

文化の翻訳

稲賀繁美

異なる文化圏を跨ぐ技術の移転、文化概念の移植には、翻訳さらに誤訳がともなう。近代という時代を、今乱暴に、世界制覇の途上にある欧米と、その残部たる非西欧との間の接触・葛藤の時代と定義しよう。この近代において「美術」の蒙った運命も、文化間翻訳という視点から分析するに値する。周辺の学術領域でも、「文学」（鈴木貞美）「宗教」（磯前順一）あるいは「哲学」（朝倉友海）といった基本的な枠組みが再検討されている（括弧内は、日本におけるその最近の傑出した論者）。いずれも西欧起源の歴史性を背負った概念枠を、普遍的に通用する、あるいは世界大に適用すべき理論的枠組みと混同するところから、議論に無用な混乱が発生し、これに由来する範疇論的誤謬は今なお、各所に存続している。

欧州で発達した翻訳理論は、ほとんどの場合、印欧語族の内部交渉での議論に終始しており、その枠を超えた場合にも、個々の非欧米特殊少数言語を欧米主要言語に通用する理論的枠組みのなかで処理しようとする。そこには欧米原産の理論の枠組みに乗ることが、即ち唯一可能な学術的措置であると看做す短絡が、濃厚に蟠っている。酒井直樹がフマニタスという西欧的教養に原材料を提供するアントロポスたる未開人類学的資料、という対比で揶揄した現象である。帝国側の植民地に対するこの非対称な関係は、脱植民地主義が喧伝される21世紀の今日では逆転現象を惹起した。かつての帝都の一流学府で旧植民地出身の有色人種が主要な地位を占めるに至ったからだ。だが問題はそれによって脱却されるどころか、かえって倒錯し、教条的な固着さえ見せる事態を迎えている。日本において同様の議論は、例えば日本語を母語としない作家に日本の文学賞を授けることの是非、といった水準で反復されている（郭南燕・編著『バイリンガルな日本語』）。この日本語国粋主義は、今なお非西欧出身作家にはノーベル賞受賞者があまりに少ない、といった憤懣とも、いわば裏腹だ。ここにもきわめて歪な文化翻訳の「島国的」捻じれ現象を観察できよう。

美術の世界でも議論の精緻化が望まれる。例えば天心・岡倉覚三が提唱した「朦朧体」。その背景にはホイスラーが《夜想曲》で欧米官展派の絵画理論を乗り越えようとした実験への極東からの同調を認めうる。それは横山大観や菱田春草を經由してベンガル・ルネサンスに飛び火し、水洗技法を生み出した。そのホイスラーに東西の融合を見たフェノロサは西洋アカデミーのキアロスクーロを凌駕・包括する概念として日本語の「濃淡」を提唱し、それを継承し定式化したアーサー・ダウの教本は、構図分析でエイゼンシュテインにまで影響を与えた筈である。Decoupage, assemblage, montage といった映画技法は、こうした東西を跨ぐ文化翻訳の往還のなかで、「理論」信仰の脱構築のためにも再構築されるに値する。

Translation of Culture

INAGA Shigemi

The transfer of technologies as well as the transplanting of concepts across different cultural spheres involves translation. And translation is not immune to mistranslation. The so-called Modern Age can be defined bluntly as the era of contact and conflict between the West and the rest; the West on its way to conquering the world, and the rest to be conquered. In this contact zone of conflict, the fate of the term art-*bijutsu* is worth analyzing in terms of cross-cultural translation. In recent years, academic spheres have reexamined basic theoretical frameworks; in literature (Suzuki Sadami), religion (Isomae Jun'ichi) and philosophy (Asakura Tomomi), just to mention a few of the main authors of recent years. In all of these instances, useless confusion is observed; the history-bound Western local conceptual paradigm is carelessly mistaken for a universally valid model, appropriate for global use, and the resulting categorical mistakes still persist everywhere.

Western translation theories are based mainly on the study of Indo-European languages. When they extend their reach beyond this limit, they tend to reincorporate the non-Western minor languages within the sphere of Western linguistics and treat them as entities compatible with the paradigm propagated in the West. It would seem as if the application of the Western academic tools and methodology were the only relevant scientific treatment of the issue. This is what Sakai Naoki pointed out by the complementary pair of *humanitas* vs. *anthropos*, where *humanitas* stands for Western-based theory, and for the former's benefit, the anthropological first-hand materials are provided from the non-Western native "the rest." By the beginning of the 21st century, this unequal relationship towards the ex-colonies that the imperial powers still exercise has produced a reversed side effect. Under the banner of post-colonialism, people of color from ex-colonial lands have occupied main (but marginal?) strategic positions within the elite academic precincts of former imperial capitals. And yet the problem was far from being overcome and the issue has taken a still more perverted outlook with dogmatic strictures even more firmly hardened. In Japan, a similar case is mistranslated into a debate about whether or not non-native authors are entitled to be awarded Japanese literary prizes in Japan (see Nanyang Guo, ed., *Bilingual Japanese Literature*, Sangensha, 2013, in Japanese). This linguistic purism and ethnic exclusionism in the Japanese literary scene may somehow reflect an unhealthy resentment among Asians toward a visible lack of equality; statistically, they claim, there are only too few non-Western authors among Nobel Prize recipients. We can also observe here an example of insularity complex that is revealed in terms of cross-cultural translation.

More elaboration is also needed in the discussion of art-*bijutsu*. Just take the example of *môrôtai*-style brush handling that was put forward by Okakura Kakuzo. In the background of this technical innovation we may observe a Far Eastern attuning response to Whistler's experiments in *Nocturnes*, which was attempting to surpass the aesthetic theory of representation in Western academic schools. Thanks to Yokoyama Taikan and Hishida Shunsô, the *môrôtai* style migrated to India and set fire to the Bengal Renaissance in art, resulting in the invention of the famous "wash" technique. Ernest F. Fenollosa, who saw in Whistler a fusion of East and West, singled out the Japanese term of *nôtan* as a surpassing concept to replace the *chiaroscuro* of the Western academy. Arthur Wesley Dow's textbook continued and solidified that encompassing definition. His textbook went so far as to inspire Eisenstein's cinematographic theories. Such techniques as *découpage*, *assemblage* and *montage* are worth being reconsidered in terms of cultural translation. The going back and forth between East and West encourages us to reconstruct the hegemony of theories so as to deconstruct their status-quo in the era of "After Theory" (Terry Eagleton).