

EVENT SUMMARY:

Translation and the Borders of Contemporary Japanese Literature: Inciting Difference

Talk by Dr Vicky Young

Wednesday 28 January 2026

This setting feels particularly meaningful, given Daiwa's stated purpose to support closer links between Britain and Japan, since the central concerns that underpin my talk this evening derived precisely from a long-standing personal and academic exploration of what it means to read, to teach, and to translate Japanese literature in the UK. In fact, on my first ever day of teaching in Cambridge in October 2017, Kazuo Ishiguro won the Nobel Prize for Literature, an accolade whose reporting across Japanese and British media was soon shadowed by the question: What makes literature Japanese, English, British or otherwise? In the Guardian it was reported that the British author had won the Nobel, but in Japan, in the Sankei, he's reported to be an English author of Japanese birth.

My employment was also narrowly preceded by a movement to decolonise the curriculum in the Faculty of English at Cambridge which demanded attention be given to lesser known areas of literary production, including writers from Britain's former colonies and critical methodologies formed outside the more dominant paradigms of North American and European and Anglophone scholarship. In my research, I have foregrounded narratives shaped by experiences of Japanese imperialism, such as writers from Okinawa and of Korean descent. But how, I had to ask myself, might those texts and contexts connect to, and indeed differ from, literary legacies of the European empire? This question then drove others as they intersected with a rising academic interest in translation, which spurred on fresh discussions of what is meant by national and world literatures and the growing popularity among readers of English of literary works translated from Japanese. In this talk, I'm going to try and dig deeper into some of these ideas, by drawing on my book: 'Translation in the Borders of Contemporary Literature', which was published by Routledge in June 2024. But I also will reflect on related developments in the 18 months that have passed since then, both within the wider context that I was looking at, and indeed my own thinking and research that remain ongoing.

So I'll begin by outlining the stakes. In recent years, as many of you are well aware, Japanese literature in translation has garnered remarkable popular and critical acclaim. In 2018, when the National Book Foundation reinstated its formerly retired National Book Award for Translated Literature, the first winner was the novel on the left, by Tawada Yoko, translated by Margaret Mitsutani. In 2019, the next year, Stephen Snyder's translation of Ogawa Yoko's 'The Memory Police' became a finalist of this very same award, and that was shortlisted in 2020 for the International Booker Prize. Also in 2020, 'Tokyo Ueno Station', Morgan Giles's translation of a novel by Yu Miri became the second Japanese language novel to win this national book award. In 2022, a further collaboration by Tawada and Mitsutani 'Scattered All Over the Earth' added to the tally of Japanese finalists. At the same time, translations of Japanese literature in the UK and worldwide are selling extremely well. In August 2024, Nielsen Bookscan reported that 4 of the 11 translated fiction titles to have sold over 20,000 copies in the UK were Japanese. That same year, in November, The Guardian reported that 43% of the 40 top-selling titles of translated fiction were Japanese, with Polly Barton's translation of 'Butter' by Asako Yuzuki, heading the charts.

If the National Book Awards decision to retire its prize for translated literature in the 1980s indicated a general apathy among readers of English towards fiction in translation, the decision to reintroduce this category in 2018 seems to suggest a growing interest in translation, and its re-evaluation perhaps as a literary form in its own right. This progress has been supported by translators and publishers, spearheaded by the Three Percent project, which was begun at the University of Rochester in New York, which in 2017 revealed that only three percent of all books purchased in English were translations, and within that an even smaller proportion could be classed as literature.

Nevertheless, Japan's case within this more global situation appears compelling. In December 1988, as Edward Fowler has recounted, the Japan Foundation invited representatives from five big US publishers to Tokyo. These Tokyo execs were there because interest amongst Northern American readers of books about Japan, including translations of modern Japanese literature, were on the way and were declining. So there seems to be a turnaround of fortunes within three decades. From this situation, to 2018, when Tawada's book wins that award. Those three decades more or less map on to the Heisei period, 1989 to 2019. Um. That was an era in Japanese history, which is most commonly associated with the lost decades of economic decline as well as significant disasters such as the March 11th earthquake in 2011 and the subsequent tsunami and nuclear meltdown of the Fukushima Daiichi nuclear plant that followed.

One might therefore ask, what forces might have helped to change this significant role of Japanese literature in a global setting? Also why was it literature that seemed to flourish in those 30 years

otherwise marked by stagnation and narratives of crisis? Of course, to ask such questions may be churlish. These are of course reasons to be cheerful, and perhaps Japanese literature succeeded on the global stage just because it's really great. That's what I would like my students to think. As well as seeing the wider benefits of making more texts available in English on a personal and professional level, the increasing openness to and marketability of texts in translation allows me to entice students into the classroom, into our programs, and for me to diversify my syllabus to show that Japanese literature means 'more than Murakami'.

Translation is of course also a diplomatic tool; an emissary to recall the title of Tawada's prize-winning work. Indeed, the first award exclusive to translations of Japanese literature into English, named after the scholar Donald Keane, was funded by the Japan-US Friendship Commission. Writers and scholars have also expanded on this diplomatic function. In a survey of existing translations written in 1991, Norma Field alludes to the processes by which the selections made by translators since the 1950s had become implicated, whether consciously or not, in the process of canon formation. So these were the people bringing the likes of Kawabata Yasunari, Japan's first Nobel laureate into English, and also instilling certain cultural associations between Japanese literature, its central themes and aesthetics.

More recently, the scholar Margaret Hillenbrand has described Murakami and his global success as a conduit to cosmopolitan cultural citizenship, pointing to the personal responses that his fiction has produced and inspired amongst producers in China, Hong Kong and Taiwan. Although Hillenbrand's concern lies in cinematic remakes and other transmedial interpretations rather than translation per se, it is of course translation in the first instance that makes those creative endeavors possible and what this creativity illustrates is a desire for a transnational popular culture to express a new mode of East Asian identity that is uprooted from notions of the self that is elsewhere, as she writes, conceived in dictatorially nationalist terms. However, despite assertions that Murakami's worldwide sales place him in the category of a global rather than Japanese writer, the nation remains the primary unit and form of address in these discussions. There is also a practical issue, so long as the notion of Japanese literature presumes that it has been written in Japanese. and that there is indeed a Japanese language in which these texts are written.

The renewed prospect of world literature has offered an alternative version in this regard. In the Japanese context, world literature was until rather recently conceived of as a category of texts distinct from Japanese literature. However, since the mid 1990s, new iterations have emerged from within comparative literature studies that have begun to revise that understanding. While these definitions are multiple and evolving, the one that I took up that seemed to have taken hold most evidently within Japanese literature is that of David Damrosch, who in this book published in 2003 argued that the

work of world literature is first a work of literature, and second one that circulates beyond its point of origin. This maxim summarises the scholarly vision that is developed in parallel with the more popular contexts that I've just described, to entrench the notion that literature gains in translation. Expressed otherwise in this global age, the opportunity to be classed among a new world literature underscores the interests for writers, texts, and the nations that claim them to be successful in translation.

The current proliferation of prizes for translated literature suggests that there are ways to assess whether a translation is good or bad, successful or not. However, if this question suggests the skills of the translator, it also seems to have something to do with an inherent quality, an inherent translatability of the text itself. For example, in an essay titled 'The Murakami Effect,' Stephen Snyder, translator of 'The Memory Police', proposed that Murakami's writing succeeds in translation and finds a global audience exactly because it is intended for translation from the original place of its creation. Here, Snyder is basing his assessment on the fact that Murakami is himself an experienced translator of North American fiction. He translated works like 'The Great Gatsby' and 'Catcher in the Rye' into Japanese, and therefore he has some insight into how writing for translation works. In other words, Snyder says Murakami's writing demonstrates its own translatability just from the way that it is produced. However, Snyder also cautions that this runs the risk of conditioning readers and publishers to expect the same kinds of literary voices from other Japanese writers. Thus, it threatens to construct a homogenous image of Japanese literature that overlooks the wider diversity of text produced in Japanese. Snyder makes a comparison with an author named Mizumura Minai who writes in English and Japanese and poses the question, 'What happens if you have a bilingual text in English and Japanese and you translate it into English? What do you do?' I've put an example here which is the translation of Kawakami Mieko's 'Breasts and Eggs', and this was celebrated amongst the diversification of the image of Japanese literature in translation by paying attention to writing by women. What struck me when I saw this, again, judging books by covers, is that above the title and the author's name, we have a quote from Murakami Haruki saying, 'It took my breath away' as if this is the seal of approval that readers need in order to pick up this book.

While Snyder nowhere contends that Murakami is easy to translate, and indeed I'd argue that no active translation is straightforward, his arguments overall suggest how increasingly global expectations of translation of which text could or should be translated, and how, also results in a selection by which only those texts deemed translatable, whatever that means, make it into the global marketplace. In a similar vein, Emily Apter has argued that when the problem of a globalising mass culture and public culture is approached from the perspective of translatability, new and important questions emerge of cultural commodification and ideology. How then do some works gain international visibility while others do not? I am not going to attempt to define what makes a text translatable or not here this

evening, my interest lies rather in understanding what becomes of the untranslated works of Japanese literature, and how they might teach us to rethink translation and indeed other ways of translating.

Although the English term 'translation' follows its Latin etymology to conjure a sense of lateral movement, it's the idea of linking, bridging these metaphors. However, the equivalent Japanese term, *bonyaku*, incorporates the ideogram, which on its own, *hirugaeru*, means to flutter, to suddenly change. Tawada Yoko has highlighted this by turning a glove inside out in stage performances. In a separate interview with a scholar of German literature, Bettina Brandt, she describes this action as suggesting a slightly dramatic and romantic gesture that makes it possible to show the flip side of something in an unexpected way. While this linguistic framing places emphasis upon the precise textual challenges of translation, in citing Snyder's essay on the dangers of homogenisation, I also mean to invoke other questions, namely what image of the nation does literature in translation place on the global stage to be consumed?

The image of Japanese literature in translation today is without question more diverse than it was. Yet that diversity remains limited. I say this with compassion because the task of translating can never be complete. Still it is the case that, so long as this is the dominant image that presides, an evident challenge remains in how to account for the existence of narratives produced in Japanese by writers from the nation's periphery that interested me at the beginning, such as from Okinawa. or those who hail from its former colonies, including Korea and Taiwan.

I wish to introduce the work of a writer that has occupied my energy and entertained me for many decades now by the name of Sakiyama Tami. Sakiyama was the real trigger for me to consider what it might mean to translate differently. Sakiyama was born on the island of Iriomote. Her family then relocated to Miyako and then to Okinawa's main island. She started writing in the late 70s and early 80s, and those stories from the 80s and 90s are always about little island communities detached from the world. Since the 2000s, her work has become increasingly dynamic and polemic, offering often scathing and visceral portrayals of Okinawa's complex reality, scarred by the legacies of war and bound to explicitly unfinished histories of colonisation, war and occupation. As I'm sure many in this room are aware, the islands of Okinawa constituted the Ryukyu Kingdom until the 1870s, when they were colonised by the Meiji Japanese state, and subjected to oppressive linguistic assimilation, cultural assimilation, and discrimination on account of their perceived backwardness from the mainland. These rifts were deepened by the devastating land battles fought on Okinawan soil between US and Japanese troops, from April 1st to June 23, 1945, resulting in the deaths of roughly 160,000 civilians or one third of the population. While the US returned autonomy to most of Japan in 1952, it retained control of Okinawa until May 15th, 1972. As Japan's southernmost prefecture, today almost one quarter of

Okinawa is covered by US military bases, a statistic that translates to 74% of all such facilities stationed across Japan, on just 0.6% of the national land mass. It is in the suburban areas that are flanked by these military bases that Sakiyama's more recent fictions take place.

The most distinctive, even addictive, dimension to me of Sakiyama's prose is her radical linguistic experimentation that mixes standard Japanese with multiple vernaculars from all across this archipelago: classical Japanese as well as contemporary slang. So it's regional and it's historical. While this playful nature with language is extant throughout Sakiyama's writing, the publication in 2002 of an essay titled 'Shimakotoba de Kachashi', marked a ramping up in the degree of this complexity. *Shimakotoba* is a scholarly work divided into three sections that weaves textual criticism. The word *Shimakotoba* names the multiple, mutually unintelligible vernaculars found from Amami at the top of that archipelago, down to Sakashima. It's a colloquial phrasing describing the region's multilinguality. *Kachashi* is a popular dance regularly performed at weddings and parties across Okinawa. It is characterised by participants making this whisking motion with their hands. The name *Kachashi* derives from the island word meaning *kakimazeru*, to stir up. But in Sakiyama's phonetic writing of this, it also suggests the root of the verb 'kachun' or 'kaku' in Japanese, to write, so sort of writing and whisking at the same time.

The primary target of Sakiyama's intention to stir or whisk up with her island words is the Japanese language and a way of fighting back against that historical erasure of Okinawa's multilingual voices in the face of that linguistic assimilation. Sakiyama's preference for the term *shima*, which is a Japanese word, is a neutral term, but in the Okinawan context it also means the community. So you can have a physical landmass of a Shima with multiple Shima living on it. It also then decenters the authority of that central Okinawan island, thinking about the whole of the archipelago rather than just Okinawa being one part of it. It makes space then for all of the vernaculars found across the archipelago, including though the rest of Japan, because then in this framing, Japan also becomes an island, and of course it's an island nation. By writing *Shimakotoba*, an uncommon Japanese term, that nonetheless reproduces standard pronunciation in a script that is associated with words of non-native origin. You can see how she's writing it in katakana. She's further defamiliarising and decentering Japan as the standard national center and standard national language. In these ways, Sakiyama's lexical and orthographic choices act out the very disruption that they described, through a technique of inciting or stirring up, that perfectly emulates that frenetic dance of the *kachashi*.

Throughout the course of her essay, Sakiyama is critical of other Okinawan writers whose efforts to write their stories in Japanese often pander to the expectations of a mainland Japanese reader, maybe dropping little Okinawan words in just to give a little bit of exoticism, or making the imagery easy to

recognise of Okinawa as this subtropical island place with blue seas, and blue skies, the happy-go-lucky islander, all of those kinds of images. In contrast, throughout Sakiyama's fictions, the islands are scorched by the aggressive heat of the sun, so the characters need to hide indoors. The beautiful seas of Okinawa are black and bottomless, filled with corpses, and the towns are inhabited by ghosts. This subversive imagery emerges not through narrative alone, however, but seems intimately connected to this alternative strategy of writing and language that she articulates in this essay. She describes this strategy in terms of wanting "to dismantle the position of Okinawan words that have been swept up against their will into standard-like Japanese. It's not about asserting some regional identity or other by latching dialect onto Japanese like a tail fin. I simply wondered, reckless as it may be, whether or not I could erect the difference between languages while keeping that difference intact, and to conceive of difference as the distinctive language of my literature."

It is this passage alongside the title of Sakiyama's essay that inspired the subtitle of my book, and when I submitted that manuscript to Routledge, I really wanted that to be the title. But I was overruled by experienced publishers. So, 'Inciting Difference'. In Japanese, the phrase that Sakiyama uses in this section is *ishitsu o tachiageru*, literally to cause difference or heterogeneity to stand up. So I tried to capture that in a loose translation as a practice that interweaves the acts of sighting, writing, agitating, inciting, and even the critical insights that inform her writerly practice. What is crucial here is that if translation typically presumes or aims for the smooth translation of one text or one story into another, Sakiyama's writing suggests the need for a more disruptive strategy that retains and potentially creates more gaps and friction than it resolves.

In Shimakotoba's second section, Sakiyama unleashes the full intent of this 'guerrilla' strategy, rooted in linguistic difference to rest open history. While the term 'guerrilla' suggests a figure fighting against the nation, it evokes multiple associations within Okinawa's recent past. First, the young men who were rounded up by Japanese troops and deployed into homeland defence battalions during the fighting of 1945, and second, the role of US military bases and troops stationed in Okinawa during the conflict in Vietnam. Sakiyama even adds a further layer onto this image when she describes how these island words might be deployed in a suicide attack that could blow to smithereens the monolithic tower of Japanese language. She was writing this one year after 9-11. At that point, the narrator of her essay, checks herself in an almost comic moment. "Did she say guerrilla?" However, by writing the term 'strategy' in Japanese, using the characters to write and war or battle, so it's a writerly battle, she makes clear that her target is language, not human life, because it's language that can withstand being orphaned, exiled, and placed on the brink of death. Here she uses the term *Shinigata-gata*. *Shinu* is the verb in Japanese to die. *Shinigatai* is the difficulty of dying. *Gata-gata* then is this sort of rhythmic gunfire, the rattling, the dismantling of all of these different things. *Shini* in Okinawan means very. So

you have all of these things layered into one term. You get the sense that these destructive metaphors are imagining in this essay a future in which Japanese might rise. Again, she then says they're going to join hands, Japanese and Shimakotoba, pulverized and scattered, before being swept away into the rhythms and explosive blasts to dance the kachashi. In this sense, Sakiyama's linguistic dance refuses to be calmed or smoothed, summarised or, as I've just illustrated, neatly communicated. Rather, it symbolises, in her words, "a barbaric dismantling of the world order, an insolent strategy and a reckless rule wrecking."

The third and final stage of her essay then brings this life and death battle to its violent conclusion within a short fiction. In a desolate landscape to the south, we have V-chan: so Japan but written over glossed with the pronunciation or a reading that would put it into Chinese, Shima-chan, little island, as the victor and aggressor of a suicide attack in a literal war of word that has pushed each to the brink of death again. This is the very final part of the short story. As you can see, the narrator can only cry out in pain, as the markers of this island's words bleed into her own language. Sakiyama then renders this violence onto the page in broken, fragmented strings. There's a lot of katakana, there's a lot of ellipsis. It's not a smooth narrative sentence. The two characters then fall into silence, the story and essay close by panning out to a narrator who asks, "Can this story and its battered words, which replicate the landscape and characters they describe, ever gain circulation in the world as a novel written in Japanese?"

Reading Sakiyama's essay thus seems salient when considering the invisibility or visibility in different ways of Okinawan fiction within the current climate, in which translation is a marker of global success. In fact, since the 1990s, there have been volumes of Okinawan fiction published in English translation. At the time, these were lauded for promoting the diversity, and the decolonisation of Japanese literature. However, the fact that these translations appear in specially curated anthologies means that their appearance is less obviously transgressive but rather serves to give shape to the margins of Japanese literature.

For example, the book 'Southern Exposure' whose subheading 'Modern Japanese Literature from Okinawa' conveys a need to label those Okinawan stories in relation to the mainstream national literature, and limit their effects to what she describes as the imagination and interpretation of the colonisers. In other words, Okinawan appears as a variant of Japanese literature that can't really travel unless with a Japanese passport. I highlight these citations because Sakiyama's particular attention to materialities offers a firm example that might dovetail with the idea of a conscious untranslatability. The question, after all, for me as a scholar, instructor, and aspiring translator of all of this, is how on earth to transmit and translate it to make it eligible to English readers and indeed all of you here this

evening. It is clearly not enough to focus on story. That last short story didn't really have a plot, narrative momentum, or sentence structure alone. When we translate from Japanese to English, in Sakiyama's case, the specific materiality, the look of the text, is the first thing that we alter. Yet does that mean that this kind of text is untranslatable? Or can we find another way?

I'm going to give one more extreme example of this attention to materiality that emerges through Sakiyama's writing. These are the titles of seven short stories that she published between 2006 and 2008 in the journal *Subadu*. They later were published in a single volume by Nagasaki-based publishers. They're seven stories linked, so the character who appears in the first appears in the seventh, which then announced them to be a cycle of sorts. But otherwise they're all independent stories from one another. The only things that connect them is that they start from the town of Koza, which is then renamed as Kōja, which is a part of Okinawa now merged into Okinawa's city, flanked by those major US military bases. They're very structurally complicated, so their framing is justified because they're not a narrative that is continuous, but rather they have connected themes.

One of them is about memory, about the battle of Okinawa, about how to tell the past of history, which is significant because, from 1997, there was a right-wing movement that gathered momentum in terms of producing new textbooks that had a particular take on history. Those groups arrived in Okinawa around 2006 to find the truth of the Battle of Okinawa, and this is exactly the time when Sakiyama started writing this. She has an explicit line: 'If you want to learn the truth of history, don't go reading those textbooks. They're a waste of your time.' In this context, Sakiyama's recourse to complex narrative structures and textual strategies seems counterintuitive. If Okinawan voices and the stories that they carry are at risk of being silenced or revised, why would you make them difficult to access? Yet this strategy seems more relevant precisely because of the defiant stance that it takes. On one hand, this multilingual ferocity seems intrinsic to the sights and sounds of Koza, and other aspects of its history, including a night of riotous clashes between Okinawan civilians and U.S. military police on December 1st, 1970, at the height of the war in Vietnam. This is a photograph that I took when walking around Koza, and you can see this shop front: it's a family restaurant, you can see Mickey in katakana, and you can see the dollars and yen. There's a lot going on, but this is the cacophony of Koza that appears in her text. So there's an attempt to really sort of bring this to life.

But in a second, more ethical light, this defiance pushes against efforts to dislocate those stories away from their context, taking them out of context, the context that breathed this life and meaning and vigour into them, potentially appropriating them or misappropriating them elsewhere, or closing the gaps so that the other possible interpretations or ways of translating these can never appear. The

erasure and substitution of elements in translation, in other words, constitutes more than an act of transportation, and its ramifications can be profound.

This problem crystallises in the first character of the title of Sakiyama's fifth Koza story, which at first glance looks like the katakana 'he'. In standard Japanese, we could be permitted to add two dots like this and 'he' would become 'be'. Sakiyama's got a triangle there, and that's not how you use triangles in Japanese literature. What is that doing there? In fact, this triangle marks Sakiyama's attempt to render the sound 'se', which cannot be written in Japanese, but which occurs in vernacular from Miyako Island, where she spent some of her childhood. This knowledge suggests the meaning of the word as cold, which would make a smooth translation possible, but this also raises an ethical dilemma as the translator of Sakiyama's texts, because if smoothing over is one thing, and what is lost and erased in translation is one problem, is it right that I add something that is not legible in the Japanese or the original text? So to provide a possible meaning of this term is to erase the substance by which Sakiyama's title is otherwise illegible to almost any other reader who would pick it up unless they have direct access to the author and I was very honoured to be able to speak to her about this, which is why I know. Not only this, it loses sight of the opportunity to translate this character in a more creative way that privileges the materiality above its meaning. Rather than see this text as being untranslatable, I read it as an invitation to contemplate the practice and ambition of translation in you.

I opened this talk with the possibility that translation shapes Japanese literature, that is, in the sense of what books prospective students get to see when they go to the Japanese literature section in the bookshop, how that body of fiction is seen and how it is accessed within the world. In that sense, I was considering more hypothetical implications based on a context outside of Japan and my perspective therein, and that continues to evolve. But in fact, the opportunities of global recognition through translation are now having tangible impacts upon writers and publishers working within the domestic Japanese literary context as well. One might, for example, point to the softback version of Imamura Natsuko's 'Murasaki no Skato no Onna', translated by Lucy North as 'The Woman in the Purple Skirt'. It was first published in 2019, and it won the Akutagawa Prize that year. A book is published and then it is translated within two or three years- this sequence of events seems unremarkable. But the description of the work, on the *obi* or the belt that goes around the book describes it as a 'translation publication', available in 17 languages and 23 countries, revealing that translation and international recognition are now important for marketing original works to Japanese readers as well, and even within that short time span.

In this case, Lucy North also wrote the critical afterword, the *kaisetsu*, that accompanies the text at the back of the book. In the established tradition, these short essays were normally written by literary

scholars or sometimes a writer of a similar generation to the author of the book that was the primary focus of the text, and would offer some sort of insight into the critical themes, and how to appreciate the value of this work. The fact that in this case, that afterword is written by the translator who talks about her decisions in how she chose what to translate, seems to be an unprecedented move in which the translators are also being able to feed back, and enable readers to gain recognition for their work as translators, which is important. But it also guides the reader into the value of the work, and the value of the work then shifts from the central themes to what problems of translation it created.

In a similar vein, I was in the branch of Kinokuniya in the Dubai mall about a month ago, and I found this copy of 'Butter', which again advertises its popularity among English readers, indicating how the appeal of Japanese texts for non-Japanese readers can be used as a selling point again for Japanese readers too. Last week, I learned of this brand new publication in Japanese, by a scholar and translator, Konosu Yukiko, that reports the ongoing high sales throughout 2025, and indicating the emergence of a more critical interest within Japan in this phenomenon as well. As I said in the beginning, these are reasons to be cheerful, and if the current climate invites more translations, then this remains a case that I wish to champion. However, as long as the buzz around Japanese literature and translation seems to serve a more mainstream national interest and image, what I have hoped to share today is an invitation to always ask what little stories this bigger one omits, forgets or even erases.

In this book, 'Ghostly Matters, Haunting, and Sociological Imagination', Avery Gordon has written that that which appears absent can be a seething presence. That is the value that I give to Sakiyama's work and many of the other texts that I haven't been able to cover this evening. Even though they may not be visible on the global stage or translatable in the sense that has become conventional today, they remain a part of the whole, that is literature written in Japanese. By peering into these gaps and taking up these invitations, I venture that we might also find other models of translation through which these other texts, their intertexts, and their contexts can come into view. This is the flip side of the narrative with which I began, one which foregrounds the role played by those texts that remain thus far untranslated, in shaping our perceptions of what Japanese literature is today, and one that asks how we might allow those texts to teach us to translate differently. Thank you very much.