THE TENNŌ SYSTEM AS THE SYMBOL OF THE CULTURE OF TRANSLATION

YANABU, Akira

Department of Intercultural Studies, St. Andrew's University, Osaka, Japan

The Tennō system has been generally looked upon as being the center of Japanese culture. However, from my viewpoint of the translation theory of translated cultures it consists almost entinely of imported foreign clutures. Clearly the terms and rituals of the Tennō system are almost all translated cultures. The following serves as examples: the word "Tennō" itself, the treasures of the Tennō family, their clothes, rituals and so on.

This paper at first introduces these facts and then deals with the reason. Some symbolic anthropologists in Japan have argued about the Tennō system from the viewpoint of the boundary of culture. They often call the argument "the kingship theory," some of which are similar to my argument on the translation theory. However, the kingship theory argues it from inside a culture while the translation theory generally presupposes two cultures and it treats the Tennō system from the boundary between these two cultures.

The translated culture is different from both its original one and the one to which it is transferred. This "difference" usually accompanies the difference of value; a higher or lower value goes with the translated cultures. From that kind of higher value the Tennō system has derived its authority.

Keywords: TENNŌ, CULTURE, RITUAL, TRANSLATION, TRANSLATED WORD, BOUNDARY, KINGSHIP, WA, KAN, ON-READING, KIN-READING, OUTSIDE.

1. "Tennō" as the Translated Word

What is the symbol of Japanese culture? Many people then may answer that it is the "Tennō " the Japanese Emperor. The Constitution of Japan prescribes that the Tennō "shall be the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people." Even scholars who criticize the Tennō system assume it to be the center of Japanese culture. Now, does the Tennō system express Japanese culture? Strange to say, most of the Tennō system has not consisted of Japanese culture but of imported cultural things, which are correctly speaking in my terms, of the culture of translation. Then, at first, I will point out this fact as shown below, and then deal with its reason.

In the first place, the word "Tennō" was imported from ancient Chinese literature. In those days, the name of the person who would later become the Tennō was *Sumeramikoto* or *Ōkimi* in the native language. When Chinese characters came into the islands about in the fifth century, his name became written as Tennō (天皇) in Chinese characters. Chinese characters in Japan often translate into English as "Sino-Japanese." Apparently while they are similar to Chinese words there are major differences, because they are different in their sounds, grammars and even meanings. The word "Tennō" in ancient Japan was also made from such Chinese characters. The earlier names in the native

language soon faded away and Tennō, derived from foreign language remained as the formal name. What is important here is that such a use of the word Tennō was not the proper way to use it in China. A philologist, Tsuda Sōkichi writes that Tennō had meant the pole star in Heaven as a term of Taoism, which was an important religion in ancient China. That is to say, not knowing the correct meaning, people in ancient Japan introduced and used this Chinese word, which was from the language of the highest civilization in those days (Tsuda, 1963).

In Japanese history the Tennō system has undergone several great changes. One of these changes was at the beginning of the modern era when the Tennō was ranked as the *Dai-nihon-teikoku Tennō* (大日本帝国天皇, the Tennō of the Empire of Great Japan) in the Meiji Constitution. Particularly during World War II Japanese authorities often used this title. I think that "the Empire of Great Japan" in this formal title consisted of translated words. In 1881, eight years before the promulgation of the Meiji Constitution a famous educator Nishi Amane wrote *A Draft of the Constitution* under the orders of Yamagata Aritomo who was responsible for the enactment of the constitution. He writes in this paper as follows:

> *Teikoku-dai-nihon* (帝国大日本, the Empire, Great Japan) signifies four islands: Nihon Chikushi Shikoku and Ezo, ... I mean this name results from the same sort of title as Great Britain that means a country unifying England and Scotland (1962: 202).

"Great Japan" is thus modeled after "Great Britain" in its geographical meaning. In addition, *teikoku* (帝国) in his writing here became used in those days as a translated word from "the British Empire", and Nishi was the originator who used this translated word. We can understand therefore that *Teikoku-dai-nihon* used here by Nishi imitated "the British Empire" and "Great Britain". Later, based upon that this model which was called in Japanese translation *Dai-ei-teikoku* (大英帝国, the Empire of Great Britain), people of the day must have coined *Dai-nihon- teikoku* (大日本帝国 the Empire of Great Japan) as the formal title for Japan. It was natural that the Japanese took Britain, the most civilized country in those days, as their model. In spite of Nishi's hopes people had soon forgotten this original meaning. This title would before long become understood as the seemingly imposing name of this country and so could become the formal title.

After the new Constitution in 1947, people often called Tennō by the name of *shōchō Tennō* (象徴天皇); this is because the new Constitution prescribed Tennō as *shōchō* (symbol). In 1946, when the Diet considered the draft of the Constitution, some member questioned the meaning of this word, *shōchō* to the Minister Kanamori who was responsible for the enactment of the Constitution. Because the Minister, could not answer adroitly, he replied that *shōchō* meant *akogare* (longing), which caused the members of the Diet to laugh. People of those days made fun of this Kanamori's answer saying "an *akogare* commentary on the Constitution." To tell the truth, the Commander in chief of the allied forces, MacArthur, had already written the original draft before the discussion in the Diet, the Japanese Minister of the day therefore could not answer effectively. This matter showed that Japanese accepted the title of the translated word *shōchō* without knowing its correct meaning.

Now I would like to explain my term "translation" or a "translated word." In short, I will say that the meaning of a translated word is not always equivalent to that of its original word. I will outline the whole circumstances as an abstract model. Let us suppose that there is cultural phenomenon α in culture "A." In a narrow sense α can be a word in language "A." If α is exporting into another culture "B" that is different from A, α does not move into B as the same thing as the original α. It becomes α' through the translation, then α' $\neq$ α. Here α' appears as a thing which has lost its cultural structure in A, or a word divorced from proper context. Its meaning in B is therefore uncertain, obscure or seemingly having a double meaning.

On the other hand, human consciousness reflects the cultural structure, and the structure of language and of culture controls that part of the human brains corresponding to it. Human beings thinks therefore that such a thing which has lost its structure or a word lost its context ought not to exist. In other words, human consciousness cannot usually seize the reason α' has appeared. Then people think α' to be α itself, or to be β in another culture "B." For instance, the populace usually thinks words translated into Japanese such as *kenri* (権利, right), *shimin* (市民, citizen) to be real Japanese words. On the other hand, intellectuals who are knowledgeable of Western culture think that *kenri* = right, *shimin* = citizen and so on. They do not generally notice that neither of these judgments is correct (Yanabu, 1982).

The model mentioned above is, so to speak, the argument from the viewpoint of cultural relativism; thinking from this viewpoint, the explanation above must be almost applicable to the issues of intercultural communication. On the other hand, from the viewpoint of cultural universalism, the model should express as α' $=$ α because both the clutures A and B are universal. Speaking of many real translated phenomena, some of them are α' $\neq$ α and the others are α' $=$ α, or else one phenomenon of translation contains simultaneously α' $\neq$ α and α' $=$ α. For instance, a Japanese *kuruma* (car) and an American car are almost α' $=$ α from their material viewpoint, while they are α' $\neq$ α when viewed from their social meaning or from their function in daily life.

2. The Rituals of the Tennō System as the Culture of Translation

What I have said above about the words of the Tennō system is also applicable to its rituals in a similar way. The most precious things in the Tennō family must be the Three Sacred Treasures which are the mirror, the sword and the comma shaped beads . As the historian Murakami Shigeyoshi (1986) has explained they have all been imported or copied from Chaina or Korea. Other famous precious things of the Tennō family are those in the ancient warehouse, *Shōsōin*, in which there are many original and copied works of arts and precious things which have been transmitted from abroad. In addition people around the Tennō family have eagerly imported, collected and stored these things. Furthermore it is quite unusual in the world, as experts of fine arts have pointed out, that so many ancient and precious things were collected in one place in such a good state of preservation.

The music of the rituals peculiar to the Tennō family is *gagaku* (the Imperial court music) which had also been introduced from ancient China. It has remained better

preserved in Japan than in China , its country of origin, and Korea through which it was transmitted to Japan. Speaking of the myth of the Tennō family the most famous one is *Tenson Kōrin* (the descent to earth of the descendant of the Sun-Goddess) that *Kojiki* (Record of Ancient Matters) and *Nihon-shoki* (Chronicles of Japan) have handed down. In regard to this myth a famous historian, Egami Namio, has explained on this myth that the same sort of stories as the ancestor of the governor who had at one time descended from Heaven have been inherited from various parts of the eastern Eurasian continent; the ancient Japanese must have inherited the *Tenson Kōrin myth* from them. Similarly *Daijōsai* (the ritual of succession to throne) must have followed on from the rituals observed by nomadic people on the continent (1988). As for the titles of Tennō and the era names of successive Tennō, they have been coined from two Chinese characters selected from Chinese literature. The costume of the Tennō family has inherited to that of the Tang dynasty in ancient China.

The things, mentioned above are the translated cultures chiefly from the advanced civilized country of the day, China. In the modern era, however, it was chiefly from Western countries that Japanese imported and translated foreign things. The formal costume of the Tennō was modeled after the French military uniform style. *Goshin'ei* (the portrait of Tennō) which people once worshiped everywhere in Japan was dressed in this French style of clothes, a cap and even a saber. Today although the military uniform is of course not used, the formal costume of the Tennō family is the Western style together with the traditional one imported earlier from China. Speaking of vehicles, the car of the former Tennō, made by Benz in Germany was very famous, while the vehicle for the wedding ceremony was a British style coach. In the wedding of the present Crown-Prince, for security reasons this British style coach was not used, and was replaced by a car made by Rolls-Royce in Britain. The formal cooking of the Imperial court is French cuisine. As for the finishing education of the Crown-Prince, while his father studied under an American tutor, he furthered his education at Oxford University in Britain.

I will emphasize here that these sorts of imported things are of the culture of translation, namely, $\alpha' \neq \alpha$, and these circurnstances are, to our surprise, quite difficult for Japanese people to comprehend. Regarding the words and rituals of the Tennō system in the modern era, we have been, so to speak, present on the spot; strange to say, it is difficult for Japanese people to notice that such words and things have been imported from foreign countries. For instance, how many Japanese noticed that *Goshin'ei* which nearly all Japanese worshiped as the picture of the living god was wearing a thoroughly French style of dress? Many Japanese think the era name *Shōwa* (昭和) is surely Japanese, since they have forgotten how this word had once appeared. How did the following era name *Heisei* (平成) appear? Scholars of Chinese classics assembled and selected Chinese characters from ancient Chinese literature one by one. In short, the French costume had changed into another meaning while its appearance remained the same. Again, while its appearance remained the same, the word *Shōwa* changed into another meaning when it was accepted as a Japanese era name.

Speaking of a recent case, the present Empress was, just before her marriage, going to meet the Tennō for the first time and was requested to put on the formal costume of the Imperial Court. Her family then intended to prepare the formal Western clothing as the

formal Imperial costume for her, however, they could not get a pair of long white gloves, so she went to the Court with a pair of short white gloves. People spoke afterwards that the Court blamed her for the shame of her apparel. Why was she in the wrong? It was not because she did not put on the foreign clothes, but because she did not put on the formal Imperial clothes. A more recent case is that of the present Crown Princess who once put on *wa fuku* (Japanese clothes) in public, and some people in the Imperial Household Agency blamed her for the inappropriateness of this clothing. What did they require her to put on instead of Japanese clothes, then? Was it Western clothes? Surely the original meaning of Western clothes had changed, however, into the formal costume of the Tennō family.

3. The Tennō System from the Viewpoint of "Boundary Theory"

As to, the cultural or symbolic structure of the Tennō system, recently and in particular from the viewpoint of so called symbolic anthropology, some Japanese researchers are discussing it in a similar way to my view. They accept and argue the theories on boundary, liminality or margin, which Mary Douglas (1979), Victor Turner (1974) and so forth have dealt with. I will call them "boundary theory" below. Based on this boundary theory, they are particularly discussing the subject of the Tennō system, which they often call the "kingship theory", so I will briefly outline these theories.

Yamaguchi Masao argues that while scholars have discussed the Tennō system as the center of power from the viewpoint of politics, they should in fact study it as the structure of both the center and the boundary of Japanese culture. The kingship cannot be an entirety without the boundary opposed to it. In the Japanese ancient myth, a famous hero, Susanō-no-mikoto embodied such a boundary. He was a weeping child who performed profanity at the High Celestial Plain, he was then expelled and while in a phase of wandering subjugated a huge eight headed serpent before founding the Izumo Kingship. He was the importer of disorderly chaos, the embodiment of violence and the originator of order; thus, he was the god of the double meaning. Through his existence, the ancient Tennō system included wild powers that could otherwise be out of order, and as such, it became created as a cosmographical world (1975: 1989). Yamaguchi also deals with another mythical hero Yamatotakeru-no-mikoto as follows:

> He offered the original image of a Japanese tragic hero through a pattern of the "wandering stories of high personages." The hero wandered, and undertook sufferings to himself, he expiated thus the sins of community and died tragically (1989: 191).

In this way, he says, the kingship recovered the entirety through the medium of such a deep structure.

Ueno Chizuko explains this pole of the boundary using a word *yosomono* (stranger) as follows:

> In short, Tennō has been a stranger. It is a gross mistake that Tennō has been the ancestor of the *jyōmin* (people). Tennō has been a stranger, which the ideologists of the Tennō system have been saying repeatedly. There is no reason to misread it (1988: 7-8).

She also explains this matter using a term "outside" as in the following:

> We should think of the dialectic of the\inside and the outside at the beginning of the power theory. In other words, it is necessary to recognize the "outside" or the existence of the "out" to have self-consciousness for a community or a nation (*Ibid*: 8).

So far her view is similar to mine. This theory might explain the facts I mentioned above that the Tennō system has consisted of foreign cultures. However, a little later, she says this about the "outside" or the "boundary":

> This "outside," however, is not necessary at all to be the substantial outside but to be the symbolic outside is sufficient. If a community has the idea of the outer world, people can also have a certain self-consciousness as contrasting with the outer world. The outside is, therefore, not necessary to be even the geographical outside.

The argument on the Tennō system viewed from my translation theory and that of the boundary theory are, seemingly, quite similar but different in a crucial point, which she has stated in the quotation above.

I have also said that the Tennō system has consisted of outside cultures, in which the "outside" is practically the outside, namely really the geographical outside. The translation theory necessarily presupposes two different cultures or languages. The boundary theory is, when they deal with the boundary as of a foreign culture, also similar to the translation theory; it treats, however, the boundary from inside a culture. On the other side, the translation theory deals with the boundary essentially as the boundary between two cultures.

Words or cultural phenomena of translation may be suspicious and mysterious from some viewpoints. This is because as I explained above, between cultures A and B when α in culture A moves into culture B it changes into α' so that $\alpha' \neq \alpha$. The interpretation of the translation theory and that of the boundary theory may resemble each other, when we look at the external phenomena. For instance, people have thought *oni* (demon) to be the one who was expelled from a culture, but from another point of view, it may be the one who had come from some outside the world. Although there could be cases of both, the boundary theory does not consider which case the *oni* in question derives from; in either case the *oni*'s existence was suspicious, strange and mysterious.

To take another instance of language, in the modern era in Japan, people have so frequently used and abused such difficult translated words as *kenri* (right), *sonzai* (being), *jyokyo* (situation), *sogai* (alienation) and so on, though they have not understood the meanings well; we may say because people have not understood these words they have willingly abused them. Having written about these circumstances in various books and papers, I will not explain them in detail here (1976, 1987). However, another similar instance does occur these days in which so called foreign loan-words are written in the Japanese syllabary, *katakana*. We can see in a commercial on TV for some cold remedy phrase such as "*Kondoroichin* (コンドロイチン) is efficacious!" Nearly all TV viewers cannot understand what the word *kondoroichin* means. Naturally the producer of this commercial fully understands these circumstances and that because the viewers cannot understand its meaning, it can be efficacious for them. I have called this sort of

phenomenon the "cassette effect", which is peculiar to translated words; I think that this "effect" transform translated words into something mysterious and fascinating like the efficacious medicine. In case of the contrary it makes them into something suspicious and disagreeable like *oni*, namely, the "cassette" causes either a positive or a negative effect.

4. Translation Theory in Japanese Language

The attempt to consider over the entire human world in the name of "culture" has begun comparatively recently, and at most from the late-nineteenth century. This attempt which the modern ages may have requested is, however, very difficult to research because an idea such as culture is quite vague and hard to define. It is desirable that one should establish some material ground in order to research a phenomenon objectively and scientifically. As for my method the material ground for researching culture is language. The ground that I deal with in the Tennō system to be a culture of translation is the structure of translation in Japanese language, so I will outline its point below.

The basic structure of translation in the Japanese language was formed in ancient times when the natives of these islands first encountered Chinese characters. In my view the core of this structure is "*on*-reading" (音読み) and "*kun*-reading" (訓読み) of Chinese characters and "vertical reading" (読み下し) the lines of Chinese writing.

On-reading and *kun*-reading contrast with each other, and are two readings of the same Chinese character. While *on*-reading is the Japanese sound modeled after the original Chinese pronunciation following the Japanese phonology, *kun*-reading represents the sound of the native Japanese word corresponding to the Chinese character, so both readings are Japanese ones; it is in particular important that *on*-reading is seemingly similar to Chinese but different. In the same way, the Japanese translated words and cultural things are seemingly similar to the original foreign ones but different. Vertical reading is, on the other hand, the Japanese method for the reading of Chinese writing. It changes the order of original words according to Japanese grammar, then adds Japanese particles and other grammatical words understanding Chinese writing. Thus, Chinese writing read vertically are also apparently similar to the original writing but different; they are, so to speak, neither Chinese, nor Japanese but translated writing. While *on*-reading and *kun*-reading are interchangeable readings between a Chinese origin word of *kan* (Chinese) and a corresponding Japanese word of *wa* (Japanese), vertical reading uses both *wa* and *kan*, and together forms one Japanese writing. We can call the former a paradigmatic relation of *wa* and *kan*, and the latter a syntagmatic relation of *wa* and *kan*; this structure of these two relations is similar to what structuralism defines but is different, which I will explain later. This structure combining the two originally different languages of *wa* and *kan* into just one by differentiating them each other has founded the method of translation in Japan. By means of this method, Japanese scholars and students have studied not only Chinese classics, but also Dutch, English and other Western languages throughout Japanese history. This way of learning must have also become the basic structure for accepting foreign languages and even foreign cultural things.

Referring to some stone monuments, we can understand that these two readings and vertical reading methods might both have begun about the same time when Chinese

characters first came into Japan. The originators might have been visitors from Korea, and natives might have cooperated with the work. People in Korea might have already used these methods, and similar methods seem to have been used to some extent in other areas surrounding ancient China. It was, however, the achievement of Japanese culture to have succeed and completed these methods. Owing to these methods of translation, people soon invented a way of Japanese writing that was written in *Kojiki* (Record of Ancient Matters) and *Manyō-shū* (the earliest extent collection of Japanese poetry). From this way of writing *wa-kan-konkōbun* (writing in literary Japanese ornate with Chinese words) resulted; later contemporary Japanese writing succeeded it. In other words, people have formed Japanese writing through the method of translation.

Afterwards, when Japanese encountered with Dutch, English and other Western languages, they read these languages essentially in the same way. They read every original word with a Japanese word (*on*-reading or *kun*-reading), then changed the order of the original words, added some Japanese (vertical reading) and read them. Thus Japanese students and scholars have inherited this method for studying foreign languages up untill today.

The paradigmatic relation of *on-kun*-reading is the relation of replacing words; in this method it is quite important for the cultural structure of translation that this relation usually causes a distinction of value between the higher-grade and lower-grade. Usually *kan* (Chinese) ranks as the higher, while ordinary *wa* (Japanese) ranks as the lower; however, *kan* sometimes ranks as the lower. In either case the distinction of *wa* and *kan* accompanies higher or lower value. The paradigmatic relation of translation is, strictly speaking, different from what structuralism explains, because the higher and the lower are not exactly interchangeable each other. In other words, the "distinction" corresponds with the positive or negative effect of "cassette effect" mentioned above. This distinction results from the situation where two different structures encounter each other; this is peculiar to the issue of the translation theory.

The encountering of different cultures generally produces a value, or people in a specific culture discover a new sort of value when they encounter another culture. The structure of value between *wa* and *kan* is peculiar to Japanese culture, but it must be a universal phenomena where important values begin to appear in the circumstances of intercultural contacts. Making an additional remark I think that prior to the modern era the Japanese sciences have derived their authority from translation; namely, they have become the mediator of the replacement of the higher and the lower. In the same way then, the authority of the Tennō system results from the culture of translation. This, I believe, is not so strange in the history of cultures; to give an example, the important parts of modern Western culture have resulted from the contacts with ancient Hebrew, Greek and Oriental cultures, in other words, the ancient Western people must have discovered new sorts of values there.

The *on-kun*-reading relation is applicable to so called loan-words written in *katakana* (Japanese syllabary) which are widely used today. These loan-words are essentially similar to *kan* words. For instance, "liberal" and *riberaru* (リベラル) are not equivalent; because their scripts and sounds are of course different, moreover, from the viewpoint of grammar, while liberal is an adjective, *riberaru* is a root of an adjective verb and is a sort

of noun. Their meanings are different too. The relation of these two words is the same as the relation between Chinese words and Chinese characters in Japanese (Sino-Japanese), therefore, riberaru is a sort of *kan*. Thus the loan-words written in *katakana* also have distinction from ordinary native Japanese *wa* words that are usually written in *hiragana* (the Japanese cursive characters). The Japanese translating method through this ancient structure has maintained the same principles even though its external appearance has changed with time.

To make an additional remark, this structure of translation through *wa-kan* must have largely contributed to the swift and large scale importation and acceptance of the advanced foreign cultures. It has built the advantageous feature of Japanese culture, which I would not deal with in detail in this paper though.

Besides, this "distinction" is, on the other hand, different from "discrimination" formed in the political or social structure. The present Tennō system forms a structure of distinction, while the Tennō system formed by Meiji Constitution was that of discrimination, which I will explain later.

5. The Structure of the Tennō System and Some Historical Prospect

The Tennō system has, on the one hand, conserved the unique core of Japanese culture; on the other hand, because it is of "translation," it has necessarily changed when it has had the opportunity for intercourse with foreign cultures in history. The argument about the Tennō system in the translation theory should deal with these two phases, namely the conservation of uniqueness and the changes through translation in history.

The Meiji Constitution created the rituals of the Tennō system as the apparatus of ultimate discrimination of Japanese people, and after 1945 in the age of the new Constitution the roles of the rituals have largely changed and weakened. In short, they were not the rituals of the living god anymore. Meanwhile, through the development of TV and other popular media, the rituals have become established next to people's daily lives. The Imperial Law has prescribed some of them such as the Succession to the Throne and the Mourning for the Tennō; it has excluded, on the other hand, other traditional customary rituals like the Imperial Wedding and so on as formal rituals, though the Imperial Wedding soon reestablished itself in effect as a formal ritual. Maybe more important matters are that practically the same sorts of rituals have appeared continuously, taking, in particular, European Royal Families as models; these are greeted like national sports events, inquiries after people in calamities, participation in charitable works, visits to foreign countries and Royal Families and so on. People usually watch them on TV and they always get a high audience rating. Critics sometimes say the Tennō family has thus become somewhat public entertainers, it is important however that these performances are presented as the *hare* (gala) corresponding with the *ke* (ordinary) of the daily lives of the populace; they form the cultural structure of "syntagmatic relation" mentioned above, where *hare* is next to *ke*. This relation is not of the political "discrimination" but of cultural "distinction" as I stated above. In principle, political or social powers build discrimination consciously and people in its structure are usually conscious of it, on the other hand, people are generally not conscious of cultural

distinction, which is formed in the cultural structure. In view of this, distinction is rather similar to "difference" in terms of structuralism.

While the former Constitution formed the Tennō system based upon the Prussian Constitution, in the the present Constitution the Tennō system is signified *as shōchō* which is translated from "symbol." The core of this newly translated system is the "acts in matters of state" performed by Tennō, many of which are formal performances: such as "appointment" contrasting with the eariler "designation," by which the Constitution prescribes that the Tennō "shall appoint the Prime Minister designated by the Diet." Besides, the promulgation of treaties, the awarding of honors and so on are formal practices as opposed to the substantial practices undertaken by the representatives of people. These formal performances are almost worthless from the viewpoint of politics; from the cultural point of view, however, these performances as *shōchō* are the indispensable half of the role of paradigmatic relation between the formal practices and the substantial ones.

The cultural structure mentioned above is essentially due to the contrast between *wa* and *kan*. The former is native language or culture and the latter is what was originally introduced from foreign languages or cultures and has changed its meaning with the lapse of time. Through this historical change, it is important in the cultural viewpoint that the confronting relation between higher-graded *kan* and lower-graded *wa* has remained; I have already argued about these circumstances in regard to the technical terms of the Japanese sciences in various books and papers. The same is generally true of the Tennō system.

The essential dual structure of *wa* and *kan* has remained firmly entrenched in the history of Japanese language and culture as I have explained above. The former Constitution has once defined the Tennō system as the structure of "discrimination," which may have been, however, an exceptional phase in Japan's long history. The fundamental core of the Tennō system in Japanese history must have been the structure of cultural "distinction."

REFERENCES

Amino, Y., Ueno, C., Miyata, N. (1988): *Nihon Ōken Ron.* (On Japanese Kingship) Shunjyū-sha, Tokyo, 270pp. (in Japanese). 網野善彦、上野千鶴子、宮田登 (1988): 『日本王権論』春秋社. 270pp.

Douglas, M. (1979): *Purity and Danger, an Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo,* Rontledge & Kegan Paul, London, 188pp. 塚本利明訳 (1985) 『汚穢と禁忌』思潮社, 328pp.

Egami, N. (1988): *Kiba Minzoku Kokka.* (Horse-riding People's Country) Chuokoron-sha, Tokyo, 361pp. (in Japanese). 江上波夫 (1988) 『騎馬民族国家』中央公論社, 361pp.

Murakami, S. (1986): *Tennō to Nihon-Bunka.* (Tennō and Japanese Culture). Kodan-sha, Tokyo, 256pp. (in Japanese). 村上重良 (1986) 『天皇と日本文化』講談社, 256pp.

Nishi, A.(1962): Kenpō Sōan (A Draft of the constitution); In, Nishi, A: *Nishi Amane Zenshū dai 2 kan* (The Complete Works of Nishi Amane vol. 2), Munetaka-shobō,

Tokyo, pp.197-237. (in Japanese). 西周 (1962) 憲法草案. 『西周全集　第二巻』宗高書房, pp.197-237.

Tsuda, S. (1963): Tennō Kō. (Treatise onTennō), In, Tsuda, S. *Tsuda Sōkichi Zenshū dai 3 kan* (The complete works of Tsuda Sōkichi vol . 3.) Iwanami shoten, Tokyo, pp.474-487. (in Japanese). 津田左右吉　(1963): 天皇考,『津田左右吉全集　第三巻』岩波書店, pp.474-487.

Turner, V. (1974): *Dramas, Fields and Metaphors; Symbol Action in Human Society* Ithaca, Cornell University Press, New York, 309pp. 梶原景昭訳 (1981) :『象徴と社会』紀伊国屋書店, 1983, 343pp.

Yamaguchi, M (1975): *Bunka to Ryōgi-sei.* (Culture and Double Entendre). Iwanami shoten, Tokyo, 266pp. (in Japanese). 山口昌男　(1975): 『文化と両義性』岩波書店, 266pp.

Yamaguchi, M (1989): *Tennō-sei no Bunka-jinrui-gaku.* (Anthropology on the Tennō system). Tachikaze shobō, 354pp. (in Japanese). 山口昌男 (1989): 『天皇制の文化人類学』立風書房, 354pp.

Yanabu, A. (1976): *Honyaku towa Nani ka.* (What is Translation?). Hōsei University Press, Tokyo, 211pp. (in Japanese). 柳父章(1976): 『翻訳とはなにか』法政大学出版局, 211pp.

Yanabu, A. (1982): *Honyaku-go Seiritsu Jijyō.* (The Coinage of Translated Words in Modern Japan). Iwanami shoten, 212pp. (in Japanese). 柳父章 (1982): 『翻訳語成立事情』岩波書店, 212pp. Yanabu, A. Übersetzt von Coulmas F. (1991): *Modernisierung der Sprache.* iudicium, 146pp. (in Germany) .

―――――――― 翻訳文化の象徴としての天皇制 ――――――――

――――――――― 柳父　章 ―――――――――

要旨：天皇制は、ふつうもっとも日本的な文化の代表のように考えられているが、その言葉や儀式は、ほとんどすべて外来の言葉や文化でできている。翻訳論の立場で言えば、翻訳語、翻訳文化でできている。たとえば天皇という言葉、天皇家の宝物、天皇家の人々の服装、さまざまな儀式が翻訳である。本論文はまずこの事実を紹介し、次にその理由について考える。理由について考える理論では、象徴人類学で、文化をその境界から考える王権論があって、天皇はヨソモノであるという。翻訳論の天皇制論は、この王権論と似ているが、王権論が一つの文化の内側から境界と王権を考えるのに対して、翻訳論では二つの文化を前提として、その境界から天皇制を考える。
　翻訳語、翻訳文化は、一般にそのもとの言語、文化とも、翻訳された側の言語、文化とも違う特徴がある。この「違い」は構造主義の「差異」と似たところもあるが、価値の上下をともなうところが同じでない。翻訳は、高い価値をともなう「違い」の現象を造り出す。ここから、天皇制の権威が由来する。この「違い」は「差別」とも違う。明治憲法は天皇制を「差別」の体制として位置づけたが、天皇制の長い歴史の中ではこれはむしろ例外であって、翻訳論の立場から見た文化論的な「違い」の構造こそ本質的であろう。