The Translation of Sounds

How Japanese Onomatopoeias Found in Manga Are Translated to English and Norwegian

Kine Hagemann Unhjem

Master's Thesis in JAP4691 – Modern Japan

Asia and Middle East Studies

Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages (IKOS)

60 Credits

UNIVERSITETET I OSLO

Spring 2018

II

The Translation of Sounds

How Japanese Onomatopoeias Found in Manga Are Translated to English and Norwegian

Kine Hagemann Unhjem

Master's Thesis in JAP4691 – Modern Japan

Asia and Middle East Studies

Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages (IKOS)

60 Credits

UNIVERSITETET I OSLO

Spring 2018

Abstract

Japanese is a language filled with onomatopoeias – words that are seen to imitate their meaning in sound. When a language like Japanese is compared to European languages like English and Norwegian, one realizes that these European languages contain a relatively scarce amount of such words. This creates a discrepancy that becomes obvious in translation, and the questions arise: how is one to translate the Japanese onomatopoeia into a language like English or Norwegian- and what have other translators done? This thesis has attempted to find answers through investigating translation theory and translations of Japanese comics (manga), originally rich in onomatopoeias, conducted by four individual translators. It will be argued that the translator should try to translate with an onomatopoeia, and results from the research on the conducted translations will indicate a popular, onomatopoeic translation method: invention of a suitable onomatopoeia in translation. In creating the new onomatopoeia, the translators frequently altered an already-established word (onomatopoeia or not) of the language they were translating into. It will also be shown that when the original onomatopoeia is integrated with surrounding text, the translators become less willing to translate with an onomatopoeia. To some extent, the universality of the onomatopoeia will be assessed. As far as this study goes, the onomatopoeic form does not appear to be consistent.

Acknowledgements

Back in middle school we were made to present our future goals in class. I remember stating that I would aim for a master's thesis in Japanese studies, however, I really doubted that I could make it back then. Now, ten years later, I am writing the acknowledgements for my thesis, because this would not have been possible without the support of many kind souls.

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor Tomoko Okazaki Hansen, who regularly took the initiative to arrange meetings, suggest improvements and provide relevant sources. Her aid has been invaluable, and without her I would not have known which directions to take. I would also like to thank the other teachers on the programme, who have provided me with useful input.

Thanks to fellow students Lynn and Maria, with whom I have had fruitful conversations with. A special thanks to Christopher Olsen, who took the time to proofread and comment upon my work. I would also like to express my thanks to my lovely friends who offered to help, and on a regular basis told me they looked forward to read my completed thesis. You provided strong motivation in times when it was needed.

Last but not least, I want to thank my dear family, who has always been there for me and supported me in my endeavors. A special thanks to my mom Janken, my dad Eivind, my brother Emil, my sister Ruby, my aunt Lise-Lene, and my grandmother Karin. You made me believe in myself.

Any mistakes are my own.

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations

COND	Conditional
CONJ	Conjunction
CONT	Continuative aspect
COP	Copula
EMP	Emphasis
IMP	Imperative
NEG	Negative
POS	Possessive
PST	Past tense
PTCL	Particle
SL	Source language
ST	Source text
TL	Target language
TOP	Topic
TT	Target text

List of Figures

List of Tables

1. Introduction

1.1 Aims and Scope

An onomatopoeia can be understood as a word that imitates its meaning in sound. This distinguishes the onomatopoeia from 'ordinary words', which are seen to have a phonological form unrelated to their meaning. While the onomatopoeia is an international phenomenon, the extent of its use and number, together with its given attention, vary from language to language. While a language like Japanese is famous for its wide use of thousands of onomatopoeias, it seems impossible to find any discussion on it in a language like Norwegian. Then, the questions arise: what would happen in a translation context? What would happen in the translation of an onomatopoeia-filled text constructed in a language rich with onomatopoeias into a language that rather lacks them? What should the translator do? In this thesis I have chosen to investigate this through examining translations of Japanese onomatopoeias found in manga (Japanese comics) into English and Norwegian, in light of theories on both the onomatopoeia, and translation. I decided to include examinations of both English and Norwegian translations in order to achieve a broader perspective of the possible translation methods. However, as English and Norwegian are related languages, I will not examine their translations separately, but rather together under other categorizations.

This study has three main aims, which are as follows:

(1) to investigate how Japanese onomatopoeias found in manga are translated to English and Norwegian;

(2) to investigate how the onomatopoeia should be translated according to existing translation theory; and

(3) to assess the universality of the onomatopoeias considered.

Aim (1) describes what I will look for in the data. Aim (2) will provide a foundation on which one can better understand the results of aim (1). Aim (3) seeks to find out whether the Japanese onomatopoeia(s) could be argued to be rendered in the translation with a similar (phonological/phonetic) form (and semantics) or not, in order to evaluate the onomatopoeic universality many times hinted at in Hinton, Nichols and Ohala's *Sound Symbolism* (1994b).

1.2 Data and Method

I specifically chose to investigate manga/comics as I knew I would find a decent amount of onomatopoeias in such data. I chose to look into four Japanese manga paperbacks (all being volume 1 of their respective series), and their corresponding translations; two English translations and two Norwegian translations. They are as follows:

1. *Bishōjosenshi sērāmūn* 美少女戦士セーラームーン by Naoko Takeuchi 武内直子 (1992)
   English translation: *Pretty Guardian Sailor Moon* by William Flanagan (2011)

2. *Kuroshitsuji* 黒執事 by Yana Toboso 枢やな (2007)
   English translation: *Black Butler* by Tomo Kimura (2010)

3. *Meitantei conan* 名探偵コナン by Gōshō Aoyama 青山剛昌 (1994)
   Norwegian translation: *Mesterdetektiven Conan* by Jens E. Røsåsen (2004)

4. *Nana* ナナ by Ai Yazawa 矢沢あい (2000)
   Norwegian translation: *Nana* by Øyvind Kurisaki-Sagberg (2008)

I read through each Japanese original with the corresponding translation by its side, taking notes of the Japanese original onomatopoeias, and the translations of them. I define the following as an onomatopoeia in the Japanese manga originals:

1. a word or phrase that is external to coherent text, and is not in the form of a highly conventional/ordinary word/phrase not regarded as a spontaneous cry/exclamation; this kind of word/phrase that stands by itself could be called a holophrase (Feist 2013, 109-110), and in the manga it is often found outside 'speech bubbles' housing most of the direct quotations of the comic characters;

2. a reduplicated (repeated) two-syllable word (then a four-syllable word) written in the Japanese katakana syllabary[1], and found inside coherent text (often in speech bubbles); the motivation behind these criteria is that I want to consider translations where the translator has been aware that he/she was translating an onomatopoeia; Japanese contains many onomatopoeias, and not all of them might be that obvious in coherent text[2], but the reduplicated two-syllable word written in katakana often provides a clear contrast to surrounding text.

The Japanese onomatopoeias were counted, and were further distinguished as either a "holophrase-onomatopoeia" (found outside coherent text), or an "integrated onomatopoeia" (found inside coherent text). The translations of the Japanese onomatopoeias were divided into five different categories, and then counted under each category. The translation categories are influenced by Casas-Tost's study on the translation of Chinese onomatopoeias found in novels into Spanish (2014) (see 3.4). The five translation categories are given below.

1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia:

A translation instance that comes under this category is not considered a translation with an onomatopoeia (non-onomatopoeic translation). If the translated word/phrase exists in a dictionary (*Oxford Reference Dictionary* in the case of English words/phrases; from here on ORD, *Store Norske Ordbok* in the case of Norwegian words/phrases; from here on SNO), and is not described as imitative/onomatopoeic in its entry there, and is neither a one-syllable holophrase nor a partly/fully reduplicated holophrase, it comes under this category. I want to be open to the idea that words can function as onomatopoeias in spite of their non-onomatopoeic dictionary entries. For that reason, if

---

[1] One of three Japanese alphabets, which is often used in writing foreign words. However, it is also frequently used in the writing of Japanese onomatopoeias.
[2] Like the word "bikkuri" (surprised), which has become standardized in Japanese.

a word outside coherent text is constituted of one syllable, or is reduplicated – traits that are common for onomatopoeias (see chapter 2), it will be considered an onomatopoeia.

2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text:

A translation instance that comes under this category is not considered a translation with an onomatopoeia (non-onomatopoeic translation). If the translation instance is not seen to have rendered the original onomatopoeia in any way (not even with a substitution), it will come under this category.

3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia:

A translation instance that comes under this category is considered a translation with an onomatopoeia (onomatopoeic translation). If the translated word/phrase exists in a dictionary, and is described as imitative/onomatopoeic in its entry there, it will come under this category. In addition, a one-syllable-, or reduplicated holophrase which does have a dictionary entry, although a non-imitative/non-onomatopoeic one, will also come under this category.

4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia:

A translation instance that comes under this category is considered a translation with an onomatopoeia (onomatopoeic translation). If the translated word/phrase does not exist in a dictionary (English word/phrase not in ORD, Norwegian word/phrase not in SNO), and is not considered a transliteration of the original onomatopoeia (see category 5), it will come under this category.

5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing:

A translation instance that comes under this category is considered a translation with an onomatopoeia (onomatopoeic translation). If the translated word/phrase is seen to render the (close to) same sound of the original onomatopoeia in the target alphabet (English or

Norwegian alphabet), it will come under this category.

When it comes to reduplicated (or even multiplied) holophrase-translations, I will check whether the first unit bears relevant dictionary meaning. If it does, the translation instance will come under category 3 of translation with a target language onomatopoeia. If the first unit does not bear relevant dictionary meaning, the translation instance will come under category 4 of translation with an invented target language onomatopoeia. For instance, if a translator has translated with "rain-rain" outside coherent text to emphasize an image of rainy weather, I will put the translation instance under category 3, since the first unit "rain" exists in the dictionary, and has relevant meaning to the image of rainy weather. However, if the translator translated with "raiiin-rain" or "rein-rain", I will put the translation(s) under category 4, because the first unit "raiiin" is not listed in the dictionary, and the other first unit "rein", while listed in the dictionary, does not bear relevant meaning to rainy weather. If a reduplicated translation exists in its full form in a dictionary, it will be put under category 3.

1.3 The Structure of the Thesis

Chapter 2 will provide an understanding of the onomatopoeia in general, and in light of Japanese and English/Norwegian. In this chapter I will also argue for a slightly different approach to the term "onomatopoeia", which this thesis has adopted. Chapter 3 explores translation theories in order to investigate possible rights and wrongs in the translation of the onomatopoeia. At the end of this chapter (3.4, 3.4.1) Casas-Tost's study (2014) will be considered in order to provide an idea of what to expect in my own findings. Chapter 4 presents the results of my research, together with analysis. The results will be compared to those in Casas-Tost's study. Examples from all translation categories will be considered, and the most popular translation method(s) (in general and according to different translators and different types of onomatopoeia) will be revealed. Chapter 5 concludes the thesis.

2. Identifying the Onomatopoeia

2.1 Sound Symbolism and the Onomatopoeia

The onomatopoeia can be regarded as a subcategory of sound symbolism. Sound symbolism, is what Hinton, Nichols and Ohala explain as "(...) the direct linkage between sound and meaning." (1994a, 1). Sound symbolism stands out in the field of linguistics because linguistic theory in general assumes that the relation between sound and meaning is not directly linked; it is arbitrary (Ibid.). In further describing the concept of sound symbolism, Hinton, Nichols and Ohala divide it into four subcategories, arranged according to the degree of direct linkage between sound and meaning. These subcategories, along with their explanations (1-6), will be briefly rendered below.

The first subcategory is called corporeal sound symbolism. Corporeal sound symbolism covers the use of particular sounds or intonation patterns to express the internal state (emotional or physical) of the speaker. This includes involuntary sounds such as coughing or hiccupping. This category has the most direct linkage between sound and meaning, because it could be said that it contains symptoms rather than symbols. Some aspects of corporeal sound symbolism could be described as vocatives, which have the function of gaining the attention of a hearer. The use of vocatives to gain the attention of another individual is a fundamental function of vocal communication throughout the animal kingdom. Corporeal and vocative utterances can overlap, the crying of a child, for instance, is both symptomatic and vocative in nature. Some corporeal utterances are regularly manipulated by speakers, as vocative or turn-taking signals. Clearing the throat or coughing are often used for this. Corporeal utterances have many universal components, both in human languages and across species.

The next subcategory is called imitative sound symbolism. This is the category describing onomatopoeias. The onomatopoeias are explained as words and phrases representing environmental sounds (e.g., "meow", "quack", "clunk", "pop", "beep"). Much onomatopoeic vocabulary do become conventionalized, however, imitatives or onomatopoeias include many utterances that utilize sound patterns outside of conventional speech, and therefore become difficult to portray in writing. Hinton, Nichols and Ohala acknowledge that onomatopoeias are not only used for the purpose of imitating environmental sounds, but also for the purpose of imitating movements. Rather

6

than explaining this with the fact that movements often produce sounds, they argue that this is because the rhythms of sound and the rhythms of movement are so closely connected in the human neural system that they are virtually inseparable. In the representation of repeated sounds and movements the linguistic strategy of reduplication is frequently utilized, like in the English "ding-dong", or "zig-zag".

Synesthetic sound symbolism is the third subcategory. This is defined as the acoustic symbolization of non-acoustic phenomena. Synesthetic sound symbolism is the process whereby certain vowels, consonants, and suprasegmentals[3] are chosen to consistently represent visual, tactile or proprioceptive properties of objects, such as size or shape. For instance, it has been observed that the sound segment of a close, front vowel (like [i]) is regularly used for diminutive forms and other words representing small objects (in the world's languages). Intonation patterns are also used synesthetically, like in the use of deep voice and vowel lengthening in speaking of large objects.

The fourth subcategory, which has the weakest linkage between sound and meaning according to Hinton, Nichols and Ohala, is called conventional sound symbolism. Here one comes close to the arbitrary end of the language scale. This is the association of certain phonemes and phoneme clusters with certain meanings (like when the /gl/ of "glitter", "glisten", "glow", and "glimmer" is believed to carry the meaning of 'light'). Conventional sound symbolism can be largely language-specific in its choice of phonetic segments. Conventional sound symbolism is often used in the creation of names for commercial products. Hinton, Nichols and Ohala give the example of the shampoo brand *L'Oreal*, which is interpreted to trigger associations of a feminine-sounding name (Laura), a flower name (Laurel), and flowing hair (due to continuant, "flowing" sounds). Then, at the ends of sound symbolism, one sees the human mind at work creating links between sound and meaning, even when such links might not be intrinsic or universal.

Here, Hinton, Nichols and Ohala mainly describe the onomatopoeia as an imitation of empiric sound, like many other academics do (Casas-Tost 2014, Feist 2013). In this thesis, however, I intend to use the term "onomatopoeia" as an overarching one, covering both imitations of empiric sound, and imitations of non-empiric sound.[4] Yet, the onomatopoeia will still be considered a whole word or phrase, distinguished from (synesthetic- and conventional) sound symbolism which (in this thesis) only considers individual phonemes or clusters of them (which do not form a word). My

---

[3]   Stress and intonation.
[4]   Imitations of non-empiric sound could otherwise be described as mimetics or ideophones. Examples of imitations of non-empiric sound in English could be "bling", "tingle" and "zig-zag".

motivation for labeling every imitative word or phrase an onomatopoeia originates from the idea that it could be really difficult to determine whether an imitative word is imitative of empiric sound or some non-empiric, mental sound. This difficulty is acknowledged by Sasamoto and Jackson, who emphasize that we interpret the imitative word in our own ways (2016, 37). In addition to this, Hinton, Nichols and Ohala stated that the human mind has trouble with distinguishing movements from sound. How, for instance, is one to interpret the English imitative word "crack"? Is this word imitative of the cracking movement itself, or the resulting sound of it? Is it imitative of both? As the answer most likely would vary from individual to individual, there is no right and wrong here. When this is taken into consideration, I find it most favorable to understand the term "onomatopoeia" as an imitation of a strongly perceived sound, regardless of this sound being empiric or not. In deciding what an imitative word truly is imitative of, all that can be done is to interpret one's own impression. From here onwards, all imitative words will be referred to as onomatopoeias.

2.1.1 Consistency of Sound Symbolism

Scholars interested in the imitative function of language sometimes try to map out patterns of individual (language) sounds. As a first step in investigating the universality in how we imitate perceived sounds, conducted mappings of Japanese and English sounds could be briefly compared in order to identify any similarity.[5] Hakī, in mapping out symbolic meanings of individual sounds in the Japanese language, can amongst other things tell that the phoneme /b/ symbolizes "explosion/burst" and "corpulence" (2017, 59). In addition, as the /b/ is voiced (unvoiced version is /p/), it triggers additional associations of "heavy", "big", and "coarse" (Ibid.). Rhodes, in explaining aural images of English sounds, states that a word-initial /b/ triggers the notion of "abrupt, loud onset", and gives examples like "boom" and "bang" (1994, 276-277). Thus, it seems like the /b/ triggers similar notions in both languages, at least when it comes to the notion(s) of 'bursting'. In explaining the Japanese phoneme /y/, Hakī presents notions of "shrill", "shaking", and "unpredictable/indefinite motion" (2017, 59). A similarity can be seen with an English notion of the (English) /y/: "loud, vocal tract noise" (Rhodes 1994, 276-277). The /y/ in both languages could be seen to trigger the notion of an intense (human) voice, then. Hinton, Nichols and Ohala mention that high tones like /i/ are associated with "high-frequency sound", "small size", "sharpness", and "rapid movement" (1994a, 10). Hakī mentions similar associations of the Japanese /i/: "small", "fast",

---

[5]   I was not able to find any sources on Norwegian sound symbolism.

"thin", "high-pitched", and "tension/nervousness" (2017, 59). Hence, it appears to be at least some consistency in the sound symbolism between Japanese and English.

2.2 Characteristics of the Japanese Onomatopoeia

While the *Oxford English Dictionary* only lists 287 truly onomatopoeic words in English, Japanese is said to have a repertoire covering thousands of this type of word (Sugahara 2010, 1-3). This repertoire has made Japanese rather famous for being a language that frequently, and in varying contexts of communication, uses onomatopoeic words.[6] Akita (2017, 21) categorizes the Japanese onomatopoeias into the following semantic categories:

(1) *giongo* 擬音語, phonomimes: words imitating auditory experience in sound, like "ahaha" (laughing), and "dokan" (bang)

(2) *gitaigo* 擬態語, phenomimes: words imitating visual or textural experience in sound, like "pika" (flashing), and "nebaneba" (gluey)

(3) *gijōgo* 擬情語, psychomimes: words imitating body-sensational or emotional experience in sound, like "muzumuzu" (itchy), and "wakuwaku" (excited)

Considering the phonology, around one-sixth of Japanese onomatopoeias begin with /p/, like with "pika" above, and "potapota" (dripping), which is not allowed in non-onomatopoeic, native words (22). Many of the other onomatopoeias put voiced obstruents initially, like in "ziwari" (soaking gradually), which is very unusual in native words that are considered non-onomatopoeic (Ibid.).

Morphologically speaking, the onomatopoeias are built on roots of CV or (C)VCV, which may be reduplicated (repeated), or suffixed by a syllabic nasal [m, n, N], or a syllabic obstruent (glottal stop [ʔ]) (Iwasaki 2013, 69).[7] In addition to this a word-final "ri" could be added (Akita 2017, 29). These morphological forms possess specific meanings. In explaining the reduplicated, Japanese onomatopoeia, Akita asserts that they are iterative, unbounded, atelic, and durative (26).[8] She gives the example of "korokoro" (a light object rolling), and contrasts it with its non-reduplicated counterpart: "koro" (a light object rolling once) (Ibid.). The suffixes tell us something about how the

---

6 Regardless of its widespread appeal, however, the Japanese onomatopoeia is not often found in serious literature (Maynard 2011, 155).

7 C represents a consonant, and V represents a vowel. The syllabic obstruent or glottal stop [ʔ] is the abrupt closure of the vocal folds, resulting in the cutoff of streaming air from the lungs.

8 Iterative: recurring, unbounded: limitless, atelic: having no clear goal/end, durative: of continuing action.

(imitated) sound ends. The addition of a word-final syllabic /n/ would add the semantic notion of an end with some reverberation: "koron", a light object rolling once with some reverberation (29). Suffixing with a glottal stop, the Japanese character "っ" (small *tsu*), gives the impression of an emphasized sound that happens momentarily (Hakī 2017, 60): [koroʔ], a light object rolling once, quickly. Adding a word-final "ri" would give the idea of a quiet ending: "korori", a light object rolling once, quietly (Akita 2017, 29).

Japanese onomatopoeias can be realized as verbs, adverbs, nouns, or adjectives; most commonly as adverbs. For example, the Japanese onomatopoeia "furafura" (manner of swaying) can be realized as an adverb in "furafura aruiteita" (walked with a staggering manner), and as a verb in "furafura shita" ([I] feel/felt dizzy) (Iwasaki 2017a, 150). The verb "suru" ("shita" above) meaning "do", has little semantic content of its own, and it is the verb most commonly used to form onomatopoeic verbs in Japanese (Ibid.). However, when it comes to highly innovative (newly created) onomatopoeias, the verb "suru" is rarely used in native, adult speech (Yoshioka 2017). Verbs can also be derived from some onomatopoeic words with an additional morpheme, "tsuk", as in "furatsuku" (stagger) (Ibid.).

The Japanese onomatopoeia is often integrated into the syntax of a sentence (Iwasaki 2017b). An example to this could be found in the sentence: "Ushi ga *noronoro to* michi wo aruiteiru no ga mieta no de, *bikkuri shite* kuruma wo tometa." (I got *surprised* and stopped the car when I saw that a cow was *slowly* walking down the road.) (Nihongo wo tanoshimō! "Noronoro" 2007, my translation). Here the two onomatopoeic words *noronoro* (slowly) and *bikkuri* (surprised) are both well integrated into the sentence. The adverbial *noronoro* is combined with the quotative particle *to*, which modifies the verb *aruiteiru* (walking). The conventionalized onomatopoeic word *bikkuri* is combined with the verb *suru* (*shite* above) to derive the onomatopoeic verb.

One reason as to why Japanese is characterized by integrated onomatopoeic words is that the Japanese language maps manner onto onomatopoeic words, which are then used as manner adverbs or verbs to describe main verbs lacking the semantic content of manner (Iwasaki 2017b, 194-196). The main verbs in Japanese incorporates motion and path instead of manner. This is contrastive to English, which incorporates motion and manner in its main verbs, but not path. Path in English is mapped onto prepositions following the main verb. In terms of language typology, this distinction makes Japanese a verb-framed language, and English a satellite-framed language (Talmy 2000, 221-226). This is illustrated in Example 2.1, where manner is marked in italics and path in bold.

Example 2.1

Japanese: Ushi ga *noronoro to* naya wo **deta**. (The cow *slowly* **left** the barn)

English: The cow *wandered* **out** of the barn.

The onomatopoeic word *noronoro* is combined with the quotative particle *to* in order to form an adverbial which describes manner (*slowly*) and modifies the main verb. The information of where the cow is headed is mapped onto the main verb *deru* (*deta* above), meaning "to leave/go out". In order to tell something about *how* the cow left the barn an adverb (or extra verb) is needed. In English, information of *how* the cow left can be mapped onto the main verb, as in *wandered*, whereas path must be assigned to a 'satellite', in this case *out*. One could perhaps argue, then, that language typology has something to say for the differing importance of onomatopoeic words in the two languages, making them more valuable in Japanese.

In what fields are Japanese onomatopoeias used? Ishiguro can tell that onomatopoeic words are important in fields such as advertising, fashion, poetry, sports, storytelling, and even more so in describing symptoms at the doctor's office, in Japan (2016). He argues that the high expressivity of onomatopoeic words is favorable in explaining symptoms, making the pinpointing of diagnoses easier.

2.3 Characteristics of the English and Norwegian Onomatopoeia

This section will consider both English and Norwegian onomatopoeias. This is because English and Norwegian are related languages; many of their onomatopoeias are similar in several aspects. Besides, during my research I did not find any literature considering the Norwegian onomatopoeia in detail. Thus, I will here explain the Norwegian onomatopoeia in light of the literature found on the English counterpart.

Sugahara asserts that onomatopoeias have been given little attention in Europe and the United States due to the idea of them being a trivial and unnecessary part of language (2010, 1). He found 287 onomatopoeic words in English, and the relatively low number may explain the lack of interest in them (in English-speaking countries). While I have not counted onomatopoeias in Norwegian, the number of Norwegian onomatopoeias could be estimated to be similar to that of the English

number; due to the languages being related.

It could be argued that English possesses onomatopoeias that could represent all of the Japanese, semantic categories: phonomimes, phenomimes, and psychomimes. Needless to say, there are onomatopoeic words in English which imitate auditory experience; phonomimes, like animal sounds and sounds of collision ("meow", "woof", "oink", "clunk", "bam", "splat") that could be said to be found in every language. Onomatopoeic words for visual and textural experience; phenomimes, are also to be found in English, examples are "bling" and "crunch(y)". To find English examples that parallel the Japanese psychomimes, however, turns out to be a more complicated matter. While body-sensational onomatopoeias could be argued to be found in words such as "itch", "tingle", and "tickle", onomatopoeic words for emotional experience almost seem to be nonexistent. The contrastive words "glee" and "gloom" could perhaps be examples. These limits illustrate the English language's "lack" of onomatopoeias (Dingemanse 2008). Like English onomatopoeias, Norwegian onomatopoeias are mainly phonomimes. Many of them could perhaps be considered loanwords from English: "bam", "bang", "pop", "splash/splæsj", "splat(t)", "ding-dong". The English phenomimes "bling" and "crunch(y)" also have their Norwegian equivalents: "bling" and "krønsj(y)". When it comes to psychomimes, Norwegian might be even poorer than English. A possible candidate could be the verb "krible", which could be understood as the Norwegian translation of the English "tingle". Both English and Norwegian then, have a very scarce psychomime-inventory.

Peculiar phonological patterns are characteristic of both English and Norwegian onomatopoeias. The sequence of the phonemes /f/ and /w/ in the English "fwoosh", an imitation of rushing wind, would not be allowed in English, non-onomatopoeic, native words. Norwegian onomatopoeias, as seen above, are sometimes borrowed from- or influenced by English. This is also seen in example 4.37 of this thesis, which concerns what could be understood as a variation of "fwoosh": *fhwoosh* (see 4.5.2). The pronunciation of this word in Norwegian could be varying, but the sequence of /f/ and /h/ is not allowed initially in Norwegian, non-onomatopoeic, native words. The phoneme /w/ is rarely used.

Assaneo, Nichols and Trevisan state that onomatopoeias mainly are monosyllabic in the languages of the world (2011, 5). Yet, reduplication seems to be a common trait of both English (Sew 2005) and Norwegian onomatopoeias. Reduplications like "ding-dong", "tick-tock/tikk-takk", "zig-zag/sikk-sakk", "clip-clop/klipp-klopp", and "knock knock/bank bank" are all apparent in both

languages. Sew explains that a more or less reduplication of a word often results in the semantic notion of more intensity or a higher quantity of things (Ibid.). This explanation could be seen to conform with Akita's on Japanese onomatopoeias (see 2.2). The sequence "boing-boing" for instance, contrasted with a single "boing", would give the impression of more intensity, duration, etc. However, contrasted with Japanese, neither English nor Norwegian has a conventional way to elaborate how an onomatopoeia ends. Written attempts could be "boiiing" or "boinggg", in trying to render a single "boing" with some reverberation.

In English, the same word can be used both as a noun and a verb (Iwasaki 2017a, 151). This is seen with "knock" as a noun in "there was a *knock* on the door", and as a verb in "you should *knock* on the door". The same rule applies in Norwegian. The word "bank" (knock) functions as a noun in "jeg hørte et *bank*" (I heard a *knock*), and as a verb in "*bank* på døra!" (*knock* on the door!). English onomatopoeias can be realized as verbs when verbs of low semantic content are added. Added verbs could be "go" as in "the stock market *went phut*", "make" as in "*make whoopee*", and "throw" as in "*throw* a *wobbly*" (Feist 2013, 109). This is not as common in Norwegian. Instead, an onomatopoeia is used as a verb by itself: "skyene *buldret*" (the clouds *rumbled*), or the quotative verb "si" (say) is used: "toget *sa klikketi-klakk*" (the train *said clickety-clack*). English onomatopoeias are most often realized as nouns or verbs, and rarely as adverbs, as is common in Japanese (Iwasaki 2017a, 151). The exception seems to be highly innovative onomatopoeic words (152), such as in Example 2.2 below. The realization of the highly innovative onomatopoeic phrase as a verb in (b) would seem slightly odd.

Example 2.2
(a) The church bells rang *cling-clang* as usual. [adverbial use]
(b) The church bells *cling-clanged* as usual. (?) [verbal use]

The reason why highly innovative words are mapped to adverbs may be their lack of conventionalization. Despite the innovative words' effort to mimic in sound what they are imitating, there seems to be some need for clarification or specification. That is where the conventionalized verbs come in, as in (a) above, where *rang* clarifies that *cling-clang* is a manner of ringing. It is the same with Norwegian in this case, as can be observed in Example 2.3.

Example 2.3

(a) Kirkeklokkene ringte *kling-klang* som vanlig. (The churchbells rang *cling-clang* as usual) [adverbial use]

(b) Kirkeklokkene *kling-klanget* som vanlig. (?) (The churchbells *cling-clanged* as usual) [verbal use]

Feist argues, contrary to the examples above, that onomatopoeic words are restricted in English syntax and are often used as holophrases (where a single word functions as a phrase or sentence), as in his borrowed example from the *Corpus of Contemporary American English*: "They go in – *Crash! Bang! Wallop!* That's their style. We do it softly, softly." (2013, 109, emphasis mine). This also applies to Norwegian. The simple syntax of the English and Norwegian onomatopoeias might be one reason as to why they have been given little attention.

In what fields does one find onomatopoeias in English and Norwegian? Boase-Beier seems to suggest their importance in fields such as advertising and poetry, with them being able to convey complex, mental contents (2014, 104-105). The Japanese onomatopoeias were argued to be a handy tool in describing symptoms at the doctor's office (see last paragraph of 2.2). This use of onomatopoeic words is most likely not equally applicable in the case of English and Norwegian, which probably lack the adequate amount of body-sensational onomatopoeias. However, more research needs to be done in this field in order to ascertain this.

3. Translation Theory Applied to the Onomatopoeia

3.1 Introduction

Onomatopoeias have been given some consideration due to their claimed non-arbitrariness. However, this salient feature is often questioned when it comes to crossing language borders. While Hinton, Nichols and Ohala foreground universal tendencies in onomatopoeic words, arguing that human (in some cases even mammalian or vertebrate) neurology and cognition lie behind (1994a, 8), Boase-Beier argues that the same human cognition, primed by biology as well as culture, explains why onomatopoeic words are not universal in form (2014, 104). Acknowledging the influence of culture, and after analyzing wordings such as "universal tendencies", it seems safe to conclude that the assumed non-arbitrary link between word and meaning in a certain language weakens in the multilingual spotlight; the non-arbitrary becomes arbitrary. This entails a need for the onomatopoeia to be translated (not just transliterated[9]). One could imagine that the translation of an onomatopoeia would go smoothly when the language one is translating into has a corresponding onomatopoeia. However, should drastic changes be made- or should units be left as they are (to the extent that it is possible) when there are no such corresponding onomatopoeias to translate with? For what purposes? The original, non-arbitrary word could pose demanding questions in the translation process. When it does, it has become a translation problem, and the translator ought to consider own theories about translation or investigate others'. A translation theory, as described by Owji (2013): "identifies translation problems and recommends the most appropriate procedure for translation in order to solve the identified problems." This chapter will explore translation theories and see how they apply to the onomatopoeia in the attempt of discovering how the onomatopoeia should be translated and why. Firstly, Baker's view on translation ethics and morality (2011) will be discussed in order to obtain a general idea of a fundamental guideline for translators (3.2), followed by an estimation of the importance of the onomatopoeia together with the exploration of some translation strategies that could be applied to the onomatopoeia in translation (3.3). At the end a recent study (Casas-Tost 2014) will be examined in order to illustrate possible tendencies in the translation of the onomatopoeia (3.4).

---

[9]   The action of writing a letter or word using the closest corresponding letter(s) of a different alphabet or language. Common procedure in the translation of names: e.g., *tanaka* 田中→ Tanaka

3.2 Translation Ethics and Morality According to Baker (2011)

In order to create a fundamental guideline for translators and separate right actions from wrong actions one needs to establish the idea of what a proper translation is. The question of how one should render a source text (ST), the original, in a target text (TT), the translation, seems to generate various standpoints, as comments range from the ones advocating a strict literal translation (Edwards 1957, Newmark 1988) to the ones advising against it (Belloc 1931, Nida 1964). These differing opinions, along with their resulting translations, can be put on a continuum with the term "adequate" at one extreme and "acceptable" at the other, to use Toury's terms (1995, 56-57). An adequate translation refers to a translation that favors faithfulness to source text- and culture. One could argue that a literal translation advocated by Newmark would come close to the adequate end. An acceptable translation denotes a translation that favors (emphasized) cohesion in the target text. Opponents of literal translations would most likely produce translations of a more acceptable nature, as they deem literal translations inferior in quality. Thus, adequate translations might be harder to process as a reader/listener, but they could offer a clearer picture of the original; allowing the readers/listeners to interpret the words of an author/speaker for themselves. Acceptable translations might be easier to process as a reader/listener, but they may include drastic changes from the original. As one can understand from this, universal criteria for a proper translation seem impossible to establish. What makes a good translation will depend on its purpose(s), and purposes of translation are many and differing in nature. Therefore it is hard to talk about translation criteria before purposes have been discussed. But deciding on a purpose for a translation in question could also prove difficult, especially since different people involved in the translation process might disagree on the matter. If an author were to say something about how his/her novel should be translated (in order to fulfill a certain purpose) it could be very different from what a translation company would say, and even from what an individual translator would say. The readers could also have opinions on the matter. However, regardless of the many differing opinions and the many possible procedures it is the translator in question that translates and therefore must make the decisions and act accordingly, whether accepting instructions from above or not. Then, how is the translator to choose the right purpose and way of translation?

In her second edition of *In Other Words* (2011), a recognized textbook on translation, Baker attached an additional chapter acknowledging the ethical dilemmas of translators, emphasizing the social and political impact of their choices. On the first page of the chapter it is written: "Of central

concern in this chapter is the need to develop critical skills that can enable translators and interpreters to make ethical decisions for themselves, rather than have to fall back uncritically on abstract codes drawn up by their employers or the associations that represent them." (274). Here Baker places considerable responsibility on the shoulders of the individual translator, encouraging them to refrain from following their employers'/associations' fixed directives uncritically. Baker deems these directives abstract; thus offering little concrete help in the encounter of a translation problem. Directives often mention the importance of accuracy, impartiality, and confidentiality; and they could also be "difficult to adhere to for ethical reasons." (286). Regarding ethical issues that could arise when following the accuracy directive, Baker brings up extracts from an article including linguistic choices that could be said to objectify women combined with a romantic narrative of a colonial world. Baker questions the importance of accuracy here, arguing that an accurate translation in this case could contribute to the maintenance of an unfavorable discourse (286-288). Issues regarding impartiality and confidentiality could also arise, especially in the case of interpreting, where the interpreter in question might feel that he/she is being part of an abuse of some sort, or where the interpreter feels that entrusted confidential information must be let out in order to avoid damaging a person, a group of people, or even an entire society (283-290).

Baker reiterates the importance of translators reflecting upon dilemmas individually throughout the chapter, claiming that translators should dismiss contractual or legal obligations related to terms of employment when necessary, in order to be reflective and ethically responsible citizens (284); because translators have ethical responsibility as producers of language and discourse (288). She uses both 'ethics' and 'morality' in her discussion, and distinguishes the terms on the basis that morality is more individual-concerned, while ethics is more collectively decided upon (276-278). Both terms are, however, concerned with "right and wrong". In exploring the the various ways of separating right from wrong, Baker mentions deontological approaches, what is right in and of itself – irrespective of consequences, and teleological approaches, what produces the best results and therefore is right (Ibid.). She seems to come to the conclusion that a deontological approach is the right choice, more specifically the approach of Kantian ethics: "(...) Kantian ethics maintain that actions are right or wrong in and of themselves, irrespective of their consequences and of contextual considerations. A similar logic, or sentiment, is often expressed in the blogs and writings of professional translators." (280). She goes on to state that:

> In Kantian terms, we would have to acknowledge that the author has a right to express his own world view, and the reader has a right to access and judge that world view for him- or herself. Unfortunately, many contexts of translation do not afford translators the opportunity to include footnotes or even prefaces in which they might comment on unsavoury aspects of a source text that they wish to dissociate themselves from, thus forcing them to make a decision that involves doing harm to one or more parties in the encounter: the author, the reader, their own values, a social or ethnic group, or even society as a whole. (288)

In other words, translators should render as closely as possible the world view of the author when translating, without worrying about consequences; even harmful ones. Although it seems that Baker accepts this view somewhat reluctantly, she earlier made a point that it could be unethical to make drastic shifts in the translation of literature without the knowledge and consent of the author, and/or without alerting the target reader (283). Her translation ideal then, seems to include the unification of the accuracy principle and the right to add explanatory notes or prefaces.

The influence of Kantian ethics on translation seems to suggest a universal rule- and purpose: to render the world view of the author as accurately as possible in order to let the target audience access it and judge it for themselves. However, how exactly to render a ST as accurately as possible in a TT will vary from language to language, and is subjected to individual opinions within a language society. Advocates of both adequate and acceptable translations would claim that their preferred translations are accurate. Defenders of acceptable translations that tend to include more or less drastic shifts from the original would justify their actions on the grounds that a translation should not look like a translation: the spirit or feel of the original should be made easily accessible in conventional target language forms (Belloc 1931, 22, 153). And the purpose of letting a target audience access a closely rendered ST meaning in a TT can be questioned in the translation of song lyrics for instance, where the original ST content may not be deemed as important as the maintenance of rhyme and rhythm. However, if not as a universal rule/purpose, the Kantian view on translation can function as a general guideline.

To summarize, a translator should in general translate as to fulfill the purpose of giving the target audience the opportunity to judge an 'unaltered' world view; that is, the closely rendered world view of the original author. This also applies to the case of interpreting. In order to achieve this the translator must decide on a translation strategy that brings forth his/her idea of "accurate" in the translation. However, while accuracy is deemed crucial in translation, as can be understood from

various translation associations' codes of ethics, it can be questioned. The individiual translator's moral should not be erased and replaced by fixed translation ethics: if the translator feels that following the accuracy principle might damage own- or others' values, then there is room for choosing another way of translation. All this can be understood from this review of Baker's chapter on translation ethics. Now, what does this mean for the onomatopoeia?

If the general rule is to translate as accurately as possible in order to render an original world view, then a reasonable conclusion would be to keep the onomatopoeic nature in the translation of an onomatopoeia by default. This would mean that if the translation of an onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia is believed to cause no harm, then this should be the followed procedure. Even though finding an onomatopoeic translation for an onomatopoeia might be challenging in itself, the effort should be done as long as the predicted result does not bring about further complications. Further complications encompass violation of own- or others' values: a translator would perhaps avoid an onomatopoeic translation of (an) onomatopoeia(s) describing a cruel scene because it would be too intense for a certain target audience, especially if the purpose of translation does not entail challenging the target audience on that particular field. Another type of complication is gambling with people's comprehension: if the onomatopoeia one seeks to translate does not have a corresponding word or concept in the target language, one risks the comprehension of the target reader in inventing an onomatopoeia in the target text. In this way the target reader could end up confused in his/her impression of the target text, which would be unfortunate if the original author never created confusing onomatopoeias to begin with. Translating a difficult onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia might damage the accuracy principle, then. However, removing the onomatopoeia in translation might do exactly the same damage. The question of whether to keep the (difficult) onomatopoeia in translation or not lingers. In the next section, an estimation of the importance of the onomatopoeia will be given together with the exploration of chosen translation strategies in order to approach favorable procedures in times of when an onomatopoeia has proven itself particularly difficult to translate.

3.3 An Estimation of the Worth and Rights of the Onomatopoeia

The onomatopoeia proves hard to translate because of its dual emphasis on word form[10] and comprehensible content. The supposed direct link between the former and the latter makes the word unique, even within the language it was created in, and therefore it could be argued to deserve a similar physique in translation. However, this is not always easy to adhere to, as semantic fields (a set of words grouped together by meaning referring to a specific subject: happy, sad, angry, etc. → emotion) where onomatopoeias exist differ from language to language (Casas-Tost 2014, 41). For instance, one language could possess an onomatopoeia for a certain taste – a word imitating the taste-sensation in sound, while this is nonexistent in other languages. Therefore, one could argue that onomatopoeias are culturally determined. When both form and meaning are difficult to maintain in translation, translators tend to sacrifice the form (45). While it is understandable that this is common procedure in such situations, a question can still be posed regarding the importance of keeping the form; thereby keeping the onomatopoeic nature. In the following, I will try to establish an idea of the value of the onomatopoeic form, and present some translation strategies that comply with this value.

In translation there will be cases where the original form cannot be changed without further complications; cases where the conservation of both form and meaning is deemed crucial. This is the case when translating poetry, as discussed by Hovhannisyan (2012). Hovhannisyan deliberates on how both the original form and meaning are important to keep in a translation of a poem, as the poem could be seen as a poem of its form: physique of words, and at the same time a poem of its meaning: content. Because of the equal, heavy importance on both form and meaning, she states that poetry is one of the most difficult objects to translate, even mentioning opinions of it being untranslatable. The form in poetry is essential because it often contains a rhythm and/or other musical aspects in the words carefully and intentionally chosen by the poet. Even if the poem were without evident rhyme and rhythm one still cannot be that liberated in the translation because everything is intended in a poem, and therefore has a meaning: metaphors, violation of grammatical laws, pauses, etc. (Ibid.). Hovhannisyan admits that the translator has to be a poet as well in order to translate poetry.

---

[10]   With the term "word form" I refer to the phonological/phonetic and morphological qualities of a word.

Poetry can be compared to onomatopoeias. Just like poetry, onomatopoeias contain musical- or specific sound aspects. In addition to that there is a similarity in how both onomatopoeias and poems try to establish a non-arbitrary link between form and meaning. The words in a poem are deliberately chosen to closely render the poet's feelings, ideas, or personality, and onomatopoeias closely render perceived sound. The difference being that poems establish a non-arbitrary link to its meaning above the word-level. The point to be made here is that the form of the onomatopoeia might have a similar importance to that of the form in a poem. The more immediate, demonstrating effect of the onomatopoeia might as well have been very much intended because of its specific nature, and therefore the conservation of its form should be considered. Just like the sound aspects of a poem should not be sacrificed in translation if the original poem relies heavily on these (Ibid.), neither should an onomatopoeia-rich novel text be rewritten completely in translation. The meaning of an onomatopoeia is closely connected to its form.

The onomatopoeia has a direct, more vivid nature in how it demonstrates reality rather than refer to it. It could be regarded as a "showing-word" instead of a "saying-word", discussed by Sasamoto and Jackson (2016). How frequently the onomatopoeia is used in colloquial language depends on the language in question, but there is good reason to believe that when it is used, it is used with intention. An author of a written text that chooses to use an onomatopoeia might want to make the reader react in certain ways (activate more senses in the reader), and when an onomatopoeia is used without subsequent explanations the author might want to make the reader interpret the environment or circumstances him/herself. The idea that onomatopoeias in general are used deliberately in order to simulate reality, combined with the common notion that this type of word is unique within every language, create a strong argument in favor of preserving the onomatopoeic form. Galibert, in his explanation of the overall purpose of translation, states that a translation should: "(...) create the same impact as the original text." (2004). Words that most definitely create a distinctive impact are onomatopoeias, and it would be hard to imagine how to create the same distinctive impact in a translation without using an onomatopoeia. In what follows, strategies on how to translate an onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia will be examined.

If there is a target language (TL) onomatopoeia corresponding to the source language (SL) onomatopoeia, then it would be favorable to use that TL onomatopoeia in translation as it both preserves the original onomatopoeic form and offers comprehensible matter to the target audience. When that TL onomatopoeia does not exist is usually where the translation problem of the onomatopoeia starts. Baker (2011, 26-42) lists some translation strategies used by professional

translators when dealing with a translation issue. These could be used when TL onomatopoeias are not adequate. One strategy which could be used in order to maintain the form is the usage of a loan word from the ST. Here one simply puts the SL item into the TL text and alphabet. This strategy is often used with culture-specific items, and certain instances of onomatopoeias are very much so. If this does not quite work, considering the comprehension of the target audience, one could also add adjacent explanations. Another option mentioned by Casas-Tost is the discursive creation, which entails creating a fitting TL onomatopoeia on the spot (2014, 47). As with the example of poetry discussed above, this demands creativity of the translator, and could be time-consuming. However, if there is no TL onomatopoeia to be found, and one still wishes to preserve the original impact, this might be the best solution. It will be an onomatopoeia, so therefore it will keep its distinctive form, and because it has been made with the thought of TL conventions and target audience comprehension in mind, it could be used without adjacent explanations which would disturb the original, direct impact. Examples of the mentioned options are listed below, illustrated with a Japanese onomatopoeia: "kon kon" (knock knock). The English translations could be:

    Example 3.1
    (1) corresponding onomatopoeia in TL: *knock knock*. "Come in! It's open."
    (2) SL onomatopoeia in TL; loanword: *kon kon*. "Come in! It's open."
    (3) loanword + explanation: *kon kon* – there was a knock on the door. "Come in! It's open."
    (4) creation of suitable TL onomatopoeia: *kong kong*. "Come in! It's open."

If example (4) is considered too vague, an explanation like in example (3) could be added. In all these cases the onomatopoeic form has been preserved; an attempt has been made to keep the impact of the original text. A question that may emerge is whether this kind of result is adequate for the comprehension of the target audience. The preservation of the form comes more or less at the price of the meaning, and another question emerges: is it worth it?

The preservation of the form is not uncomplicated. To what extent it sacrifices meaning can always be discussed, but one could wonder if it should be necessary at all if it distorts comprehension. As it is common for translators to sacrifice the form in difficult cases, and as one acknowledges the fact that the purpose of the onomatopoeia, however important and unique it may be, is subjected to the purpose of translation, one realizes that the onomatopoeia does not have a special (enough) status in the translation context. This entails that there will be many instances where the onomatopoeic form

has been discarded, and that it sometimes is strong reasoning behind. With that said, I will now present some translation strategies which discard the onomatopoeic form in translation, with examples from Japanese and English.

The culture-specific onomatopoeia constitutes a semantic void (a meaning-void), as listed by Owji (2013), in translation, which is a major problem encountered in translation at the lexical (word) level. However, if one leaves the standpoint of defending the onomatopoeic form in translation, there exist multiple strategies that could be used in order to cope with these semantic voids. Onomatopoeias are often easily rendered with ordinary words/explanations of the sound(s) in question. For instance, the Japanese onomatopoeia for smiling: "nikoniko", could be rendered as "a cheerful smile" in English. So apart from omitting the onomatopoeia, one could substitute it with an ordinary word or phrase. Returning to Baker's list of translation strategies, one finds several ways to substitute the onomatopoeia in translation. One method is to translate the onomatopoeia with a more general word. The word could indeed be a more general onomatopoeia, but it could also be an ordinary word more frequently used than the more 'detailed' onomatopoeia; e.g., to use "smiling" instead of the onomatopoeia for it realized in Japanese, "nikoniko". Similar results may be obtained through the strategy of translating with a more neutral or less expressive word. For instance, to substitute "*Eeek!*" in "she went *Eeek!*" with a word like "screaming". If one wishes to explain the specific content wrapped up by the original onomatopoeia in more detail, one could make use of paraphrasing, which simply uses some phrases to explain the original concept not being grasped by a single term in the TL. The Japanese onomatopoeia "jiii", imitates the 'sound' of someone staring intensely, and needless to say, there is no equivalent in English. Here, a paraphrasing strategy could be used to render the concept in phrases like: "the neighbor's eyes would not let go of me", or "one could almost hear how intensely he stared at me". Another translation strategy mentioned by Baker is the strategy of translation by illustration. This strategy could be used when pointing out the appearance of someone/something would be better/easier in the translation; e.g., when an original onomatopoeia which imitates the sound of a state/condition could more easily be explained by pointing to visual clues of that state/condition. The Japanese sound of something being bumpy: "dekoboko", could be explained in the translation as "the road was bumpy". The meaning would be more or less the same, and the easy explanation in the TL would be more concise than trying to render the specific sound aspect. With the translation strategies discussed in this paragraph in mind, it is reasonable to believe that meaning can be transmitted in creative and clever ways, and that it is possible to make up for the loss of original form/impact, at least partly.

To summarize, onomatopoeias have value in that they are more direct in their transmission of meaning, which make them a unique tool in various forms of storytelling. Readers as well as authors have the ability to easily distinguish the onomatopoeia from the rest of the text, owing to the unique nature of the onomatopoeia. This speaks in favor of the argument that authors are well aware of their actions when they are using an onomatopoeia; they use them deliberately. And, according to the Kantian view on translation, one would need some strong argumentation as to why one would neglect an author's deliberate attempt at describing his/her world view, in translation. Onomatopoeias seem to be in possession of some special rights in translation, then. However, strong argumentation of dismissing them in translation will always be there, and what is "strong" argumentation and not is entirely relative. As mentioned earlier, it all comes down to the overall purpose of translation. To this, the purpose of the onomatopoeia is subordinate. Nevertheless, it seems that the value of the onomatopoeia could be discussed back and forth indefinitely. It is under such circumstances that it would be interesting to investigate the empirical treatment of the onomatopoeia in translation. In the next section, Casas-Tost's study (2014) will be examined in order to comply with this.

3.4 Treatment of the Onomatopoeia in Translation According to Casas-Tost's Study (2014)

In her 2014 study, Casas-Tost investigated the treatment of the Chinese onomatopoeia in translation to Spanish. Her method consisted of constituting a corpus of seven contemporary Chinese novels and then scrutinizing their Spanish translations. One of the motivations behind the study was a wish to set focus on the onomatopoeia in a translation perspective, in order to suggest solutions to the translation problem it often causes. Like the gap between the languages Japanese and English/Norwegian, there is a considerable gap between the languages Chinese and Spanish, and there will be onomatopoeias that lack corresponding units in the language pair; thereby raising the difficulty of their translation. Casas-Tost extracted a total of 490 onomatopoeias from the corpus of the Chinese texts, and three main tendencies were identified in the translation of them (in order of frequency):

1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia (50,6%)
2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text (32,6%)
3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia (16,7%)

24

With substitution, Casas-Tost refers to the loss of onomatopoeic features in translation. However, she includes ideophones in the group of substitution. She explains that while onomatopoeias are imitative in nature, ideophones are not, but their letters or phonemes do nevertheless suggest something of the more expressive sort compared to ordinary words and expressions. For instance, the word "zig-zag" could be described as an ideophone instead of an onomatopoeia. The word "zig-zag" presents the idea, of progressing while moving straight from side to side, with presumably non-arbitrary sound. However, "zig-zag" is not imitative of any empiric sound. It is therefore often labeled an ideophone, which describes an idea with particular expressive, but not imitative, sound. In the cases where the Chinese onomatopoeia is translated with what Casas-Tost distinguishes as an ideophone, the phenomenon is described as an instance of substitution. Casas-Tost states that in 50% of the substitution instances the Chinese onomatopoeia has been translated with a Spanish ideophone. She presents an example of ideophone translation, rendered below (onomatopoeia and ideophone translation marked with underscore):

> (a) *Tingdejian de zhi shi touding shang shuyezi zai weifeng zhong <u>sasa</u>*
>   *shengxiang* [...].
> (b) Listen-part.[11]-see part. only is top[12]-loc.[13] tree leaf in gentle breeze-loc <u>sasa</u>-
>   sound.
> (c) El único sonido es el <u>murmullo</u> de la brisa entre las hojas de los árboles [...].
> [The only sound that could be heard was the murmur of the breeze through the
>   leaves of the trees]. (Example 2, 45-46)[14]

The Spanish *murmullo*, translated to English as *murmur*, has been identified as an ideophone, and thus do not qualify as an onomatopoeia. Casas-Tost has also regarded some instances of discursive creation, the act of creating a fitting target language equivalent to the Chinese onomatopoeia on the spot (in which the result would make less or no sense if put into other contexts), as instances of substitution (1,2% of the total substitution instances of 50,6%).[15] With omission, Casas-Tost alludes to the partial or total suppression of onomatopoeia. This is illustrated in one of her examples, also rendered below:

---

[11] Marks particle.
[12] Marks topic.
[13] Marks locative.
[14] Casas-Tost originally included Chinese characters in her examples, which have not been rendered here.
[15] Casas-Tost does neither give examples nor detailed information of the discursive creations identified in her study. Thus it is hard to say what made some of them qualify for the substitution group.

(a) *Ta "cha" de you dianle yi zhi yan* [...].

(b) He cha-part. again lit up-part. one clas.[16] cigarette.

(c) Volvió a encender un cigarillo [...].

[He lit up another cigarette]. (Example 4, 46)

The distinctive, audiovisual feature of the Chinese onomatopoeia *cha* has not been rendered by any means in the Spanish translation shown here. Finally, the tendency of translating the original onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia contains instances of using an established target language onomatopoeia (57%), discursive creation (24%), using a loan word (17%), and addition of explanatory phrases (2%), termed amplification in Casas-Tost's study.

The study, then, suggests that it is most common for translators to substitute or omit the onomatopoeia in the translation of Chinese into Spanish. Casas-Tost explains that this is to a considerable degree caused by the languages' different distribution of onomatopoeias across different semantic fields. For instance, she notes that Spanish has a less varied repertoire of laughter onomatopoeias compared to Chinese (47). And even if there were existing equivalents in the target language, it could be a mismatch in terms of frequency of use. However, she also emphasizes the individual translator's role in the translation of the onomatopoeia, explaining that the translator's chosen translation style also takes part in the decision of the onomatopoeia's fate. Casas-Tost wants to highlight that even though it may be difficult to preserve the onomatopoeic feature in translation, it is indeed possible, but its realization depends on the translator in question.

3.4.1 The Relevance of Casas-Tost's Study (2014) to this Thesis

Casas-Tost chose novels as her research material in order to prove that onomatopoeias exist and thrive in high-brow literature as well as comics. This thesis, however, will focus on onomatopoeias used in the comic genre; onomatopoeias that, to a higher degree than those used in ordinary literature, fit under Casas-Tost's idea of "superficial embellishment". Onomatopoeias used in comics could be argued to be superficial on the basis that they are often used as holophrases external to units of coherent text (outside of so-called speech bubbles). However, superficial or not, onomatopoeias in comics are also units of text which need to be translated in one way or another.

---

16   Marks classifier.

The translation problem and the strategies available for dealing with it are more or less the same in the contexts of literature and comics. A salient difference between the genres, however, is that onomatopoeias are often more prominent in the comic genre (at least before translation). Whether this comic feature makes the onomatopoeia a greater translation problem or not, or whether it makes it easier to preserve the onomatopoeic form or not, is hard to say, but will be touched upon in the next chapter.[17]

Casas-Tost's study has proposed an idea of what to expect in translations of the onomatopoeia, at least between languages with very different repertoires of onomatopoeias, namely that its salient feature will be lost. However, Casas-Tost made an important distinction between onomatopoeias (imitative) and ideophones (not imitative). Onomatopoeias translated into ideophones were not to regard as onomatopoeic translations according to her study. However, as understood from the introducing pages of *The Grammar of Japanese Mimetics*, what distinguishes the different sound symbolic terms like onomatopoeia and ideophone from each other is not set in stone (Iwasaki, Sells and Akita 2017). Casas-Tost mentioned that 50% of her substitution cases (50,6%) were in fact instances of ideophone translation. If ideophones were to be regarded as the same type of word as the onomatopoeia, and counted as onomatopoeic translation, Casas-Tost's earlier main tendencies would look something like this (in order of frequency):

1. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia (incl. ideophones) (42%)
2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text (32,6%)
3. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia (25,3%)

With the ideophone translation instances (25,3%), earlier included under the substitution category, now moved to the category of translating the onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia, the main tendencies have changed order. The most frequent tendency is now to translate the source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia (42%). The substitution category now ranks

---

[17] It could be deemed easier to maintain the onomatopoeic form in translation of onomatopoeias found in comics, as readers would be prepared for-, and expecting (inventive) onomatopoeias in that genre (see 4.2.3). In addition, one could argue that the translators often do not have a choice but to translate with an onomatopoeia (or at least something), as it is hard to edit out the Japanese characters constituting the original onomatopoeia; as the readers will notice the Japanese characters, an explanation will be needed next to the characters in order to not confuse the target audience (see 4.3.2). However, this could also be seen as more of a translation problem, as the translator is unable to remove ST items that the translator does not wish to translate (e.g., due to the potential translation being confusing itself).

last (25,3%). With the data arranged this way, one obtains the impression that the translators studied were indeed aware of the special nature of the onomatopoeia, and that they actually made an effort to preserve this distinct feature in translation. In fact, Casas-Tost also recognizes this effort (45). The propensity of changing the form entirely in these translation cases might not be as dominant as first thought. However, if one brings together the two categories of non-onomatopoeic translation (omission and substitution) one is presented with an index of 57,9%, which would rank above the category of onomatopoeic translation (42%):

1. Non-onomatopoeic translation (omission and substitution with another type of word) (57,9%)
2. Onomatopoeic translation (incl. ideophones) (42%)

Again, in a broader perspective, the predominant tendency is to not translate with an onomatopoeia when the original onomatopoeia poses a translation problem. This means that it still is reasonable to expect more instances of non-onomatopoeic translation of the problematic onomatopoeia, in novels as well as comics. However, a lot can be said and discussed about exactly how the onomatopoeia has been preserved in translation or not, so it is of importance to investigate the different nuances of the (non-)onomatopoeic translations. In that regard, it is essential to define clear and reasonable categories of these translation nuances in order to initiate an orderly and proper discussion. Casas-Tost presented a categorization of her data which this thesis has been heavily influenced by, although some changes have been made. This thesis' categorization of data will be explained below.

The data of this thesis is categorized into five categorizations. They are as follows:

1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia.

> Example 3.2
> *onaka ga **pekopeko*** (lit. stomach is dented = to be very hungry) → my stomach is empty.

This is the first main tendency described by Casas-Tost. Translations of the onomatopoeia with another word that cannot be said to be of an onomatopoeic nature (see 1.2) will be listed as category 1 translations. The translation in question will be put in this category if the word exists in one of the dictionaries presented in 1.2, and does not list the quality of imitative/onomatopoeic in its entry

there. At the same time, if the translation is of a holophrase-onomatopoeia (see 1.2), the translation must neither be a one-syllable word, nor a partly or wholly reduplicated (or multiplied) word; in accordance with the criteria set in the introduction of this thesis. Unlike Casas-Tost's categorization, ideophones will not be listed with this category, as the distinction between onomatopoeias and ideophones is not made in this thesis (explanation given in 2.1). A translation with what Casas-Tost could label an ideophone may in this thesis be considered a translation with an onomatopoeia. Also, discursive creations are not listed with this category, in contrast to Casas-Tost's practice.

2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text.

Example 3.3
*onaka ga **pekopeko*** → X

The second main tendency described by Casas-Tost. No change has been made here with respect to Casas-Tost's original category; this category entails the removal of the onomatopoeia in translation, without any substitution of it in the target text.

3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia.

Example 3.4
*onaka ga **pekopeko*** → my stomach is **growling**.

The last main tendency of Casas-Tost is also included in this thesis, as the third category. This category entails use of an established TL onomatopoeia (established equivalent as described in Casas-Tost's study) in the translation of the ST onomatopoeia. In practice, if the word used in translation exists in one of the dictionaries presented in the introduction chapter, and does list the quality of imitative/onomatopoeic in its entry there, it will be put in this category. In addition, holophrase-onomatopoeia translations (see 1.2) that consist of a one-syllable word, or a partly or wholly reduplicated (or multiplied) word will also be included in this category; in accordance with the criteria set in the introduction of this thesis. Casas-Tost also associated the strategies of discursive creation and using a loan word with this category, however, these two strategies will not be included here. Instead, they will be independent categories in this thesis.

4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia.

Example 3.5

*onaka ga **pekopeko*** → my stomach goes "**wurr wurr**".

This category corresponds to Casas-Tost's discursive creation. The translation of a ST onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia not conventionalized (enough) in the TL will be regarded as a translation with an invented target language onomatopoeia. If the word used in translation does not exist in one of the dictionaries presented in the introduction chapter, and is not a transliteration of the original onomatopoeia, it will be regarded as a category 4 translation.

5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing.

Example 3.6

*onaka ga **pekopeko*** → my stomach goes "**pekopeko**" (starving).

This corresponds to using a loan word; inserting a ST onomatopoeia in the TT (and TL alphabet). If the word used in translation renders close to the exact same sound found in the original onomatopoeia, only in TL alphabet, it will be considered a category 5 translation. Transliterated onomatopoeias with explanations given in additional paraphrasing (amplification as described in Casas-Tost's study), e.g., in sidenotes, will also be listed here. However, the frequencies of the methods of additional paraphrasing and non-additional paraphrasing have been kept track of separately, in order to distinguish the most common of the two in this thesis (see 4.6).

Categories 1, and 2 are classifications of translations where the original onomatopoeic form has been lost. Categories 3, 4, and 5 are classifications of translations where the onomatopoeic form has been rendered. In the following chapter, the results from the research on the chosen manga paperbacks will be presented in the aforementioned categories.

3.5 Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, an attempt has been made to understand the onomatopoeia from a translation perspective. The onomatopoeia, presumed to have a non-arbitrary link to its meaning, is prone to lose this particular feature in crossing language borders. It is therefore in need of being translated like other words, in order to be properly understood. The form of the onomatopoeia is what constitutes it. However, it is often difficult to preserve both original form- and meaning in translation, and it is most common for translators to give up the form in favor of meaning. Thus, it is not uncommon for the onomatopoeia to disappear in translation. An ethical approach to translation was taken in order to figure out the rights and wrongs when it comes to the translation of the onomatopoeia. A conclusion was made in which it was deemed important to render an author's world view as accurately as possible, and that would imply translating with an onomatopoeia if the author had used an onomatopoeia. However, this rule could only function as a general guideline, as there are many varied purposes of translation, some of which deem it necessary to violate the accuracy principle. An attempt was then made to estimate the value of the onomatopoeia itself, in order to investigate if that could have a say in whether it is worth keeping in translation or not. It was discovered that the onomatopoeia provides vivid impressions which could give a more direct access to an author's ideas, much like an entity in a poem would. Because of this peculiarity, it was argued that the onomatopoeia is very much intended in the texts it is found. This intended, vivid expression would indeed stimulate more senses in the audience if it were to be kept in the translation, however, the meaning could then be jeopardized, and if the purpose of translation deems the onomatopoeia irrelevant or undesirable, the onomatopoeia could easily be omitted, labeled a disadvantage. Strategies for both keeping and leaving the onomatopoeic form in translation were explored. Finally, Casas-Tost's study was examined in order to establish an idea of what to expect in the translation of the onomatopoeia, at least between languages of very different origin. It was discovered that the tendency of the translators was to translate without using an onomatopoeia. Whether or not to translate an onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia is context dependent. However, if the purpose of translation in question does not counteract the onomatopoeia, one could argue that the general guideline of accuracy applies, and that the effort should be made to translate with an onomatopoeia.

4. Results and Analysis

4.1 Main Findings

From the data consisting of four Japanese manga paperbacks I was able to extract a total of 1644 onomatopoeias.[18] After investigating their English and Norwegian translations, I managed to organize them as in Table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1: *Translation categorization of the total 1644 Japanese onomatopoeias*

Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	34	2,07%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	282	17,15%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	197	11,98%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	634	38,56%
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	497	30,23%

This data categorization shows an evident preservation of the onomatopoeic form (categories 3, 4, 5 = 80,77%), contrary to the findings of Casas-Tost (overall number of onomatopeic translations from her study estimated to be 42%, see 3.4.1). Here category 4 of onomatopoeic invention takes the throne, with 634 Japanese onomatopoeias translated into an invented target language onomatopoeia, thereby constituting 38,56% of the overall data. Following up is category 5 of transliteration, with 497 Japanese onomatopoeias translated this way, constituting 30,23% of the overall data. In third comes the first category of non-onomatopoeic translation, category 2 of omission, with 282

---

[18]   Repeated onomatopoeia included. Thus a number of tokens; not types.

Japanese onomatopoeias translated this way, which makes up 17,15% of the overall data. It is interesting that this categorization appoints category 4 and category 5, two onomatopoeic-translation categories, as most common, while the first non-onomatopoeic translation category, category 2, comes in third. This is an opposite to Casas-Tost's main tendencies, where the practices of substitution and omission were most common, whereas the practice of translating with an onomatopoeia came in last (also after my recalculation of her results, if one sees substitution and omission together as the non-onomatopoeic category = 57,9%). Perhaps the most intriguing is the fact that in this categorization, category 1 of substitution came in last, with only 34 out of 1644 Japanese onomatopoeias translated in such a manner, constituting a modest 2,07% of the overall data. Contrary to this, Casas-Tost originally listed substitution as the most common practice in her study.

Table 4.2: *Comparison of results*

	My results	Casas-Tost
Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	2,07%	25,3%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	17,15%	32,6%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	11,98%	42%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	38,56%	Included in the 42% under Category 3, and possibly in the 25,3% under Category 1
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	30,23%	Included in the 42% under Category 3

Naturally, as discussed in the previous chapter, whereas Casas-Tost did not consider ideophone translation as onomatopoeic translation, I chose to consider it onomatopoeic translation (see 3.4, 3.4.1). This could partly explain why my index in category 1 of substitution is relatively low, because what Casas-Tost could have considered ideophones and therefore put under that category, I have put elsewhere, particularly under category 3 of translation with a TL onomatopoeia. However, these contrasting choices do not offer a satisfying explanation as to why the discrepancy in the substitution results is that conspicuous. Even though all of the translation instances categorized under (my) category 3 of translation with a TL onomatopoeia were to be regarded as non-onomatopoeic ideophones and moved under category 1 of substitution, the new index of category 1 of substitution would be 231 – 14,05%, which would still be the lowest index when compared to the indexes of the remaining categories. This indicates that there is a fundamental difference between Casas-Tost's study and mine, in regard to the translators' individual choices/styles, the appeal of certain translation strategies (probably due to different genres), or the language pairs. Perhaps the fundamental difference could be seen to pervade all three domains. In this chapter, the data will be divided further into different categories, in order to highlight different points of interest; namely that of the distinction between holophrases (onomatopoeia outside coherent text) and integrated onomatopoeias (onomatopoeia in coherent text), and that of internal categorization of each of the four manga paperback translations. I have divided the following chapter sections in the aforementioned translation categories, each translation category section will particularly include examples from the manga paperback translation where the translation category in question was most prominent. As it turns out, each translator had a different favorite translation category, with category 1 not being favored by anyone. The sections will also contain considerations about the translator's choices/style, how the translator's choices/style integrate(s) in the comic genre, and the similarities and differences regarding the original onomatopoeias and their translation. In the following section, category 1 of substitution will be discussed in detail (4.2), followed by category 2 of omission (4.3), category 3 of translation with a TL onomatopoeia (4.4), category 4 of onomatopoeic invention (4.5), and category 5 of transliteration (4.6).

4.2 Category 1: Substitution of the Original Onomatopoeia for Another Type of Word Other than an Onomatopoeia

Category 1 was the least popular category in the overall data shown above. None of the four manga paperback translations had substitution as the main translation strategy. This could signify that substitution is deemed an unfavorable translation method of onomatopoeias found in comics. However, an interesting observation is to be made when one investigates the categorization of the translations of what I call the integrated onomatopoeia, only. Integrated onomatopoeias are onomatopoeias found within coherent text in the Japanese originals (i.e., within so-called speech bubbles). A total of 29 integrated onomatopoeias were identified in the overall number of 1644 onomatopoeias, and they are categorized in Table 4.3 below.

Table 4.3: *Translation categorization of the total 29 Japanese integrated onomatopoeias*

Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	26	89,66%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	0	0%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	2	6,90%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	0	0%
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	1	3,45%

The integrated onomatopoeias – with the exception of three instances, have all been translated with substitution for another type of word. This statistic is quite different from the one listing the categorization of the remaining 1615 holophrase-onomatopoeias, which, for the record, is shown in Table 4.4. Holophrase-onomatopoeias are onomatopoeias which stand outside coherent text/speech bubbles in the Japanese originals.

Figure 4.1: *Illustration of (1.) an integrated onomatopoeia and (2.) a holophrase-onomatopoeia, with the English onomatopoeia "crack(ing)" as an example.*

Table 4.4: *Translation categorization of the total 1615 Japanese holophrase-onomatopoeias*

Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	8	0,50%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	282	17,46%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	195	12,07%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	634	39,26%
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	496	30,71%

Only half a percent of the holophrase-onomatopoeias were translated with substitution. Thus, substitution was the most favorable translation method of the integrated, in-text onomatopoeias, while it was the least favorable translation method of the solitary holophrase-onomatopoeias. When only considering the integrated onomatopoeias, this study corresponds to that of Casas-Tost's. The onomatopoeic translation of an onomatopoeia from a language with a rich repertoire/high frequency of onomatopoeias into a language with a lesser repertoire/lower frequency of onomatopoeias then, seems to be much harder when the onomatopoeia in question is intertwined with surrounding text. Hence, a non-onomatopoeic translation method like substitution becomes favorable. Still, the question why needs to be considered. After discussing chosen examples in 4.2.2, I will argue that a reason for this might be the importance of being as clear-cut (and therefore as conventional) as possible within translations of clarifying text, which speech bubbles in comics contain. It is not difficult to imagine that translators opt out of translating with an available onomatopoeia when there is a significant frequency-discrepancy between that onomatopoeia and the original one. Translating with the available onomatopoeia could result in disturbing the fluency of the target text, especially with the existing stigma of the onomatopoeia being infantile in mind (Ishiguro 2016; Sugahara 2010, 1).[19] Interestingly, Casas-Tost noted that the translators in her study moved the onomatopoeic

---

[19]   Stigma argued to exist in both Japanese and English. See references given in text.

translation of the Chinese laughter-onomatopoeias into quotations, while the Chinese originals were mainly expressed outside quotations, by the narrator's voice (2014, 47). This could indicate that in-text onomatopoeias found inside quotations are easier to translate, as the direct nature of a quote facilitates an onomatopoeic translation which is also more direct in nature (compared to normal, arbitrary words). Particularly expressive and inventive onomatopoeias found within translated quotes could also more easily be rationalized by translators, as quotes do not necessarily follow grammatical rules, and as long as the translation in question is seemed to fit the character who utters the quote. However, this does not seem to be the case at all with the translated manga paperbacks investigated in this study. Even though all the integrated onomatopoeias extracted in this study were found inside quotes of characters, only 10,35% (categories 3, 4, 5) of these were translated with an onomatopoeia. As understood from Table 4.3, this corresponds to three cases, which will all be examined in the following paragraphs.

4.2.1 Considering the Onomatopoeic Translations of the Integrated Onomatopoeia

One out of the three onomatopoeic translations of the integrated onomatopoeia was a translation with a transliteration, conducted by Tomo Kimura, the translator behind the English version of Yana Toboso's 黒執事 *kuroshitsuji* (2007), or *Black Butler* (2010) in English. The original, Japanese sentence where the onomatopoeia occurs is transliterated and rendered below (a), then my glossed translation follows (b), and at the end the translation by Tomo Kimura is given (c). The onomatopoeia is emphasized in bold.

> Example 4.1
> (a) *kocchi wa "ichido tsukandara hanasanai nezumi **hoihoi** daisakusen" desu da!!*
>
> (b) here TOP[20] one-time catch-COND[21] release-NEG[22] mouse **hoihoi** big-strategy COP[23] COP
>
> (c) Here we have the "once I catch you, I won't let go, mice **hoihoi**!" grand plan!!

---

[20] Marks topic.
[21] Marks conditional.
[22] Marks negation.
[23] Marks copula.

This quote is taken from a scene where a housemaid presents her mouse-catching strategy to her fellow coworkers. The Japanese *hoihoi* could be said to display both onomatopoeic- and interjection qualities. Kimura herself explained the *hoihoi* in her *Translation Notes* at the end of the paperback. There, she makes clear that *hoihoi* correlates to: "shoo, shoo!" (interjection) in English (2010), and seemingly makes an explanation as to why she chose to translate with a transliteration. The *nezumi hoihoi*, or *mice hoihoi*, is a pun on the Japanese "gokiburi hoihoi", a name of a brand of cockroach traps, meaning "cockroaches, shoo, shoo!" (Ibid.). However, it should also be noted that *hoihoi* could be seen as an onomatopoeic adverb meaning "readily/easily", which complements the verb *tsukandara/tsukamu* (catch). The new, overall meaning of the sentence would then be that the mice/cockroaches are "easily caught" with this device. This particular reading is not unlikely, as it is most common for Japanese onomatopoeias to appear as adverbs (see 2.2). It seems unlikely that Kimura would have transliterated *hoihoi* if it were not for the original pun, as she translated 6 out of the 7 remaining integrated onomatopoeias in the manga with the substitution method. This was also the only instance she translated an integrated onomatopoeia with transliteration. Phonetically speaking, *hoi* [hoi] sounds different from *shoo* [ʃuː], so English readers would most likely not see the connection between *hoihoi* and *shoo*. If Kimura had not recognized there being a pun, it is highly probable that she would have translated it differently. However, it is then also probable that she would have translated either with *shoo*, or another interjection; or even onomatopoeia. Nevertheless, this special case of onomatopoeic translation cannot be seen as anything else, due to the strong motivation behind it caused by a pun.

Kimura was also in charge for another onomatopoeic translation of an integrated onomatopoeia. This time she translated with an existing TL onomatopoeia. The sentence where the onomatopoeia was found is rendered below, together with the translations.

Example 4.2

(a) *hijō haibi da* **guzuguzu** *sunna*

(b) emergency deployment COP **guzuguzu** do-IMP[24].NEG

(c) This is an emergency! Don't stand around **twiddling** your thumbs!

---

[24] Marks imperative.

According to the *Thesaurus of Japanese Mimesis and Onomatopoeia* (TJMO), *guzuguzu* translates to "hesitatingly; dilly-dallying". Kimura chose a slightly different translation, with the phrase "*twiddling* your thumbs", which also depicts waste of time. *Twiddling*, or "twiddle", had its entry in the *Oxford Reference Dictionary* (ORD), and the entry listed 'imitative' as one of the word's qualities. Thus, this is a straightforward example of a translation with a TL onomatopoeia.

The third and last onomatopoeic translation of an integrated onomatopoeia was conducted by Jens E. Røsåsen, the translator behind the Norwegian translation of Gōshō Aoyama's 名探偵コナン *meitantei conan* (1994), *Mesterdetektiven Conan* (Master-Detective Conan) (2004). Again, the sentence where the onomatopoeia ocurred, together with its translations, are given below. The Norwegian translation done by Røsåsen is given in (c), and the corresponding, English sentence is given in (d).

Example 4.3

(a) *bakkamitai...* **herahera** *shichatte...*

(b) fool-like **herahera** do-regrettably-CONJ[25]

(c) Hva er det du **fniser** så hysterisk av?

(d) What makes you **giggle** so hysterically?

Herahera is a laughter onomatopoeia which depicts a dubious kind of laugh (TJMO). Røsåsen has chosen to translate it into Norwegian as *fniser*, a verb which is also to be considered a laughter onomatopoeia, according to the Norwegian dictionary, *Store Norske Ordbok* (SNO). Hence, another translation with an existing TL onomatopoeia. One could perhaps argue that there is a slight, semantic discrepancy between the two words, however, as *fniser* is explained by its entry as a subdued laugh (SNO), while the dubious *herahera* is said to be the laugh of an embarassed, or deceiving person (TJMO). One could claim, however, that Røsåsen tried to make up for the discrepancy by intensifying *fniser* with *så hysterisk/so hysterically*, so as to perhaps make it appear more dubious.[26] Nevertheless, the translation might be the best solution if one seeks to translate with an onomatopoeia. Because while Japanese has a wide selection of laughter words, many of

---

[25] Marks conjunction.

[26] The intensifying with *så hysterisk/so hysterically* could also be seen as a contradicting translation, as *herahera* has an additional connotation of "loose/slovenly".

them onomatopoeic, Norwegian has not that many. Other Norwegian translation alternatives for *herahera* I managed to come up with were "flir(e)"[27] (smile/laugh maliciously or foolishly), "glis(e)" (smile/laugh scornfully while showing teeth), "humre" (joyful, subdued laugh), "knis(e)" (subdued laugh, same as *fniser*), and "skratt(e)" (laugh loudly). Out of these, "flir(e)" and "glis(e)" might be the best match semantically, however, only "knis(e)" turned out to be onomatopoeic in form.

Except for the first transliteration case, in which the onomatopoeic translation seemed to be strongly motivated by a pun, the translators appeared to have a free choice in whether to translate with an onomatopoeia or not. Yet, they chose to translate with an onomatopoeia. This could be a coincidence, but it could also be an indicator of the translator's wish to translate an onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia, in spite of the majority of the cases being non-onomatopoeic translations. If so, the non-onomatopoeic translations would be the results of translation cases where translating with an onomatopoeia was deemed rather unfavorable. In the following paragraphs, examples from substitutional translations of the integrated onomatopoeia will be examined in order to investigate whether onomatopoeic translations were difficult to conduct.

4.2.2 Considering Substitutional Translations of the Integrated Onomatopoeia

Returning to *Black Butler*, the translation which covered ⅔ of onomatopoeic translations of the integrated onomatopoeia, one is also met with the majority of 6 substitutions of the same type of onomatopoeia. However, a claim could be made that translator Kimura is sensitive to the Japanese onomatopoeia, and also inclined to translate it differently from other words. One example of this is shown in Example 4.4.

> Example 4.4
> (a) *yakitate **sakusaku** mirufīyu*
>
> (b) bake.CONT[28]-just.done **sakusaku** millefeuille
>
> (c) A freshly baked, crispy Mille-feuille!

---

[27] Without the additional "e" the word becomes a noun. With it it becomes a verb.
[28] Marks continuative aspect.

Sakusaku is listed as "crisp/crispy" and "crunch/crunchy" in TJMO, however, *crisp/crispy* is not categorized as an onomatopoeia in ORD. The word has its origin in Latin, from "crispus", meaning "curled" (ORD). One could perhaps argue that if Kimura genuinely wanted to translate with an onomatopoeia, she could have used *crunchy* instead, which, in fact, is categorized as an onomatopoeia (Ibid.). However, not everyone can be thought of as adepts at Latin words and their original meanings, and some would perhaps say that *crispy* does sound like, and therefore becomes, a suitable onomatopoeia. One could argue, that the phonetic quality of *crispy* somewhat resembles the sound of something which is: "hard but brittle" (Ibid.). The *cr*-section of *crispy* [kr] is made out of a stop [k][29], which is a small burst resulting from the sudden release of blocked air in the vocal tract, and a (close to) trill [r], which gradually, through small vibrations of the tongue, lets out the airstream. The transition from a complete blockage to a more open airflow could resemble the phenomenon of something hard slowly but steadily falling apart or crumbling, without much effort to start the process. With this mentality, *crispy* becomes an onomatopoeia of movement rather than sound, as the word mimics its notion in movement of the vocal organs, or perhaps air (tongue pressed against the palate for air blockage, then lowered to let air flow), as discussed by Feist (2013, 107). However, words such as *crisp/crispy* and *crunch/crunchy* are often used to describe food, as in Example 4.4 above, and therefore one could assume that the connotation of food is deeply embedded in the words. For that reason, it might not be difficult to convince readers that the sound of continuously eating something crispy like crackers is *cr cr cr* [kr kr kr], or perhaps *crisp crisp crisp* [krɪsp krɪsp krɪsp]. For the section that comes after *cr*, *-isp(y)*, many things could be said, both in favor and unfavor of the possible argument that it is also somehow mimicking. However, that discussion will not be given here. When one is not certain whether a word is onomatopoeic in its origin or not, all one can do is usually to consider the sound symbolism (see 2.1) of each phoneme/phoneme-section the word is constituted of (as done with *cr* here). But it is difficult to prove anything. One could claim that *crispy* is not completely arbitrary, because it begins with *cr*, which here is argued to perchance symbolize something in accordance with what the whole word denotes. However, at the same time, the word is not a full-fledged onomatopoeia. It has been noted here that Kimura has translated with a word not completely arbitrary in form.

---

[29] Other stops are: /g/, /t/, /d/, /p/, and /b/.

Another example of Kimura utilizing sound symbolism instead of an onomatopoeia is shown in Example 4.5.

Example 4.5

(a) *goji sanjuppun...* **girigiri** *desu ne*

(b) five-o'clock thirty-minutes **girigiri** COP right.PTCL[30]

(c) Half past five. ...I am cutting it quite close.

Girigiri is the Japanese sound of being barely before a deadline, or barely within a limit (TJMO). Needless to say, there is no existing, onomatopoeic equivalent in English. In such cases the translator has to translate with a slightly different TL onomatopoeia, invent a TL onomatopoeia, or use the ST onomatopoeia, here *girigiri*, as a loanword in the target text, in order to conduct an onomatopoeic translation. In this case, all three methods require some effort as the concept of the state of being barely before/within something, and similar concepts, have not been assigned a characteristic sound in English. Rather, the idea of such concepts having a non-arbitrary sound does not exist in English. Therefore, if a translator were to transliterate *girigiri* for instance, additional explaining would be inevitable, as the English readers will be met with something they did not know exists. Kimura opted out of an onomatopoeic translation here, and instead combined sound symbolism and alliteration to make up for the loss. The alliteration is seen in the repitition within the phrase *cutting it quite close*, where the words *cutting*, *quite*, and *close* all begin with the same [k] sound, thereby constituting an alliteration. This is a common feature in poetry and lyrics which adds a musical aspect to the literary content; it adds a pattern that stands out from the rest of the text. Kimura has not only succeeded in making the non-onomatopoeic phrase stand out, she has also provided supplementary imagery through the sound symbolism of the stop [k], which was explained in the last example. Stops like [k] are often associated with abrupt sounds and acts in the world of sound symbolism (Hinton, Nichols and Ohala 1994a, 10), and one could therefore argue that the initial [k] in *cutting* matches the semantic inventory of the whole word. This provides a more vivid reading of the word, and the sensation lingers as the following words repeat the initial [k]. Additionally, *quite* and *close* are monosyllables (constituted of only one syllable), thus making them resemble onomatopoeias which often appear as such (Assaneo, Nichols and Trevisan 2011, 5). In sum, one could say that the result is a vivid and lingering impression of the notion of "cut". It is

---

[30]   Marks particle.

true that the original *girigiri* does not translate as *cutting*, however, *girigiri* presupposes there being a limit to something, a point in time or space which separates the acceptable/possible from the unacceptable/impossible, and a way of separating things is by *cutting*. One could perhaps interpret *girigiri* as being "close to the *cut* in time/space". Still, however much one puts into this translation, it is not the obvious equivalent of *girigiri*; one might say that the translation is closer to an acceptable one than an adequate one (see 3.2). Nevertheless, it does not seem completely arbitrary either.

Kimura has not translated all of the integrated onomatopoeias in the manga as creatively as above. One last example of her substitution translations will be given below.

> Example 4.6
>
> (a) *yappari kore sugoku **bukabuka** ja nai!*
>
> (b) as.expected this immensely **bukabuka** PTCL.PTCL is.NEG
>
> (c) See, this ring is much too big for you!

Bukabuka imitates the phenomenon of being overly large, while leaving some space underneath/between; in this context it is a ring that is the topic of discussion. *Bukabuka* is another example of the Japanese gitaigo, words that mimic visual or textural experience in sound (see 2.2), and English lacks this kind of words. One could contend that adding *much* to the already *too big* intensifies the sentence like an onomatopoeia would do, but it is highly likely that both *much* and *too* correspond to the Japanese *sugoku*, meaning *immensely*. This is another example where an onomatopoeic translation proves difficult, perhaps rather unfavorable. Like with *girigiri* above, *bukabuka* does not have an exact equivalent in English, as there exists no idea of the sound aspect of *big* in English.

A rather famous Japanese onomatopoeia that appeared several times during my data investigation was *dokidoki*, the sound of the heart beating; especially due to fear or nervousness. As an integrated onomatopoeia, *dokidoki* appeared two times in Naoko Takeuchi's 美少女戦士セーラームーン *bishōjosenshi sērāmūn* (1992), *Pretty Guardian Sailor Moon* in English, translated by William Flanagan (2011), and two times in Ai Yazawa's ナナ *nana* (2000), translated into Norwegian as *Nana* by Øyvind Kurisaki-Sagberg (2008). All four examples are shown below, the first two the

English translations of Flanagan (4.7, 4.8), then the Norwegian translations by Kurisaki-Sagberg (4.9, 4.10).

Example 4.7

(a) *nande **dokidoki** sun no yo*

(b) why **dokidoki** do PTCL PTCL

(c) What am I getting all worked up for?!

Example 4.8

(a) *namae wo kiita dake de **dokidoki** shichau... hen da wa*

(b) name PTCL listen.PST[31] only PTCL **dokidoki** do-regrettably strange COP PTCL

(c) I just hear the name and my heart goes racing. I'm just weird.

Example 4.9

(a) *iya mate **dokidoki** shinakute iin datta*

(b) no wait.CONJ **dokidoki** do-not.CONJ fine-PTCL COP.PST

(c) Nei, ro deg ned, Nana...

(d) No, calm down, Nana...

---

[31] Marks past tense.

Example 4.10

(a) *naishin **dokidoki** shinagara sono yoru no raibu ni kite itta na*

(b) in-heart **dokidoki** do.CONT-while that evening POS[32].PTCL concert to.PTCL
wear.CONJ go.PST EMP[33].PTCL

(c) Det var den jeg hadde på meg den kvelden på konserten... Innerst inne var jeg
skikkelig nervøs.

(d) That was the one I was wearing that evening at the concert... Deep inside I was
really nervous.

None of the translators made the effort to translate with an onomatopoeia in this case. This could indicate that there are no corresponding onomatopoeias in English and Norwegian. However, this does not seem to be the case, as both Flanagan and Kurisaki-Sagberg translated the holophrase variants of *doki(n)/dokidoki* with *b(a)-bmp* and *du-dunk* respectively; both translations being onomatopoeias pointing to the repeated beats of a heart. While the idea of heartbeats giving (onomatopoeic) sound is familiar in both English and Norwegian, translations like *b(a)-bmp* and *du-dunk* are considered onomatopoeic inventions here, as the words are not listed in the dictionaries used. Onomatopoeic inventions do not easily integrate into grammar and grammatical rules, at least not without jeopardizing meaning, as they are not conventionalized. Examples are shown in 4.11.

Example 4.11

(1) I can really feel the *b-bmp*ing before I get on stage. (?)

(2a) Du kunne nesten høre at det *du-dunk*et. (?)

(2b) You could almost hear that it *du-dunk*ed. (?)

If the source text did not include correspondingly odd phrases, this kind of translation would be deemed unfavorable. The Japanese *dokidoki* can be paired with the verb "suru", meaning "do", which indicates that *dokidoki* is highly conventionalized in Japanese, as innovative onomatopoeias

---

[32]   Marks possessive.
[33]   Marks emphasis.

in Japanese are rarely used with "suru" (Yoshioka 2017). Going from *dokidoki* then, to the potential translations shown in Example 4.11, represents the transformation of a conventionalized onomatopoeia into a lesser conventionalized one. Which, although an onomatopoeic one, could be seen as a very different translation. It is thus not surprising that the translators chose to translate differently from the examples above, as the examples do not guarantee reader comprehension, while the Japanese sentences with *dokidoki* do.

The translators did, however, have other options than using onomatopoeic inventions if they wanted to translate with an onomatopoeia inside the speech bubbles. In the case of English, both "throbbing" and "thumping" are used to describe strong, regular heartbeats, and they are both considered onomatopoeic in form according to ORD. These words could easily be used in the translations of the phrases shown in 4.7 and 4.8, and this is illustrated in Example 4.12.

Example 4.12

Translation 4.7 → (e.g.) What makes my heart **throb** so fiercely?!

Translation 4.8 → (e.g.) I just hear the name and my heart goes **thumping**. I'm
                just weird.

It could be said that *throb* only points to the normal rhythm of the heart, however, adding the intensifying adverb *so fiercely* creates the image of a more nervous heart, which suits the context better. In translation 4.8, Flanagan used the verb *go*, a semantically 'light' verb which is often used to introduce onomatopoeic words in English (Feist 2013, 109).

(4.8, c) I just hear the name and my heart goes racing. I'm just weird.

This made it simple to insert *thumping*, but one could also argue that it made *racing* appear more onomatopoeic. Yet, it seems safe to assume that Flanagan deliberately made non-onomatopoeic translations a part of his style, as he translated 8 out of 8 integrated onomatopoeias with substitution. When it comes to the Norwegian translation alternative, Kurisaki-Sagberg could have used the straightforward verb "banke" (knock; beat) which is onomatopoeic in its origin according to SNO. However, similar to *throb* above, when "banke" is used to describe a heartbeat, it could give the impression of a normal one, unless one adds an intensifier. Examples with "banke" in the translations of 4.9 and 4.10 are given below.

Example 4.13

Translation 4.9 → (e.g.) Nei, ikke nødvendig det at hjertet ditt **banker** så ivrig,
Nana...

[No, it is not necessary that your heart beats this eagerly,
Nana...]

Translation 4.10 → (e.g.) Det var den jeg hadde på meg den kvelden på
konserten... Innerst inne **banket** hjertet mitt skikkelig.

[That was the one I was wearing that evening at the
concert... Deep inside my heart was really beating.]

Like Flanagan, Kurisaki-Sagberg translated none of the integrated onomatopoeias with an onomatopoeia (6 out of 6). Thus, in spite of the fact that the integrated onomatopoeias stood out as reduplicated words written in katakana, these two translators did not deem it necessary to carry over the onomatopoeic form in the translation of them. Røsåsen also follows this trend (with the exception of one case earlier shown in Example 4.3, which constitutes 1 out of 7 translations of the integrated onomatopoeia), and a proof of this is given in Example 4.14.

Example 4.14

(a) *keisatsu ga kita totan ni, anna ni **orooro** suru no wa hen da!!*

(b) police PTCL come.PST just.as PTCL that PTCL **orooro** do PTCL PTCL
strange COP

(c) ...De har virket nervøse og perplekse helt siden politiet dukket opp.

(d) ...They have seemed nervous and perplexed ever since the police showed up.

The Japanese *orooro* represents the state of being confused, worried, and not knowing what to do (TJMO). In English as well as Norwegian, there are no onomatopoeic equivalents, and it could be difficult to know where to start if one were to invent one. If *orooro* were to be transliterated, some explanation would be required somewhere, as Norwegian readers most likely would not grasp the meaning of the word if it were to stand by itself. The space for paraphrasing, however, might be

limited on a comic page where images need to take up space. Furthermore, not all translators are free to (or willing to) use a separate section as translation notes. So a transliteration could also require some effort. In such cases it might be more favorable for translators to translate with similar, non-onomatopoeic words; it would safeguard target audience comprehension, and save time for the translators. Røsåsen did in fact encounter several difficult, integrated onomatopeias in the manga paperback he translated, of which there are no onomatopoeic equivalents in Norwegian; like *deredere* (flirting; amorous), *jirojiro* (staring), and *banban* (relentlessly). So one could argue that he had reasonable grounds for translating with non-onomatopoeic words.

All of the translators in this study encountered integrated onomatopoeias difficult to translate as such, however, they also encountered integrated onomatopoeias that seem to have corresponding onomatopoeic words in English/Norwegian; which they were apt to translate in a non-onomatopoeic fashion. Kimura translated two integrated onomatopoeias as such, and Røsåsen one-, Flanagan and Kurisaki-Sagberg none. There could be several reasons to this. The low rate of onomatopoeic translations could be due to time limits, instructions from above/publisher/translation company, fear of low target audience comprehension/criticism of translation, or the individual translator's style, or a combination of these factors. It is not unusual for translators to have deadlines, and this could affect whether they take the time to find/invent TL onomatopoeias. Some translators might even receive directions from (e.g.) the publisher which discourages onomatopoeic translation. Even if the translator in question were free to do as he/she wants, there still exists an uncertainty regarding target audience comprehension. It is not unthinkable that translators are rather fastidious about their translations, and therefore they make sure that their sentences are easily understood and natural sounding. A risky translation could, after all, damage their reputation. In other words, translating into a language with low/lower frequency of onomatopoeias most likely entails few/fewer onomatopoeias in translation. It should also be noted that, in comics, what is written inside the speech bubbles could be seen as explanations to the drawn images, or, in other words, clarifications of the story. Comics do tell a lot of the story with only images, however, without the text written inside the speech bubbles the details become unclear. Thus, it becomes important to be as clear as possible in the text within the bubbles, so as to not accidentally deprive the readers of a proper understanding of the narrative. Hence, the translators might feel that they should refrain from experimenting with new-, or the only available low-frequency onomatopoeias in the translation of integrated onomatopoeias. If the translator in question had no restrictions, and also had a fairly common TL onomatopoeia available, the individual translator's style could have a say in whether to use it or not. If no corresponding TL onomatopoeia were available, and the

circumstances speak in favor of an invention, it could still be that the translator in question would not feel creative/comfortable enough to conduct that. In addition to all these factors, one could perhaps argue for an existing mentality which asserts that Japanese onomatopoeias are incomparable to the onomatopoeias of the target language of English/Norwegian, which presents the non-onomatopoeic translation as the only possible, 'correct' translation. In result, the non-onomatopoeic translation becomes the default.

4.2.3 Considering Substitutional Translations of the Holophrase-onomatopoeia

Contrary to its appeal with integrated onomatopoeias, the substitution method only constituted 0,5% of the 1615 holophrase-onomatopoeias (8 cases). A reason for this could be that the exterior holophrase-onomatopoeias are considered to not carry significant (enough) information when compared to the integrated onomatopoeias, so that the translators feel that they can take them more lightly and experiment with more risky, vague (onomatopoeic) translations. The image behind the onomatopoeic translation will also help steer the minds of the readers to the right semantic domain. Another reason could be a general notion which holds that the onomatopoeia is a convention of-, and therefore should be in-, the comic genre (Cartoons and comics "Features of comics" 2007). With this reasoning one would expect an onomatopoeic translation of a holophrase-onomatopoeia, something which makes the conducted translation of it with a substitution an interesting case. In the following, examples from substitutional translations of the holophrase-onomatopoeia will be given.

Kurisaki-Sagberg translated the most holophrase-onomatopoeias with another word other than an onomatopoeia, 4 cases all in all. Three of these are shown in Example 4.15 below.

Example 4.15
(1) *yoro* (stagger) translated with: sjangle [stagger]

(2) *kaaa* (blush) translated with: rødme [blush]

(3) *wakuwaku* (excited) translated with: gleder meg [looking forward to it]

The Japanese originals (1) and (2) qualify as gitaigo (imitation of visual/textural experience), while (3) qualifies as gijōgo (imitation of body-sensational/emotional experience). Norwegian does not contain many onomatopoeias of the gitaigo/gijōgo kind, and none to match the originals above. As Norwegians are not too familiar with the idea of visual/emotional experiences giving sounds by themselves, it could be difficult to make Norwegian readers understand the experience in question with an obviously invented- or transliterated onomatopoeia. Without additional explanation, it is highly likely that they would interpret it as an onomatopoeia of some empiric sound, as they are more familiar with. Here, Kurisaki-Sagberg saw it best to translate without onomatopoeias in order to accurately convey that states are being described, not empiric sound. If one really wanted to translate these onomatopoeic states with onomatopoeias, however, one could attempt at translating with empiric-sound onomatopoeias which could be interpreted as natural prerequisites or consequences of the listed states. For instance, instead of translating with *sjangle* [stagger], one could translate with "svisj", which could be seen as the Norwegian variant of the English onomatopoeia "swish"; to move with a hissing sound. *Yoro* imitates an unsteady walk which would sometimes include some abrupt movements making the air hiss.[34] "Surr(e)" [mess; confusion; lose control; humming; twirl; go round] is another onomatopoeic option (SNO), and based on the word's semantic repertoire, one could argue that it actually is a Norwegian example of an onomatopoeia representing state(s). Instead of *rødme* [blush], one could use onomatopoeias of heartbeats to represent the portrayed, flustered feeling, like *du-dunk* discussed earlier. As the TJMO describes *wakuwaku* as a sensation of trembling with joy, one could perhaps use the 'trembling' aspect in the Norwegian translation, and let the drawn image alone explain the 'joy' aspect. In Norwegian one finds "dirr(e)" [quiver; tremble], which is, actually, especially described as a 'motion-imitative' word by SNO. Thus, "dirr(e)" could be seen as another Norwegian example of an onomatopoeia representing state. The suggested translations may not qualify as obvious translations of the Japanese originals, however, they have maintained the onomatopoeic form. If it is true that holophrase-onomatopoeias are trivial in the narration of a comic, it might not be critical to deviate from their original content a little.

---

[34]　It should be noted, however, that the semantics of *yoro* also include the notion of "being sloppy/moving sloppily". Seen this way, *yoro* becomes a contrast to the more 'active' or 'effective' "svisj".

4.2.4 Summary

In this section, examples from translation category 1 were analyzed, and particular attention was given to the differing appeal of the category between the cases of integrated onomatopoeias and holophrase-onomatopoeias. While it was most common to translate the integrated onomatopoeia with a substitution, it was least common to translate the holophrase-onomatopoeia in such manner. It has been argued that this could be due to the importance of being as clear-cut as possible within speech bubbles, as they clarify the images in the comic, and the contrary expectation of (creative) onomatopoeias outside speech bubbles. It has also been mentioned that the lack of space in a comic restricts additional, explanatory paraphrasing of onomatopoeias, something which would suggest more onomatopoeic translations in regular literature (no images to take up space). However, as understood from Casas-Tost's study, this is not the case (the non-onomatopoeic translation categories taken together, category 1 of substitution, and category 2 of omission, constituted 57,9% in her study). In the next section, translation category 2 of omission will be considered.

4.3 Category 2: Omission of Source Text Onomatopoeia in the Target Text

Translation category 2 of omission turned out to be the third most common translation category, and the most common non-onomatopoeic translation category, in this study, with 282 out of 1644 onomatopoeias translated this way, thereby constituting 17,15%. However, most of these translations belong to Jens E. Røsåsen, the translator of *meitantei conan*, who translated 262 out of 299 onomatopoeias found in that manga in such manner. The categorization of the translations done by Røsåsen is given in Table 4.5 below.

Table 4.5: *Categorization of the 299 translations done by Røsåsen in meitantei conan/Mesterdetektiven Conan*

Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	7	2,34%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	262	87,63%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	8	2,68%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	22	7,36%
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	0	0%

It is evident that Røsåsen chose omission as the default translation method in the translation of the onomatopoeias found in *meitantei conan*. This decision could be made on the grounds that the discrepancies between the languages will be substantial and many, but it could also be the result of thinking pure convenience; when not translating onomatopoeias, one does not have to use time on finding a fitting translation, editing fonts, etc. As *meitantei conan* is a manga concerning a detective solving different cases, it could be that the (holophrase-) onomatopoeias were deemed irrelevant to the more important explaining and reasoning in these cases; taking place within the coherent text/speech bubbles. However, if the motive behind the omissions were pure convenience for the translator/publisher, and if the original purpose of translation did not take account of that, it could be argued that the overall translation has violated the principle of accuracy, which should have applied (see 3.2, 3.5). When reading through *Mesterdetektiven Conan*, one could actually end up a little confused, or at least understand that something is missing, as the Japanese onomatopoeia is still left in the Norwegian translation. It usually requires some amount of editing to completely remove the Japanese onomatopoeia in translation, as it often is atop the image, or drawn into it. All the manga translations considered in this study have Japanese onomatopoeias left on their pages, but in *Mesterdetektiven Conan* most of them are given no explanation, so it is easier to become

confused and question their meanings. The argument could also be made that there is something missing in a comic without onomatopoeias, especially if the original comic had them. An example can be drawn from a page where a woman is screaming in fear; *kyaaaa* in Japanese. The Japanese hiragana[35] characters for *kyaaaa* are left untouched, so the Norwegian readers will most likely understand that they explain or enhance the image in some way, or even that they constitute an onomatopoeia. However, as there is no explanation given in Norwegian, they can not be certain that the characters constitute an onomatopoeia of a scream. So it is not unlikely that the Norwegian readers only see a woman looking frightened, and not a woman screaming. A similar example is seen on a page where dogs are barking *gau gau gau* in Japanese, while the Norwegian equivalent of *voff voff voff* or *bjeff bjeff bjeff* (or anything else) is not given. The difference might not be of a significant nature, but one could claim that the translation would have become more accurate with a little more effort. Røsåsen did translate some onomatopoeias differently, 30 even in an onomatopoeic fashion, so one could wonder why he did not translate the scream and barks, which one perhaps would have expected. This speaks in favor of the motive being pure convenience, and not fear of target audience confusion.

Another evidence for the convenience theory can be found if one investigates the places where Røsåsen did include the onomatopoeia in translation. In many of these cases, the original, Japanese (holophrase-) onomatopoeia was given a tiny speech bubble of its own. For instance, the ringing of a phone was enveloped with a blank space typical of a comic speech bubble, possibly to draw more attention to the onomatopoeia. If Røsåsen had not included a translation within the speech bubble, it would have become even more evident that something was missing from the translation, as speech bubbles become pointless without something written inside. So one could claim that the onomatopoeic speech bubbles motivated his onomatopoeic translations. If he did not wish to translate these onomatopoeias, he could have removed the speech bubbles completely, but that would have required much more editing. It is more convenient to remove and add text within a blank space.

It should be noted that I was unable to confirm whether Røsåsen translated directly from Japanese, as the information about the translation and translator was limited. However, regardless of which language Røsåsen translated from, the Japanese origin is the same, and the argument suggesting a possible violation of the accuracy principle still applies. If Røsåsen did translate from another language than Japanese, then that could also be seen to violate accuracy; and as the readers are not

---

[35]   One of three Japanese alphabets.

made aware of this, the translation could be deemed unfair or unethical.

4.3.1 Omissions Conducted by the Other Translators

Omission was not a popular translation method amongst the other translators. Flanagan translated 12 out of 657 onomatopoeias with omission (1,83%), Kimura 2 out of 549 (0,36%), and Kurisaki-Sagberg 6 out of 139 (4,32%). In all of these cases, especially in Kimura's, it could be argued that the omissions are the result of the translator not noticing the Japanese original. Onomatopoeias in comics come in all forms and sizes, some are rather small on the paper, some might even be hard to distinguish from the background. For instance, Flanagan translated the Japanese onomatopoeia *gorogoro*, the rumble of a thunder, with omission. The onomatopoeia, however, was written with small, dark characters onto a dark background representing thunderclouds. Thus making it slightly difficult to notice. Moreover, Flanagan had already translated *gorogoro* with the invented *rmmbl rmmbl* some pages earlier. Flanagan's overall translation is filled with creative, onomatopoeic inventions (which will be discussed in section 4.5), so it would in fact be hard to prove that he deliberately translated with omissions. Amongst Kurisaki-Sagberg's omission cases, one finds *ahaha* (laughter), and *biku* (startled), onomatopoeias which he also had translated earlier, as a transliterated *ahaha*, and *kvepp* (startled), respectively. So there is reason to believe that these three translators translated with omissions as a mistake, at least in some cases.

4.3.2 Summary

Based on the examples given here, it was argued that the motivation behind Røsåsen's extensive use of the omission method could be convenience (regarding time, editing, etc.). One would have to use less time on a manga translation if one does not consider the many onomatopoeias often integrated in the images. However, as the Japanese characters often are left untouched in the translations, the decision to exclude their meanings could lead to target audience confusion. With other examples it was argued that Flanagan, Kimura, and Kurisaki-Sagberg unintentionally translated with omissions. Considering the possible target audience confusion that could arise as a consequence of not explaining remaining SL characters, and the editorial skill needed to remove these characters, one could claim that it is rather difficult to avoid onomatopoeic translations in the comic genre, at least when translating from a language like Japanese to European languages like English and Norwegian.

4.4 Category 3: Translation of Source Text Onomatopoeia Using a Target Language Onomatopoeia

Translation category 3 of translating with an existing TL onomatopoeia came in second to last when regarding popularity, with 197 out of 1644 onomatopoeias translated in this manner, making up 11,98%. The relatively few cases of category 3 translations could be due to the language discrepancies, but they may also be the result of the translators experimenting more (making inventions) with the majority of holophrase-onomatopoeias; as they are more or less explained by the images, and not considered as important as the integrated onomatopoeias (see 4.2.2, 4.2.3). There was, however, one translator who favored the translation method of category 3. Øyvind Kurisaki-Sagberg, the translator of *nana*, translated 65 out of 139 onomatopoeias with an existing TL onomatopoeia. This is shown in Table 4.6.

Table 4.6: *Categorization of the 139 translations done by Kurisaki-Sagberg in nana/Nana*

Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	10	7,19%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	6	4,32%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	65	46,76%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	56	40,29%
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	2	1,44%

Considering the discrepancy between Japanese and Norwegian when it comes to onomatopoeias, a question that arises is whether these category 3 translations would be considered the more or less obvious translations, or translations that deviate in semantics in order to maintain the onomatopoeic

form in translation. Another question that could be posed is whether the translations, which are semantically equal to the originals, are similar in form to the originals or not, because if they are, they might speak in favor of the onomatopoeia showing universal tendencies, as argued by Hinton, Nichols and Ohala (1994a, 8). First, I will investigate the semantic connections between the originals and the category 3 translations of them conducted by Kurisaki-Sagberg (4.4.1), and then I will look into the similarity of forms between the originals and Kurisaki-Sagberg's category 3 translations of them which are seen to correspond with the originals in semantic content (4.4.2). In the end, category 3 translations conducted by other translators will be considered.

4.4.1 Semantic Connections Between the Original Onomatopoeias and Kurisaki-Sagberg's Category 3 Translations of Them

Kurisaki-Sagberg translated the very first onomatopoeia one is met with in *nana* with a Norwegian TL onomatopoeia. This is shown in Example 4.16.

Example 4.16
shubo (igniting) translated with: **klikk** [click]

These onomatopoeias are found on a page illustrating a man lighting up a cigarette with a lighter. The Japanese onomatopoeia *shubo* is imitating the sound of a flame being lit, while the Norwegian *klikk* imitates the sound of a button or switch being operated. While both onomatopoeias imitate empiric sound, there is a discrepancy regarding which sound they are imitating, thus, there exists a semantic discrepancy. Both onomatopoeias could be seen as fitting to represent the lighter being operated, however, they are clearly distinguishable as *shubo* does not imitate a sharp sound of a button/switch being operatend, and *klikk* does not imitate any sound of a flame or fire. The translation with *klikk* could be seen to be the better option compared to the Norwegian onomatopoeia "gnistre" (of Old Norse origin according to SNO), often used to render the sound of shooting particles from a campfire. Although "gnistre" is associated with fire, it might be a little misleading to use in the context of a lighter, as a lighter generally does not shoot particles from its fire. In order to translate with a Norwegian TL onomatopoeia in this case, Kurisaki-Sagberg saw it best to deviate from the original semantics.

In *nana* the Japanese onomatopoeia *biku* (startled) appeared 4 times, but Kurisaki-Sagberg did not translate them all in the same way. This can be seen in Example 4.17 below.

Example 4.17

(1) ***biku*** (startled) translated with: **gulp** [swallow audibly]

(2) ***biku*** translated with: (translation category 2: omission)

(3) ***biku*** translated with: **kvepp** [startled; horrified]

(4) ***biku*** translated with: **gulp**

The Japanese *biku* imitates a felt, sudden surprise, often with an accompanying jerking reaction. Kurisaki-Sagberg translated the first *biku* with *gulp*, an onomatopoeia imitating the sound of a heavy swallow. In Norwegian, everyday speech, *gulp* or *gulping* actually denotes regurgitation. However, in Norwegian comics, *gulp* is more likely to imitate a heavy swallow, often as a sign of nervousness. In two out of four cases, Kurisaki-Sagberg saw it best to translate the 'surprised' *biku* with the 'nervous' *gulp*. Needless to say, the surprised jolt of *biku* and the nervous swallowing of *gulp* are not equal in content. Kurisaki-Sagberg might have translated with the semantically deviating *gulp* in order to use a highly frequent, Norwegian onomatopoeia. Compared with *kvepp*, which is very similar to *biku* in semantic content, *gulp* is more frequently used, as *kvepp/kveppe* could be considered a Norwegian dialect word (SNO). One could interpret the omission-translation of *biku* as an(other) indicator of Kurisaki-Sagberg's uncertainty regarding the proper translation, and in this case he chose to omit it. However, it could also be that he simply did not notice the original onomatopoeia during the translation process.

Near the end of *nana*, Kurisaki-Sagberg chose to translate the Japanese gijōgo *wakuwaku* (excited) with a reduplicated *glitre* (sparkle). This is shown in Example 4.18.

Example 4.18

wakuwaku (excited) translated with: **glitre glitre** [sparkle sparkle]

According to SNO, *glitre* is derived from Old Norse, and not considered an onomatopoeia. However, as the word is reduplicated, and considered a holophrase in this study (the phrase is excluded from coherent text), it qualifies as an onomatopoeia here. In addition, one may argue that *glitre* contains sound symbolism, as the word begins with the consonants [gl], and has semantic content which describes 'light' (see 2.1). In English, one can find a pattern in words with semantic

content describing 'light', as many of them begin with the consonant cluster [gl] (e.g., glitter, glow, glimmer, gleam, glint, etc.) (Sasamoto and Jackson 2016, 37). This phenomenon could be said to exist in Norwegian as well, as Norwegian and English are related languages (Norwegian: glitter, glød, glimmer, glimt). The word *glitre* denotes flashes of light, and as flashes of light do not make empiric sound, *glitre* can be considered a Norwegian gitaigo. The Japanese *wakuwaku*, however, is a gijōgo: it imitates an emotional aspect of excitement, and not a visual aspect of light flashing. So there is a semantic gap between the original onomatopoeia and the onomatopoeic translation. As mentioned in 4.2.3, there is no exact equivalent for *wakuwaku* in Norwegian, so it is inevitable that a Norwegian TL onomatopoeia used to translate it will deviate somewhat in semantic content. Kurisaki-Sagberg chose to render the emotional, joyful excitement in translation with a visual image of flashing light. This might not be a vague translation, as 'light' is often used as a metaphor/description of joy or happiness. This can be seen in one of the example phrases given under the *glitre* entry in SNO: "være glitrende glad" [be sparklingly happy]. Under the *sparkle* entry in the English ORD one finds explanations such as: "liveliness". Thus, it could be argued that Kurisaki-Sagberg translated the notion of joy/happiness from the semantic field of emotion into the semantic field of visibility; in order to translate with a suitable TL onomatopoeia. It should also be noted that in the image where *wakuwaku* is written, tiny stars are drawn around the excited character's head. Hence making it more natural to translate with something denoting light, such as *glitre*.

There are some translations which could be understood as equals to the original onomatopoeias appearing in *nana*. Three of these are given in Example 4.19 below.

> Example 4.19
> (1) **gi** (creak) translated with: **knirk** [creak]
> (2) **chu** (smooch) translated with: **smask** [smooch]
> (3) **konkon** (knock knock) translated with: **bank bank** [knock knock]

All of the Japanese originals here are onomatopoeias imitating empiric sound, likewise are the Norwegian translations. And within each pair, the onomatopoeias seem to imitate the same type of sound. Most of the semantic matches between the Japanese originals and the Norwegian translations result from onomatopoeias imitating empiric sound. This is not surprising, as Norwegian is lacking most of the gitaigo and gijōgo found in Japanese. While it has been shown here that Japanese originals of both the giongo- (imitation of auditory experience) and

gitaigo/gijōgo type could cause difficulties in an onomatopoeic translation into Norwegian, it is the giongo that is most likely to be translated with little or no modification in semantic content; as Norwegian has similar/equal (giongo) onomatopoeias. In the next section, Japanese and Norwegian onomatopoeias with similar, semantic content (taken from the data of *nana* and Kurisaki-Sagberg's translation of it) will be compared in order to examine the similarity of the word forms. If it is not only the semantic content that is similar, but also the word form between a Japanese- and a Norwegian onomatopoeia, one could argue that the onomatopoeia is more or less universal in its form.

4.4.2 The Similarity of Form Between the Original Onomatopoeias and Kurisaki-Sagberg's Category 3 Translations of Them Similar in Semantic Content

In Example 4.19, three original onomatopoeias and their corresponding translations conducted by Kurisaki-Sagberg – which were seen to match with the originals in semantic content, were given. These pairs will now be examined in order to evaluate the similarity of their word forms. I will start with Example 4.19 (1), rendered as Example 4.20 below.

Example 4.20
gi (creak) translated with: **knirk** [creak]

At first glance, it does not look like the words have much in common except for the semantics. The Japanese *gi* [gi] is made out of two phonemes, the Norwegian *knirk* [kniɾk] five. While *gi* begins with a single consonant [g], *knirk* begins with [kn]. Japanese *gi* has a continuing 'feel' to it, as it ends with an open airflow of the vowel [i]; and it is also common to prolong this [i] (TJMO). Norwegian *knirk* on the other hand, ends abruptly with the stop [k], terminating the word with a small burst of air. It is not a difficult matter to distinguish the words, however, resemblances could also be observed. Both words begin with a velar plosive/stop [g, k], it is voiced in *gi* [g], but not in *knirk* [k]. The introduction of the word with a burst of air could be seen to give the word some power, possibly to imitate the semantics of: "dull, heavy sound" (Ibid.), which is often associated with the rubbing of wood (Ibid., SNO). The stop could also be motivated by the accompanying semantics (of the whole word; *gi/knirk*) of something not running smoothly (ORD, SNO). The stop completely blocks the airstream from the vocal tract, and is thus imitative in both sound and movement. It could be that the respective initial stops are motivated by the same idea. Apart from

the initial stops, the words also resemble each other in the only vocal they contain, [i]. According to Ohala's Frequency Code theory of 1984, high tones, as [i], are linked with: "high-frequency sounds, small size, sharpness, and rapid movement" (Hinton, Nichols and Ohala 1994a, 10). Hakī, in explaining the symbolism of the vowel [i] in Japanese, lists similar keywords (2017, 59). Creaking can be understood as a sharp, high-frequency sound according to SNO and ORD. Accordingly, the [i] could also be seen to be motivated by the same idea – in different languages. The Japanese *gi* and the Norwegian *knirk* are clearly distinguishable, so they may not qualify as proof of the onomatopoeia being universal. However, when one lowers the level from onomatopoeia to sound symbolism, one could argue for universal uses of phonemes or phoneme clusters.

Example 4.19 (2) is rendered as Example 4.21 under.

Example 4.21
chu (smooch) translated with: **smask** [smooch]

The Japanese *chu* [ʨɯ] is made out of two phonemes, while the Norwegian *smask* [smɑsk] is made out of five. A voiceless affricate (stop followed by a fricative) [ʨ] marks the beginning of *chu*, while a pure fricative [s] is initial in *smask*. The *chu* ends with an open airflow of [ɯ], however, contrasted with *gi* above, the [ɯ] in *chu* is generally not prolonged (TJMO). Norwegian *smask* ends abruptly with a stop [k]. The only vowel in *chu* [ɯ] is an unrounded, close, back vowel, while the only vowel in *smask* [ɑ] is an unrounded, open, back vowel. These word forms do not resemble each other much. What can be said is that both words contain an unrounded, back vowel, and that they both display fricative features. The fricatives could be taken to imitate the hiss of air moving rapidly as in suction, which could be a part of the kissing act. Again, similarities can only be found at the sound symbolism level, and in this case they might not be convincing enough.

The last component of Example 4.19 is rendered as Example 4.22 below.

Example 4.22
konkon (knock knock) translated with: **bank bank** [knock knock]

The Japanese *konkon* could be seen as a reduplicated *kon* (knock), and the Norwegian *bank bank* a reduplicated *bank* [knock]. Therefore, only the first constituent in the words will be considered. The Japanese *kon* [koN] is composed of three phonemes, and the Norwegian *bank* [bɑnk] four. The *kon* begins with a voiceless, velar stop [k], while the *bank* is initiated by a voiced, bilabial stop [b]. The following vowel is a rounded, close-mid, back vowel [o] in *kon*, and an unrounded, open, back vowel [ɑ] in *bank*. The following consonant is a uvular nasal [N] in *kon*, and an alveolar nasal [n] in *bank*. The Japanese *kon* ends with the nasal, while the Norwegian *bank* adds a velar stop [k] at the end. The similarities can be summed up as follows: both words begin with a stop, both words contain a following back vowel, and both words have a nasal following the vowel. The stop [k] is also present in both words, but placed first in *kon* and last in *bank*. The words are clearly distinguishable, yet, they share several similarities. In discussing the universality of the onomatopoeia, Assaneo, Nichols and Trevisan actually mention that the onomatopoeias for the act of knocking are relatively equal around the world (2011, 5). Apparently, the phonemes /k/, /o/, and /u/ are frequently used in these onomatopoeias (Ibid.). The /k/ and /o/ are found in the Japanese *kon*, while only /k/ is found in the Norwegian *bank*. However, /o/ and /u/ are both back vowels, together with [ɑ], so if the back-quality of the frequent vowels is highlighted the Norwegian *bank* also becomes more of a proof of universality in onomatopoeias. The act of knocking entails the deliberate attempt at receiving another individual's attention through abrupt and relatively loud sound. In this regard it becomes plausible to use a stop, like /k/, as its abrupt nature fits with the abrupt act of knocking. Low tones, like the back vowels listed above, are often associated with low-frequency sounds, and heavy, dull movements (Hinton, Nichols and Ohala 1994a, 10), which could be interpreted to fit the act of knocking. Even though *kon* and *bank* are distinguishable, they are also similar in several ways. If not a proof of universal tendencies in the onomatopoeia, they could serve as an argument in in the advocacy of universalism in sound symbolism.

The universalism of the onomatopoeia was considered briefly in this section. Rather than being the whole onomatopoeia that shows universal tendencies, it is its certain parts/features that seem more likely to reappear across language borders. It is the sound symbolism that is sometimes recognizable, and not so much the onomatopoeia. In the next section, translations with a TL onomatopoeia conducted by the other translators will be considered.

4.4.3 Translations With a Target Language Onomatopoeia Conducted by the Other Translators

The other translators in this study have not translated much with TL onomatopoeias, however, some cases are to be found. One of these is a translation conducted by Flanagan, the English translator of *bishōjosenshi sērāmūn*. The translation is shown in Example 4.23.

Example 4.23

baribari (ripping) translated with: **scratch scratch**

The entry for *baribari* in TJMO explains that it is: "said of the manner of ripping or stripping something rather thick or the associated sound". The Japanese *baribari* could thus be interpreted both as a gitaigo and a giongo. The entry for the English, single *scratch* in ORD goes as follows: "to make a shallow mark or wound on (a surface) with something sharp". The *scratch* in ORD is said to be of an unknown origin, but in this study it is considered an onomatopoeia. However, it is hard to determine whether *scratch* is an onomatopoeia imitating manner (sound), or empiric sound. As can be understood from the two entries above, the semantic content of the two onomatopoeias deviate somewhat from each other. The *baribari* is frequently used in the manga to accompany the image of a cat fervently waving its paws in the grip of a human, thus ripping the human's clothes, and scratching the human's skin or face. So both of the semantics above could be seen to fit the situation. The strings of phonemes are different, but this could partly be due to different semantics.

Another case of a translation with a TL onomatopoeia is found in Flanagan's work. This one is shown in Example 4.24.

Example 4.24

tobotobo (plodding) translated with: **plod plod**

The TJMO explains *tobotobo* with: "to plod along; to trudge along (said of a walk which gives the impression that one is tired.)". Thus, the English translation here could be argued to be the most appropriate one.[36] The TJMO mentions the additional aspect of 'being tired' under the *tobotobo* entry, while the ORD adds the extra notion of 'working slowly' under the *plod* entry there. If not a perfect semantic match, there is a strong resemblance between the original onomatopoeia and the

---

[36] The entry for *plod* in ORD describes it as onomatopoeic.

onomatopoeia used in the translation. The *tobo* and *plod* are easily distinguished, however, similarities can be found. Both *tobo* and *plod* contain four phonemes. Also, both words begin with a stop. In *tobo* [tobo], the stop [t] is an unvoiced, alveolar one. In *plod* [plɔd], the stop [p] is an unvoiced, bilabial one. The following sound is the rounded, close-mid, back vowel [o] in *tobo*, and the alveolar, lateral approximant [l] in *plod*. The vowel in *plod* [ɔ], is a rounded, open-mid, back vowel, and it follows the [l]. The vowels in both words are back vowels, and they are both pronounced with a rounding of the lips. In *tobo*, the consonant that follows the vowel is a voiced, bilabial stop [b]. The consonant that follows the vowel in *plod* is [d], a voiced, alveolar stop. Thus, both of the consonants directly following the vowel in their respective words are voiced stops. No sound/phoneme is added after the [d] in *plod*, while the vowel [o] is repeated after the [b] in *tobo*. The [o] could symbolize heaviness (Hakī 2017, 59), however, the final [o] in *tobo* could also be regarded as more of a phonological rule than a genuine imitation, as the Japanese syllabary does not allow words to end with a stop like [b]. If one removes the final [o] in *tobo*, or at least consider it silent in the pronunciation of the word, the original onomatopoeia and its translation become similar in sound.

Example 4.25
original: **tob(o)** [tob]
translation: **plod** [plɔd]

The combination of a vowel with low pitch [o, ɔ] together with a following voiced stop [b, d] creates the image of something heavy and/or slow/dull when it comes to movement, according to the sound symbolism theory (Hinton, Nichols and Ohala 1994a, 10; Feist 2013, 112; Hakī 2017, 59). This sound symbolism seems to fit the semantics of the words, and the argument could be made that the onomatopoeias for the act of plodding in the world's languages contain universal sound symbolism. To test this within the scope of this thesis, the Norwegian word for plodding, *traske*, could be compared to the pair above.

Example 4.26
Japanese: **tob(o)** [tob]
English: **plod** [plɔd]
Norwegian: **traske** [trɑskɛ]

According to SNO, the Norwegian verb *traske* contains the meaning of walking with slow, heavy steps, which seems to fit the semantics of the preceding pair. It is also considered onomatopoeic in its origin, however, it does look dissimilar to the preceding pair at first glance. The word *traske* begins with a burst of air, like the preceding pair, in its use of the stop [t]. Then a flap [ɾ] follows. The first vowel of the word is the unrounded, open, back vowel [ɑ], and this is followed by the unvoiced, alveolar fricative [s], and then the unvoiced, velar stop [k]. The word ends with another vowel, the unrounded, open-mid, front vowel [ɛ]. However, the final [ɛ] is a suffix marking the infinitive of a verb in Norwegian, so it is highly likely that it does not carry any imitative function. Like with the case of *tobo* above, the final vowel of the word will not be considered in this analysis. The three words will be compared on the basis of the forms shown in Example 4.27.

Example 4.27
Japanese: **tob** [tob]
English: **plod** [plɔd]
Norwegian: **trask** [tɾɑsk]

Like mentioned above, *trask* has the initial stop in common with the other words. The stop could be used as an intensifier (Feist 2013, 112), perhaps in order to imitate the feeling that much effort is needed when one is tired and walking. The second similarity amongst the the three words is the use of a back vowel. In *trask*, however, the vowel is unrounded, and makes the word sound different from *tob* and *plod* with rounded vowels. Like discussed above, the back-feature of the vowels could be seen to symbolize heavy, slow movements, something which fits with the semantics of all three words. The *trask* distinguishes itself from the other words with the following unvoiced, alveolar fricative [s]. However, Feist argues that the continuing hissing-sound of the fricative [s] is a feature of it that could symbolize slowness (Ibid.). Thus, the fricative [s] could also be seen to fit the semantics.[37] Yet, as [s] is not included in all three words, it becomes an argument against universality. All of the words end with a stop, but the final stop in *trask* is unvoiced. Sasamoto and Jackson argue that the unvoiced counterparts could trigger an idea of clarity (2016, 45), something which may not fit the semantics discussed here. Similarities can be found amongst all three words, but differences are also obvious. In this case the Japanese and English onomatopoeias seemed to suggest some universality in form, however, the addition of the Norwegian onomatopoeia seemed to debunk the universality.

---

[37]   In Japanese, the [s] -sound could evoke ideas of "smoothness", "lightweight", and "small" (Hakī 2017).

Translator Kimura also translated with a few category 3 translations. A translation of hers that is bordering between a category 3 translation with a TL onomatopoeia and a category 5 translation with a transliteration is shown in Example 4.28 below.

Example 4.28
hahaha (laughing) translated with: **hahaha**

Both onomatopoeias imitate laughter, and according to the example they share the exact same form. Thus, the example could be understood as a case of a translation with a transliteration. However, this example has been considered a translation with a TL onomatopoeia, as the *hahaha* -sequence is often used to imitate laughter in English as well, and as the Japanese original actually includes a glottal stop [ʔ] at the end [hahahaʔ], an abrupt end to the final vowel, which is not indicated in the English translation.[38] Except from the glottal stop in the Japanese original, and the fact that the Japanese "a" often is pronounced with the central part of the tongue [a], while the English "a" is pronounced with the back of the tongue [ɑ], the two onomatopoeias markedly resemble each other. For comparison, *hahaha* [hɑhɑhɑ] is also used to imitate laughter in Norwegian. Thus, the *hahaha* -sequence seems to show a universal tendency. The idea that the onomatopoeias for laughter in the world's languages resemble one another might not be hard to swallow, as laughter is a common, impulsive, human reaction. When one is laughing aloud, the jaw is markedly lowered and a resulting "a" -sound is heard. Air being noisily pushed through the glottis is also a common feature, resulting in a [h] -sound.

Another example of Kimura's category 3 translations is given in Example 4.29.

Example 4.29
kunya (to bend once suddenly) translated with: **flop**

The Japanese *kunya* is described as a sudden bending (TJMO), while the English *flop* is described as follows in ORD: "to fall or sit etc. (down) suddenly, awkwardly, or with a slight thud." and/or with "to hang or sway limply or heavily." Thus, there is some deviation in the semantics, however, to fall or sit could entail a bending body, and both entries mention the aspect of something happening "suddenly". Kimura could have translated with "bend" instead of *flop*, however, "bend"

---

38   The original Japanese writing was: "ハハハッ", where "ハ" is [ha] and " ッ " (small *tsu*) is the glottal stop [ʔ]. There is no standard way of rendering the word-final " ッ " (glottal stop) in English.

is not considered an onomatopoeia according to ORD. The entry for *flop* does not list the imitative feature, but it is considered a variation of "flap", which is considered an onomatopoeia. Hence, *flop* might sound more onomatopoeic than (an onomatopoeic use of) "bend". In spite of somewhat similiar semantics, the strings of sounds/phonemes in the two words are considerably different. The *kunya* [kɯnja] begins with an unvoiced, velar stop [k], and this is followed by the unrounded, close, back vowel [ɯ]. In *flop* [flɒp], the unvoiced, labiodental fricative [f] comes first, and a second consonant, the alveolar, lateral approximant [l], follows. The first and only vowel in *flop* is the rounded, open, back vowel [ɒ]. This vowel is followed by the final phoneme in the word, the unvoiced, bilabial stop [p]. In *kunya*, the [ɯ] is followed by the alveolar nasal [n], and the nasal is in turn followed by the palatal approximant [j]. The *kunya* ends with another vowel, the unrounded, open, central [a]. Thus, there is not much to say about the similarities of the words, one similarity is that both words contain a back vowel.

4.4.4 Summary

What has been observed is that there are multiple cases where the TL onomatopoeia deviates from the semantics of the Japanese, original onomatopoeia. This is as expected, as Japanese has a wider repertoire of onomatopoeias. Where a translation (with a TL onomatopoeia) seems to contain similar semantics to that of the Japanese original, both the original and the translation are usually onomatopoeias imitating empiric sound. This is also no surprise, as most of the onomatopoeias found in English and Norwegian are onomatopoeias imitating empiric sound. Original onomatopoeias and their category 3 translations with similar semantic content were compared in order to investigate the similarity of their word forms. If the word forms also were similar, this could speak in favor of the onomatopoeia being universal. However, none of the onomatopoeias in the discussed onomatopoeia-pairs were completely equal to one another, and there were many dissimilarities. As the word forms are different, one must scrutinize the similarity of the individual sounds/phonemes that the words are composed of, and if some sounds/phonemes share a/several feature(s), check whether this/these feature(s) has/have an established sound symbolic meaning that could match the semantics of the whole onomatopoeia, in order to properly evaluate the universality of the onomatopoeia in question. According to the examined examples above, it is the sound symbolism (that constitutes a part of the whole onomatopoeia) that suggests universal tendencies, and not so much the whole onomatopoeia. Yet, in some of the cases above, neither an equal onomatopoeic form nor apparent sound symbolism was found. In section 4.5, onomatopoeic

inventions will be considered. The word forms of the onomatopoeic inventions used in translation will give a broader perspective on the universality of both the whole onomatopoeia, and sound symbolism.

4.5 Category 4: Translation of Source Text Onomatopoeia Using an Invented Target Language Onomatopoeia

Translation category 4 of onomatopoeic invention turned out to be the most favorable translation method in this study. 634 out of 1644 onomatopoeias were translated in this manner, constituting 38,56%. William Flanagan, the translator of *bishōjosenshi sērāmūn*, made the category 4 translation method his style, and translated most of the onomatopoeias he found with an invention. This is shown in Table 4.7 below.

Table 4.7: *Categorization of the 657 translations done by Flanagan in bishōjosenshi sērāmūn/Pretty Guardian Sailor Moon*

Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	11	1,67%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	12	1,83%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	112	17,05%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	459	69,86%
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	63	9,59%

Out of the four translators considered in this study, Flanagan had to translate the most onomatopoeias. As the *bishōjosenshi sērāmūn* paperback originally contains 657 onomatopoeias spread across 183 pages, one could argue that the onomatopoeias constitute a significant part of the comic (roughly 4 onomatopoeias a page). Knowing this, Flanagan might have deemed it important to maintain the onomatopoeia in translation. And, as Japanese onomatopoeias often do not translate easily into English, he saw it best to translate with his own inventions. The inventions, however, only take the place of original holophrase-onomatopoeias; none of the original, integrated onomatopoeias were translated with an invention. If the translator is confident in his/her onomatopoeic invention-skill, it could be less time consuming to invent onomatopoeias on the spot, compared to finding the right TL onomatopoeias. As most of the manga onomatopoeias accompany an image in order to give further details about the depicted event, an invented onomatopoeia could be understood by the readers just as well as an established onomatopoeia, because the image gives a context to interpret the invented onomatopoeia in. Thus, the invention method could prove handy in comic translation, especially in cases where the original onomatopoeia is considered an invention as well.

As the onomatopoeic invention is made in translation to create a TL equivalent, it could be understood to contain the same semantic content as the original. What is interesting to find out, however, is how the translator in question has made the form of the invention similar/dissimilar to that of the original. To what extent must the translator change the word form of the original onomatopoeia to make it recognizable to the English/Norwegian audience? In the following, chosen examples of translations with an onomatopoeic invention will be considered, starting with Flanagan's translations.

4.5.1 The Similarity of Form Between the Japanese Originals and Flanagan's Category 4 Translations of Them

Flanagan's onomatopoeic inventions are many, and, considering the phonological rules of English, rather creative in form. This can be seen from Example 4.30, rendering the first onomatopoeia one is met with in his translation.

Example 4.30
gaba (stand/jump up suddenly) translated with: **mph gam**

The Japanese original, *gaba*, is a gitaigo imitating the body movement: "to suddenly stand up with force, to jump up from a lying position." (TJMO). The *gaba* is written over the protagonist jumping up from the lying position in bed, realizing she is late for school. Lacking an established, English equivalent, Flanagan invented *mph gam* to translate with. It seems like Flanagan divided his onomatopoeic invention into two parts in order to make it comply with the Japanese characters left untouched, which also look divided due to the protagonist's head popping up between the が*ga* and the ばっ*ba*. The *gaba* [gabaʔ] is constituted of a voiced, velar stop [g], an unrounded, open, central vowel [a], a voiced, bilabial stop [b], another [a], and a final glottal stop [ʔ]. The *mph gam* could have different pronunciations. It could be pronounced [mfgɑm] if the *ph* -section in *mph* is to be understood as an unvoiced, labiodental fricative [f], as it conventionally is in English. However, it could also be that the *ph* is pronounced as the unvoiced, bilabial stop [p], with extra aspiration in its pronunciation, thus constituting [pʰ]. The whole pronunciation of the word would then be [mpʰgɑm]. Assuming that Flanagan straightforwardly would have used the English phoneme /f/ if he wanted the fricative in his onomatopoeic invention, instead of resorting to the conventional *ph*, it is the latter pronunciation [mpʰgɑm] that will be considered here. The *mph gam* [mpʰgɑm] consists of the bilabial nasal [m], the aspirated, unvoiced, bilabial stop [pʰ], the voiced, velar stop [g], the unrounded, open, back vowel [ɑ], and once again the nasal [m]. The word forms are obviously different. However, a pair of stops is found in both words, [g, b] in *gaba* and [pʰ, g] in *mph gam*, which in the sound symbolism theory could describe abrupt actions. It is not easy to pinpoint the motivation behind the double usage of the continuant, "flowing" [m] in *mph gam* (which could be seen to contrast with the original semantics of "sudden/abrupt"), but as the English readers are guided by the accompanying image, they will probably understand *mph gam* as an onomatopoeia emphasizing a sudden/abrupt situation. However, they will most likely see it as an onomatopoeia of a sudden/abrupt, empiric sound (giongo), instead of a gitaigo.

Another invention of Flanagan is shown in Example 4.31.

Example 4.31
guuuu (rumbling of stomach) translated with: **rummbl**

Here, Flanagan has altered the established, English onomatopoeia: "rumble" (ORD). The Japanese *guuuu* can be seen as a variation of "guuguu" (sound of rumbling stomach) (TJMO). The original author might have wanted to describe one long rumble (contrasted with continuing rumbling), and

therefore used a single, prolonged *guuuu*. Flanagan might have wanted to render these features, and thus added to "rumble" an extra nasal [m] for prolongation, and removed the final orthographic "e" (not pronounced) for the sense of an abrupt ending to the sound. Flanagan's *rummbl* [ɹʌmːbl] is composed of the alveolar approximant [ɹ], the unrounded, open-mid, back vowel [ʌ], a prolonged, bilabial nasal [mː], the voiced, bilabial stop [b], and the alveolar, lateral approximant [l]. The Japanese *guuuu* [gɯːʔ] consists of the voiced, velar stop [g], a prolonged, unrounded, close, back vowel [ɯː], and a final glottal stop [ʔ]. Also here the word forms are rather different. Both word forms do contain a single, unrounded, back vowel, however. In *guuuu*, it is this back vowel [ɯ] that is prolonged, while in *rummbl*, it is the nasal [m]. One could argue that Flanagan in truth translated with the established TL onomatopoeia "rumble", and only made slight alterations, and that if he were to make an onomatopoeic invention from scratch in the translation, it could have been more similar in form to the Japanese *guuuu*. Basing his onomatopoeic invention on "rumble" however, makes it easier for the English audience to comprehend the onomatopoeia, as "rumble" is a conventionalized word in English. Flanagan has made use of this kind of method multiple times in his translation, also with non-onomatopoeic words, as can be observed below.

> Example 4.32
> *chuu* (slurping/sucking) translated with **sipp**

While *sipp* is not found in ORD, "sip" is, and contains the meaning of: "to drink in repeated small mouthfuls or spoonfuls." The word "sip" is not considered an onomatopoeia in ORD, however, one could perhaps argue that with orthographic and/or phonetic adjustments, an originally non-onomatopoeic word could function as an onomatopoeia. Adding the extra "p" at the end of the word does not change the word form considerably, and desirably the semantic content of "sip" is left unharmed. At the same time, the additional letter could give the impression that the action is prolonged, or more intense, thus it becomes imitative. Hence, making adjustments to an already established word in order to make it function as an onomatopoeia (or more onomatopoeic) could be a useful method if the target language contains a word or words with the right semantic content, but lacks the onomatopoeic form.

One more example from Flanagan's translations is shown in Example 4.33.

> Example 4.33
> *to* (cat landing on its paws) translated with: **tp**

The Japanese *to* is not listed in the TJMO, and could be regarded as an onomatopoeic invention. The *to* is accompanying the image of a cat landing on its paws after a high jump. The *to* [to] is constituted of the unvoiced, alveolar stop [t], and the rounded, close-mid, back vowel [o]. Flanagan's translation *tp* [tp] is a consonant cluster that is phonologically illegal in English, consisting of the stop [t], followed by the unvoiced, bilabial stop [p]. Both words consist of only two phonemes, and they both begin with the stop [t]. The sudden/abrupt nature of the stop could seem to fit the sudden landing of the cat. The cat is, however, not 'heavy', so additional voicing of the stop ([t] becoming [d]), which would imitate more weight (Hakī 2017), is not needed here. In the Japanese *to*, the stop is followed by the vowel [o], which could trigger a couple of fitting images like large size (which perhaps could correlate to the notion 'big impact' [of landing]), and softness (of the cat) (Hinton, Nichols and Ohala 1994a, 10). However, as mentioned earlier, the vowel could also be seen as a phonological necessity, as the Japanese syllabary does neither allow word-final stops (except for the glottal stop [ʔ]) nor the rendering of a single consonant (except for /n/m/). So if one considers the [o] more or less silent, or trivial, it is only the [p] in *tp* that separates the words from each other. Flanagan could have felt that the word needed another (different) letter/phoneme in order to distinguish his onomatopoeic invention from a mere letter "t". The choice then, fell upon another voiceless stop [p], which could be seen to trigger the same images as [t], only with more intensity as it is bilabial instead of alveolar (Feist 2013, 112).

While some similarities can be observed when disassembling the onomatopoeias and comparing their constituents' sound symbolic features, three out of four of Flanagan's onomatopoeic inventions discussed here had more than one segment separating it from the Japanese original.[39] It was noted that he sometimes makes use of a method that alters the word form of an established, English word (normal word or onomatopoeic) with suitable semantic content in his creation of an onomatopoeic invention. As understood from sections 4.4.2 and 4.4.3, translations with an established TL onomatopoeia generally seemed to differ in form from their originals, so it comes as no surpise that onomatopoeic inventions based on an established TL word differ from the originals here. In the next section, chosen inventions of the other translators will be considered.

---

[39]   When no segment is seen to distinguish the onomatopoeia used in translation from the original onomatopoeia it will be considered a transliteration.

4.5.2 Category 4 Translations Conducted by the Other Translators

Translator Kimura has also translated with some onomatopoeic inventions. One of these is shown in Example 4.34.

> Example 4.34
> ***nya*** (meow) translated with: **meooow**

The Japanese *nya* [ɲa] could be seen as a short version of a cat's meow (TJMO). Kimura has used the English TL onomatopoeia "meow" [mɪaʊ] as a foundation in her translation, and prolonged it so that [mɪaːʊ] is formed. It is not easy to ascertain why she prolonged the "meow" in the translation of the relatively short *nya*, but this is something she has done consistently with following *nya*-words as well. Perhaps she wanted to emphasize the persistent noise of the cat in translation. The two words have several similarities. Both words begin with a nasal, contain the unrounded, open, central vowel [a], and end with a vowel. However, rather than saying that it is Kimura's creation that shares traits with the Japanese original, it is the English TL onomatopoeia that somewhat resembles the *nya*.

Kimura maintains the tradition of altering a TL word in the creation of an onomatopoeic invention, as can be observed below.

> Example 4.35
> ***gohon*** (cough loudly) translated with: **koff**

The Japanese *gohon* [gohoNʔ] could be understood as a single, loud cough (TJMO). After the uvular nasal [N], a glottal stop [ʔ] is added to emphasize an abrupt ending. Kimura has chosen to translate this with *koff* [kɒfː], which is mostly an orthographic variation of "cough" [kɒf]. The "cough" is considered an English onomatopoeia (ORD), however, as the Japanese original imitates a loud cough, Kimura might have wanted to render this loudness in an alternative spelling of the word, which could be interpreted as more direct ("k" instead of "c" to represent the [k] segment, and "ff" instead of "(u)gh" to represent the [f] segment).[40] What can be said of both words is that they are composed of consonants and vowels pronounced far back in the mouth (except for the

---

[40]　In Japanese, one can separate between what one would consider a lighter coughing, "こんこん　*konkon*", and a louder coughing, "ごほんごほん　*gohongohon*". The same distinction is not found in English.

unvoiced, labiodental fricative [f] in [kɒfː]). This might not be random, as the onomatopoeias imitate the spontaneous, human noise of ejecting air or other matter from the lungs. Again, it is the TL onomatopoeia that resembles the Japanese original in this way, and not so much the translator's "invention".

Kurisaki-Sagberg is another translator who made use of onomatopoeic inventions. This is shown below.

Example 4.36
babababa (sound of car engine) translated with: **brrmbrrm**

The Japanese onomatopoeia can be considered an invention, as its entry is nonexistent in the TJMO. This invention accompanies the image of a car standing still, and therefore it is likely that it imitates a car engine starting up (as the car is seen moving in a following image). The Norwegian translation is an invention as well, however, it is influenced by the more standard version "bro(o)m", which is often used to imitate the sound of car engines in Norwegian. The Japanese invention consists of a four-times multiplied *ba* [ba], a voiced, bilabial stop [b], and an unrounded, open, central vowel [a]. The Norwegian invention is a reduplicated *brrm* [brːm], which consists of the voiced, bilabial stop [b], a prolonged, alveolar trill [rː], and a bilabial nasal [m]. The only common feature here is the initial [b], which, with its "bursting" of air in pronunciation, could be seen to imitate the (sound of) bursts happening inside an operated engine. While the Japanese invention inevitably contains a following vowel, the Norwegian invention contains none.

Another example of Kurisaki-Sagberg's onomatopoeic inventions is presented in Example 4.37.

Example 4.37
ba (sudden motion) translated with: **fhwoosh**

The Japanese *ba* is not listed in the TJMO, however, "pa" is. The "pa" is among other things described as a motion onomatopoeia/gitaigo that imitates a quick or sudden motion. The *ba* found in this case could be understood as a voiced variation of "pa", as the *ba* is accompanying the image of a woman suddenly moving away from a man. The application of the voiced feature on the original "pa" could be seen as a method to make it more intense (Hakī 2017, 59). The *ba* is written with the small *tsu* at the end, indicating a glottal stop [ʔ], and this could also give the impression of

74

more energy and/or speed (60). The *ba* could for instance be translated into English as "jolt" (NativeCamp 2016). The Norwegian *fhwoosh* is most likely an imitation of the sound of wind rushing, as it only consists of fricatives and another continuant (the vowel sound). It is also very similar to the English "whoosh/fwoosh", which is also seen to imitate the sound of rushing wind. The *ba* [baʔ] consists of the voiced, bilabial stop [b], the unrounded, open, central vowel [a], and a glottal stop [ʔ]. The *fhwoosh* [fʷuːʃ] is made up by what can be regarded a rounded, unvoiced, labiodental fricative [fʷ], a prolonged, rounded, close, back vowel [uː], and the unvoiced, postalveolar fricative [ʃ]. The [baʔ] and the [fʷuːʃ] do not resemble each other. This might not be surprising, however, as the [baʔ] imitates (the imagined sound of) the motion itself, while the [fʷuːʃ] imitates the resulting, empiric sound.

4.5.3 Summary

The Japanese originals and their invented translations did occasionally display similar or common consonants and/or vowels. However, except for *to* and *tp* in Example 4.33, all of the eight onomatopoeic inventions discussed here had more than one sound/phoneme separating it from the Japanese original. Thus, universality in how we perceive sound can once again be questioned. It was mentioned that Flanagan's inventions were rather creative in form, however, two of his inventions discussed here (*rummbl* and *sipp*) were considered alterations of existing TL words. The alteration of an already existing TL word seemed to be a favorable method amongst the other translators as well, as all of the four inventions conducted by the other translators examined here were such alterations. Thus, as established TL words did not prove to be equal in form to the Japanese originals in 4.4.2 and 4.4.3, it is no wonder that the onomatopoeic inventions discussed here deviate from the Japanese originals as well. More onomatopoeic inventions that are made from scratch need to be investigated in order to truly evaluate the similarity of (real) onomatopoeic inventions to the Japanese originals. One could perhaps argue that the easiest procedure in the invention of an onomatopoeia is to alter an established word. When the reader can recognize an established word in an "invented" onomatopoeia, he/she will immediately associate the invention with the semantic content of the established word (*rummbl* makes one think of "rumble" and "rumbling"). With this method, one might not even need the context of the comic image, as the semantic content of this kind of invention is explained by the established word found within the invention itself. The reliance on established words in the creation of onomatopoeias though, is also something that could speak against the universality of them, especially if the altered established

word in question was not an onomatopoeia to begin with. In the next section, the "unaltered" transliterations of category 5, the last category in this study, will be considered.

4.6 Category 5: Translation of Source Text Onomatopoeia Using a Transliteration With/without Additional Paraphrasing

Category 5 of transliteration was the second most popular translation method, with 497 out of 1644 onomatopoeias translated this way, constituting 30,23% of the overall data. The top contributor to category 5 was translator Tomo Kimura of *kuroshitsuji*, who is responsible for 432 of the overall 497 transliterations. This is shown in Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.8: *Categorization of the 549 translations done by Kimura in kuroshitsuji/Black Butler*

Cat.1. Substitution of the original onomatopoeia for another type of word other than an onomatopoeia	6	1,09%
Cat.2. Omission of source text onomatopoeia in the target text	2	0,36%
Cat.3. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a target language onomatopoeia	12	2,19%
Cat.4. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using an invented target language onomatopoeia	97	17,67%
Cat.5. Translation of source text onomatopoeia using a transliteration with/without additional paraphrasing	432	78,69%

It is clear that Kimura chose transliteration as her main translation method of onomatopoeias. This could indicate a belief in their universality. However, Kimura was also the only one in this study to add explanatory paraphrasing next to the transliterations. Out of her 432 transliterations, 390 had an accompanying, English clarification. This leaves 42 transliterations of hers, and 107 transliterations in general, without any additional paraphrasing. Even though the transliterations are accompanied

by clarifying images, Kimura saw it necessary to explain most of them further. Again, the idea of onomatopoeic universality is challenged. In this case, it will be interesting to look into what Kimura has paraphrased and not. In the next section, some of Kimura's transliterations will be considered. After that, transliterations conducted by the other translators will be presented.

4.6.1 Kimura's Transliterations

Kimura's transliterations are written next to the unaltered Japanese characters. When there is additional paraphrasing, this is written in curved brackets, either under or next to the transliteration. One of Kimura's transliterations with additional paraphrasing is rendered in Example 4.38.

Example 4.38
kopopo translated with: **kopopo** (pour)[41]

The *kopopo* is not listed in the TJMO (and not found through online searches), so it will be considered a Japanese onomatopoeic invention. This invention is accompanying the image of tea being poured from a teapot into a teacup. Kimura has interpreted and paraphrased this as *pour*. The English word *pour* is not onomatopoeic in origin (ORD), however, one could argue that an onomatopoeic clarification is unnecessary when the original onomatopoeia is maintained in the transliteration. As the pouring of some liquid is likely to produce sound, the *kopopo* could be regarded as a giongo, an onomatopoeia imitating empiric sound. On the one hand, one could argue that additional clarification is not needed, as the original onomatopoeia is an invention, with no set semantic content (it depends on the context). And as the original onomatopoeia is believed to be a giongo (and not a gitaigo/gijōgo), English readers will not misunderstand what the onomatopoeia is imitating (as they are used to onomatopoeias mainly imitating empiric sound). On the other hand, one could argue that additional clarification is needed, as inventions are influenced by the language they are created in (with its own conventions), and that English readers will have a harder time guessing the content of the original invention as they are unfamiliar with the Japanese premises. Besides, the English readers will not know whether an original onomatopoeia is an invention or not. Kimura might have decided to paraphrase as a precaution. Even though the additional paraphrasing could be seen to disturb the directness of the onomatopoeia (especially if the paraphrasing is not onomatopoeic), it prevents misunderstandings.

---

[41] In this and following examples, what is written inside the brackets is what the translator originally paraphrased.

One finds multiple transliterations of the Japanese "smiling" -onomatopoeias in Kimura's work. This is exemplified in Example 4.39.

Example 4.39
(1) *niko* translated with: **niko** (smile)
(2) *nikkori* translated with: **nikkori** (smile)
(3) *nikoniko* translated with: **nikoniko** (smile)
(4) *niya* translated with: **niya** (grin)
(5) *niyaniya* translated with: **niyaniya** (grin)

These onomatopoeias are repeated throughout the paperback. Kimura makes a distinction in her additional paraphrasing between the *niko* variants (*niko, nikoniko, nikkori*) and the *niya* variants (*niya, niyaniya*). The *niko* variants are described with *smile*, while the *niya* variants are described with *grin*. The *niko* could be undestood as a warm and happy smile, while the *niya* can be seen as a more vulgar one (TJMO). Kimura contrasts *smile* with *grin* in her explanations to render the Japanese distinction. While the straightforward, English word *smile* is used to explain the warm smile of the *niko* variants, the word *grin* is used to clarify the *niya* variants. The *grin* is explained in ORD as either a broad smile showing the teeth, or a forced, unrestrained, or stupid smile. Thus, like *niya*, the *grin* triggers some additional (negative) associations. As mentioned earlier in this thesis, The English language does not contain equivalents to the Japanese "smiling" -onomatopoeias/gitaigo. Hence, it comes as no surprise that Kimura's clarifications, *smile* and *grin*, are non-onomatopoeic. Whether Kimura has clarified with an English onomatopoeia or not seems to depend on the English repertoire of onomatopoeias. While the Japanese giongo *kacha* has been clarified with the English onomatopoeia *clink*, the Japanese gijōgo *guttari* has been clarified with the English, non-onomatopoeic word *exhausted* (likely due to lack of such gijōgo). One could argue however, that whether the clarification is onomatopoeic or not is irrelevant, as the transliteration itself maintains the onomatopoeia in translation. Kimura's approach to the translation of the onomatopoeia might challenge the readers as it maintains so much of the (different) source culture, yet, it might also provide the most honest translation.

Kimura left 42 transliterations without any additional paraphrasing, however, all of these could be understood as a repetition of an earlier transliteration which did have additional paraphrasing. This is illustrated in Example 4.40 below.

Example 4.40

(1) *don* translated with: **don** (bam)

(2) *dooooon* translated with: **dooooon**

The (1) appeared some pages before (2) did. The *dooooon* in (2) can be seen as an intensified variant of *don* in (1). Thus, Kimura deemed it unnecessary to clarify (2) with "baaaaam" for instance.

4.6.2 Transliterations Conducted by the Other Translators

Other than Kimura, Flanagan is the only translator that made notable use of transliterations. Kurisaki-Sagberg did only add two transliterations to his work, the laughter sequences of *ahaha*, and *ahahaha* respectively. Røsåsen added none. The difference between Kimura's transliterations and the other translators' however, is that Kimura added explanatory paraphrasing to hers. One example of a transliteration without additional paraphrasing is shown in one of Flanagan's transliterations.

Example 4.41

gakon translated with: **gakon**

The *gakon* is not listed in the TJMO, but it appears online in a Japanese thesaurus.[42] There, *gakon* is described as the (sound of a) state in which something put together comes apart. In the manga, *gakon* accompanies the image of a canned product falling out of a vending machine. Even though the online thesaurus describes *gakon* as a (sound of a) state, one could easily imagine the clunk of a can coming down a vending machine, and it is likely that Flanagan saw *gakon* fitting to imitate that sound for the English readers. The *gakon* [gakoN][43] is after all constituted of two stops [g, k], which, according to the sound symbolism theory, could be seen to imitate something abrupt; like when a can collides with the bottom of a vending machine. As considered earlier in this chapter, Flanagan mostly made use of onomatopoeic inventions in his translations of the onomatopoeia. However, he also transliterated 63 times, in places he most likely deemed the original

---

[42] Found on Weblio, 10 April 2018.
[43] Phonetic reading based on Japanese pronunciation.

onomatopoeia to be relevant to the English readers as well. And as Flanagan adds no explanatory paraphrasing to any of his transliterations, he could be seen to have more faith in the universality of the onomatopoeia compared to Kimura.

4.6.3 Summary

The category 5 translation method of transliteration turned out to be the second most popular translation method, owing to Kimura's frequent usage. However, as Kimura adds explanatory paraphrasing to almost all of her transliterations, the method does not speak in favor of onomatopoeic universality in this case. It was argued that Kimura's method might have been the most honest translation, and that without being confusing to the target audience (due to explanatory paraphrasing). Flanagan transliterated the most after Kimura, although without additional paraphrasing. Flanagan's transliterations could support the idea of onomatopoeic universality as they stand alone for the English readers to interpret. However, as Flanagan for the most part translated the Japanese onomatopoeias with onomatopoeic inventions (intended for English audience) the argument of onomatopoeic universality loses ground once again.

4.7 Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter, the results of the research were presented, and an analysis of them was given. It was discovered that the onomatopoeias found in the Japanese manga paperbacks considered here were translated in very different ways. Røsåsen translated most of his onomatopoeias with the category 2 method of omission, Kurisaki-Sagberg with the category 3 method of translation with a TL onomatopoeia, Flanagan with the category 4 method of onomatopoeic invention, and Kimura translated most of her onomatopoeias with the category 5 method of transliteration. The category 1 method of substitution was the most common when only considering the translations of the integrated onomatopoeias (see Table 4.3). When only considering the translations of the holophrase-onomatopoeias, the category 4 method of onomatopoeic invention took the throne (see Table 4.4). With all translations considered (translations of both integrated- and holophrase-onomatopoeias), category 4 of onomatopoeic invention became the most favorable translation method, followed by category 5 of transliteration, category 2 of omission, category 3 of translation with a TL onomatopoeia, and then category 1 of substitution (see Table 4.1). The most frequent use

of the category 4 method contrasts with what Casas-Tost found to be most common in the translation of Chinese onomatopoeias found in novels, substitution/omission (see Table 4.2). It was argued that the holophrase-onomatopoeias found in manga were easier to translate as onomatopoeias, as they are not crucial to the narrative, and as they are somewhat clarified by the accompanying image. Thus, (when translating holophrase-onomatopoeias) the translators are free to experiment more. The universality of the onomatopoeia was assessed while examining the various examples. As far as this study goes, the onomatopoeia does not appear to be universal. There were many obvious dissimilarities between the originals and their translations. However, similarities were sometimes found when considering smaller segments of the onomatopoeias. Like when onomatopoeias imitating something abrupt would have stops [p, b, t, d, k, g] in common. Through the theory of sound symbolism, the common features were given sound symbolic meaning which sometimes seemed to fit the semantic content of the whole onomatopoeia(s) in question. The next chapter will be the conclusion, where the findings of this thesis will be summed up.

5. Conclusion

This study was conducted with the following three aims:

(1) to investigate how Japanese onomatopoeias found in manga are translated to English and Norwegian;

(2) to investigate how the onomatopoeia should be translated according to existing translation theory; and

(3) to assess the universality of the onomatopoeias considered.

The main findings of this thesis can be summarized as follows.

The Japanese onomatopoeias were translated in very different ways. All of the four translators considered in this study had their own, distinct translation method. Yet, some translation methods were more popular than other, and the method of translating with an onomatopoeic invention turned out to be the most favorable. In creating an onomatopoeic invention, the translators often resorted to the altering of an established TL word, probably in order to safeguard target audience comprehension. The second most popular translation method was the one of translating with a transliteration. Transliterations with and without additional explanations were found, however, most of them came with an additional explanation. The translation method that came in third was omission. In fourth came the method of translating with a TL onomatopoeia. The least popular translation method was substitution. However, when only considering translations of the integrated onomatopoeia, the substitution method was the most preferred method. Substitution was also a popular method in Casas-Tost's study (2014) regarding translations of Chinese novel onomatopoeias into Spanish, so it would seem that in translating integrated onomatopoeias from an onomatopoeia-rich language into an onomatopoeia-lesser language, the onomatopoeia is quite difficult to maintain.

After investigating translation theory, a proposition was made that as long as the onomatopoeic translation is not seen to damage own or others' values, the purpose of translation, or the accuracy principle, it should be conducted. This is because the original author has the right to express

82

him/herself in own words, and the reader the right to see and judge those words for him/herself. It was argued that as the onomatopoeic word is unique within every language, and as the author deliberately chooses it to create a certain effect, it deserves a similar physique in translation. According to the results of this study, three out of four translators chose to mainly translate the onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia. The onomatopoeic form was frequently dropped in the translations of the integrated onomatopoeia however, but this could be due to fear of damaging the accuracy principle.

The onomatopoeic pairs considered in this study did not provide an argument in favor of onomatopoeic universality. The onomatopoeias were in most cases dissimilar from each other. However, sometimes one could argue for the consistent sound symbolism found in certain sound segments or phonemes of the different onomatopoeias. In the cases were neither a similar onomatopoeic form nor apparent sound symbolism was found, one could sometimes argue that the different semantics were (partly) to blame; Japanese onomatopoeias often imitate (the sound of) non-empiric sound, while English/Norwegian onomatopoeias mainly imitate (resulting) empiric sound.

This study has broadened my understanding of the onomatopoeia, both in general, and in a translation perspective. I have come to understand that the translation of an onomatopoeia with an onomatopoeia could be rather demanding, and that it sometimes is reasonable to avoid it. However, at the same time, I believe that translation methods of the onomatopoeia is a rarely discussed topic, and if it were given more attention, more clever ways of onomatopoeic translation will be discovered. I also think it is stimulating for translators to challenge themselves in translation, and that it would be really rewarding if they were to succeed at a creative, onomatopoeic translation. What seems to be the biggest challenge is the onomatopoeic translation of an integrated onomatopoeia from a language with high-frequent onomatopoeia-use into a language with low-frequent onomatopoeia-use. In order to deal with this challenge, relevant language pairs must be considered, and various onomatopoeic translations (created and) tested. I would also like to encourage more in-depth study of the onomatopoeia in languages where the onomatopoeia has been deemed marginal or trivial, like in Norwegian, because the more we know about the onomatopoeias, the easier it will be to use them in translation. As the onomatopoeia exists all around the world, and enriches language in how it creates a direct path to our ideas, experiences, and emotions, it only seems natural to work for its preservation.

Bibliography

Dictionaries

Chang, Andrew C. 1990. *A Thesaurus of Japanese Mimesis and Onomatopoeia: Usage by Categories*. Tokyo: Taishūkan Shoten.

Guttu, Tor. 2005. *Store Norske Ordbok*. Oslo: Kunnskapsforlaget.

Hawkins, Joyce M. 1986. *The Oxford Reference Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Primary sources

Aoyama, Gōshō 青山剛昌. 1994. *Meitantei conan* 名探偵コナン. Tokyo: Shōgakukan 小学館.

——. 2004. *Mesterdetektiven Conan*. Translated by Jens E. Røsåsen. Oslo: Egmont Serieforlag.

Takeuchi, Naoko 武内直子. 1992. *Bishōjosenshi sērāmūn* 美少女戦士セーラームーン. Tokyo: Kōdansha Comics 講談社.

——. 2011. *Pretty Guardian Sailor Moon*. Translated by William Flanagan. New York: Kodansha Comics.

Toboso, Yana 枢やな. 2007. *Kuroshitsuji* 黒執事. Tokyo: Square Enix.

——. 2010. *Black Butler*. Translated by Tomo Kimura. New York: Yen Press.

Yazawa, Ai 矢沢あい. 2000. *Nana* ナナ. Tokyo: Shūeisha 集英社.

——. 2008. *Nana*. Translated by Øyvind Kurisaki-Sagberg. Oslo: Egmont Serieforlag.

References

Akita, Kimi. 2017. "Grammatical and functional properties of mimetics in Japanese". In *The Grammar of Japanese Mimetics*, edited by Noriko Iwasaki, Peter Sells and Kimi Akita, 20-34. New York: Routledge.

Assaneo, Maria F.; Juan I. Nichols and Marcos A. Trevisan. 2011. "The Anatomy of Onomatopoeias". *PloS ONE* 12, (6): 1-11.

Baker, Mona. 2011. *In Other Words*. Oxon: Routledge.

Belloc, Hilaire. 1931. *On Translation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Boase-Beier, Jean. 2014. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. New York: Routledge.

Cartoons and comics. 2007. "Features of comics". Accessed 7 May 2018. http://lrrpublic.cli.det.nsw.edu.au/lrrSecure/Sites/Web/cartoons/4652_04.htm#a.

Casas-Tost, Helena. 2014. "Translating Onomatopoeia from Chinese into Spanish: a Corpus Based Analysis". *Perspectives* 22, (1): 39-55.

Dingemanse, Mark. 2008. "Three misconceptions about ideophones". *The Ideophone*. Accessed 16 April 2017. http://ideophone.org/three-misconceptions-about-ideophones/.

Edwards, Anthony D. 1957. *Language in Culture and Class*. London: Heinemann.

Feist, Jim. 2013. ""Sound Symbolism" in English". *Journal of Pragmatics* 45, (1): 104-118.

Galibert, Sylvain. 2004. "A Few Words on Translations". *Translation Directory.* Accessed 28 November 2016. http://www.translationdirectory.com/article591.htm.

Hakī, Masako 波木井優子. 2017. "Onomatope renshūchō: kaitei ni mukete – gakushūsha no goyō chōsa yori「オノマトペ練習帳」改訂に向けて— 学習者の誤用調査より". *Rikkyōdaigaku nihongaku kenkyūjo nenpō* 立教大学日本学研究所年報 7 (16): 54-65. doi: info:doi/10.14992/00015043.

Hinton, Leanne; Johanna Nichols and John J. Ohala. 1994a. "Introduction: Sound-symbolic processes". In *Sound Symbolism*, edited by Leanne Hinton, Johanna Nichols and John J. Ohala, 1-12. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1994b. *Sound Symbolism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hovhannisyan, Mariam. 2012. "The Art of Poetry and its Translation". *Translation Directory*. Accessed 26 November 2016. http://www.translationdirectory.com/articles/article2364.php.

Ishiguro, Kei 石黒圭 2016. "Onomatope wo anadorenai mittsu no riyū オノマトペをあなどれない三つの理由". *Yomiuri Online*. Accessed 27 January 2017. http://www.yomiuri.co.jp/kyoiku/ichiran/20161007-OYT8T50013.html.

Iwasaki, Noriko. 2017a. "Grammar of Japanese mimetics used by English and Korean learners of L2 Japanese in KY Corpus interviews: Does L1-L2 similarity help?". In *The Grammar of Japanese Mimetics*, edited by Noriko Iwasaki, Peter Sells and Kimi Akita, 148-171. New York: Routledge.

— 2017b. "Use of mimetics in Motion event descriptions by English and Korean learners of L2 Japanese: Does language typology make a difference?". In *The Grammar of Japanese Mimetics*, edited by Noriko Iwasaki, Peter Sells and Kimi Akita, 193-218. New York: Routledge.

Iwasaki, Noriko; Peter Sells and Kimi Akita. 2017. *The Grammar of Japanese Mimetics*. New York: Routledge.

Iwasaki, Shoichi. 2013. *Japanese*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Maynard, Senko K マイナード泉子 K. 2011. *Raito noberu hyōgenron* ライトノベル表現論 Tokyo: Meiji shoin 明治書院

NativeCamp. 2016. "Dokidoki... nihongo tokuyū no onomatope, eigo de wa dō iu no?「ドキドキ…」日本語特有のオノマトペ 英語ではどう言うの?". Accessed 3 April 2018. https://nativecamp.net/blog/study/5218.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Hertfordshire: Prentice Hall.

Nida, Eugene A. 1964. *Towards a Science of Translation: With Special Reference to Principles and Procedures Involved in Bible Translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Nihongo wo tanoshimō! 日本語を楽しもう! 2007. "Noronoro のろのろ". Accessed 17 April 2017. https://pj.ninjal.ac.jp/archives/Onomatope/50_on/noronoro.html.

Owji, Zohre. 2013. "Translation Strategies: A Review and Comparison of Theories". *Translation Journal* 17, (1): 1. http://translationjournal.net/journal/63theory.htm.

Rhodes, Richard. 1994. "Aural images". In *Sound Symbolism*, edited by Leanne Hinton, Johanna Nichols and John J. Ohala, 276-293. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sasamoto, Ryoko and Rebecca Jackson. 2016. "Onomatopoeia – Showing-word or Saying-word? Relevance Theory, Lexis, and the Communication of Impressions". *Lingua* 175-176: 36-53.

Sew, Jyh W. 2005. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. London: Routledge.

Sugahara, Takashi. 2010. "Onomatopoeia in Spoken and Written English: Corpus- and Usage-based Analysis". Doctoral thesis, Hokkaido University.

Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a Cognitive Semantics: Volume II, Typology and Process in Concept Structuring*. London: The MIT Press.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Weblio. 2018. "Gakon ガコン". Accessed 10 April 2018. https://thesaurus.weblio.jp/content/%E3%82%AC%E3%82%B3%E3%83%B3.

Yoshioka, Keiko. 2017. "Acquisition of mimetics and the development of proficiency in L2 Japanese: A longitudinal case study of an L1 Dutch speaker's speech and gesture". In *The Grammar of Japanese Mimetics*, edited by Noriko Iwasaki, Peter Sells and Kimi Akita, 172-192. New York: Routledge.