with the adoption of an experiencer role, and mark ‘involvement’.

ii. Additional inferential evidential markers
In addition to the inferential evidential constructions specified in the analytical framework here, it may be beneficial to extend the analysis to other inferential evidential structures. Examples in the English data include copular constructions with comparative complementisers as if/though and like – as in It's as if a part of my brain had split off and was keeping an eye on me [EE5] – and descriptive perception verbs (which incorporate an inferred to me relation) such as look and sound. In the Japanese data, possible additional search targets include the verb (ni) mieru ‘look (like)’ and the auxiliary garu ‘show signs of / appear to’.

According to Kuroda (1973), garu is one of the means available to a narrator to describe the internal states (emotional, sensory perceptual) of an other, which cannot be known to the narrator experientially. Interestingly, in elaborating the circumstances in which garu is used, Makino and Tsutsui (1986) make reference to the role of empathy relations between a speaker/narrator and the other: they note that “If the subject of a sentence in which these adjectives occur is not the first person (or one with whom the speaker can empathise) then garu is attached to the adjective” (ibid. 124).

Although not one of the set of evidential particles examined in the present thesis, a preliminary search of the JCC using the conjugated forms tagatteita and tagatteiru (chosen in order to identify instances of garu that are not part of other verbs such as agatteiru ‘rising up’ and so on), generates 46 concordances, all of which appear in the EJ translated sub-corpus. Since examples were found in all six of the texts in the EJ sub-corpus but none of the texts in the JJ sub-corpus, it appears that the use of garu-constructions reflects some aspect of translational effects, either in E>J translation or in translation in
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192 As was shown to be the case with complementation, categories that are not prototypically evidential in character may have evidential import. For example, deictic, demonstrative, aspectual and person marking may have evidential extensions, and are therefore potential targets for further investigation (Aikhenvald 2004/2006).
general, and possibly pertaining to empathy relations. Examples of garu-constructions in the JCC include (97) and (98).

(97) デーモンが力をかしてくれかどうか知りたがっていた [EJ1]  
Dēmon ga chikara o kashite kureru ka dou ka shiritagatteita  
He seemed to want to know if Damon would help him out or not

(98) その日がデーブの誕生日で、彼は外出したがっていた [EJ1]  
sono hi ga Dēbu no tanjoubi de, kare wa gaishutsu shitagatteita  
It was Dave’s birthday that day and he seemed to want to go out

Without detailed analysis of the 46 examples identified in the data, it is difficult to say whether, for example, the garu-constructions might have been construed alternately using other inferential evidential markers (such as sou or you) and what functions they appear to have.\(^{193}\) However, the frequency of occurrence of garu in the JJ vs. EJ sub-corpora is a somewhat surprising, and certainly marked, contrast that prompts further investigation.

iii. Additional reporting constructions

While the present analysis focused on narrator-perspective reports of autobiographical memories only as narrated in REMEMBER-constructions, it is important to confirm whether similar patterns of stance-taking are evident in the complement structures of other reporting constructions. The report of experiences that are prototypically associated with privileged access to the consciousness of the experiencer, for example experiences reported by private verbs of perception (see, miru ‘see’) and emotion (feel, kanjiru ‘feel’), would be suitable targets. In both English and Japanese, these verbs accept object complements that can construe either an experiential or non-experiential stance: in the English data this is realised in the choice of ing vs. that complements, and in the Japanese data by patterns of no vs. koto nominalisation (and optional NP modification by NP-no koto).

iv. Self-referential structures

The present analysis described the use of optional to me to explicitly identify the experiencer in SEEM-constructions in the ECC data. Extending the analysis of self-

\(^{193}\) Iori et al (2000:141) suggest that, compared with you, garu may have a slightly critical tone.
referential structures in non-translated vs. translated data may be a productive complementary line of enquiry when considering the position of the author/translator *self* in autobiographical narration. Following Lyons (1982: 107-8) and Langacker (1990: 20), it is suggested that explicit self-reference may be linked to the construal of a scene from either a subjective/objective vantage. In furthering the investigation of self-referentiality in the ECC and JCC data, the examination of general patterns of use of the experiencer identifier *to me* – such as *the book was a revelation to me* [EE2] – reflexive pronouns (*jibun* ‘myself’, *myself*) and first person pronominal reference (which is normally omitted in Japanese), are all likely sources of insight (cf. Hermans 2002b).

**v. Affective stance marking**

As mentioned in 2.1., ‘stance’, as defined by Biber and Finegan (1989), can refer to affective or evidential aspects of meaning. The notion of affective stance and its textual realisations have been discussed at length in relation to Japanese (Maynard 2002, Suzuki 2006), for example, with reference to copular verbs or patterns of topic marking (*wa*) (Maynard 2002), and expressive uses of demonstratives (Hasegawa 2006, Naruoka 2008). In English, affective stance may be evident in, for example, affective adverbs such as *naturally* and *peculiarly* (Biber and Finegan 1989) or ‘concealed’ exclamatory constructions – such as *how natural* and *how peculiar* – mentioned in 4.2.5. (Grimshaw 1979: 287). In terms of the narration of autobiographical memories, markers or affect, which are associated with ‘involvement’, might be interpreted as supplying ‘event specific knowledge’, in the form of emotional intensity (Rubin 2006, Conway 2005). Extending the analysis of stance-taking, the comparison of affective marking in non-translated vs. translated autobiographies, may be a suitable complement to the analysis of evidential stance.

**vi. Empathy Perspective**

Since an exposition of the role of empathy is of central importance in the present thesis, the examination of empathy relations as manifest in grammatical structure offers significant descriptive and explanatory potential. In the linguistics literature, the grammatical realisation of empathy relations is discussed with reference to
‘empathetic deixis’ (Lyons 1977) and ‘empathy perspective’ (Kuno and Kaburaki 1977, Kuno 1987).

Lyons (1977) develops the category of ‘empathetic deixis’ to account for the use of deictic terms in terms of psychological proximity/distance, for example, observing a tendency for speakers to use proximal rather than distal deictic expressions when there is personal ‘involvement’ or ‘identification’ with a referent, a pattern that is also noted by Lakoff (1974) and Levinson (1983). Kuno and Kaburaki (1977) and Kuno (1987) use the concept of empathy to account for a range of grammatical structures, including subjecthood, transitivity/ergativity, passivity and the use of possessives in Japanese. In their accounts of ‘empathy perspective’, empathetic identification is likened to the positioning of a camera, or adoption of a certain vantage from which to describe a scene.

Although these accounts foreground different aspects of the way in which empathetic identification may be manifest in grammatical structure, both offer potential avenues for the extension of the present analytical framework.

Thus, without extending the current data set, the analysis of additional textual indicators of positionality can be used to generate fuller profiles for individual texts and sub-corpora, allowing the replication of patterns of co-occurrence of textual features to be identified. Since the corpus design also allows the comparison of ST-TT data in parallel (at the level of sub-corpus, individual text and individual instances of textual features), close textual analysis of shifts in stance-taking can also be undertaken.

(b) Augmentation of ECC and JCC corpora

Given that corpus building involves substantial work, it is preferable to exploit the existing data set as far as possible in the first instance, mining the data to its full potential. However, while the current corpus is substantial in size (in excess of one million words in the ECC and 2.5 million characters in the JCC) and able to generate large numbers of examples for analysis, as mentioned already, each of the four sub-corpora comprises only a small number of texts; six or seven in each case. Therefore, the influence of any one text on the overall profile of a sub-corpus will always remain significant and, particularly where individual texts exhibit substantial
variation, the extent to which the differences observed between sub-corpora can be considered a function of their non-translation/translational character, rather than factors related to the individual text (e.g. author/translator style), will always be limited.

Since future extensions of the study aim to test hypotheses using statistical methods, there are advantages to adding more texts to the ECC and JCC corpora. Although stringent selection criteria were applied in building the current corpus, it is a reasonable compromise to loosen criteria that are not deemed to be of central importance (such as date of first publication), or simply add texts published in the period since the corpus was built, in order to enlarge the corpus and thereby increase the likelihood of obtaining statistically verifiable results.

(c) Additional Reference corpora
The use of additional reference corpora offers a route towards confirmation or contradiction of the tendencies observed in the current data set. In order to test whether the tendencies observed in the present data are indeed independent of English/Japanese language transfer, the present analytical framework could be applied to the recently constructed autobiographical sub-corpus of the TEC which, at the time of writing, contains eight texts translated into English from Arabic, French, German and Japanese.

Alternatively, in order to further develop a thesis in relation to the epistemological character of translations (as compared to other forms of mediated discourse), application of the analytical framework to reference corpora containing text types that have been characterised in terms of their epistemological similarities and differences to translations – i.e. ghostwritten autobiographies, biographies and self-translations – might be particularly illuminating. Where suitable reference corpora are not readily available, resources such as user-defined selections from existing corpora (such as the BNC and BCCCWJ) and/or electronic resources and searchable format books (eBooks and so on) might function as ad hoc corpora, allowing easy searching for key textual features.

Comparative analysis of the character of original vs. translated autobiographies may, in this way, be productively complemented by further
comparisons of self-translated and ghostwritten autobiographies in mutually revealing combinations. When considering the nature of translation as mediated discourse, such comparisons are likely to be helpful in distinguishing the effects of mediation per se from those of interlingual transfer.

(d) Paratextual Analysis

As shown by the work of Hermans (2007) and Baker (2006) (see 1.2.3.), paratextual materials constitute rich resources for tracing the position of the translator. In relation to the particular concerns of the current research, the contents page of Genette’s (1987/1997) Paratexts is suggestive of the importance of epistemological concerns in shaping paratextual materials. For example, Genette approaches the discussion of paratexts under such thematic headings as genesis, truthfulness, contracts of fiction, context, generic expectations and definitions which, collectively, can be regarded as profiling aspects of the epistemological character of a text. As Lejeune (1975/1989) indicates, questions of whether a narrative is fact/fiction, auto/biography, a translation or not are important in directing the reader’s ‘mode of reading’. This resonates with the assumption that differentiation of types of knowledge on the basis of the source and mode of acquisition of the knowledge is of central importance in human cognition.

The brief examination of paratextual devices framing translations in the EJ sub-corpus (in 6.2.2.) confirmed that such materials can provide significant insights into a translator’s interpretation of their relationship with an author/subject. As demonstrated anecdotally, translators’ atogaki can be probed for imagery associated with empathy, identification, and conceptualisations of relative distance. Extended, principled analysis of paratexts, particularly in conjunction with textual analysis, is therefore likely to expand the explanatory potential of the study in relation to the hypothesised influence of identificational relationships.

Mindful of Baker’s caution that “figures and frequencies are only a starting point” and close examination of the circumstances of production of a translation is necessary in order to move towards “situated explanations” for the textual patterns observed (2004: 183), a range of other published materials, including interviews and translators’ discourse – for example, the translator Jay Rubin’s (2005) account of his long-term collaboration with Haruki Murakami – and
materials elicited by direct correspondence with authors, translators, editors and publishers, may be used to attempt to trace the circumstances of the commission and production of the translation, choice of translator/material, and roles and relationships between various participants. Such information may be used to develop an understanding of respective participants’ interpretation of their position in relation to the autobiographical subject.

Since identificational relations between a translator-SELF and author/subject-OTHER are assumed to be affected by the degree of access the translator has to the author, either directly through established personal relationships or consultations during the translation process, or indirectly through research and secondary sources – as suggested by Munday (2008: 198), the separation between author and translator may become less clearly defined in cases where collaborative relationships have developed – details of the circumstances of commission and the process of translation are of particular relevance in developing a multi-faceted account of translator/author relations.

Finally, author and translator biographical information (age, gender and other verifiable and quantifiable indices) might be collated in attempting to trace potential empathy factors. Since all the texts examined here were published after 2000, in almost all cases authors and translators are still active and, in some cases, have proactively expressed an interest in participating in such enquiries.

Although it is not suggested that direct causal links can be drawn from these kinds of data, they may be revealing when considered in conjunction with profiles of the textual features of individual translations and groups of translations. While the factors that may stimulate empathy for an OTHER are manifold – they remain subject to investigation (Batson 2009) and may be ultimately unrecoverable (Langacker 1991: 307) – certain indicators, such as shared biography and life

194 Considering the question of whether translator and author gender (and/or translator and narrator gender) tend to coincide, a brief survey was carried out using the literary sub-corpus of TEC (using the author/translator gender selection function in the sub-corpus selector of the user interface) and anthologies of short fiction in translation (by manual methods). These searches indicated that same-gender translation is more common than different-gender translation (a tendency that is more pronounced in first person than third person or omniscient narration). Although there are no known published statistics of translator-author/narrator gender (nor of gender in biographical or ghostwriting mediation), such an investigation might prove a useful index for positing an explanation of identificational relations with reference to gender, if a preference for same gender mediation is confirmed. Such enquiry might also be regarded as a first step towards addressing Munday’s (2008: 197) question, “what happens when a male translator translates a female author; or a female translator a male author”.
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experiences, may be relevant, or at least assumed to be so by an author or translator.

(e) Triangulation and Statistical Methods

Although the usefulness of applying statistical measures to linguistic data has been questioned, and an over-reliance on quantitative methods in corpus linguistics is warned against (Malmkjaer 1998, Tymoczko 1998, Olohan 2004), there is a growing body of work describing the importance of using robust statistical methods in testing hypotheses and making generalisations, recently described at length with specific reference to translation studies (Gries 2009a, 2009b; Oakes and Ji eds 2012, Ji 2012). Gries (2009a), for example, argues that where the goal of empirical observation is the description and explanation of data, the data “must be reported as accurately and revealingly as possible” so that hypotheses can be tested and correlations with explanatory factors explored (ibid. 3).

The findings of the present analysis are reported using rather crude quantitative measures of raw and relative frequency, and have not been subject to statistical inferencing in order to confirm whether differences observed between the non-translated and translated data sets are statistically significant. Rather, the most persuasive indicator in the present research is the observation of the same directional tendency in both ECC and JCC data (i.e. bi-directional confirmation). However, it is anticipated that in future extensions of the research, descriptive and interpretive hypotheses generated on the basis of the present findings will be tested using statistical methods. In particular, the triangulation of data derived from textual analysis, paratextual analysis, the use of reference corpora and/or other contextual and biographical information in various permutations, to mine for correlations between the co-occurrence of various textual and contextual features, is likely to provide a robust platform for hypothesis testing (cf. Halverson 2010).

6.3. Implications

The point of departure for the present research was an interest in investigating the nature of translation as a mediative process, which was approached through the
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195 Halverson (2010: 360) acknowledges that the corpus-based method described in Halverson (2003) is inadequate without additional supplementary data for triangulation.
examination of the position occupied by authors vs. translators in relation to the knowledge they communicate. Drawing on epistemologically-grounded arguments in philosophy and the cognitive sciences, a thesis was elaborated to the effect that the perception of a SELF-OTHER contrast between a translator-SELF and author-OTHER has implications for the evidential relationship between the translator and knowledge being communicated. It was suggested that, from a default position of relative distance between translator and knowledge (arising in the perception of non-coincidence of the identities of the translator-SELF and author-OTHER), the translator may occupy, or at least approach, the experiential position of the author by a process of empathetic identification (arising in the perception of similarity between the translator-SELF and author-OTHER). The present research used autobiographical narratives, in which the kinds of contrasts and congruences between SELF and OTHER mentioned here are particularly salient, as data for empirical analysis.

The translation of an autobiography, it was argued, gives rise to a paradox in which competing imperatives – the requirement for NARRATOR=EXPERIENCER coincidence indicated in Lejeune’s (1975/1989) autobiographical pact, the translational convention of first person displacement (Pym 2004, 2007), and everyday norms of evidential marking – coincide and interact in complex ways. Considering the present thesis, regarding SELF-OTHER relations in translation, with autobiographical data in mind, the research can be conceived as an investigation into the extent to which translation entails a biographical mode of consciousness – one which is grounded in the apprehension of a SELF-OTHER contrast, and characterised by the adoption of a third person, reportive (non-experiential) evidential stance – or an autobiographical mode of consciousness – one which arises in SELF-OTHER identification, and characterised by the adoption of a first person, experiential stance.

In the course of making the transition from an abstract thesis to a research design that would allow empirical observation of the phenomena in question, a chain of reasoning was developed that drew on bodies of knowledge in a range of disciplines, including translation studies, philosophy, psychology and linguistics. Although such breadth of reference risks a somewhat superficial engagement with respective theoretical and conceptual foundations, all of the works consulted share
a fundamentally cognitivist orientation – i.e. subscribe to the tenets of embodied cognition and the metaphorical basis of conceptual structure (Evans and Green 2006) – that render their respective accounts mutually reinforcing. The key concepts of position, empathy, distance, evidentiality/epistemology, (autobiographical) memory, and selfhood employed here were also interpreted in relation to these basic principles.

Accepting that translators are, in all senses of the term, ‘embodied agents’ (Hermans 1996b, 2002a, 2007; Pym 1998, Robinson 1991, 1997, 2011) whose “conceptual systems [are] directly grounded in perception, body movement, and experience of a physical and social character” (Lakoff 1987: xiv), the translating subject is, fundamentally, constituted and located within the physical SELF. However, further to embodied, subjective experience is a capacity to transcend the body, to occupy the experiential perspective of an OTHER, as intersubjective experience. As Yamanashi (1998) puts it, our “sense-based and body-based experience, including sense-based information management” is extended by the “projection of perspectives, empathy and shifting points of view” (Yamanashi 1998: 31, translated by Maynard 2002: 66). Thus, while embodied experience gives rise to the subject, the first person (translator-)SELF, in relation to whom the (author-)OTHER is located at positions of relative distance, intersubjective experience allows for the separation between SELF and OTHER to be transcended by identificational projection to the experiential position of the OTHER.

Considering the translator’s negotiation of position in terms of a dialectic of separation vs. identification between the translator-SELF and author/subject-OTHER, the present research engaged with the cognitive function of empathy as the mechanism whereby SELF-OTHER identification, or intersubjective transfer, occurs. As discussed at length in Chapter 1, the role of empathy has been mentioned a number of times in characterising a ‘translational state of mind’ (Nikolaou 2008), and a number of theories engage either directly or indirectly with empathy and related notions. For example, Robinson’s (1991, 1997, 2011) ‘somatic’ theory of translation draws on the notions of mimesis, shared affect and ‘contagion’ (2011: 170) in characterising the experience of translation, and in so doing, describes facets of experience that are readily interpreted with reference to empathetic
Elsewhere, Venuti’s (1991) exploration of *simpatico* between translator and author, O’Sullivan’s (2011) elaboration of a theory of ‘antipathetic’ translation – whereby the translator adopts a “consciously oppositional stance” (ibid. 184) – and the identification of ‘apathy’ in biographical and translational mediation (Frank 1985: 198, Reeves-Ellington 1998) offer complementary approaches to the investigation of translator position to the one adopted here. Indeed, synthesising these respective accounts into a comprehensive and situated ‘pathetic’ theory of translation may constitute a timely contribution to the discourse on positionality in translation.

Ultimately, what is at issue is the relationship between SELF and OTHER, a dialectic that is at the very heart of work in such disciplines as the cognitive sciences, philosophy, ethics, and sociology. This study represents one attempt to engage with such SELF-OTHER relations, as they are negotiated in the translation of autobiographical narratives. As such, this research constitutes a small contribution to on-going work in translation studies, in particular, responding to Halverson’s (2003: 197-8) call for the development of parsimonious and comprehensive explanations for the features of translated/mediated texts with reference to “general characteristics of human cognition”.

---
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236 The phenomenon of contagious yawning is a well-known example of mimicry that is interpreted as a manifestation of empathy (De Waal 2008).
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## Appendix B – Contents of BCCCAEJ Corpus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Reference</th>
<th>EE1</th>
<th>EJ1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language (region)</th>
<th>English (UK)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>100,475 words</td>
<td>250,977 characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td><em>Bit of a Blur: The Autobiography</em></td>
<td><em>Burā. Burittō poppu to hyakuman pondo no shanpan no hibi</em> (Blur. The days of Brit pop and a million pounds of champagne)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Little, Brown</td>
<td>Blues Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Little, Brown</td>
<td>Blues Interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>Alex JAMES</td>
<td>ONZOU Shigeru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>English (UK)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>38 (Born 1968)</td>
<td>58 (Born 1949)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>EJ2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (region)</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>127,994 words</td>
<td>208,413 characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Tough Choices: A Memoir</td>
<td>Watashi wa koushite uketsuke kara CEO ni natta [How I went from receptionist to CEO]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Portfolio</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Nicholas Brealey Publishing</td>
<td>Diamond</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
<td>Softcover tankobon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>Carly FIORINA, MURAI Akiko</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>51 (Born 1954)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>EJ3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (region)</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>94,966 words</td>
<td>246,976 characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Still Me</td>
<td>Kurumaisu no hīrō. Ano meihaiyū Kurisutofā Ribu ga tsuzuru “shougai” to no tatakai [Wheelchair hero. The famous actor Christopher Reeve’s account of his battle with disability]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Random House</td>
<td>Tokuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Random House</td>
<td>Tokuma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>0-09-925728 9</td>
<td>4-19-860909-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>Christopher Reeve</td>
<td>FUSE Yukiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>45 (Born 1952)</td>
<td>45 (Born 1953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>EJ4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Image" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language (region)</th>
<th>English (Sierra Leone)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>82,321 words</td>
<td>193,328 characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>A Long Way Gone: The true story of a child soldier</td>
<td>Senjou kara ikinobite. Boku wa seinen heishi datta [Surviving the battlefield. I was a child soldier.]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Harper Perennial</td>
<td>Kawade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Farrah, Strauss, Giroux</td>
<td>Kawade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>978-0-00-714709-7</td>
<td>978-4-309-20486-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Softcover tankobon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>Ishmael BEAH</td>
<td>TADAHIRA Miyuki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>English (Sierra Leone / US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>27 (Born 1980)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>EE5</td>
<td>EJ5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (region)</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>118,423 words</td>
<td>283,017 characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Wasted: A memoir of anorexia and bulimia</td>
<td>Konna karada daikirai! Kyoshoku to kashoku no memowāru [I hate this body! A memoir of anorexia and bulimia]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Harper Collins</td>
<td>NHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Farrah, Strauss and Giroux</td>
<td>NHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>0-00-655089 4</td>
<td>4-14-08042-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>Marya HORNBACHER</td>
<td>YASHIRO Michiko</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>22 (Born 1974)</td>
<td>36 (Born 1962)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>EE6</td>
<td>EJ6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Lucky Man: A Memoir" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="ラッキーマン" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language (region)</th>
<th>English (US)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>99,880 words</td>
<td>270,906 characters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Lucky Man: A Memoir</td>
<td>Rakki Man [Lucky Man]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Ebury</td>
<td>Softbank Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Random House</td>
<td>Softbank Creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>0-09-188567-1</td>
<td>4-7973-29690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Author / Translator**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Michael J. FOX</th>
<th>IRIE Masako</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>40 (Born 1961)</td>
<td>49 (Born 1953)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>JJ1</td>
<td>JE1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (region)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English (US / New Zealand)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>122,462 characters</td>
<td>53,270 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Gotai fumanzoku [Im-perfect Health]</td>
<td>No One’s Perfect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Kodansha</td>
<td>Kodansha International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>OTOTAKE Hirotada</td>
<td>Kodansha International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>4-06-209154-2</td>
<td>4-7700-2500-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>OTOTAKE Hirotada</td>
<td>Geraldine HARCOURT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>21 (Born 1976)</td>
<td>48 (Born 1952)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>JJ2</td>
<td>JE2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td><img src="image1.png" alt="Cover Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.png" alt="Cover Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (region)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>108,662 characters</td>
<td>47,509 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Hashiru koto ni tsuite kataru toki ni boku no kataru koto [What I Talk About When I Talk About Running]</td>
<td>What I Talk About When I Talk About Running</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Bunshun</td>
<td>Vintage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Sakai Agency</td>
<td>Random House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>978-4-16-750210-2</td>
<td>9780099526155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>MURAKAMI Haruki</td>
<td>Philip GABRIEL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>Japanese / English</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>57 (Born 1949)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>JJ3</strong></td>
<td><strong>JE3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cover Image" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Cover Image" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language (region)</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>181,559 characters</td>
<td>80,052 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td><em>Kuu neru suwaru. Eiheiji shūgyouki</em> [Eat sleep sit. A record of ascetic training at Eiheiji]</td>
<td><em>Eat Sleep Sit: My Year at Japan’s Most Rigorous Zen Temple</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Shinchosha</td>
<td>Kodansha International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Shinchosha</td>
<td>Kodansha International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>978-4-10-123131-0</td>
<td>978-4-7700-3075-7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>NONOMURA Kaoru</td>
<td>Juliet Winters CARPENTER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>US</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>35 (Born 1959)</td>
<td>60 (Born 1948)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>JJ4</td>
<td>JE4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language (region)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>357,698 characters</td>
<td>162,993 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Toppamono. Sengoshi no kage wo kakenuketa gojūnen [Devil May Care. Fifty years in the shadow of postwar Japan]</td>
<td>Toppamono. Outlaw, Radical, Suspect: My Life in Japan’s Underworld</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Shinchosha</td>
<td>Kotan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Shinchosha</td>
<td>Kotan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>987-4-10-136171 (Vol. 1) 978-4-10-136172-7 (Vol. 2)</td>
<td>0-9701716-2-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author / Translator</td>
<td>MIYAZAKI Manabu</td>
<td>Robert WHITING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
<td>51 (Born 1945)</td>
<td>63 (Born 1942)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Reference</td>
<td>JIS</td>
<td>JE5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language (region)</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English (US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length of text</td>
<td>177,493 characters</td>
<td>93,977 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title</td>
<td><em>Waga jinsei no toki no toki</em> [The time of the time of my life]</td>
<td><em>Undercurrents: Episodes from a Life on the Edge</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of first publication</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place of publication</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publisher</td>
<td>Shinchosha</td>
<td>Kodansha International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copyright Holder</td>
<td>Shinchosha</td>
<td>J-Lit Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISBN</td>
<td>4-10-111910-4</td>
<td>978-4-7700-3007-8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding</td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author / Translator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language of Habitual Use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Reference</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Language (region)</strong></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English (US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of text</strong></td>
<td>99,295 characters</td>
<td>56,823 words</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Title**             | *Yakuza Tsuki*  
[Yakuza Moon] | *Yakuza Moon: Memoirs of a Gangster’s Daughter* |
| **Year of first publication** | 2004 | 2006 |
| **Place of publication** | Tokyo | Tokyo |
| **Publisher**         | Gentosha | Kodansha International |
| **Copyright Holder**  | Gentosha | Kodansha International |
| **ISBN**              | 978-4-344-40786-5 | 978-4-7700-3086-3 |
| **Binding**           | Paperback | Hardback |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Author / Translator</strong></th>
<th><strong>Name</strong></th>
<th><strong>Nationality</strong></th>
<th><strong>Language of Habitual Use</strong></th>
<th><strong>Gender</strong></th>
<th><strong>Age at time of writing</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TENDO Shoko</td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>(Born 1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Louise HEAL</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>English (UK/US)</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Text Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>JJ7</strong></td>
<td><strong>JE7</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Image</td>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td>[Image]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Language (region)</strong></th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>English (US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of text</strong></td>
<td>116,179 characters</td>
<td>33,213 words</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong></td>
<td>Kaifuku suru kazoku [Healing Family]</td>
<td>A Healing Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Year of first publication</strong></td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of publication</strong></td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Publisher</strong></td>
<td>Kodansha</td>
<td>Kodansha International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Copyright Holder</strong></td>
<td>Wylie Agency</td>
<td>Wylie Agency New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISBN</strong></td>
<td>4-06-263735-9</td>
<td>4-7700-2048-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Binding</strong></td>
<td>Paperback</td>
<td>Hardback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Author / Translator</strong></td>
<td>OE Kenzaburo</td>
<td>Stephen SNYDER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nationality</strong></td>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language of Habitual Use</strong></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>English (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age at time of writing</strong></td>
<td>59 (Born 1935)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C – Sample Header File

Filename: JE3.hed

<?xml version="1.0" encoding="UTF-8" standalone="no"?>
<!DOCTYPE techeader SYSTEM "techeader.dtd">
<techeader>
  <title subcorpusid="autobiography" filename="je3">
    <subcorpus>autobiography</subcorpus>
    <collection>Eat Sleep Sit</collection>
  </title>
  <section id="s1">
    <translator gender="female">
      <name>Juliet Winters Carpenter</name>
      <nationality description="US"/>
      <employment>lecturer, translator</employment>
      <status>freelance; part-time</status>
    </translator>
    <translation extent="61739">
      <publisher>Kodansha International</publisher>
      <pubPlace>Japan</pubPlace>
      <date year="2008">2008</date>
      <copyright>Kodansha International</copyright>
    </translation>
    <translationProcess mode="wwst">
      <direction>into mother tongue</direction>
      <type>full</type>
    </translationProcess>
    <author gender="male">
      <name>Nonomura Kaoru</name>
      <nationality description="Japanese"/>
    </author>
    <sourceText>
      <language>Japanese</language>
      <status>original</status>
    </sourceText>
  </section>
</techeader>
Appendix D – Frequency Data for Analysis of ECC and JCC

(a) REMEMBER-constructions in ECC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text / Corpus</th>
<th>Concordances Extracted</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
<th>Object of Investigation</th>
<th>Analytical Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE5</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE6</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EE Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>405</strong></td>
<td><strong>162</strong></td>
<td><strong>243</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JE Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>221</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>98</strong></td>
<td><strong>37</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ECC Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>626</strong></td>
<td><strong>285</strong></td>
<td><strong>341</strong></td>
<td><strong>168</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b) REMEMBER-constructions in JCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text / Corpus</th>
<th>Concordances Extracted</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
<th>Object of Investigation</th>
<th>Analytical Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oboerusu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>omoidasu</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>kikoku suru</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ4</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ5</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ6</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ Total</td>
<td><strong>479</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>418</strong></td>
<td><strong>33</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ1</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ3</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ5</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ6</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ Total</td>
<td><strong>707</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>575</strong></td>
<td><strong>94</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCC Total</td>
<td><strong>1186</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>993</strong></td>
<td><strong>127</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concordances Extracted: 479 418 33 17 11 61 13 7 22 (7) 8 4
Exclusions: 98 88 8 2 0 10 2 3 3(2) 0 0
Analytical Categories: 98 88 8 2 0 10 2 3 3(2) 0 0

Concordances Extracted: 204 160 25 19 0 44 3 14 13 (8) 5 1
Exclusions: 145 98 44 3 0 47 10 15 13 (3) 6 0
Analytical Categories: 145 98 44 3 0 47 10 15 13 (3) 6 0

Concordances Extracted: 284 1186 993 127 54 12 193 38 47 53 (22) 27 6
Exclusions: 284 1186 993 127 54 12 193 38 47 53 (22) 27 6
Analytical Categories: 284 1186 993 127 54 12 193 38 47 53 (22) 27 6

Note: The table shows the distribution of each word pair across different categories.
### (c) SEEM-constructions in ECC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text / Corpus</th>
<th>Concordances Extracted</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
<th>Object of Investigation</th>
<th>Analytical Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to me*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE2</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE4</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE5</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE Total</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE1</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE4</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE5</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JE Total</td>
<td>486</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECC Total</td>
<td>1,043</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>774</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The number of SEEM-constructions that incorporate the explicit experiencer identifier to me is included in the totals for respective complement types (to, zero-to, as, like and that) and has not been double counted.
(d) SEEM-constructions in JCC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text / Corpus</th>
<th>Concordances Extracted</th>
<th>Exclusions</th>
<th>Object of Investigation</th>
<th>Analytical Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ1</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ3</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ4</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ5</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJ7</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JJ Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>740</strong></td>
<td><strong>381</strong></td>
<td><strong>359</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ1</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ2</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ3</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ4</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ5</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ6</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EJ Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1108</strong></td>
<td><strong>606</strong></td>
<td><strong>502</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>JCC Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,848</strong></td>
<td><strong>987</strong></td>
<td><strong>861</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>