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Introduction
To receive foreign cultures, we, the native speakers of the Japanese language, need to translate the original works from foreign languages into our own. Thus, translation and cultural reception have an inevitably deep connection. As Friedrich Schleiermacher said, in “On the Different Methods of Translating,” “that utterances are translated from one language to another is a fact we meet with everywhere, in the most diverse forms” (43). Translations have given us the power to interact with those who do not share a common language with us, and through translated works, we can better understand about not only foreign cultures but also our own. The term “translation” has wider meanings than one might think, sometimes referring to the visual adaptations of literature, but in this article, the term “translation” refers to the conversion of a text from one language into another.

Translation studies only became a serious area of scholarly research in Japan towards the beginning of the 21st century when comprehensive studies from Western academia, such as the Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (1998), and Introducing Translation Studies: Theories and Applications by Jeremy Munday (2001), were first published. These studies by British scholars have shown us a lot of key concepts about translation and given us a lot of inspiration. These days, translation studies seem to be very popular among Japanese academic institutions.

One might think translation studies in Japan has a rather short history, because now the Western (especially British) theoretical
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framework is well known among us, even though it does not seem to fit with Japanese translation activity. It might be a surprise, however, to find many theories about the work of translation have been elaborated by Japanese writers and academics since the Meiji era (1868-1912), when Japanese translations of Western essays and literary works started to flourish. In 2010, Akira Yanabu, Akira Mizuno, and Mikako Naganuma published *Nippon no Hon’yakuron: Anthology to Kaidai* [Japanese Translation Theories: An Anthology and Bibliographies] in order to look through the main translation theories in Japan since the Meiji era and to present an overview of the theoretical and historical perspectives in Japan. They analyze the works according to Lawrence Venuti’s two definitions of “domesticating translation” and “foreignizing translation,” but, according to Mizuno, their analyses align overall with Schleiermacher’s thinking, rather than Venuti’s (39).

Despite the prevalence of their use among scholars, these terms seem to be deployed with somewhat different definitions from Venuti’s and are used more in accordance with the concepts in Schleiermacher’s theory. Schleiermacher offered two possibilities of translation styles in “On the Different Methods of Translating”: “In my opinion, there are only two possibilities. Either the translator leaves the writer in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer toward him” (49). Venuti advanced Schleiermacher’s theory and formulated the concepts of “foreignizing translation” and “domesticating translation” in *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. As Venuti said, “Schleiermacher allowed the translator to choose between a domesticating practice, an ethnocentric reduction of the foreign text to receiving cultural values, bringing the author back home, and a foreignizing practice, an ethnodeviant pressure on those values to register the linguistic and cultural differences of the foreign text,
sending the reader abroad” (15). While Venuti suggests “foreignizing translation in English can be a form of resistance against ethnocentrism and racism, cultural narcissism and imperialism, in the interests of democratic geopolitical relations,” (16) he also says:

Insofar as the effect of transparency effaces the work of translation, it contributes to the cultural marginality and economic exploitation that English-language translators have long suffered, their status as seldom recognized, poorly paid writers whose work nonetheless remains indispensable because of the global domination of British and American cultures, of English. Behind the translator’s invisibility is a trade imbalance that underwrites this domination, but also decreases the cultural capital of foreign values in English by limiting the number of foreign texts translated and submitting them to domesticating revision. . . . The concept of the translator’s “invisibility” is already a cultural critique, a diagnosis that opposes the situation it represents. (13)

His motive behind the book “is to make the translator more visible so as to resist and change the conditions under which translation is theorized, studied, and practiced today, especially in English-speaking countries” (13). Because of this perspective, the two strategies are sometimes criticized as too political, and a number of scholars use these definitions in accordance with the concepts in Schleiermacher’s theory instead. Venuti also argues:

the terms “domestication” and “foreignization” do not establish a neat binary opposition that can simply be superimposed on “fluent” or “resistant” discursive strategies, nor can these two sets of terms be reduced to the true binaries that have
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proliferated in the history of translation commentary. . . . [T]he terms “domestication” and “foreignization” indicate fundamentally ethical attitudes towards a foreign text and culture, ethical effects produced by the choice of a text for translation and by the strategy devised to translate it, whereas terms like “fluency” and “resistancy” indicate fundamentally discursive features of translation strategies in relation to the reader’s cognitive processing. (19; italics in original)

In this article, the terms “domesticating translation” and “foreignizing translation” will be used in accordance with the concepts of Schleiermacher’s theory, and “the ethical attitudes of translators” will be considered.

In Nippon no Hon’yakuron Yanabu points out the following differences between Japanese and Western translation attitudes: Western people have had confidence in their own cultural superiority, while in Japan, foreign articles have been translated into Japanese so that we have received the advanced foreign culture (32).

Historically, foreignizing translation has dominated Japanese translation culture, but we must note that, as Mizuno points out, “the foreignizing translation in Japan does not mean to resist the foreign culture, but it has had dynamism for Japanese language to convert its style or create a new style” (Yanabu et al. 39). Translationese in Japanese Literary Translation, a comprehensive text-analyzing study by Yukari Fukuchi Meldrum (2009), analyzes Japanese contemporary translation works to show how Japanese “translationese” — the Japanese language used in translation works — has been established.

Taking into account the outcomes of the previous studies mentioned above, this article argues: (1) in accordance with the strategy of foreignization, translators in Japan have made “faithful translations” to the original works; (2) as a result, the essence or the
author’s intention of the original works remains in the Japanese translation works, sometimes better than in other adaptations, such as films made in the original language; (3) and that the Japanese “faithful translations” have acted as a tool for Japanese people to receive the foreign culture not as an idealized image of the country where the original work was written, but as a “real” image of it.

**Japanese Translation Tradition**

Japan has a long history of translation works since the 8th century. As Yanabu pointed out, traditionally “in Japan, foreign articles have been translated into Japanese language, so that we received the advanced foreign cultures” (32). In order to study advanced foreign cultures, a lot of foreign materials have been translated into Japanese since the Nara period (710-794 CE), when Kentoushi missions to Tang-dynasty China brought back various documents to Japan. According to Yoichi Yamaoka, the Japanese modern translationese, or hon’yakuchoo, first appeared in *Jiyuu no Kenri* (1895), in the form of a translation by Masajiro Takahashi of John Stuart Mill’s *On Liberty* (95). This style of translationese was used in order to help the Japanese audience understand the original works in the original language, English in this case, and has been used since then. As the style moves the readers toward the author, it is considered a foreignizing translation. Until recent years, this foreignizing translation style has dominated the translation works in Japan.

We must note that there is a prominent difference between translations of Western and Japanese languages. Historically, Western translation started with the aim of propagation of Christianity to the rest of the world, and so the primary text for translation was the Holy Bible. That is to say, the range of occidental texts translated by the West into other languages was mainly restricted to religious material. On the other hand, the Japanese have translated many different types of works
written in foreign languages into Japanese, in order to receive the advanced foreign cultures, and there has always been a question of what to translate. In other words, the question for the Japanese about what to translate has always been ahead of the question about how to translate, not least because, historically, the human and financial resources for translation works were limited.

There are three main factors that have determined translation work in Japan. The first is the political and social background of the time; as the translation works are published in order to receive the foreign cultures into Japan, and to get as many readers as possible, the political and social background of the day cannot be ignored. There have been some legal or regulatory restrictions about publishing, too. For example, after World War II, the Civil Information and Education (CIE) section of the General Headquarters (GHQ) for the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers regulated the publishing of the Japanese translation works. Secondly, the economic factors should be considered. In Japan, private companies have mainly published the translation of foreign works, therefore, the profitability of each book has been the critical issue to the publishers. Publishing companies need to consider not only the political and social background but also what would sell well. Lastly, we need to factor in the translators’ or publishers’ cultural appetites. In Japan, the question of what to translate has fallen mainly upon the translators or publishers in charge. They need to be motivated by the foreign science, cultures, or literature in the original works, and if they have these interests, they are more likely to translate the works. Conversely, if the translators or publishers have not been interested in the original works, a publication of the translated versions would be very unlikely. In Himitsu no Okoku: Hyouden Ishii Momoko (A Secret Kingdom: A Biography of Momoko Ishii), the author, Mariko Ozaki, describes how hard Ishii sought for good children’s books from other countries, especially from English and American
literatures, and how enthusiastically she translated them into Japanese. The fact that many translation works by Momoko Ishii have been very popular in Japan since they were first published, and are still widely beloved, shows how the translator’s cultural appetite is important.

**CIE’s Competitive Bidding during the Occupation**

Immediately after the end of World War II, Japanese people craved books. After years of wartime control of what could and could not be published, there was a demand not only for books written in Japanese, but also for English-language texts. Japanese publishing industries recovered surprisingly early after World War II, as John B. Hench points out: “the recovery of Japanese book publishing was astonishing. Because of the pent-up demand for books and other reading material, publishing was actually one of the first Japanese industries to recover. . . . The rapid response of Japanese publishers was highly welcome locally” (237). Before World War II, American literature was not regarded as highly in Japan as it was in Europe. For the Japanese, “high-culture” was thought to come from Europe rather than the United States,¹ so the occupation of Japan was a great chance for the United States to make their culture, especially literature, more highly-regarded and popular in Japan than before. Hench points out that despite the situation, “[e]fforts to encourage the publishing of Japanese translation titles . . . were not much more successful than the marketing of OEs [Oversea's Editions]. Few of the early reprints of foreign literature were American books. Books by U.S. authors in fact numbered only 104 (7.6 percent) of the 1,367 translations that Japanese publishing houses issued between November 1945 and April 1948”(238). This result also shows us that the translators’ or publishers’ cultural appetites were one of the critical factors for publishing in Japan even under the U.S. occupation.

On 5 December 1946, GHQ’s circular letter No.12 was
circulated among Japanese publishing companies. The purpose of the circular was to announce the regulations regarding the importation and dissemination of foreign magazines, books, films, news, photos, etc., in Japan. The circular contained ten regulations about the rights to translate, reprint, and publish this material. A copy of this circular letter is cited in Hon’yakuken no Sengoshi [The Post-World War II History of the Translation Rights] by Noboru Miyata (400-7). In accordance with the stated regulations, all the foreign copyrights were controlled by GHQ and the intermediary agencies for the translation rights also needed GHQ’s permission. Four agencies, including George Thomas Forster (the United States) and Leon Prou (France), won GHQ’s permission at that time, according to Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.²

In this way, no translations of foreign works were supposed to be published in Japan without GHQ’s permission, and this enabled GHQ to function as a national censor. According to Hiromi Ochi, “since 1948 when CIE’s competitive biddings for the translation right was installed, GHQ’s cultural policy in occupied Japan became systematic” (27). In fact, Noboru Miyata, who was in charge of translation works in a publishing company at that time, writes, “those biddings under the occupation had done great achievements that allowed Japanese to publish many American best sellers at that time and many classical works from Europe which are still published in these days, but it cannot be denied that there were also many works in the program that suggest the Japanese occupational policy to democratize Japan to be a fortress against communism. Japan had no authority at all to select the books for those biddings” (Miyata, Sengoshi 87, 89).

A Case Study: An American Tragedy
Before World War II, Matsuo Takagaki, a professor of Rikkyo
University, was a pioneer of studies of American literature in Japan. He also had a profound knowledge of Dreiser’s works and wrote a bibliographical introduction to his works, *Dreiser*, in 1933. In this book, Takagaki said, “*An American Tragedy* should be a reflection of imperfectness of American society, and it is an error to think the crime was primarily caused by Clyde Griffiths’ personality” (107).

During World War II, Dreiser pointed out the contradictions and inequalities in American society in *America Is Worth Saving*. These themes would have suited the political and social condition in wartime Japan. Yoshio Nakano translated “Scarcity and Plenty,” the second chapter of *America Is Worth Saving* in the November 1, 1944 issue of *Eigo-Seinen. America Is Worth Saving* was published in 1941 in the United States after Japan’s bombing of Pearl Harbor. We have no way of knowing how Nakano managed to get Dreiser’s article, in light of the many restrictions on information from the United States at that time, but this shows that Japanese academic intellectuals maintained their interest in Dreiser’s works, even in wartime.

The film adaptation of *An American Tragedy*, *A Place in the Sun*, which was produced in 1949 and released in 1951 in the United States, triggered the republication of the translation of *An American Tragedy* in Japan in 1950. This novel does not seem to have been among the CIE’s bidding lists, because “after memorandum by GHQ dated April 4, 1949, Japanese publishing companies can negotiate directly with the authors overseas,” according to *Showa no Hon’yaku Jikembo (The Translation Case File of Showa Period)* by Noboru Miyata (114). According to *Hon’yakuken no Sengoshi* written by the same author, the translation right was directly acquired by Hayakawa Publishing through Forster’s Agency (135). The royalties were incredibly high, but Hayakawa Publishing expected large sales of the book thanks to the film (135).

However, it did not sell well, and Hayakawa Publishing was
almost bankrupted. Originally, the title of the book in Japanese was *Amerika no Higeki* [*An American Tragedy*], but after many copies were returned to the publisher, the title was changed into *Hi no Ataru Basho: Amerika no Higeki* [*A Place in the Sun: An American Tragedy*] to show the connection with the film (Miyata Sengoshi 136). But what was the film like? According to Hal Erickson, *A Place in the Sun* is:

A huge improvement over the 1931 *An American Tragedy*, directed by Josef von Sternberg, *A Place in the Sun* softens some of the rough edges of Dreiser’s naturalism, most notably in the passages pertaining to George’s and Angela’s romance. Even those 1951 bobbysoxers who wouldn’t have been caught dead poring through the Dreiser original were mesmerized by the loving, near-erotic full facial closeups of [Montgomery] Clift and [Elizabeth] Taylor as they pledge eternal devotion. (Erickson, italics mine)

There are several differences between the original novel by Dreiser and this film. First of all, the title was changed from *An American Tragedy*, which embodies the American social problems of the time, into *A Place in the Sun*, which suggests a more positive and less localized situation. Along with the change of title, the names of the main characters were also changed, arguably becoming more sophisticated: Clyde became George, Roberta became Alice, and Sondra became Angela. The film, therefore, might not remind its audience of the original novel. Dreiser wrote about what happened after Clyde’s arrest, the American social reaction to his crime, and his anguish. However, in the film, the final farewell between George (Montgomery Clift) and Alice (Elizabeth Taylor) stands out as the beautiful scene. In this way, Dreiser’s intentions were removed from the film and only its plot was used. George’s family background, the
solitude he faced when he came to the city and started work at his uncle’s factory, his emotional turmoil from the poverty and the desire to be rich, and his mental pain after the crime were not clearly shown in the movie, while Dreiser spent almost two-thirds of the novel describing them. This film, changed into a sad love story, was a great success and won six Oscars, including Best Director, Best Adapted Screenplay, and Best Cinematography.

Regardless of the alterations in the film from the original novel, the Japanese translator Jun Tanaka hardly omitted any of the content for the Japanese translation and says, “this work is not only a large preliminary protocol, but also a deep criticism toward American society and a severe protest” (Dreiser, Amerika no Higeki 355) in the afterword of his Japanese version. Tanaka’s comments are consistent with Dreiser’s thoughts on the source material for the novel, cited in his biography by Thomas P. Riggio:

His time in California, nevertheless, was not altogether fruitless. While there he began to focus on a story that was rooted in a type of sensational crime that he believed characterized American life. He first observed these crimes as a young reporter in 1892, and he continued to take notes on such cases for years. They consisted of murders in which the motive is not personal hatred but the desire of a socially marginal man to escape from a romantic entanglement in order to marry another woman who brings with her upper-class position and wealth. Dreiser had a brilliant insight into this condition: such an aspiration “was really not an anti-social dream as Americans should see it, but rather a pro-social dream. [The defendant] was really doing the kind of thing which Americans should and would have said was the wise and moral thing for him to do had he not committed a murder. His would not ordinarily be called
the instinct of a criminal; rather, it would be deemed the instinct of a worthy and respected temperament.”

Riggio further states that, during World War II, Dreiser was known as a communist intellectual in the United States. Furthermore, modernist literature flourished on the scene at that time, and Dreiser, a naturalist author, had already lost his popularity in the United States when he died in December 1945. According to Donald Pizer:

Although critics such as Alfred Kazin and F. O. Matthiessen continued to praise him for having achieved a powerful blend of social realism and pathos, it became more common to attack Dreiser, as did Lionel Trilling in his well-known essay “Reality in America,” both for his idea of reality and for his mode of depicting it. Trilling’s essay indirectly expresses a widely shared revulsion by formerly radical critics of the 1930s (Philip Rahv and Malcolm Cowley are other significant examples) toward writers whose work and thought had close ties to the Communist Party and its policies during the decade. Dreiser was perhaps the principal example of a major American literary figure of this kind.

In Japan, however, after World War II, his works still had their value, and several translations were repeatedly published. After World War II, the translations of An American Tragedy published in Japan were as follows:

1950 translation by Jun Tanaka, published by Hayakawa Publishing;
1960 translation by Yasuo Okubo, published by Shincho-Bunko;
1963 translation by Fukuo Hashimoto, published by Kadokawa-Bunko;
1978 translation by Yokichi Miyamoto, published by Shueisha. According to Kiyohiko Murayama, Dreiser “was actively involved in social movements as a communist intellectual in 1930s when the crisis of the Great Depression and Fascism were raging in the United States, and when he died in 1945, he was a member of the communist party” (Dreiser, Sisuta 508). Riggio also mentions, “In July 1945, five months before his death, Dreiser made his last dramatic gesture of public protest by joining the Communist Party.” Given that Dreiser was criticized as out of date by American critics and became unpopular as a communist among Americans, the fact that Dreiser still had many readers in Japan is rather noteworthy.

**Faithful Translation of *An American Tragedy***

In the United States, the critical evaluation of Dreiser’s works has changed drastically along with the change of the political and social conditions. As we see in the above, *An American Tragedy* was adapted into the film, *A Place in the Sun*, and in this film, its social and political perspectives were entirely removed. However, all the Japanese versions of *An American Tragedy* were translated faithfully to the original novel, though Tanaka’s version changed its title to *A Place in the Sun—An American Tragedy* after the film was released. Tanaka fully understood Dreiser’s intentions for this novel, as evidenced by his afterword.

These faithful translations brought the work’s social and political message to Japanese readers, even though they disappeared from the American film adaptation. Readers in Japan received Dreiser’s social message through those faithful Japanese translations, because reading is a type of cultural interaction between the readers and the author, even via translations. Kenji Inoue mentions the “sociality which features in
American literature” and the “anti-civilized primitiveness in American literature” in the afterword of A Collection of Fukuo Hashimoto III, titled “Hashimoto-Sensei to Amerika Bungaku” (“Prof. Hashimoto and American Literature”) (317-21). A reader “who is a free individual and understands artworks without any political bias” may receive Dreiser’s message after reading Inoue’s afterword and consider the contradiction and problems an American society had.

**Conclusion: Faithful Translation as Our Choice**

In Japan, many translators have tried to capture the original works completely and not to omit any parts during the translation; that is, unintentionally, they have done faithful translations of the original works. By doing so, the translated works may carry the political and/or social messages from the author, as they are in the original works. Meanwhile, these messages may be removed from other adaptations of the original work and be forgotten in the original country.

Mizuno writes that in Japan, “domesticating translation does not always have negative nuances which Venuti pointed out and foreignizing translation does not mean any resistance but rather aspires Japanese language improvement” (Yanabu et al. 39). If one might think these faithful translations are a kind of foreignizing translation, which Japanese translators have done without any social or political intent, they could act as a tool for the Japanese reader to receive the foreign culture, not as an ideal image for the country where the original works were written, but as reality, as it was.

As mentioned above, Venuti stated that “the terms ‘domestication’ and ‘foreignization’ indicate fundamentally ethical attitudes towards a foreign text and culture, ethical effects produced by the choice of a text for translation and by the strategy devised to translate it” (19; italics in original); he goes on to say:
foreignization does not offer unmediated access to the foreign—no translation can do that—but rather constructs a certain image of the foreign that is informed by the receiving situation but aims to question it by drawing on materials that are not currently dominant, namely the marginal and the nonstandard, the residual and the emergent. (19-20)

In this sense, it can be said that Japanese “faithful” translations have been highly ethical, constructed a certain image of foreign culture, and let the Japanese readers question it. To understand that we have chosen what to translate by ourselves and that we have translated the foreign works as faithfully as possible into Japanese is a key to grasp how we have received Western cultures, especially American culture, after World War II.

Notes
1. See Steiner 110-111.
2. After Japan recovered its sovereignty in 1952, these two agencies continued their business for decades, but in 1973, Forster’s agency quitted its business, while Leon Prou’s is now Bureau des Copyrights Français. (http://www.mext.go.jp/b_menu/shingi/chosakuken_index/toushin/attach/1325675.htm)
3. The first book about American literature in Japan was Amerika Bungaku (American Literature) written by Matsuo Takagaki in 1927.
5. Thomas P. Riggio writes about Dreiser’s situation as follows: “Readers in the 1940s knew Dreiser as much through his public statements as through his creative writing. His political views, although not always popular, were not atypical among intellectuals before the bombing of Pearl Harbor. In early 1941 he responded to
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the prospect of American involvement in the European war with America is Worth Saving, in which he argued against coming to the aid of English imperialists and against the prospect of putting money into the pockets of wealthy Americans who would profit from war. In these years, Dreiser's infatuation with the Russian social regime reached its apogee. He aligned himself with radical political groups and supported many of the goals of the Communist Party. Until Hitler invaded Russia, Dreiser had feared that if Americans went to war against Germany, they would also fight the Russians. His public statements, therefore, expressed the ideals of such organizations as the Committee for Soviet Friendship and American Peace Mobilization.”

(http://www.library.upenn.edu/collections/rbm/dreiser/tdbio.html)


7. The following are Japanese translation works of Dreiser’s works published from 1945 to 2000. This list was made by the author from the data in Hon’yaku Tosho Mokuroku (The Catalogue of Japanese Translation Books III, Art, Language, Literature) by Nichigai Associates, Inc. To avoid any confusion caused, Japanese titles are omitted from this list. Dreiser lost his popularity in the United States from the 1940s onwards partly because an eminent American literary critic, Lionel Trilling, showed revulsion against Dreiser’s works. In Japan, however, the fact that so many translation works have been published after his death in 1945 is noteworthy. This list may be an evidence that Japanese people receive the foreign culture not as an ideal image for the country where the original works were written, but as reality as it was.
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*Sister Carrie Vol. 1, 2, 3* translated by Jiro Ozu, published by Santo Publishing in 1951

*Sister Carrie Vol. 1, 2, 3* translated by Jiro Ozu, published by Seikei Shoin in 1951

*Sister Carrie Vol. 1, 2, 3* translated by Jiro Ozu, published by Santo Publishing in 1951 (another version of the above)

*The Bulwark* translated by Tsutomu Ueda, published by Kawade Shobou in 1952

*A Place in the Sun Vol. 1, 2,* translated by Jun Tanaka, published by Hayakawa Publishing in 1952

*Sister Carrie* translated by Jiro Ozu, published by Hayakawa Publishing in 1953 (The Japanese title was changed into *Dusk* in this version.)


*Sister Carrie* translated by Takashi Matsukawa, published by Kadokawa Corp. in 1954

*A Place in the Sun* translated by Jun Tanaka, published by Hayakawa Publishing in 1954

*Free and Other Stories* translated by Takashi Sugiki and Motoo Takigawa, published by Eihousha in 1957

*Sister Carrie Vol. 1* translated by Jiro Ozu, published by Kenkyusha in 1959


*The Lost Phoebe* translated by Hikaru Saito and Nobutaka Kiuchi, published by Nan’undo in 1960

*An American Tragedy Vol. 4* translated by Yasuo Okubo, published by Shincho-Bunko in 1961
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_An American Tragedy Vol. 1_ translated by Fukuo Hashimoto, published by Kadokawa-Bunko in 1963

_An American Tragedy Vol. 2_ translated by Fukuo Hashimoto, published by Kadokawa-Bunko in 1965

_An American Tragedy Vol. 3_ translated by Fukuo Hashimoto, published by Kadokawa-Bunko in 1967

_An American Tragedy Vol. 4_ translated by Fukuo Hashimoto, published by Kadokawa-Bunko in 1968

_Dreiser (photos)_ edited by Sogosha, published by Shueisha in 1970

_Dreiser (portraits)_ edited by Sogosha, published by Shueisha in 1975

_An American Tragedy Vol. 1, 2_ translated by Yasuo Okubo, published by Shincho-Bunko in 1978

_An American Tragedy Vol. 1_ translated by Yokichi Miyamoto, published by Shueisha in 1978

_An American Tragedy Vol. 2_ translated by Yokichi Miyamoto, published by Shueisha in 1978


_Old Rogaum and His Theresa_ translated by Takashi Nozaki, published by Kawade Shobo Shinsha in 1997

_Sister Carrie Vol. 1_ translated by Kiyohiko Murayama, published by Iwanami-Bunko in 1997


_Old Rogaum and His Theresa_ translated by Eiichiro Otsu, published by Iwanami-Bunko in 1999
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