THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

TRANSLATION: A PERSONAL INTERPRETATION

BY

MICHAEL J. MAEHDER

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

FRENCH-ENGLISH TRANSLATION

DEPARTMENT OF FRENCH, ITALIAN, AND SPANISH

CALGARY, ALBERTA

APRIL, 1991

© MICHAEL J. MAEHDER 1991

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-66960-8

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies for acceptance, a thesis entitled, "Translation: A Personal Interpretation" submitted by Michael J. Maehder in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in French-English Translation.

Supervisor, P. Fothergill-Payne
Department of French, Italian
and Spanish

Dr. Anthony Greaves
Department of French, Italian
and Spanish

Dr. Michael Dewar
Department of Classics

Date: 91.04.09

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes the role that a translator's perceived purpose for translating a given text plays in the translation process. Chapter I analyzes the roles of semantic meaning and form in the understanding of a text and in the translation or re-creation of a text. Chapter II proceeds from the analysis of an author's perceived target audience to the translator's own perception of a new target audience for the original text, and posits the theory that a change in the translator's perceived target audience will result in changes in translation method that can be identified in the translation itself. Chapter III substantiates this theory by linking variations in translations of specific passages to changes in perceived target audience. The examples are taken from my translation drafts of three French-Canadian short stories, "La Cassette", "Dolorès, I", and "Dolorès, II", found in a collection of short stories entitled Un singulier amour, by Madeleine Ferron (Les Editions du Boréal Express, 1987).

PRECIS

La raison pour laquelle on traduit varie selon l'objectif perçu pour la traduction de la part du traducteur. Cette thèse analyse le rôle que cette perception de l'objectif joue dans le processus de la traduction. Le Chapitre I analyse les rôles de la sémantique et de la forme de la langue dans la compréhension d'un texte et dans la traduction ou "deuxième création" d'un texte. Le Chapitre II analyse la perception de l'auteur de son groupe de lecteurs cible et celle du traducteur face au nouveau groupe de lecteurs cible. De plus, on énonce la théorie qu'un changement de perception du groupe de lecteurs cible chez un traducteur mènera à des changements dans la méthode de traduction, ce qui se manifeste dans le texte traduit. Le Chapitre III fournit des preuves à l'appui de cette théorie en démontrant le lien entre les variations notées dans la traduction de textes spécifiques et les changements dans la perception du groupe de lecteurs cible. Ces exemples sont tirés de mes brouillons de traduction de trois nouvelles canadiennes-françaises, "La Cassette", "Dolorès, I", et "Dolorès, II"; celles-ci se trouvent dans une collection de nouvelles de Madeleine Ferron, intitulée Un singulier amour (Les Editions du Boréal Express, 1987).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the help and co-operation of many people this thesis could not have become a reality. I would especially like to thank my thesis director, Peter Fothergill-Payne, for both his patient guidance thoughout the course of my studies, and for his help in making this thesis come together after my move to Ottawa. My special thanks go out to Dr. Esther Enns-Connolly from the Department of Germanic and Slavic languages, who headed a directed-reading course on translation theory which eventually provided the foundation for Chapters I and II of this work.

I would like to express my gratitude to the various entities at University of Calgary who were instrumental in providing grants for my research. As well, I would also like to thank Madeleine Ferron and Les Editions du Boréal Express for their friendly co-operation in allowing me to publish my translations of Ms. Ferron's short stories.

Finally, my sincere gratitude to my friends and colleagues in Calgary, Montreal, and Ottawa, as well as to my family, all of whom contributed to this thesis, either by expressing their input, or by supporting me in the course of my work.

Michael Maehder

Ottawa, 1991

CONTENTS

Approval Page ii

Abstract iii

Précis iv

Acknowledgements v

Introduction 1

Chapter I: The Struggle between Meaning and Form 4

Chapter II: The Role of the Perceived Target Audience .26

Chapter III: Combining Theory and Practice 49

Conclusion 78

List of Abbreviations 86

References 87

Appendix A: Passages and Translations Cited 89

Appendix B: Translations

I. "The Tape" 94

II. "Dolores, I" 101

III. "Dolores, II" 110

INTRODUCTION

This thesis sets out to examine how a translator's perception of the translation's raison-d'être affects how he[1] translates. It is not an attempt to understand every motivation behind a translator's complex decision-making process, but rather, it specifically explores how the translator's perception of his target audience (TA) can affect his method of translation. Chapter I discusses translation method, focusing on the manner in which the translator highlights and re-creates the struggle between the semantic meaning and the form of the source text (ST). Chapter II analyzes the notion of perceived TA and posits the theory that general changes in perceived TA can affect translation method. Chapter III discusses textual examples that support both the individual principles discussed in Chapters I and II, and the theory outlined in the latter part of Chapter II.

The examples cited in Chapter III are taken from my translations of three French-Canadian stories: "La Cassette", "Dolorès, I", and "Dolorès, II", by Madeleine Ferron. Appendix A includes the specific passages cited

---

1. The use of masculine singular pronouns (he, his, etc.) throughout this work is purely a linguistic convention and is not meant to imply specific gender. It was felt that other options such as repeating "translator" or using the generic plural "translators" and its corresponding pronouns were awkward and/or inappropriate in a text of this length and nature.

and their corresponding draft and final translations, while the final translations in their entirety can be found in Appendix B.

My decision to write a thesis on the topic of translation was a natural progression for me, since languages have always played a major role in my life. I grew up as an Anglophone in a bilingual city, Montreal, the son of a French-Canadian mother and a German immigrant father. Translating was something I could do, not because I had been taught or trained, but simply because I was fluent in English and French. Translation theory, I decided, was something I wanted to know more about, in order to understand why I was doing what I was doing when I translated. Logically, I could not attempt to understand what I was doing if I was not actually translating; therefore, I began my search for a text to translate.

I decided to translate short stories, because they were of an appropriate length to allow me to translate more than one in a reasonable amount of time, and at the same time, afford a broad range of examples of different aspects of translation. Furthermore, the nature of the language generally used approximated everyday speech more than other literary genres such as poetry, and thus suited my desired "pragmatic" approach to translation. Because I was more concerned with practical or everyday language, I selected recently written texts.

I chose a French-Canadian author, first because I am Canadian, and second, because, in my opinion, the wealth of French literature "made in Canada" is, with a few notable exceptions, overlooked by unilingual Canadian Anglophones. I chose the three short stories from Un Singulier Amour, because Madeleine Ferron is a well-published French-Canadian author who is virtually unknown in English Canada and whose writing-style and subject matter appeal to me.

After having completed several translation drafts for each of the short stories, I was able to link general changes in my translation method to changes in the perception of my TA. I researched translation theory in general and the role of the TA in particular, and posited the theory developed in Chapters I and II of this thesis. Because the vast majority of translation theory available is in English, I decided that it would be more suitable to write this thesis in English rather than in French.

This work constitutes an interpretation of a particular aspect of the decision-making process that I underwent as I translated, but I believe the principles discussed provide a basis for analyzing the effect that any translator's perceived TA can have on his method of resolving the constant struggle between meaning and form. It is hoped that this thesis will provide a greater insight into the role that the translator's personal bias can play in translation.

CHAPTER I

THE STRUGGLE BETWEEN MEANING AND FORM

Within a single language system, the relationship between meaning and form can vary greatly. For example, Barnwell (1974, 11) states that one meaning can have several forms (meaning:forms), or one form can have several meanings (form:meanings). Because of the lack of any consistent, one-to-one correspondence between meaning and form, language is subject to interpretation. At first glance, the need for interpretation would seem to result only from the form:meanings relationship, and not from that of meaning:forms. This appears to be so because if one single meaning has various forms (meaning:forms), the author can arbitrarily choose any of the forms to represent the meaning, and the reader will arrive at the same meaning as the author. Thus, no interpretation is necessary. On the other hand, when a form already chosen by an author has more than one meaning (form:meanings), the reader must interpret which of the meanings the author originally intended. In other words, the fact that form can have several meanings leads to the interpretation of the specific meaning of words in a text.

In fact, authors sometimes play on the multiplicity of meanings by deliberately using a form that is vague and open to interpretation to make the reader aware that more

than one interpretation is possible or desirable. It is up to the reader first to spot it, and second, to decide for himself which interpretation(s) he will choose to read into the text. From this one can surmise that form can affect meaning because interpretation is necessary when a form has more than one meaning (form:meanings).

But if, as Barnwell states, one meaning can have several forms, how can the statement that form affects meaning be true? If one meaning can have several forms, the form that meaning takes would not appear to affect meaning. In other words, the form of language would be arbitrary, and language could be seen simply as a vehicle that communicates meaning. Indeed, Steiner (1975, 21) says that "languages are wholly arbitrary sets of signals and conventionalized counters." If this is so, it would seem that because a meaning can have more than one form (meaning:forms), meaning should somehow be independent and separable from language, it should somehow be a universal that antecedes form. If one meaning can have several forms, one can hypothesize that form does not in itself affect meaning, which directly contradicts what was stated earlier. How can this inconsistency be explained?

Assuming that form does not affect meaning would indicate that meaning is independent of language. This in turn means that, theoretically, each meaning can be assigned at least one form. Theoretically this last hypothesis is possible; pragmatically, however, this is

not the case in language. Because language is an open system which seeks to communicate while at the same time having to deal with any possible phenomenon, it is pragmatically inexact. Nida and Taber (1969, 56) state that "in view of the fact that people are expected to speak about a staggering variety of experiences with only a limited number of words or semantic units (perhaps 25,000 to 50,000 for the average person), it would seem that language would be incredibly ambiguous and obscure." This lack of precision may seem unfortunate and even detrimental to communication, yet it is this very lack of precision which allows people to communicate verbally in the first place. As Steiner (1975, 205) notes, "if a substantial part of all utterances were not public or, more precisely, could not be treated as if they were, chaos and autism would follow." Consequently, according to Steiner (1975, 407), because language "has to be imprecise to serve human locution, understanding is always partial, always subject to emendation."

Therefore, whether or not "true meaning" exists and is theoretically independent of form, the actual understanding of meaning is always partial because it is based on a pragmatic language which does not have one form for every meaning. The fact remains that, in pragmatic language, "different" meanings must sometimes share form(s). Pragmatic communication can be seen, then, not as two or more people hitting the exact same meaning

target, but rather as people coming close to the same target without ever having to hit an identical mark. If communication relied on everybody hitting the exact same spot on the target, no reasonable amount of communication would be achieved. This manner of viewing the communication of meaning will perhaps help clarify the apparent inconsistency in Barnwell's original statement that one meaning can have several forms. The term "one meaning" should be interpreted as a relatively broad "pragmatic" target and not simply as one theoretically isolated point. In other words, there may be several ways to say "more or less" the same thing.

In language, then, certain words or constructions (forms) cover nearly identical areas of semantic field. Since meanings "overlap", one cannot so easily dismiss the need for interpretation in the meaning:forms situation. For example, when there exist two very similar words, either of whose pragmatic meaning may be suitable for a specific function in a text, interpretation may play a role in our understanding of the text. The author's choice (form) to express the meaning may be seen either as arbitrary, or important to the meaning of the text, depending on the reader's interpretation. The part of the meaning which does not "overlap" or share the same area of a semantic field as another possible form may or may not be important to the overall meaning.

Steiner (1975, 32) states that "languages conceal and

internalize more, perhaps, than they convey outwardly," because, although we speak to communicate, we also speak "to conceal, to leave unspoken. The ability of human beings to misinform modulates through every wavelength from outright lying to silence" (1975, 46). Our understanding of words, thus, is not based solely on what they actually say or denote, but also on what they imply (connote) and on what they don't say (omit). Similar words or forms may share aspects of a semantic field, but when one is chosen or "made explicit" over another, the other similar one (and all that it says, implies, and omits) is necessarily omitted. The choice of one word over another could actually be playing a role in the transmission of a message. Thus, theoretically, language can arbitrarily be assigned form without the form of a language affecting the meaning, although pragmatically, our understanding of this form is not completely arbitrary because meanings that can be pragmatically "the same" overlap only partially, causing form to affect meaning, thereby leading to interpretation.

In any case, both the meaning:forms and form:meanings variations can oblige readers who seek to "understand" what a text has to say to constantly <u>interpret meaning in</u> the (<u>form</u> of the) text before them. As Gadamer (1975, 360) says, "understanding and interpretation are indissolubly bound up with each other." This process of interpreting/understanding within the context of a single

language is referred to by Jakobson (1966, 233) as intralingual translation. In other words, the reader translates or interprets the text, which is meaning locked into form, into understanding or meaning for himself. For Steiner (1975, 27), intralingual translation is "interpretation", or "that which gives language life beyond the moment and place of immediate utterance or transcription."

Although Gadamer (1975, 348) refers to conversation as the translation process wherein speakers attempt a reciprocal translation of the other's position in order to reach common understanding, intralingual translation is not restricted to spoken language. Despite the fact that a text is a message fixed in print and, therefore, a unidirectional communication process, for Gadamer (1975, 349), "it is like a real conversation, in that it is the common object that unites the two partners, the text and the interpreter." In this way, the reader can translate the author's position to reach personal meaning through the text.

Thus, intralingual translation or understanding can be said to be comprised of two elements: the text (written or spoken) and its interpreter. Without either element, the realisation of some kind of meaning is impossible. This is especially important in the case of recorded (written or spoken) words, because any realisation of the meaning of recorded words is not

attained until there is someone there to interpret them. As Gadamer (1975, 350) states, the text (form) "brings an object into language, but that it achieves this is ultimately the work of the interpreter. Both have a share in it." That different interpretations of a text will result is a given since each interpreter will read the text in a unique way. According to Steiner (1975, 170), "all speech forms and notations...entail a latent or realized element of individual specificity. They are in part an idiolect." Therefore, he concludes that "all communication interprets between privacies" (1975, 198). As a result, Steiner (1975, 407) notes that "although the existence of a `perfect translation' or `perfect exchange of the totality of intended meaning'...are theoretically conceivable, there could be no way of verifying the actual fact."[1]

Pragmatically, then, there can be no ultimate interpretation of meaning, not even if the author were present to guide the reader to interpret the text exactly as the author intended it to be interpreted. A text is comprised of words and relationships between words, all of which are subject to personal interpretation. The fact that an author intended a specific interpretation does not mean that he succeeded in imparting that meaning, nor does it preclude other valid interpretations that he did not

---

1. The topic of individualized interpretation is discussed in greater detail in Chapter II.

foresee. House (1977, 30-31) refers to this when she writes that her "concern with textual function rather than original author's intention appears reasonable as the original author's intention in producing the text is of interest only insofar as that intention is realized, and can be seen to have been realized in the actual text." In other words, there are many possible meanings to a text apart from the author's intended meaning which relied on a specific form which is manifested as the text. As Gadamer (1975, 358) states, "there cannot...be any one interpretation that is correct `in itself', precisely because every interpretation is concerned with the text itself."

This means that the form used to express meaning is subject to interpretation and ultimately decides the total sum of theoretically possible interpretations. Even though that sum may be phenomenal because of individual interpretations, it does limit individual interpretations to what is actually in the form of the text. If the intended meaning is somehow not captured in the form, it cannot ever be realized or "released" through interpretation. In this sense, the form of the text is paramount to its sum total of interpretations, and any change in form can either exclude an interpretation that was theoretically present previously, or create new interpretations, or both. Thus, the only constant in Gadamer's text-interpreter "share" of intralingual

translation is the text itself, and, by extension, the sum total of theoretically possible interpretations based on the form. Ultimately, then, any given text can, in theory, "mean" anything its readers can and do read into its form.

The problem of multiple interpretations inherent in intralingual translation is compounded in what Jakobson (1966, 233) terms interlingual translation - translation between two (or more) languages. As in intralingual translation, interlingual translation relies on the individual meaning interpretation of the reader-translator. However, in interlingual translation, the only constant of the text-interpreter "share" of intralingual translation, the form of the text itself, is necessarily reshaped into another language for readers who normally are not literate in the text's original language.

For the purposes of this work, the discussion of interlingual translation will be limited to cases of written translation between <u>two</u> languages (as opposed to translating across several languages), since the actual translations in the appendices of this work only involve translation between two languages. However, I believe that any arguments made regarding interlingual translation between two languages can be extended to the process of translation across several languages. Just as interlingual translation necessitates a degree of intralingual translation, translation across several

languages necessitates a degree of interlingual translation. In both cases, the translation process is taken one step further, but the original steps still play an important role.

In traditional interlingual translation (i.e. between two languages), the form must undergo a metamorphosis, since no two languages consistently have identical structures or forms. As well, even commonly accepted translations of individual words (forms which somehow carry meaning, or "form/meaning relationships") do not consistently share identical semantic fields. As Jakobson (1966, 236) points out, "languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey." The grammatical categories of languages "carry a high semantic import." Therefore, the "cognitive function" of language is, to a certain degree, dependent on the "grammatical pattern" or form of language.

If one is trying to maintain equivalent <u>semantic</u> meaning, a change in the form in which the original meaning is carried is sometimes necessary. If the change is an addition to the form of the target text (TT) to make up for semantic differences in what languages actually convey, the reader might interpret that additional information - which may seem out of place in its new form - as more significant than was originally intended. The balance of the sum total of theoretically possible interpretations is therefore disturbed in interlingual

translation. In other words, whereas form is constant in intralingual translation and, thus, limits the sum total of possible interpretations (total meaning) of the text, the lack of a systematic one-to-one correspondence in form between languages makes it impossible to re-create identical form in the target language (TL) in an attempt to re-create the total meaning of the source text (ST) in the TT.

Since any change in form in intralingual translation can change the number of potential interpretations (total meaning) by precluding previously interpretable meanings and adding new interpretations, in interlingual translation where form is necessarily changed, it is impossible to maintain the balance between total meaning and form. As a result, it is possible to hypothesize that the only way the "total" theoretical meaning of the TT could be equal to the total meaning of the ST is if the forms of both languages were completely equivalent. Because this is not the case in interlingual translation, it is impossible to reproduce all potential interpretations of the ST inasmuch as this relies on the relationship between meaning and form being constants in both languages. As Benjamin (1969, 75) states, "the relationship between content and language" (or meaning and form), "is quite different in the original and the translation." Even if exactly equivalent meanings could be found interlingually outside of form, the fact that

form differs interlingually and that we rely on form to "understand" meaning upsets the meaning/form balance which results in "total" meaning somehow being modified.

One can, thus, conclude that the form of the text somehow contributes to the total meaning of the text by what it (potentially) does or does not convey. Benjamin (1969, 78) says that total meaning or "sense in its poetic significance is not limited to meaning, but derives from the connotations conveyed by the word chosen to express it." According to Barnwell (1974, 14), semantic meaning has priority over form, but "this does not mean that form is unimportant. Within each language, it is the form which indicates the meaning." Because the form of languages differ, they will indicate meaning somewhat differently. And since "the smallest differences of form may signal important shades of meaning" (1974, 15), total meaning cannot be reproduced if form is altered.

Nevertheless, the fact that the total meaning of a text cannot be reproduced interlingually cannot and should not deter translators from translating. It should be remembered that, although a total transfer of meaning is not realized, even in individual intralingual translation, people do read and do not discard the process as a futile exercise. Each individual's reading of a text is of value because a certain amount of meaning is transferred.

The fact of the matter is that any reading of a text is going to reflect a "restricted" meaning which is that

part of the total meaning construed by the individual. Because the transmission of meaning is dependent on a relatively inflexible form (grammar-based language), meaning must, to a certain extent, confine itself to the form of the ST language. As a result, the form carries, or potentially manifests, a restricted number of aspects of the total meaning, aspects which the author believes to be important to the transfer of meaning. Subsequently, the reader interprets the meaning based on the form of the text, not based on the author's intended total meaning. Although total transference of meaning between author and reader is pragmatically impossible, rather than emphasizing that a reader only gets a fraction of the total meaning, (and perhaps even less of what the author intended), another point of view should be adopted: not only does each reading somehow add to the total meaning of the text, but a large amount of meaning is shared between the source of the text and its receptor.

Interlingual translation involves much the same process as intralingual translation. In either case, both "translators" interpret a restricted meaning, part of the total meaning, or, conversely, each translator adds his share to the total meaning. However, a major difference between the two is that in interlingual translation, the translator knows he has to write down his version of meaning in another language for others to see so that they may begin to comprehend the text. As Levy (1967, 1179)

points out, interlingual translation is "at the same time an interpretation and a creation." The interlingual translator may be equal to the intralingual interpreter in that they both will translate a part of the total meaning, but the task of the interlingual translator carries extra burdens. First of all, he must publicly display what he did (and therefore did not) interpret or understand in the ST (because someone else is relying on his interpretation in order to gain some understanding of the meaning). And second, he must consciously attempt to express this version of meaning in another form, a form which may not adequately express the meaning he wants to convey. As a result, the translator must carefully interpret and consciously choose his words for his "creation". As Gadamer (1975, 346) states, "this kind of conscious process is undoubtedly not the norm in conversation," and thus, by extension, adds to the interlingual translator's burden since it is not the norm in either the interpretation or the creation of writing that is meant to be interpreted intralingually.

Benjamin (1969, 76) effectively contrasts the aim of the writer, or "poet", and that of the translator. That of the writer "is spontaneous, primary, graphic; that of the translator is derivative, ultimate, ideational," because translation "intends language as a whole, taking an individual work in an alien language as a point of departure."

Of course, this translating or rewording process is exactly what is done by a person who interprets a text intralingually by paraphrasing the text for an audience, but the interlingual translator cannot rely on his audience to be able to understand the forms of the original in the same way an intralingual interpreter can when he paraphrases, often using identical words and structures in the paraphrase. Nor can he rely on his audience having easy access to the original form of the text if they need to consult it.

The translator should strive for transference of as much of the total meaning as possible, just as the intralingual translator should seek to "understand" as much of the text as possible. Unfortunately, total translation is, by definition, impossible, not only because the translator's interpretation, no matter how thorough it may be, can never be one of total meaning, but also because any potential re-creation of total meaning relies on some combination of meaning and form which will be disturbed when the form is modified. The interlingual translator has his version of intralingual meaning interpreted from the original form, but what about other possible interpretations? Despite and, perhaps, because of the inherent multiplicity of interpretations, he tries to "compensate" for his individual interpretation of total meaning. After all, people will be relying on him in order to understand. This does not mean that he should

discard his personal interpretation. As Gadamer (1975, 358) says, "to try to eliminate one's own concepts in interpretation is not only impossible, but manifestly absurd. To interpret means precisely to use one's own preconceptions so that the meaning of the text can really be made to speak for us."

Thus, the problem for the interlingual translator is that of consciously evaluating his interpretion of what is said in the ST. As Steiner (1975, 47) states, when the difficulty in translating a speech-message becomes great enough, the interlingual translation process "passes from reflex to conscious technique." The translator often makes more of an effort to find more aspects of meaning in the source text, or at least he is more conscious of the need to do so than the intralingual translator normally is, because he knows he will eventually have to separate meaning from form for his readers. Therefore, he creates extra difficulties in the translation of meaning for himself over and above those of the intralingual translator inasmuch as he has to weigh the various possible interpretations of the ST form and decide which ones to use in the TL form. This is not to say that there is no amount of conscious technique in intralingual translation, nor does it mean that interlingual translation will consistently involve conscious technique. But it does indicate that the interlingual translator will be obliged to consciously deal with and resolve these

difficulties at some point. In doing this, the translator is sometimes made to realize just how closely meaning and form are intertwined, that form can be just another meaning aspect of total meaning, a fact that is not nearly as self-evident to the intralingual translator.

Nida and Taber (1969, 4) argue that "anything that can be said in one language can be said in another, unless the form is an essential element of the message." What this shows is that, although meaning and form are intertwined, they can usually be more or less successfully unravelled. Sometimes, however, meaning can be so deeply rooted in form, or "form-based", that the relationship between the two can become so interwoven as to make the "whole" untranslatable. Nida and Taber (1969, 5) state that, in such cases, "there is a very distinct limitation in communicating this significance from one language to another. It is usually impossible to reproduce this type of meaning." They go on to say that although re-creation is impossible because "languages just do not correspond,...we must be prepared to sacrifice certain formal niceties for the sake of the content."

As previously indicated, this argument was also put forth by Barnwell (1974), who said that meaning takes priority over form, but that form was, nevertheless, an important aspect of meaning. Pragmatically, the understanding of meaning can never really be completely removed from form, so to a certain extent, all meaning is

form-based. However, the degree to which form contributes to overall meaning can vary.

Thus, the translator is not only interpreting meaning, he is also asking himself how he is going to re-create this meaning (which fits perfectly into the form of the original language) within the boundaries of the form of another language. In a sense, he is struggling to force a precise amount of meaning into a form which cannot quite accommodate this meaning. The "struggle" in interlingual translation, then, is the translator-reader constantly evaluating the importance of the form to the "meaning" of the text, knowing that concessions will later have to be made. He is not just consciously interpreting semantic meaning, he is interpreting the effect the form has on total meaning. Indeed, Nida (1977, 502) states that "while...the two types of communication have much in common, interlingual communication does differ from intralingual communication in that it may focus upon the formal structures of the original discourse." This concentration on the formal structures is not necessarily limited to the "interpreting" phase of interlingual translation. The translator, who is also a creator, may choose to concentrate on re-creating the "formal structures" aspect of the ST in the target text. It follows, then, that in all interlingual, (form-based) meaning translation situations, it is not just a question of whether to translate just for meaning or just for form.

There is a whole cline of possibilities between the two, reflecting the struggle between meaning and form, and a certain amount of compromise between them, reflecting the decisions of the translator.[2]

As Gadamer (1975, 348) points out, translating, like intralingual interpreting, is a process of highlighting meaning. It is an intralingual highlighting in the sense that a limited amount of meaning from the total sum of possible meaning can come to the fore in any one intralingual translation. On an interlingual level, it is perhaps even more of an exercise in highlighting because all the "meaning" the intralingual translator got out of the text may be impossible or impractical to re-create in the (form of the) new target language.

According to Steiner (1975, 277), "the mechanics of translation are primarily explicative, to explicate (or, strictly speaking, `explicitate') and make graphic as much as they can of the semantic inherence of the original." However, since form can also contribute to meaning, when a translator sees a particular meaning-facet in a text that is actually deeply form-based (i.e. not simply semantic) and which cannot be "equivalently" reproduced in the TL, the translator must "separate" the two and decide whether to concentrate on reproducing the meaning or the form in the TL. It is only when such choices have to be made, and the original semantic meaning/form relationship or total

---

2. This will be further developed in Chapter II.

meaning balance cannot adequately be re-expressed to the audience, that the translator fully realizes just how important form can be to meaning. The degree of impact and the perception of the importance form and semantic meaning have on total meaning can vary so much that sometimes translators completely abandon one in favour of the other.

The effect of form on total meaning is perhaps most evident in poetry. Jakobson (1966, 238) states that in poetry, "constituents of the verbal code...are confronted, juxtaposed, brought into contiguous relation according to the principle of similarity and contrast and carry their own autonomous signification." Therefore, he continues, "poetry by definition is untranslatable. Only creative transposition is possible."

However, since meaning and form are delicately intertwined in a text and total interlingual reproduction of one is not possible without distorting the other, all translation can be viewed as creative transposition. If the translator chooses to concentrate on "semantic" meaning and neglects preserving form, total meaning will nonetheless be affected. Conversely, if the translator concentrates solely on form, meaning is bound to be distorted, because form, which "indicates" meaning, varies from one language to another. Either way, in interlingual translation, "total meaning" can neither be achieved nor preserved. Either way, the translator may feel "something

is lost" in the translation. Variation in form means changes in total meaning are inevitable, even if the translator could interpret total meaning intralingually before beginning to translate interlingually. However, as was stated earlier, these very same variations can lead to new interpretations, interpretations which may not be all that different from those that are (potentially) found in the original. The translator can take comfort in this, because without translation, a great deal of understanding, albeit somewhat modified, would never be possible.

The translator (or interpreter-creator), then, is called upon to try and find a suitable equilibrium in the struggle between preserving semantic meaning and/or form in his creation, the TT. This struggle is perhaps best described by Steiner (1975, 235) who states that "in translation the dialectic of unison (meaning) and of plurality (form) is dramatically at work. In one sense, each act of translation is an endeavour to abolish multiplicity and to bring different world-pictures back to perfect congruence. In another sense, it is an attempt to reinvent the shape of meaning, to find and justify an alternate statement."[3]

Because the very nature of the relationship between meaning and form is somewhat symbiotic, the translator must decide how to highlight the semantic meaning and/or

---

3. My words in parentheses.

form of what he interpreted in the ST. It is my belief that the manner in which the translator resolves the struggle, in other words how he highlights the original meaning/form balance, is a function of what Straight (1981, 45) labels the "purpose" of the translation. What I propose to show in the next chapter is that the translator's resolution of the struggle, or his "method", is influenced by the purpose of the translation, which is in turn related to whom the translator envisages as his target audience (TA).

CHAPTER II

THE ROLE OF THE PERCEIVED TARGET AUDIENCE

Translation makes previously inaccessible works available to new reading receptors or target audiences who are not familiar with the language of the original[1]. The importance of the role that the new target audience should play in translating has been much debated by translation theoreticians. Opinions cover virtually the entire range of possibilities. Nida and Taber (1969, 31), for example, stress the importance of taking into account the "needs of the audience," whereas Benjamin (1969, 70) implies that in translation, as in art, consideration of the receiver is pointless.

The debate centres on two diametrically opposed poles which Marilyn Gaddis Rose (1981, 33) labels as source text (ST) autonomy versus target audience (TA) needs. When a translator favours ST autonomy, he considers the form of the ST when producing his new target language (TL) text, trying to match the syntax and lexicon of the ST as closely or "faithfully" as possible. As well as transposing these purely linguistic elements, the translator may also deal with cultural elements in the same manner. Reformulating the elements which constitute the ST author's original message is his goal, no matter

---

1. Adapted from Lefevere (1981, 57).

how foreign or even contradictory they may be to the new TA. Whether or not the new TA can identify with these cultural elements in a manner "equivalent" to the original audience's understanding of them is not the primary concern of the translator translating for textual autonomy.

On the other hand, as Rose (1981, 34) says, when a translator considers TA needs, he adapts the TL text "when the target audience would find a close or integral translation incomprehensible or unacceptable." In this case, the translator tries to evoke "equivalent responses" in the TA, adapting both linguistic and cultural elements to accommodate the new target audience's needs whenever he sees fit.

What exactly are the needs of the new TA in translation? In order to answer this properly, it must first be established what is meant by ST audience needs in a "normal" ST author / ST audience relationship. That a relationship between the ST author and the ST audience exists (from the author's standpoint - when he is writing) is widely accepted. Rather than trying to define the complex nature of the author-reader relationship, which The Reader in the Text (Suleiman and Crosman, eds., 1980), among others, discusses in detail, I shall use the following statement by Nida (1977, 498) as the point of departure for further discussions in this chapter: "all valid communication...has as its essential purpose the

transmission of a message to an audience. The audience may be mistakenly conceived in the mind of the source of the message..., but the intent to communicate a message to a receptor must be there. If such intent is lacking, the communication is reduced to a mere game of verbal solitaire."

Although Nida's view does not necessarily encompass every theory of the author-reader relationship, it is consistent with many arguments put forth in The Reader in the Text, such as Leenhardt's (1980, p.206), which states that "the author and the reader are equally considered as `creators' insofar as the global structures of creation are concerned - as long as a minimal homogeneity allows for real intercommunication of ideas as well as for the inclusion of the writer in the community of his readers."

Thus, since the writer maintains the "minimal homogeneity for real intercommunication" in most types of literature, it can be said that the author's message or ST is normally written with a perceived TA in mind, and the relationship between the author and the TA is inherent in the ST itself. This argument could conceivably be extended to the few cases where homogeneity is deliberately avoided, in that an inherent author/perceived TA audience relationship could manifest itself in the way the author attempts to confuse his perceived readers. However, regardless of whether or not this is true, in most writings, including the ones translated in Appendix

B, the author writes the text so that his perceived TA can understand what he is trying to communicate to them. Given that there is at least a "perceived" relationship between the author and the audience, the next step is to find out what principles underly this relationship.

Franz Link (1980, 31), who concurs with Leenhardt's hypothesis of author/reader homogeneity, states that "the author can and does rely on a certain common knowledge of his contemporary audience. Complete understanding...is possible only if information supplied by the text and knowledge of the audience supplement each other. Understanding and communication no longer work if the audience does not have the information the author could expect from the audience of his time and his society." Therefore, the way an author formulates his text is affected by the common knowledge of his time and his society which he believes he shares with his perceived TA.

Link goes on to describe the types of common knowledge which the author supposes his audience shares with him. Although they come under many headings, such as society, history, myth, custom and tradition, they can all be grouped under the rubric of "cultural knowledge." Another type of knowledge shared by writer and audience which is implicit, though not actually mentioned by Link, is the knowledge of a common language.

Although the author assumes that his TA will share some form of common knowledge with him, he cannot and does

not expect to completely communicate every aspect of his ideas or thoughts to every one of his readers, perceived or real. As Nida (1977, 498) says, "communication within a language is never exact or absolute. There is always some loss or distortion of content in communication, not only because of physical or psychological noise, but also because no two persons within any speech community have precisely the same background experience through which they have acquired their understanding of the language code." This lack of precise knowledge-sharing is not a deterrent to communication, because the author knows the general knowledge he does share with his perceived TA is sufficient to transmit the message, and he writes based on his perception of common knowledge.

In other words, the typical writer automatically meets the needs of his perceived TA because he believes he is aware of what they need him to say and how to say it and accommodates them as he writes. That the actual audience's general knowledge will always match the author's assumed common knowledge is not a given, and, indeed, when the two do not overlap, audience "needs" are created.

Nevertheless, those members of the actual audience who fall in the range of the author's intended TA's common knowledge will be able to understand the text. But when a ST, which relies on the common knowledge (linguistic and/or cultural) of a specifically perceived time/society-

bound TA, is redirected to a new actual or intended audience which does not share that assumable amount of common knowledge because of variations due to time and/or society, communication between the text and the receptor is distorted more than would normally be expected, and is perhaps even prevented. In this case, the new TA has needs over and above the assumable ones of the perceived TA, needs which the author did not foresee because he relied on his audience having the necessary amount of assumable common knowledge. In other words, variations between assumable common knowledge of the originally perceived TA and actual common knowledge of the new TA results in unforeseen needs on behalf of the new TA.

With time and society as the two planes on which common knowledge varies, there are three possible reasons for knowledge variation between the author's intended audience and new target audience:

i) society alone varies;

ii) time alone varies; or

iii) both society and time vary.

In all three cases, the new audience as a whole is lacking some element of the "certain common knowledge" mentioned by Link, causing "target audience needs."

In the case of variations in society only, the intended target audiences (original and new) are basically contemporary, but they vary to some extent linguistically and culturally. They may represent:

i) different levels or "classes" of the same language community, thereby creating the need for changes in dialect or register (traditionally known as adaptation);
ii) similar levels of two distinct language groups, thereby requiring not an adaptation of the level of language, but of the (type of) language itself (traditionally known as translation); or
iii) two different levels in two different language communities, thereby requiring a combination of changes both in dialect/register and language (adaptation and translation).

As for variations in time only (number 2), the divergence in common knowledge is a result of moving from one period to another. For example, whereas the original work may have been written during a specific era with a contemporary audience in mind, the new adaptation written many years after the original is aimed at a modern-day audience of the same language community. This type of change involves no switches of language or class dialect per se, although a modernization of the text may be called for since language and culture are constantly evolving.

The third variation is a combination of the first two, wherein a work written for an audience of a specific time-bound and society-bound language community and/or class is rewritten for a new target audience of a different era and society. In this extreme case, both a modernization and change of dialect and/or language may be

necessary to meet the new target audience's needs.

To summarize, then: variations in the linguistic and cultural common knowledge between the author and the new TA, caused by changes in time and/or society, result in knowledge gaps between the ST and the new TA. These gaps create "TA needs," because the TA is lacking some kind of knowledge to fully appreciate what the author's ST wants to communicate.

For the purposes of this work, any further discussion of TA needs shall be limited to those TA needs brought about by variations in society (number one, pp. 31-32), since the works translated in Appendix B on which the theoretical discussion is based are more or less contemporary. This fact precludes numbers two (time) and three (time/society). The discussion will also be limited to cases which assume that the variation in society includes a language difference (i.e. that the original TA and the new TA do not share a common language), therefore requiring some form of translation and not just an adaptation of register or dialect.

Faced with the aforementioned gaps, the translator appears to have a choice of two translation methods:
1) translate "faithfully" for textual autonomy, avoid putting words in the mouth of the author, and hope that the new TA readers will fill in these knowledge gaps for themselves; or
2) adapt the text for the new TA's needs, filling in the

gaps with substitute knowledge not originally expressed by the ST, and hope that the full meaning impact of the ST is not disturbed more than "necessary".

Thus, the following questions remain: should the translator try to deal with the linguistic and cultural differences that he, as a bilingual and, at least to some extent, bicultural reader knows exist between the intended ST readers and the new TT readers (adapt)? Or is there a certain sanctity of meaning in the source language (SL) text which the translator must not disturb (translate faithfully)? If and when the translator decides to consider the new TA's needs, how far does he go in compensating for the differences? Even Nida (1964, 155), who sees merit in considering the needs of the audience, states that there is a certain danger involved in doing so: "At times the translator may be misled by his own paternalistic attitude into thinking that the potential receptors of his translation are so limited in understanding or experience that they must have his `built-in' explanations. Or he may believe that their language is so deficient that only by certain `improvements' (often arbitrary and artificial) can he communicate the message."

This seemingly inconsistent attitude is echoed by Ian Reid (1980, 82), who states that "liberties" may be essential in translating, but that "when the `translation' goes beyond those simple adjustments to make substantial

excisions or additions it has become in fact an adaptation - which is capable of distorting the essential conception." Reid (1980, 82) argues that "in such cases, it is not pedantic to express concern for textual propriety. Translators...need to be responsibly aware that tinkering with the surface of a text - however well-intentioned the alterations may be - can have profound consequences."

Of course, one could argue that a translation is really an extreme form of adaptation with a special audience in mind, one which, among other things, does not share a common linguistic knowledge with the author. This being the case, if one is bothering to attend to the TA needs by translating in the first place, why not attend to all of their needs and adapt to fill in any other gaps? This may lead to putting words in the author's mouth, but is that not what translation seeks to do in any case? Some would argue that the only way to retain textual autonomy or propriety is not to change the text at all, and since translators are translating to meet the TA's needs, they should meet them all. Others, however, would retort that this attitude results not in a translation, but, rather, a re-creation of the text.

Unfortunately, because such strong cases were made for both sides of the question in the past, it seemed as if the battle over the importance of considering TA needs were destined to rage on, just as the debate over the

chicken and the egg does. The only conclusions that could be drawn from such arguments were that liberties or adaptation for the purposes of meeting TA needs might, in certain cases, be called for. How one established when TA needs should be considered, theoretically or pragmatically, was unclear.

However, in recent years, theoreticians have devised new models of translation theory which can perhaps reconcile the two opposing camps of TA needs vs. ST autonomy. A most notable theory is Juliane House's (1977, 188) classification of translation types by their function, dividing them into "overt" and "covert" translations. According to House, an overt translation is "one in which the TT addressees are quite `overtly' not being directly addressed; thus an overt translation is one which must overtly be a translation, not, as it were, a `second original'"(1977, 189), whereas a covert translation is one "which enjoys or enjoyed the status of an original ST in the target culture (1977, 194)."

In other words, in the final product of overt translations, the new TA is not really being addressed, (and therefore neither are their needs). Rather, they are being permitted to "listen in" on a conversation between an author and his intended audience. The translator does not try to hide the fact that the TL text is a translation of another language text which has cultural and linguistic elements of that foreign language community. In the

translator's mind at least, the new audience members are aware that, since they are not being directly addressed and are having to deal with a "conversation" originally in a foreign language and culture, they might not understand all of what is being said. The translator is aware of gaps between the way the original audience understands the text and the way the new TA might understand the reformulated message ("faithful" translation), but he does not see his role as one who has to fill in those gaps. His function is not to meet his TA's needs by adapting, but rather to "tell it like it is." For this reason, it can be said that in overt translations, ST autonomy takes precedence over TA needs.

On the other hand, the final product of a covert translation is not culturally or linguistically dependent on the ST language community (even though the ST may have been) and could just as easily have been written in the TL for the TL community. That is, unlike overt translations, which are obviously related to an original ST and ignore possible TA needs in favour of textual autonomy, covert translations give priority to TA needs and try to compensate for these needs through adaptation.

House's division of overt/covert is a breakthrough in translation theory and has far-reaching implications because it allows translation theoreticians to posit that not all "translations" have identical functions. In the case of a "covert translation," the translation is meant

to be read or function as an original in the TT language. In an "overt version," the translation intends to show it was originally written in a foreign language, for a foreign-culture audience. It is meant to function as the linguistic adaptation of a foreign text into something the new TA can more or less understand, but not completely.

The following chart summarizes the main points thus far:

translator's view of importance of
perceived knowledge gaps: TA needs vs. ST autonomy
determines
method: free/adaptation vs. literal/faithful
affecting
function: covert original vs. overt translation

Clearly, then, the terms "overt" and "covert" describe translation types based on the variable of the translator's perception of what the TA's relationship to the TT should be (i.e. does the TA know the text is a translation and does the translator want to let the TA know it is by leaving the gaps?). In other words, in covert translations, the translator wants the TA readers to think that they are reading an original text which is addressed to them, so he has to consider their needs and hide the linguistic and cultural gaps that exist between them and the author's original TA through adaptation.

Conversely, in overt translations, the translator might leave the gaps as hints to the new TA readers to show that they are, in fact, reading a translation (or "listening in on a conversation") and are, therefore, not the author's intended TA. Thus, it can be concluded that the translator's perception of the TA and its needs can play a role in how he translates, particularly when the translation is to function as a covert original.

In accepting the fact that translations can be divided by their function in relation to how the TA reads them, theoreticians can more readily explain conflicting, yet perhaps equally justifiable, views of the importance of TA needs when translating. This is true because theoreticians on opposite poles (text autonomy versus target audience needs) are not necessarily talking about the same type of translation function in the first place. For example, a theoretician describing a translation which functions overtly will not consider TA needs as important, while one who is describing a translation which functions covertly will have to consider them.

Assuming a "translation" can have a covert or an overt function, the next logical step is to try to decide whether one should translate covertly or overtly. What is the deciding factor in this decision? While stating that some texts seem more likely to be translated covertly than overtly, House (1977, 204) does say that "the initial choice between translating a given ST and producing an

overt version of it...is conditioned by the arbitrarily determined purpose for which the translation/version is required."

In other words, it is the translator who decides the covert/overt function of his translation, based on his purpose. It is the translator who decides, based on his perception of the purpose of translating the text in the first place, whether to address his TA readers and consider their needs by using a covert translation, or whether to ignore their needs by using an overt version. Even though the function is based on the translator's arbitrary assessment of purpose, it is crucial inasmuch as it dictates the translator's approach to the target text and his TA needs.

If indeed a translator's method of translating is affected by the purpose of the translation in relation to the TA, it is important to look at what the purposes that motivate a translator to choose a particular method may be. What is the translator's goal in translating overtly? Why would a translator who sees the linguistic and cultural gaps between the SL group and the TL group choose not only to avoid trying to bridge the gap but also to highlight it? In order to analyse a translator's purpose, it is perhaps appropriate to restate the original goal of translation: translation makes previously inaccessible works available to new reading receptors. Now, how is it possible to do this?

Straight (1981, 43) proposes that there are two possible ways of making a work accessible to people who are not native to the culture and language of this work. The first is translation, which "works changes on the work," and the second is foreign-language teaching, which "works changes on the audience." This being the case, it is conceivable that an overt method of translating, one that underlines the linguistic and cultural differences or "gaps" between the ST language and the TA language can be seen as a refusal to work changes on the text in order to work changes on the target audience. In other words, overt translation could be viewed as a way in which foreign language/culture knowledge is transmitted or taught to the TA.

Straight (1981, 45-46) says that "the translation may be designed to convey as much as possible of the cultural and linguistic context of the original. The extreme examples of this approach contain various exotic phrases, many passages that are supplemented with explanatory prose meant to help the readers find their way through the piece of the world depicted in the work, and numerous words that are left untranslated except for lengthy footnotes accompanying their first occurrence."

This clearly illustrates how a translator, cognizant of the gaps between the SL and the TA, is attempting to work changes on the TA to try and bridge these gaps. This "overt" or literal form of translation ignores TA needs

inasmuch as the translator does not try to hide that gap from the TA readers, but makes them aware of it and tries to force them to overcome it themselves. The TA needs are "ignored" in the sense that the author does not try to make them understand by replacing unfamiliar meaning (linguistic and/or cultural) with an "equivalent." Instead, the translator is trying to "teach" the TA something about the SL text language/culture so the readers can overcome these gaps themselves, in a conscious manner.

Conversely, by working changes on the text (covert translation), the translator is somehow blocking the linguistic and cultural baggage of the foreign text while transmitting the author's basic ideas. In this case, the translator has seen the gaps between the ST and the TA and decided to compensate for his TA's needs by filling these gaps with something familiar - the nearest equivalent TA language/culture term or form to which the TA can relate. The translator translates covertly, trying to hide these gaps, searching for the best equivalents to make his TA understand. In covert translations, the translator is trying to communicate meaning without necessarily trying to "teach" the TA something about the form of the ST language/culture. He does this by filtering or adapting the linguistically and culturally foreign elements for his perceived TA.

Thus if we update our chart, we have:

translator's view of importance of

perceived knowledge gaps: TA needs vs. ST autonomy

determines

method: free/adaptation vs. literal/faithful

affecting

function: covert original vs. overt translation

both of which are determined by

purpose: communicate ST vs. teach about ST

It would appear that the translator's purpose and, therefore, his choice between translating overtly or covertly is simple. Either the translator chooses to ignore the target audience's needs and translates overtly, or he compensates for its needs by translating covertly, hoping to communicate as best as he can, despite the gap in common knowledge between the ST and the TA.

However, translation is not so cut and dried that the translator will either think that the TA has no needs at all (or that he does not want to meet any of them) or that they are of the utmost importance (and that he wants to compensate for any potential gaps). As Marilyn Gaddis Rose (1981, 33) points out while expounding on House's notion of overt and covert translations, there is a whole spectrum of possibilities between the poles of source text autonomy and target audience needs. What this means is that it is not a question of whether translators will

translate purely overtly or purely covertly, but rather one of how overtly or covertly they will translate. As indicated earlier, in translation, it is not really a question of whether or not adaptation for TA needs should be undertaken (since translation in itself is a form of adaptation for the new TA), or whether to address all the TA needs (for this could be an infinite task), but rather to what extent this adaptation should be done.

This choice regarding method and function is in turn affected by the translator's purpose. As H. Stephen Straight (1981, 45) says, "the decision between the more "literal" and the more "free" rendering must be made relative to the translator's perceived purpose." Thus, as both method (free/literal) and function (covert/overt) can vary along a spectrum, and since they are both determined by perceived purpose, it follows that the translator's purpose also varies along a spectrum, ranging from pure communication of content (meaning) to the teaching of or about the (form of the) ST language/culture.

The translator does not ask himself if he simply wants to teach his TA readers something about the ST language/culture and broaden their understanding of how languages and cultures differ, while sacrificing TL style and perhaps clarity of meaning. Nor whether he merely wants to communicate to the TA an idea that was originally expressed in another language, while sacrificing textual autonomy (form) and inherent cultural elements in favour

of the TL style and clarity of "equivalent" meaning. Being able to see the gaps because of his bilingual and bicultural status, the translator will, at least on certain occasions, want to sacrifice neither aspect completely, seeing both as essential to the total meaning impact of the text.

When the translator does indeed feel that both aspects are somehow important to the overall meaning impact of the text, he is torn between the two poles. At one extreme, the translator wants to teach the new TA because he does not want to have to sacrifice inherent ST knowledge. The only way he can do this is by forcing them to try and understand the way the ST language works. However, he cannot teach them the entire language and culture with one text. At the other extreme, he may be trying so hard to communicate a message by constantly adapting a text whose inherent message his new TA can never really understand, that the ST message gets lost in a maze of explanations.

It is therefore not surprising, as Marilyn Gaddis Rose (1981, 34) notes, that the majority of translators find themselves on neither pole, but rather somewhere in between: "Both in literature and outside literature, texts usually represent some midway point on the autonomy spectrum, veering towards one pole or the other as tastes change and as the impact of the sociohistorical environment changes." This view is basically shared by

Straight (1981, 43) who states that "most translations seek some middle ground wherein the foreign aspects of the original are preserved without making the reader feel that it was the product of an alien mind."

In other words, the translation-purpose spectrum represents the translator's attempt to balance the communication of meaning or ideas (the goal of the ST), with the effort to impart the inherent knowledge contained in the original form of the message to a TA ill-equipped to receive that message. This balance, which was discussed in Chapter I, is his attempt to resolve the constant struggle between meaning and form in language. The translation-purpose determines the way a translator re-creates or highlights the meaning/form (m/f) balance of the ST in the translation. As Rose (1981, 33) says, "the gradations along the spectrum mark both the translator's relation to his material and the translation's relation to its audience." A translator's purpose is, therefore, determined by his relationship to the source text in combination with his perceived TA, and is manifested in the method of highlighting the meaning/form struggle, ultimately determining the function of the translation.

The following chart illustrates how purpose can affect the method and function of a translation:

purpose = ST m/f balance + importance of perceived TA and its knowledge gaps (teach/communicate)

determines

method = (free/literal) leads to highlighting m/f struggle in TT

determines

function = covert "original" / overt translation

Based on this chart, one can surmise that the translator is evaluating how he should translate a particular text (method) based on his purpose, that is his relation (1) to the meaning/form balance in the ST and (2) to his perceived TA. If the perceived TA is lacking only a small amount of the common knowledge, the translator might tend to adapt more and favour TA needs (because their needs are fewer, he has less to teach). But if the perceived TA is lacking a great deal of this assumed common knowledge, the translator might tend to adapt less and be more literal (because their needs are greater, he has more to teach).

But, if it is indeed the translator's purpose which ultimately decides whether to translate more overtly or covertly for the perceived TA, then one can say that the translator decides whether communicating semantic meaning or teaching his TA something about the form of the message is more important. This decision is based on his perception of how important his perceived TA's lack of knowledge is in relation to the actual communication of ideas in the ST. To some extent, then, the translator is making a judgement call on the relative importance of meaning and form in the ST and trying to reflect it to his

TA in his method of translating.

If the translator's perceived TA and, therefore, his purpose change, the translator will move along the spectrum (ST autonomy vs. TA needs, literal vs. free, and overt vs. covert) until he finds the balance in method which reflects what he believes the balance between educating and communicating should be for that particular audience, and this will manifest itself in the way he highlights form or meaning.

One can conclude, then, that in translation, the constant meaning/form struggle of the translation process can sway between textual autonomy and adapting for TA needs. The translator's resolution of the struggle, or his "method", is affected by his view of the perceived TA's knowledge in relation to the ST, which decides the translator's purpose and the function of the translation.

In the final chapter, I intend to analyze how the resolution of the struggle between meaning and form in various stages of my translations of three short stories illustrates changes in my purpose for translating. I will also show how subtle changes in my perception of the TA were ultimately responsible for the changes in my purpose and method.

CHAPTER III

COMBINING THEORY AND PRACTICE

In Chapters I and II, examples to support the points being put forth were purposely not included, because often, in discussions of translation theory, supporting examples seem to overpower the theories. Without a doubt, however, any plausible theory should be substantiated by pragmatic examples; therefore, in this chapter I shall support my arguments with textual examples from various drafts of my translations of three short stories - "La Cassette", "Dolorès, I" and "Dolorès, II" - originally written in French by Madeleine Ferron. For reasons of economy, only the final version of these translations is included for reference in Appendix B. Initially, the examples will illustrate various points introduced in Chapter I. Later, the actual theory posited in Chapter II - that the highlighted m/f balance re-created in my translation was affected by my TA - will be substantiated. This will be done by analyzing textual examples of my resolution of the struggle between meaning and form in relation to the various steps of the theory, in order to ultimately describe my initially perceived TA and purpose. As well, subsequent changes in the perception of my TA and purpose will be discussed and substantiated using passages from different drafts of the translations. For ease of

comparison, the French original as well as an initial, intermediary and final translation draft for each of these passages, lettered A through M, have been grouped together in Appendix A.

The first textual example I would like to look at concerns the use of the word "habitués" ("La Cassette", p.157).

A ORIGINAL:
Nous nous étions habitués à cette maladie sereine qui évoluait sournoisement, sans dommage apparent. A moins que notre tendresse ne nous ait aveuglées, grand-mère et moi.

A DRAFT 1:
We had all grown accustomed to the illness which was quietly yet stealthily spreading without any visible effects. Unless, of course, our love, grandmother's and mine, had blinded us both.

A INTERMEDIARY DRAFT:
We had grown accustomed to the illness which was quietly yet stealthily spreading through his body without any visible effects. Unless, of course, my love for him and my grandmother's had blinded us both.

A FINAL DRAFT:
We had all grown accustomed to the illness that was quietly yet stealthily spreading through his body. Although, looking at him, you'd never have known he was ill. Unless, of course, our love for him had blinded both grandmother and me.

This example is far more complex than it might originally appear to be. First, the various uses of the word "nous" illustrate how, in pragmatic language, "different meanings must sometimes share forms" (Chapter I, p.6). The same form, "nous", is being used as a subject pronoun, a reflexive pronoun and a direct object pronoun. Second,

the passage is an example of what I refer to (Chapter I, p.7) as two meanings not overlapping or sharing the same semantic field, in two different languages in this case: the narrator is clearly female from the structure of the original ("...ne nous ait aveuglées, grand-mère et moi."), but this cannot be reflected in the English form. Third, regardless of their grammatical functions, the forms of "nous" being referred to in the two sentences apparently do not include exactly the same people, as the first sentence has a masculine plural agreement, and the second sentence has a feminine plural agreement. The narrator uses the masculine form "habitués" with the form "nous" which the reader assumes refers to the narrator and her grandmother. Normally the phrase "nous nous étions habitués..." would probably be translated as some variant of "we had grown accustomed to", however, because of the feminine/masculine agreement conflict which English cannot reproduce in the same way as French, I had to choose one of two interpretations. My first option was that "habitués" was being used purposely to include people other than the narrator and her grandmother, in which case I would have to show this in the translation; the second was that perhaps this was an oversight, meaning that I was faced with an example of what House termed the "concern for textual function over the original author's intention" (Chapter I, p.11). In other words, I had to decide if this was deliberate on the part of the author, or if it

was a grammatical or typographical mistake. I eventually decided to translate the phrase as "we had all grown accustomed", though I did waver in the intermediate draft.

My final choice is in keeping with House's theory that a translator should deal with what is actually written in the text, not with what the author may have intended. I decided that the use of the masculine was not a mistake, and that it was significant enough in the text to warrant the inclusion of the word "all" in the translation. This addition is reflected in Jakobson's statement (Chapter I, p.13) regarding how languages differ in what they must and may convey. French had to convey the gender and, therefore, the existence of people other than the narrator and her grandmother; English did not. Furthermore, the use of the word "habitués" is a good example of what I refer to (Chapter I, p.4) as the multiplicity of meanings, in that one could interpret the use of the masculine plural form to include either the grandfather, or other unspecified people, or perhaps even both. In order to mirror this multiplicity, I included the word "all"; nevertheless, I did not go so far as to say "all three", because I felt that this would restrict the meaning too much, and would not be justified given the vagueness of the original.

Moreover, the addition of the word "all" is justifiable, according to my argument that "if one is trying to maintain equivalent semantic meaning, a change

in the form in which the original meaning is carried is sometimes necessary" (Chapter I, p.13). While preserving semantic meaning, the addition of the word "all" does pose a problem inasmuch as it risks being interpreted as more significant (Chapter I, p.13) to the context in English than the use of the masculine plural "habitués" does in French without actually including the equivalent "tous". Nevertheless, I felt the addition was warranted, because the forms of the languages involved differed: the original and the translation indicate meaning somewhat differently (Chapter I, p.15), and, although precisely equivalent total meaning could not be achieved interlingually, a large amount of the meaning is shared between the source of the text and its new receptors (Chapter I, p.16) by means of this translation. The decision to include "all" also clearly illustrates my point on pp.16-17 of Chapter I, regarding the fact that, in interlingual translation, the translator has to write down his version of meaning and publicly display what he interpreted in the original.

The following two examples further illustrate a problem arising when a translator publicly displays his interpretation in a conscious attempt to express his version of meaning (Chapter I, p.17):

B ORIGINAL:
Le boudoir, aménagé en chambre au rez-de-chausée pour plus de commodité, était agréable, et l'ambiance de la pièce, d'une douceur presque palpable.

B DRAFT 1:
The boudoir, which had been converted into a bedroom on the main floor as a matter of convenience, was pleasant, and the room had an almost palpable calm.

B INTERMEDIARY DRAFT:
Because of its more convenient location, the living room on the main floor had been converted into a bedroom. It was a pleasant room with an almost palpable calm.

B FINAL DRAFT:
The boudoir, which had been converted into a bedroom because of its more convenient location on the main floor, was pleasant and filled with an almost tangible calm.

In this first example, the intermediary translation is not necessarily incorrect when taken out of context; however, in comparing it with the original, one notes a definite change in the focus of the sentence. Unfortunately, in the intermediary draft, I had failed to notice that by changing the structure - a change which I had thought was warranted in order to avoid a long adjectival clause - I was putting the thrust of the sentence on the location of the boudoir, rather than on the fact that it was calm. Given the context of the story up until that point (the granddaughter had arrived in the room with an uneasy feeling), the intermediate draft was mistranslated, in that the translator should strive for the transference of as much of the <u>total</u> meaning as possible (Chapter I, p.18). In the case of the intermediary draft, semantic meaning was transferred, but not contextual meaning.

The second example of my public display of interpretation is perhaps more straightforward, in that initially I had obviously not grasped the original

meaning, and instead chose to concentrate on translating the form of the original:

C ORIGINAL:
Moi qui craignais qu'elle ne succombe de douleur, je comouflai mon chagrin.

C DRAFT 1:
I, who feared that she might succomb to the pain, I hid my grief.

C INTERMEDIATY DRAFT:
I hid my grief, afraid that she might succumb to the pain.

C FINAL DRAFT:
And here I had thought she would be overcome by the pain, but I was the one stifling my own grief.

The initial drafts show to what extent I believed I could cling to the original form to interpret meaning, as evidenced by the parallel transposition of the individual words. Even the intermediary draft, which sounds more natural than the first draft, is based on the literal, form-based translation of draft 1. The final version of the translation reflects a more well thought out "meaning-based" translation.

It is important to note that the two previous examples demonstrate the added burden on the translator to interpret, in order to re-create his interpretation in another language for others to see. In this manner, interlingual translation takes intralingual translation one step further. Who, in the course of a one-language reading/interpretation, has never jumped over a particularly difficult or even incomprehensible passage

without really thinking it through? This option is not open to the translator, who is "obliged to consciously deal with and resolve" (Chapter I, p.19) difficulties in order to successfully re-create his interpretation so that others may understand.

Another example which illustrates several points discussed in Chapter I is the following:

D ORIGINAL:
"Je plume aussi une poule pour te replumer."
Surpris de s'entendre faire un calembour, il arrondit les yeux et le répète, hilare.

D FINAL DRAFT:
"I'm going to pluck you a chicken; you look as if you've been getting chicken feed instead of getting fed chicken."
Surprised to hear himself make a pun, with his eyes round, he says it again, overjoyed.

This is a good example of "form-based" meaning (Chapter I, p.20) wherein the meaning is so woven into the form that the original as such is "literally" untranslatable without seriously compromising the total meaning. Given the differing structures of English and French, I was faced with having to sacrifice either the "form" or the meaning in order to attain a reasonable translation. I evaluated the importance of the form to the overall meaning of the passage (Chapter I, p.21) and chose to re-create the "formal structures" aspect of the ST in the translation. In this particular case, I did not concentrate on the syntactical form of the original, but rather on the function of the form as a whole - that is, I used a similar English pun to replace the French pun. Specific

meaning was sacrificed, inasmuch as the English is hardly an accurate meaning-translation; nor is the translation the most natural sounding sentence in English, clearly illustrating the argument by Nida and Taber (Chapter I, p.20) that the translator "must be prepared to sacrifice certain formal niceties for the sake of content." Nevertheless, the translation does function in the context of the story and paints a similar picture of meaning using a parallel form. This translation, then, is neither based on syntactic form nor on literal meaning, yet it still serves the purpose. For this particular translation, I separated form from meaning (Chapter I, p.22) and chose to concentrate on re-creating or "highlighting" the meaning of the "form", without literally paralleling either. Though some meaning is lost in the translation, this choice can be justified, because even "if the translator chooses to concentrate on `semantic' meaning and neglects preserving form, total meaning will nonetheless be affected" (Chapter I, p.23). This might lead to new variations in the interpretation of the text (Chapter I, p.24), but, in a global context, these new interpretations do not differ greatly from the interpretations of the original. A somewhat modified, yet contextually suitable, understanding of the original text is transmitted through the translation.

After having completed several drafts of the translations, I began to analyze my method of highlighting

the balance between meaning and form in my translations. Specifically, I questioned why I had translated more literally in the earlier drafts. Since I was translating to make the work accessible to a new target audience (Chapter II, p.26), I decided to analyze the effect my perceived TA was having on my method of translation. The first step was to consciously formulate in my mind who my TA had been. Initially, I remembered, my goal as translator had been to "foster" an understanding of French Canadians and their culture in Anglophone Canadians by affording them greater exposure to French-Canadian texts. I was able to analyze how I had taken a text, written by an author who had presumably relied on the common knowledge of a contemporary French-Canadian audience (Chapter II, p.29), and redirected it (Chapter II, pp.30-31) to a TA of a different society - contemporary Anglophone Canadians. Being a bilingual and bicultural Canadian, I shared a great deal of cultural and linguistic common knowledge with both TA's (Chapter II, p.29). Thus, I was able to see many of the needs that this new TA had over and above the assumable needs of the original TA; that is the knowledge gaps (Chapter II, p.33) between the original text and my Anglophone Canadian TA. In view of these gaps, I had two choices (Chapter II, pp.33-34):

1) translate for textual autonomy, or;
2) make adaptations to compensate for TA needs.

When analyzing the early drafts of various

translation passages it is evident, by the literal style of translation, that I wanted my translation to have an overt function (Chapter II, p.36). My perceived Anglophone TA was being allowed to listen in (Chapter II, p.36) on the ST message; no attempt was being made to create a second original (Chapter II, p.36). For example, in the following passage from "Dolores, I", one can easily trace the roots of the initial English version back to the French source text.

E ORIGINAL:
Ils font maintenant partie du groupe marginal que la majorité des paroissiens feint d'ignorer.

E DRAFT 1:
They now belong to the group of marginal people that the parishioners pretend to ignore.

The structure is almost identical, without being grammatically unacceptable in English (indicating that transmission of the semantic message was nevertheless an important factor), and the translation of the words is mostly on an individual (word-for-word) level, almost as if the first dictionary meaning for each word had been translated. This is not to say that the function was entirely overt, but it does indicate that initially a more overt style of translation (Chapter II, pp.43-44) was favoured.

In the following passage from "Dolores, II", the more overt function of the translation is again evidenced in the literal translation style:

F ORIGINAL:
Une carte mortuaire, bordée de noir, est appuyée à un minuscule pot de confiture. La photo est celle d'une femme âgée. Des bandeaux lisses recouvrent ses oreilles. Elle porte une blouse à col montant et à manches bouffantes.

F DRAFT 1:
A death announcement, with a black frame, leans against a tiny jar of jam. It's the picture of an old lady. Her ears are covered by smooth ribbons. She's wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves.

One can see a perfect transposition of punctuation structure, especially when compared to the final draft of the same passage:

F FINAL DRAFT:
A death announcement, framed in black, leans against a tiny jam-jar. In the picture, an old lady with smooth bandeaux covering her ears is wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves.

Without a doubt, the initial, overt draft was meant as a linguistic adaptation (Chapter II, p.38), and not a second original.

It is interesting to note that, during the initial phase of the translations, I was an instructor for the University of Calgary, teaching French to Anglophones. I was in the habit of using "linguistic adaptations" that were fairly literal, so that my students could compare the structures of the two languages. In other words, I would translate a given French structure very literally into English so that the students could see how the French language worked, and learn to think that way, rather than thinking in English and translating literally, and often incorrectly, into French.

In a similar manner, the more overt translation function which dictated my approach to the translation and my TA's needs, although arbitrarily chosen, reflects my purpose in translating the text for my perceived TA (Chapter II, p.40). The tendency not to adapt or compensate for the gaps between the French and English languages indicates that I was attempting to work changes on the audience (Chapter II, p.41), in keeping with my original goal for translating (Chapter III, p.58). Thus, my more overt translation can be viewed as an attempt to transmit or teach foreign language/culture knowledge to my perceived TA (Chapter II, p.41). Fostering understanding or "educating" my perceived TA, the Canadian Anglophone, had been a somewhat conscious goal, arising from my belief that it was important for Anglophone Canadians to learn to understand "how" French Canadians think, subconsciously causing me to translate overtly[1]. I believed that the communication of this knowledge was largely dependent on relating the form of the original text.

This personal motivation to educate by translating towards the literal/textual autonomy end of the spectrum (Chapter II, pp.43-44) in the initial stages is clearly

---

1. The majority of the decisions as to how to highlight the balance between meaning and form, ie. the translation method, were made prior to the formulation of the theory discussed in Chapter II. The process of adapting meaning and form for my perceived TA was not a deliberate process. In no instance did I actively seek to include textual support in the translations for a theory that had already been developed.

seen in the following passage from "La Cassette":

G ORIGINAL:
Il était capricieux, raffiné, d'un charme attendrissant. Bien qu'autoritaire et égocentrique, il était, pour moi, attentif et affectueux.

G DRAFT 1:
He was capricious, refined, and exuded a tender charm. Despite his authoritativeness and egocentricity, he was attentive and affectionate to me.

In this case, the form of the original words is transposed into English words which are etymologically related and therefore have similar forms, without necessarily having the same meaning impact, thus giving the English text an overall element of stodginess which is neither present in the French, nor justifiable in the greater context of the source message.

And while the following example taken from "La Cassette" also mimics general form, there is a trivial oversight in example C which shows just how much of a role the form of the original can play in translation:

C ORIGINAL:
Moi qui craignais qu'elle ne succombe de douleur, je comouflai mon chagrin.

C DRAFT 1:
I, who feared that she might succomb to the pain, I hid my grief.

The misspelling of the word "succumb" in English stems from a classic case of "interference" of the original language on the target language. Hamers and Blanc (1983, 452) define interference as the erroneous and mostly subconscious transfer of certain elements of a language

into the target language (my paraphrased translation). In its own way, this seemingly insignificant error shows how important conveying original form to the TA was to me at that time. In other words, I was so busy concentrating on the form of the original in order to educate my TA, that it affected the form (in this case, the spelling) of my native language.

The literal transposition seen in the previous examples was evident in many passages in each of the three short stories' initial drafts. In a certain sense, I was allowing the form of the ST to interfere with the usual form of English in order to influence or "educate" my perceived TA. Of course, this was not only happening as I translated on paper to educate my perceived TA, but also as I translated in the classroom to teach my actual students. One major difference was that, in the classroom, I could more clearly see if and when my students did not understand what I was trying to convey by being literal. As well, they were there for the specific purpose of learning a language, something which is probably not the case for most people who read the translation of a short story.

In conducting the analysis of my translation drafts, I recognized that my purpose for translating had somehow been modified over time, as evidenced by a change in my method of translation; this was caused by a change in purpose (Chapter II, p.44). Since a translator's purpose

is determined by his relationship to the ST in combination with his perceived TA (Chapter II, p.46), and as I was still dealing with the same text, the reason for my change in purpose had to be a change in my perceived TA. In other words, at some point I had reassessed my TA's needs, or at least what I thought those needs were, and then tried to meet them by modifying the way I resolved the struggle between meaning and form (Chapter II, p.46).

This change in TA perception resulted largely from, first, consultation with my thesis director, who recommended concentrating on the overall meaning and effect of the text, rather than on the form, and, second, the realization that my final audience would be a board of bilingual reviewers. I came to understand the problem involved in what Bassnett-McGuire (1980, 8-9) calls the question of evaluation. My translations would be evaluated by "critics" who generally "evaluate a translation from one or other of two limited standpoints: from the narrow view of the closeness of the translation to the SL text...or from the treatment of the TL text as a work in their own language." My translations were to be evaluated by translators who would not necessarily consider TA needs in the same manner as I had, and although this more overt type of translation function was perhaps justifiable in certain instances (Chapter II, p.39), I realized that I did have to consider the needs of this more immediate TA as well.

With this in mind, I shifted my focus to pleasing all English/French bilinguals who could theoretically compare both the original texts and the translations on both of these levels. I was somehow trying to create the perfect translation for bilinguals, trying to maintain total meaning without modifying form. Of course, this was a transitional phase which did not last long. I soon realized that, because form contributed to meaning and was necessarily different in the two languages (Chapter I, pp.11-13), it was impossible to fully please myself, let alone everyone else. I could see the gaps between the two languages that other bilinguals would undoubtedly notice, and I was painfully aware that these gaps could never be bridged in a completely satisfactory manner.

Nevertheless, this transitional phase was important insofar as it showed me that I was trying to do the impossible: lean towards both the meaning/adaptation pole and the form/textual autonomy pole at the same time, in an effort to achieve a translation of total meaning (Chapter I, p.14). This prompted me to take notice of the semantic meaning in the original texts, as opposed to the form, because if one is trying to maintain equivalent semantic meaning, a change in the form in which the original meaning is carried is sometimes necessary (Chapter I, p.13). The new purpose for my new unilingual TA was to focus on conveying the stories in a form which read well in English, yet still retained a large degree of semantic

meaning from the original, despite changes in form.

Consequently, since my perception of my TA's need to be educated was diminished in favour of the need for a more natural sounding communication of semantic meaning, the degree of literalness in the intermediate drafts was significantly reduced. If being literal or maintaining textual autonomy is equated with not changing the text at all, but rather in keeping the original text itself (Chapter II, p.35), the bilingual textual examples given for the initial drafts above may not seem very "literal". However, if compared to subsequent drafts which concentrated on the transmission of a semantic message (less form-based) to the TA, the examples from the initial drafts prove to be much more literal, while the intermediary drafts tended to read more naturally in English.

As well, certain passages in the original draft which were choppy, though not necessarily literal, were reformulated. This effort to recreate the aspect of "readability" of the text shows an interest in effectively communicating a message caused by the realization that readers would not want to continue if they felt they were stumbling along through the text. This was important inasmuch as I still wanted to expose my Anglophone readers to French-Canadian culture (in this case, the ideas in the short stories), but believed that the stories would have to read well if the readers were going to get any

impression, let alone a positive one, of French Canada.

This first significant change in attitude manifests itself in several modifications made to the intermediate drafts of the translations. There is no doubt that my position on the spectrum (Chapter II, p.46) moved towards the free/adaptation pole. In general, the structure of these drafts is less likely to be based on literal translation, and more likely to represent similar semantic meaning in a more or less equivalent English structure.

For example, compare the following passages from "Dolores, I":

H ORIGINAL:
Dolorès ne comprend pas très bien les allusions que doit contenir cette phrase.

H DRAFT 1:
Dolores doesn't really grasp the allusions contained in that sentence.

Although the use of the words "allusions contained" in the initial translation is "accurate", I did not feel that it was something that I would normally say in English. In the intermediate stage, I therefore searched for a parallel meaning, one which would transmit a more or less equivalent pragmatic message in a form which seemed more natural:

H INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Dolores doesn't really grasp the full meaning of his statement.

While the sentence structure in the following example taken from "Dolores, II" remains basically the same in

both stages, the minimal changes in vocabulary created a more natural English sentence:

I ORIGINAL
Puis il va décrocher les chiffons pendus au mur, tire un seau de sous l'escalier et remet le tout à Dolorès.

I DRAFT 1:
Then he goes and takes down the cloths that are hanging on the wall, takes a pail out from under the stairs and gives it all to Dolores.

I INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Then he goes and takes down the cloths that are hanging on the wall, pulls out a pail from beneath the stairs and hands it all to Dolores.

In an effort to make the text read better by being less literal, I was looking for ways to make a straight transposition between the structure (including the words) of the translation text and the original more difficult. The use of the word "hands" in the intermediary draft is a pragmatic yet less literal synonym for "gives" used in the initial draft to translate the word "donner". As well, the use of the more concrete verb "pull" more accurately reflects the action of moving an object out of a low, hidden position.

The desire to make the text read as if it had originally been written in English (i.e. to translate more covertly) is also reflected in the following passage from "La Cassette":

J ORIGINAL:
Je l'ai aperçu plus d'une fois commencer le geste d'applaudir, participant, dans son enthousiasme, aux ovations de l'invisible mais si présent auditoire.

J DRAFT 1:

More than once, I caught him about to applaud, participating, in his enthusiasm, in the ovations of the invisible yet so present audience.

J INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
More than once, I caught him about to clap, joining the ovations of the unseen but ever so present audience in his enthusiasm.

Not only is there less paralleling of the original structure in the intermediate draft, but there is also a particularly significant change: the substitution of the word "clap" for the word "applaud". This is noteworthy because it is an example of two forms with synonymous pragmatic meanings struggling to be used in the same text. I eventually switched to "clap" in the intermediary draft because I was trying so hard to get away from copying form, that I preferred to use a term whose form was obviously not etymologically related to the French "applaudir".

It is interesting to note that in the initial drafts, I had, at least once, tried to stress the etymological link between certain words in French and English:

K ORIGINAL:
Je partis bientôt me libérer des tâches les plus urgentes afin d'être disponible.

K DRAFT 1:
I soon left to take care of my most pressing matters, so I would be free later on.

Although no form of the word "pressé" appears in the source text of "La Cassette", I chose the word "pressing" in the initial draft in a subconscious attempt to show the common etymological roots of certain words in both

languages. At the time of the initial translation, I was tending to try and educate by being more literal. However, by the time the intermediate draft was written, I was no longer trying to do this. This marked change in attitude towards my TA is clearly seen in the new, intermediate translation draft:

K INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
I soon left to take care of some of my most important business, so I would be free for later on.

* * *

Although I had already begun to reformulate the structure in the intermediate drafts in order to make them less literal, this process continued into the final drafts[2]. Thus, the final drafts and my final perceived TA for each of the stories still reflect this process to a large extent, yet are also synthesized versions of each of my previously perceived TA's and the methods I used. That is to say, I believe they still maintain a certain French-Canadian "flavour" to educate Canadian Anglophones, while trying to preserve semantic meaning in a way that reads fairly naturally to the English reader, without necessarily reading as if they had originally been created in the English language. In other words, not all attempts to "educate" the reader by being literal had been eliminated. In one instance, an example of this which had been dropped in the intermediary stage was even reintegrated. The word "boudoir" in "La Cassette" had been changed to "living room" to remove a possible

---

2. Although the drafts represent a noticeable change in both method of translation and perception of TA, it should be noted that these factors were constantly undergoing modifications. Despite the fact that this process tended to flow in one direction, the delimitation of the phases was not absolute. At various stages, the relative importance of the TA needs fluctuated enough that neither the need to educate about the form of the ST, nor the need to purely communicate the semantic message consistently overrode the other. Thus, certain aspects of another phase may have still been present, or may have manifested themselves before their corresponding phase reached its peak.

unnatural or foreign element from the text; however, in the final draft, this element was reintroduced:

B DRAFT 1:
The boudoir, which had been converted into a bedroom on the main floor as a matter of convenience, was pleasant, and the room had an almost palpable calm.

B INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Because of its more convenient location, the living room on the main floor had been converted into a bedroom. It was a pleasant room with an almost palpable calm.

B FINAL DRAFT:

The boudoir, which had been converted into a bedroom because of its more convenient location on the main floor, was pleasant and filled with an almost tangible calm.

This shows that although my main preoccupation was with transmitting semantic meaning in a "natural" English form, the idea of educating my TA by letting them know they were reading a text which dealt with a different culture was still a factor. In other words, I purposely left some gaps as hints to the new TA that they were reading a translation (Chapter II, p.38).

While this particular draft shows a slight retreat towards the educating/textual autonomy pole, the following drafts from "Dolores, II", I believe, will prove that an element of "educating" was always in the back of my mind as I translated:

L ORIGINAL:
Monsieur Lafond roule maintenant à toute vitesse. Madame Lafond s'étouffe de colère. Et Dolorès est prise d'un fou rire qui lui fait beaucoup de bien.

L DRAFT 1:

Monsieur Lafond is now driving at top speed. Madame Lafond is choking with anger. And Dolores is having a fit of laughter that does her a lot of good.

L INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Monsieur Lafond drives at top speed. Madame Lafond chokes with rage as Dolores revels in a much needed fit of laughter.

L FINAL DRAFT:
Madame Lafond chokes with rage as Monsieur Lafond floors the pedal. And Dolores is overcome by a fit of laughter, a long overdue release.

Although the tendency to veer away from the educating pole is clearly seen as the drafts progressively become less literal, the deliberate use of the French titles "Monsieur" and "Madame", consistent in every draft, even in those which seemed to favour adaptation to a great extent, clearly reflects a latent desire to educate. This very same element, which could easily have been translated, shows up consistently throughout the drafts.

I was still moving along the spectrum towards the adaptation pole, but the shift to my final TA was not as dramatic as the one to the intermediate TA. For an example of this continuing slide towards adaptation, compare the following passages from "Dolores, I":

M ORIGINAL:
Dolorès regarde, découragée, les piles d'assiettes qui recouvrent le comptoir de la cuisine et les dégâts de la veille: le plancher sale, le poêle encombré de chaudrons encroûtés.

M INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Dolores looks helplessly at the pile of dishes on the kitchen counter and at the previous evening's mess: a dirty floor and a stove cluttered with pots coated with grime / grimy pots.

M FINAL DRAFT:
Dolores looks helplessly at the mess that's been waiting there for her since last night: a pile of dishes on the kitchen counter, a filthy floor, and a stove cluttered with dirty pots that will really need a lot of elbow grease.

The intermediary draft is still quite literal, and indeed, this was one of the passages with which I was having the most difficulty. Despite the fact that, in the intermediary stage, I had veered away from trying to reproduce literal translation structures, I was still unable to reproduce a new version of meaning which satisfied me. For a long time, I was so caught up in the form of the original that I could not "unravel" it from the meaning (Chapter I, p.20). Eventually, the entire structure of the second part of the passage was reformulated to transmit what I felt to be a pragmatically equivalent meaning which was no longer form-based.

In other cases, passages which had been translated literally, even in the intermediary stage, were eventually modified, but not before time had allowed me to move even further towards the adaptation pole, even though the structure had obviously been quite literal and unnatural in English:

F ORIGINAL:
Une carte mortuaire, bordée de noir, est appuyée à un minuscule pot de confiture. La photo est celle d'une femme âgée. Des bandeaux lisses recouvrent ses oreilles. Elle porte une blouse à col montant et à manches bouffantes.

F INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
A death announcement, with a black border, leans against

a tiny jam-jar. It's the picture of an old lady. Her ears are covered by smooth ribbons. She's wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves.

F FINAL DRAFT:
A death announcement, framed in black, leans against a tiny jam-jar. In the picture, an old lady with smooth bandeaux covering her ears is wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves.

In this case, although I did not feel the final draft was completely natural in English, I was sufficiently satisfied with the draft. It was as if the textual autonomy pole of the balance was struggling to persist. Since it is pragmatically improbable that a translator be completely at one end of the spectrum (Chapter II, p.45), elements of the other end are bound to appear.

Since I had previously been significantly closer to the literal pole of the spectrum, trying to educate my TA, and because I was modifying previous drafts, rather than starting from scratch, the vestiges of literalness from previous drafts were bound to show up in the intermediary and final drafts. In the same way, the desire to somehow educate my reader persisted subconsciously, although more vestiges of literalness were eliminated as time progressed.

This can be clearly seen in the following example from "La Cassette":

A ORIGINAL:
Nous nous étions habitués à cette maladie sereine qui évoluait sournoisement, sans dommage apparent. A moins que notre tendresse ne nous ait aveuglées, grand-mère et moi.

A INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:

We had grown accustomed to the illness which was quietly yet stealthily spreading through his body without any visible effects. Unless, of course, my love for him and my grandmother's had blinded us both.

A FINAL DRAFT:
We had all grown accustomed to the illness that was quietly yet stealthily spreading through his body. Although, looking at him, you'd never have known he was ill. Unless, of course, our love for him had blinded both grandmother and me.

In the time that elapsed between the intermediary and final drafts, my attitude continued to be influenced by the need to express ideas that were initially locked into French structure in a more natural English structure. Because of this, I was more able to find meaning outside of the form of the original words, and recreate personal "equivalent" meaning in English. I was less afraid of being criticized for extensively changing form in order to maintain equivalent meaning. This meant that I felt more at liberty to change sentence structure, punctuation, and words that were not explicit in the original in order to achieve what I perceived to be "equivalency".

These changes in the final stages represent new attempts to fill in those gaps perceived by bilinguals in a "satisfactory" manner. "Satisfactory" in the sense that I felt I could justify my choices, given the impossibility of complete "theoretical" satisfaction. It was an "equivalence" with which I was "satisfied", realizing that I would have to make compromises. I recognized that it was impractical to try to teach a language and culture by simply translating a few short stories, and that by trying

to force two languages to have similar structures, I was not necessarily preserving meaning. Conversely, I also wanted to preserve some of the aspects of form because, although I viewed the transmission of the semantic message in the ST to my TA as my over-riding goal, I also had a secondary goal - educating my TA about the form of the ST. It is undeniable that my perception of my TA's need to know about the form of the original had been greatly decreased in the intermediary drafts, and then more gradually so in the final ones. Nevertheless, my perception of this TA need was never completely erased. This diminished, yet important element of maintaining some textual autonomy prevented me from adapting the original to the point where all non-coincidental aspects of the original form were removed. In other words, there is a certain motivation for closely paralleling sentence structure, word choice, and punctuation whenever possible, just as there is a motivation for changing them when such a change leads to a more effective transmission of the semantic message. By doing this, I have found a "personally satisfactory" balance between meaning and form for my perceived TA.

CONCLUSION

In this thesis, I have analyzed the role that a translator's perceived purpose for translating a given text can play in how he translates. More specifically, this study has focused on how changes in the translator's perceived TA can affect how he chooses to highlight the meaning and the form of the original in his re-creation of the text.

The hypothesis used to explain this process grew out of the analysis of the progression in my own translation drafts of three French-Canadian short stories. In conducting this analysis, it became apparent that, over time, I had altered my method of translation; I therefore sought to explain the general changes in my method of translation. Subsequently, I identified a general pattern in how literally or freely I had translated, and linked this pattern to changes in my perception of my audience. I then researched the topic of translation theory, both in general and specifically with respect to the role of the target audience in translation. Using the limited amount of primary information available on this particular aspect of translation, in conjunction with secondary information, I was able to substantiate a theory describing the translator's decision making-process which encompasses both the objective or linguistic, and the subjective or

personality-based, aspects of translation.

The two major components of the theory - that there is a struggle between semantic meaning and form, and that the translator's perception of his TA affects how he decides to highlight that struggle in the TT - were, for the most part, treated as separate entities in Chapters I and II respectively. The theory as a whole was brought together in the latter part of Chapter II, and Chapter III made use of textual examples to substantiate the individual elements described in the two previous chapters as well as the theory as a whole.

Chapter I demonstrated that although the form of meaning is theoretically arbitrary, pragmatically readers must interpret meaning in the form of the text before them because discrete meanings share form. The process whereby a reader interprets the meaning locked into the form of a text is called intralingual translation. The text, though a fixed set of words and relationships between words, does not limit the interpretation to that of the author's originally intended message; rather, it is open to the personal interpretation of each of its readers. As a result, the form used in the text ultimately decides the total sum of theoretical interpretations.

Since languages have their own distinct form, the form of a text must be changed in interlingual translation, resulting in an upset in the total possible interpretations, or total meaning, of the original text.

Because the balance between meaning and form must be disturbed in interlingual translation, it is impossible to reproduce all, and exclusively, the potential interpretations of the ST. Thus, despite the fact that semantic meaning may play a larger role, form nevertheless contributes to total meaning.

Furthermore, Chapter I demonstrated that while interlingual translation alters form and total meaning, it can still transmit sufficient meaning from the ST author to the TT readers to be worthwhile. Indeed, in both intra- and interlingual translation, only a portion of the total meaning is actually transferred from author to reader. In the case of interlingual translation, the translator, acting as a bridge between the two, must consciously attempt to express his interpretation of the text's meaning in another language. This creates an extra burden for the interlingual translator, who is obliged to publicly display what he did and did not interpret in the ST, and who must manifest his interpretation in another form which may or may not adequately convey the meaning. Despite the fact that total transference of meaning is impossible, the translator should endeavour to transfer as much as possible, and therefore must attempt to compensate for his own initial, personal interpretation, without necessarily discarding it.

The translator, then, must undertake the task of consciously dealing with passages that are both difficult

to interpret intralingually and difficult to reformulate interlingually. This process reminds the translator that form and meaning can be closely intertwined, and that the role of the form varies in importance. As a result, in interlingual translation the translator is constantly evaluating the varying roles or the "struggle" between meaning and form, as well as deciding how to highlight this struggle in the form of the TL.

Chapter II analyzed the common-knowledge relationship between an author and his perceived TA, and examined how the translator tries to resolve knowledge gaps that exist between the content of the ST and the knowledge of the new perceived TA whose members theoretically are not literate in the language of the original text. Subsequently, it is posited that the relationship between the translator's perceived TA and the text to be translated affects how the translator resolves the struggle between meaning and form.

This theory is developed as follows: an author of a text and its readers must share a certain amount of common knowledge for the message to be transmitted. Although no two people interpret words in exactly the same manner, when the author and his target audience share reasonably similar interpretations of words, a sufficient amount of meaning is communicated. Authors rely on their perceived TA to have enough common knowledge to understand the message of the text, and thus automatically meet their perceived TA's needs when writing. However, when the

actual audience does not have the necessary knowledge to understand the text, because of variations in time and/or society, gaps are created, resulting in TA needs.

Translation involves redirecting a text to a given perceived TA which does not share sufficient linguistic and cultural knowledge with the ST author, creating new TA needs. In view of this, the translator must decide whether to translate faithfully, considering textual autonomy and ignoring these new needs, or whether to adapt the text for the new TA. There are valid arguments to support both methods; however, if translations are classified by their function, either overt or covert, the conflict involved in having two different methods is reconciled, and we see that both are acceptable and justifiable. Although the translator's arbitrary assessment of the translation's purpose determines if it will function as an overt translation or as a covert second original, this assessment is crucial insofar as it establishes how the translator will proceed and justify the choices he makes while translating. The translator who chooses an overt function highlights knowledge gaps in order to teach the new TA about linguistic/cultural aspects of the ST. The translator who chooses a covert function fills in those same gaps in an effort to communicate the basic semantic meaning of the ST without attempting to teach his TA about the form of ST language/culture.

In practice, the translator normally wants to combine communicating semantic meaning and teaching about the original form, and will thus use a translation method that is neither completely covert nor overt. As he is bilingual and, to some extent, bicultural, the translator is aware of knowledge gaps between the ST and the new TA, and will therefore find himself unwilling to completely sacrifice the semantic meaning or inherent meaning of the form of the ST, since both of these contribute to total meaning of the text. The translator, then, is constantly assessing the importance of the role of semantic meaning and form in the ST and attempting to recreate this balance in the TT, basing his decisions on his purpose for translating a particular text for a perceived TA. Hence, for any given text, if a translator's TA changes, his purpose and method of translation will be affected. As a result, general changes in translation method reflect general changes in purpose, which in turn are accounted for by changes in the translator's perceived TA.

In order to substantiate this theory, Chapter III demonstrated how actual changes in my method of translating three short stories were linked to changes in my perceived TA and my purpose for translating the texts. To this end, variations in my arbitrary assessment of the purpose for the translation and their corresponding perceived TA's were discussed and justified, and were then shown to account for general variations in translation

method.

The theory put forth in this thesis, then, is descriptive, not prescriptive. It is meant to describe the effects of a specific aspect (perceived TA) of the process of translation as it applied to my own personal translation experience, rather than to dictate how one should translate for or choose a given TA. Nevertheless, because this theory allows for the translator's arbitrary assessment of the purpose for translating a text for his perceived TA, it is flexible enough to encompass the entire corpus of translators. It describes, in a manner as "scientific" as possible, the spectrum of personal positions that individual translator's may take with respect to the importance of considering the target audience's needs when translating, and how the position on the spectrum affects his translation method.

This thesis, therefore, has dealt with the personal or human factor involved in translation. It does not claim to exhaust the study of personal factors involved in translation. Rather, it has focused on the translator's perception of his TA, which is but one aspect that motivates the translator to choose one form over another, and to justify his translation as better for a particular context and TA. Many other "personal factors" that affect the translator's decision-making process remain not only to be identified and described, but also - perhaps in the context of machine translation - analyzed so as to

determine their role in adding to the overall "quality" of a translation.

ABBREVIATIONS

M/F	Meaning/Form
SL	Source Language
ST	Source Text
TA	Target Audience
TL	Target Language
TT	Target Text
VS.	Versus

REFERENCES

Barnwell, K. 1974. *Introduction to semantics and translation*. Horsley's Green, England: Summer Institute of Linguistics.

Basnett-McGuire, S.B. 1980. *Translation studies*. New York: Methuen.

Benjamin, W. 1969. The task of the translator. *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books.

Ferron, M. 1987. Dolorès, I. *Un singulier amour*. Montreal: Les Editions du Boréal Express.

-----. 1987. Dolorès, II. *Un singulier amour*. Montreal: Les Editions du Boréal Express.

-----. 1987. La cassette. *Un singulier amour*. Montreal: Les Editions du Boréal Express.

Gadamer, H.G. 1975. *Truth and method*. Trans. Sheed and Ward Ltd. New York: Crossroad Publishing Company.

Hamers, J.F., and Blanc, M. 1983. *Bilingualité et bilinguisme*. Brussels: Pierre Mardaga.

House, J. 1977. *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tuebingen: TBL Verlag Gunter Narr.

Jakobson, R. 1966. On linguistic aspects of translation. *On translation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Leenhardt, J. 1980. Toward a sociology of reading. *The reader in the text: Essays on audience and interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Lefevere, A. 1981. Beyond the process: Literary translation in literature and literary theory. *Translation spectrum: Essays in theory and practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Levy, J. 1967. Translation as a decision process. *To honor Roman Jakobson*. The Hague: Mouton.

Link, F. 1980. Translation, adaptation and interpretation of dramatic texts. *The languages of theatre: Problems in the translation and transposition of drama*. Toronto: Pergamon Press.

Nida, E. 1964. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J.Brill.

-----. 1977. The nature of dynamic equivalence in translating. *La traduction: une profession*. Ottawa: Canadian Translators and Interpreters Council.

Nida, E., and C. Taber. 1969. *The theory and practice of translation*. Vol. 8 of *Helps for translators*. Leiden, Netherlands: E.J. Brill.

Reid, I. 1980. Hazards of adaptation: Anouilh's Antigone in English. *The languages of theatre: Problems in the translation and transposition of drama*. Toronto: Pergamon Press.

Rose, M.G. 1981. Translation types and conventions. *Translation spectrum: Essays in theory and practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Steiner, G. 1975. *After Babel*. London: Oxford University Press.

Straight, H.S.. 1981. Knowledge, purpose, and intuition: Three dimensions in the evaluation of translation. *Translation spectrum: Essays in theory and practice*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Suleiman, S., and I. Crosman, eds. 1980. *The reader in the text: Essays on audience and interpretation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

APPENDIX A

PASSAGES CITED

A ORIGINAL "LA CASSETTE" p.157:

Nous nous étions habitués à cette maladie sereine qui évoluait sournoisement, sans dommage apparent. A moins que notre tendresse ne nous ait aveuglées, grand-mère et moi.

A DRAFT 1:

We had all grown accustomed to the illness which was quietly yet stealthily spreading without any visible effects. Unless, of course, our love, grandmother's and mine, had blinded us both.

A INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:

We had grown accustomed to the illness which was quietly yet stealthily spreading through his body without any visible effects. Unless, of course, my love for him and my grandmother's had blinded us both.

A FINAL DRAFT:

We had all grown accustomed to the illness that was quietly yet stealthily spreading through his body. Although, looking at him, you'd never have known he was ill. Unless, of course, our love for him had blinded both grandmother and me.

B ORIGINAL "LA CASSETTE" p.157:

Le boudoir, aménagé en chambre au rez-de-chausée pour plus de commodité, était agréable, et l'ambiance de la pièce, d'une douceur presque palpable.

B DRAFT 1:

The boudoir, which had been converted into a bedroom on the main floor as a matter of convenience, was pleasant, and the room had an almost palpable calm.

B INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:

Because of its more convenient location, the living room on the main floor had been converted into a bedroom. It was a pleasant room with an almost palpable calm.

B FINAL DRAFT:

The boudoir, which had been converted into a bedroom because of its more convenient location on the main floor, was pleasant and filled with an almost tangible calm.

C ORIGINAL "LA CASSETTE" p.161:

Moi qui craignais qu'elle ne succombe de douleur, je comouflai mon chagrin.

C DRAFT 1:

I, who feared that she might succomb to the pain, I hid my grief.

C INTERMEDIATE DRAFT 5:
I hid my grief, afraid that she might succumb to the pain.
C FINAL DRAFT:
And here I had thought she would be overcome by the pain, but I was the one stifling my own grief.

D ORIGINAL "DOLORES, II" p.72:
"Je plume aussi une poule pour te replumer."
Surpris de s'entendre faire un calembour, il arrondit les yeux et le répète, hilare.
D DRAFT 1:
"I'm going to pluck you a chicken because it looks like instead of getting fed chicken you've been getting chicken feed."
Surprised to hear himself make a pun, he rounds his eyes and repeats it, ecstatic.
D INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
"I'm going to pluck you a chicken because you look as if you've been getting chicken feed instead of getting fed chicken."
Surprised to hear himself make a pun, he rounds his eyes and repeats it, elated.
D FINAL DRAFT:
"I'm going to pluck you a chicken; you look as if you've been getting chicken feed instead of getting fed chicken."
Surprised to hear himself make a pun, with his eyes round, he says it again, overjoyed.

E ORIGINAL "DOLORES, I" p.53:
Ils font maintenant partie du groupe marginal que la majorité des paroissiens feint d'ignorer.
E DRAFT 1:
They now belong to the group of marginal people that the parishioners pretend to ignore.
E INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
They are now treated as outcasts by the majority of the Catholic community who pretend they don't exist.
E FINAL DRAFT:
They are now treated as outcasts by the majority of the Catholic community who pretend they simply don't exist.

F ORIGINAL "DOLORES, II" p.65:
Une carte mortuaire, bordée de noir, est appuyée à un minuscule pot de confiture. La photo est celle d'une femme âgée. Des bandeaux lisses recouvrent ses oreilles. Elle porte une blouse à col montant et à manches bouffantes.
F DRAFT 1:
A death announcement, with a black frame, leans against a tiny jar of jam. It's the picture of an old lady. Her

ears are covered by smooth ribbons. She's wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves.
F INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
A death announcement, with a black border, leans against a tiny jam-jar. It's the picture of an old lady. Her ears are covered by smooth ribbons. She's wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves.
F FINAL DRAFT:
A death announcement, framed in black, leans against a tiny jam-jar. In the picture, an old lady with smooth bandeaux covering her ears is wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves.

G ORIGINAL "LA CASSETTE" p.157:
Il était capricieux, raffiné, d'un charme attendrissant. Bien qu'autoritaire et égocentrique, il était, pour moi, attentif et affectueux.
G DRAFT 1:
He was capricious, refined, and exuded a tender charm. Despite his authoritativeness and egocentricity, he was attentive and affectionate to me.
G INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
He was moody, cultured, and radiated a tender charm. Even though he had a tendency to be bossy and self-centered, he was caring and affectionate with me.
G FINAL DRAFT:
Same as previous draft.

H ORIGINAL "DOLORES, I" p.57:
Dolorès ne comprend pas très bien les allusions que doit contenir cette phrase.
H DRAFT 1:
Dolores doesn't really grasp the allusions contained in that sentence.
H INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Dolores doesn't really grasp the full meaning of his statement.
H FINAL DRAFT:
Dolores doesn't really grasp the full meaning of the statement.

I ORIGINAL "DOLORES II" p.64:
Puis il va décrocher les chiffons pendus au mur, tire un seau de sous l'escalier et remet le tout à Dolorès.
I DRAFT 1:
Then he goes and takes down the cloths that are hanging on the wall, takes a pail out from under the stairs and gives it all to Dolores.
I INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Then he goes and takes down the cloths that are hanging on the wall, pulls out a pail from beneath the stairs and

hands it all to Dolores.
I FINAL DRAFT:
Then he goes and takes down the rags hanging on the wall, pulls out a pail from beneath the stairs and hands everything over to Dolores.

J ORIGINAL "LA CASSETTE" p.159:
Je l'ai aperçu plus d'une fois commencer le geste d'applaudir, participant, dans son enthousiasme, aux ovations de l'invisible mais si présent auditoire.
J DRAFT 1:
More than once, I caught him about to applaud, participating, in his enthusiasm, in the ovations of the invisible yet so present audience.
J INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
More than once, I caught him about to clap, joining the ovations of the unseen but ever so present audience in his enthusiasm.
J FINAL DRAFT:
More than once, I caught him about to clap, enthusiastically caught up in the applause of the unseen, but ever so present audience.

K ORIGINAL "LA CASSETTE" p.160:
Je partis bientôt me libérer des tâches les plus urgentes afin d'être disponible.
K DRAFT 1:
I soon left to take care of my most pressing matters, so I would be free later on.
K INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
I soon left to take care of some of my most important business, so I would be free for later on.
K FINAL DRAFT:
Wanting to be free to be with him later on, I left soon after to care of a few things that just couldn't be put off any longer.

L ORIGINAL "DOLORES, I" p.59:
Monsieur Lafond roule maintenant à toute vitesse. Madame Lafond s'étouffe de colère. Et Dolorès est prise d'un fou rire qui lui fait beaucoup de bien.
L DRAFT 1:
Monsieur Lafond is now driving at top speed. Madame Lafond is choking with anger. And Dolores is having a fit of laughter that does her a lot of good.
L INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Monsieur Lafond drives at top speed. Madame Lafond chokes with rage as Dolores revels in a much needed fit of laughter.
L FINAL DRAFT:
Madame Lafond chokes with rage as Monsieur Lafond floors

the pedal. And Dolores is overcome by a fit of laughter, a long overdue release.

M ORIGINAL "DOLORES, I" p.51:
Dolorès regarde, découragée, les piles d'assiettes qui recouvrent le comptoir de la cuisine et les dégâts de la veille: le plancher sale, le poêle encombré de chaudrons encroûtés.
M DRAFT 1:
Dolores looks helplessly at the pile of dishes on the kitchen counter and at the previous evening's mess: the dirty floor and the stove cluttered with mucky dried-up pots.
M INTERMEDIATE DRAFT:
Dolores looks helplessly at the pile of dishes on the kitchen counter and at the previous evening's mess: a dirty floor and a stove cluttered with pots coated with grime / grimy pots.
M FINAL DRAFT:
Dolores looks helplessly at the mess that's been waiting there for her since last night: a pile of dishes on the kitchen counter, a filthy floor, and a stove cluttered with dirty pots that will really need a lot of elbow grease.

APPENDIX B

I. THE TAPE

That morning, I suddenly felt the presence of death: an invisible figure waiting there. Yet when I got to my grandfather's bedside, there was nothing I could put my finger on to justify my uneasiness. The boudoir, which had been converted into a bedroom because of its more convenient location on the main floor, was pleasant and filled with an almost tangible calm. On the chest of drawers, two peonies in an opaline vase, their pistils bared, were in full bloom. The patient was propped up on pillows in white linen cases trimmed with a pink festoon pattern. He seemed to be holding up well. I was grateful to him for maintaining his nobility, despite being bedridden. He was moody, cultured, and radiated a tender charm. Even though he had a tendency to be bossy and self-centred, he was caring and affectionate with me.

We had all grown accustomed to the illness that was quietly yet stealthily spreading through his body. Although, looking at him, you'd never have known he was ill. Unless, of course, our love for him had blinded both grandmother and me.

Whenever I left their house she would see me to the sidewalk. As we walked beside the flowerbed, she would stop to lift up the head of a flower. One day, as she

bent down to cover up a stray root, she spoke of ordering a lounger for the garden. "We have to be ready for when he's able to come outdoors again." Later, taking a rose in the palm of her hand, she closed her eyes to better savour its fragrance. I just couldn't understand how she managed to act so casual, because I knew that deep down she was worried about Grandpa's illness and what it might lead to.

I really loved my grandparents. I saw them often. I liked to watch them live. I used to get a kick both out of the funny little habits that governed their daily routine, and their mutual stubbornness. Sometimes I'd catch them in the middle of an argument - my grandmother fervently opposing my grandfather's views. I was well aware that they both knew each other's arguments inside out and that, in private, they took turns giving in. Besides, things only got really heated when politics were brought up, since they both refused to break with their own traditional family loyalties. During similar conversations with friends or neighbours, my grandmother wouldn't say a word. It wasn't that she was renouncing her personal views. She just kept them to herself because it was in poor taste for a wife to question her husband's authority in front of others, especially when it came to politics.

Watching my grandmother, I learned there was more to marital devotion than just a great deal of frustration.

When Grandpa had to go away on business, waiting became rather tiresome for Grandma; despite being interlaced with feelings of anxiety, this waiting seemed delightful to me. When he returned, she wouldn't come out of it right away. She'd listen carefully to the story of his trip. Once it became clear that he had escaped all the perils of the big city, she'd relax again, especially if Grandpa had been to an operetta or an opera. Then she'd happily listen to the many details of his evening out. Everything he mentioned had been remarkable. Mind you, he was apt to forget everything that wasn't; he loved music.

Like all passions, his was accompanied by a ritual. That's why the highlight of his weekend was the Metropolitan Opera's radio broadcast from New York. His whole life revolved around that one event.

I can still see him there, lying on the black leather couch in the den. He would listen religiously, his eyes shut. More than once, I caught him about to clap, enthusiastically caught up in the applause of the unseen, but ever so present audience. During the intermissions, he would take time out to pour himself a drink and warn Grandma and me that he didn't want to hear so much as a peep out of us.

That morning, the calm throughout the boudoir-bedroom filled me with suspicion. As I leaned against the foot of the bed, I had a premonition that my grandfather was about to die.

I spoke to him softly. He raised his eyelids. No, he wasn't in pain. Suddenly, the outline of his jawbone, the bridge of his nose, his hollow temples, they all caught my eye. I just managed to control the panic welling up inside me, and I went and sat next to him. In his eyes I saw a look of terror which meant that he, too, knew the end was near. I immediately buried my grief and fright, and set my sights on a single goal: soothing the pain he must have been feeling and somehow making this last day easier for him. I was so obsessed with the idea that had just crossed my mind that I didn't even think about getting Grandma, the family, or a priest. I leaned over towards him and asked:

"Grandpa, would you like to listen to your favourite opera?"

His face brightened right away. I went to get the tape of Verdi's Aida, a favourite of his. The player was an older model and hard to work, but I thought nothing would please him more than this recording that he himself had taped and knew by heart, right down to the very last note. He especially liked some of the intonations of the "Ritorna vincitor" solo in the first act. It moved me to think that his soul, which was so touched by this passage, as he used to say, might be gently raised to the heaven he believed in as it was playing. I placed the earphones on his head. I could tell by the expression on his face that the volume was just right. His eyes were closed so he

could concentrate better. He was smiling.

Wanting to be free to be with him later on, I left soon after to take care of a few things that just couldn't be put off any longer. As my grandmother was seeing me off, I asked her to keep an eye on the player which was forever breaking down. She answered maliciously:

"I may be old, but I'm not senile, you know! I'm the one who always fixes the tape when it breaks."

I left, torn between a feeling of immense grief and one of joy, that, thanks to me, my grandfather might be spared the depths of agony.

I had been back at my place for barely an hour when the phone rang. My guess had been right; he had just died.

I rushed right over. The first thing my grandmother did was to point towards the room.

"Take the earphones off him and get rid of that wretched machine. All it ever did was break the tape and keep me running back and forth to fix it."

Then she went on in the same tone.

"And make it quick, we've got a lot to do if we want to get everything done the way he planned it."

"The way he planned it?"

"Yes, of course," she answered with a tone of authority in her voice that I had never heard before. "That way we'll make sure we're not forgetting anyone and that things are done properly."

And here I had thought she would be overcome by the pain, but I was the one stifling my own grief.

"Open the drawer on the right hand side of the desk. In it you'll find a notebook. All you have to do is follow the instructions."

Her stoicism and determination impressed me. I barely managed to hold back a sob as I removed the earphones from his head.

"Hurry," she repeated. "Now make the calls in the order on the list."

"Yes, of course, Grandma, don't worry, you can count on me." She was already at the foot of the stairs.

"I'm going up to get dressed and choose a suit for him to wear."

I went about my work on the ground floor without worrying about her. When the hearse arrived, I went upstairs to let her know. She was quietly crying. A few suits and ties were lying out on the bed.

"Decide, won't you?" she said, burying her face in her hands. "I can't bring myself to do it."

I chose the dark suit and the darkest tie and brought them down to the undertaker. By the time I went back up, she had already pulled herself back together. She managed her part beautifully. With all the `proper' things done, the planned outcome was achieved: no grief whatsoever was displayed. The dinner after the funeral service even created a sudden New Year's Day atmosphere in the house.

After the last guest had gone, my grandmother went up to her room.

When I got back to my apartment, I carefully put away the Aida recording which now held something sacred for me.

For several weeks I wouldn't allow myself to think about the death that forever cut me off from a love so dear to me. And then today, I changed my mind. If that music had accompanied my grandfather's final thoughts, would it not help me get over the pain of my grief?

I carefully put the reels in place and turned on the machine. First I heard a strange noise, followed by an endless series of warped sounds and distorted voices. I let out a cry of despair as I ran to turn it off. My grandmother had spliced the tape back on the wrong way, and Grandpa had died listening to a terrible muddle of noise.

I just had to write about this horrible experience. I can't deal with it on my own and I need to somehow vent my frustration and anger. How is it that an act motivated solely by love could turn out to be so cruel? Is somebody out there getting their kicks by playing mind games with us, or what?

APPENDIX B

II. DOLORES, I

"You can come along Dolores," Madame Lafond says, the glint in her beady little eyes betraying the big smile on her face. "Come on. If Euclide takes care of milking the cow and feeding the chickens for you, you can do the dishes when we get back. And even if he doesn't, you'll have the whole evening to get your work done."

Dolores looks helplessly at the mess that's been waiting there for her since last night: a pile of dishes on the kitchen counter, a filthy floor, and a stove cluttered with dirty pots that will really need a lot of elbow grease.

She gives a resigned shrug. It's the same thing every time Marjolaine comes over on Saturday with her three snotty kids and her drunkard of a husband who flicks his cigarette ashes next to his chair and drips beer all over the floor.

"You coming or not?" repeats Madame Lafond.

The pastor had seemed shocked that the thought of taking the young girl along to the church service hadn't even crossed their minds.

"Who will ever convert her if her foster parents don't see to it?" he had said to Madame Lafond.

Untying her apron, Dolores answers, "Sure, I'll

come," as spontaneous as only a sixteen year old can be.

She hurries up to her room and comes downstairs in her pink cotton Sunday dress, tying up her thick curly hair with a ribbon, a striking head of hair that is so healthy in contrast to her frail adolescent body.

Out by the front steps, the roar of the motor bounces off the barn wall as Monsieur Lafond revs up the Chevy. Now that European cars have come to the area, he knows that you have to warm up the engine before you leave. He thinks it makes sense, since it's the same thing with horses. Madame Lafond doesn't agree, as usual.

"Oh come on, Euclide, a car ain't nothing but a fancy piece of machinery," she says for the umpteenth time.

Her husband's way of sporadically revving the motor gets on her nerves, God it gets on her nerves!

"Get going or I'll scream!" she threatens, clenching her teeth.

Nonchalantly, Monsieur Lafond steps on the accelerator one last time, turns an ear to listen to the motor which seems ready to explode, then starts off with a jolt that sends gravel ricocheting off the fenders as Madame Lafond's head snaps back.

"You'd think you were trying to break my neck," she howls, straightening up.

The Sunday drive has just begun.

Dolores settles into the middle of the back seat so that she can see out both sides.

Every Sunday they go to Thetford Mines. The Lafonds would prefer going somewhere closer, but because the nearest Baptist church is in Thetford, they have no choice. They converted to the Baptist faith at the same time as a few other families in Saint Elphège did. They are now treated as outcasts by the majority of the Catholic community who pretend they simply don't exist.

This rejection and its consequences had been foreseen. That is why it took the Lafonds six months to finally make up their minds to convert. Six months of ongoing discussions with the Catholics, and secret meetings with the Baptists. Eventually a choice had to be made. Then the time came. Some of the arguments made by the Thetford camp had swayed them: the Catholic tithe was too costly, and some priests were not worthy of their position. But in the end, what really decided it for them was that they would no longer have to go to confession. They abhorred that practice which forced them either to lie or to humiliate themselves. It is so much easier to deal directly with God, the Baptist proponent had stated. Since the divine will is expressed in its entirety in the Bible, all one has to do to understand one's obligations and to meet the conditions which ensure eternal salvation is interpret the parables.

"A helluva religion, eh, Irma? A religion where we're all equal."

"Tell me about it, we're all a bunch of moochers,"

Madame Lafond snickers as she continues biting her nails.

"I just don't understand you, Irma. You yourself pointed it out to me last Sunday. You nudged me and whispered: `Euclide, listen to the people in the pew behind us, they speak English.'"

"Poor Euclide, just 'cause people speak English, it doesn't mean they can't be moochers too. You remind me of Madame Trepanier when we were in Toronto last year with the women's arts and crafts group: she couldn't get over the fact that three year old children could already speak English. I'll admit, most Anglos we've come across have been bosses, but really, Euclide, open your eyes. Don't you remember what Pastor Finlay said two weeks ago?"

She sighs. Is it really worth going to the service every Sunday if Euclide doesn't even listen to the sermons? She casts a furious look at her husband, then suggests that they begin the Bible reading.

"Let's give Dolores a little more time to relax," Monsieur Lafond answers, raising his voice and turning towards the young girl.

"You hypocrite," his wife hisses. "You always find an excuse to cut short your devotions."

"Nothing's stopping you from starting, Irma."

"You know very well that it wears me out. And besides, why should I go to all that trouble while Dolores lazes around?" she adds, lowering her voice.

This is, in fact, needless, since the only words that

ever catch Dolores' attention are the ones spoken in a threatening tone of voice. All the others are nothing but a murmur to her. Quiet and apparently resigned, she lives in her own little world where all good things come to those who wait. The moments of enchantment (such as the ride to Thetford), as fleeting as they may be, are enough to sustain her ability to escape reality.

She settles herself more comfortably in the back seat, smoothing out her skirt to either side, resting her hands on it. Then her face brightens.

This particular Sunday is remarkably clear. Where the plowed land juts into the forest, she can see the lush Méchantigan valley, as if she were flying above the river which gently winds through it. Today, her gaze can take it all in. Nature is ever-changing. Like life, perhaps? She smiles, carried away by this moment of hope and well-being. Suddenly, everything seems so simple and straightforward.

Yet when you see her busying herself around the house, struggling to finish her exhausting household chores, how worn out she seems: her narrow shoulders, her sunken chest, her pallid pink lips. And the kitchen counter always so cluttered. After supper, she rolls up her sleeves and ties the strings of her big twill apron in a knot around her waist. What a heart-wrenching sight it is to see Dolores getting ready to scour the pots and wash the dirty dishes that have been piling up all day.

Whenever an unexpected visitor drops by, it even embarasses Madame Lafond who feels the need to say:

"She's a real trooper, that Dolores. It's a good thing the dishes aren't always piled so high. But she's not afraid of work. Never a word of complaint. Ain't that right, Dolores?"

The young girl acquiesces, turning away the worried look that she gets whenever someone speaks to her or when she feels someone is looking at her.

It is true that a rebellious word has never escaped her lips. Besides, what could she possibly complain about? She eats these people's food and sleeps in a bed as comfortable as their own. Surely Madame Lafond must be right when she tells her again and again how lucky she is, that not all children in foster homes are so well treated...

Dolores leans her head against the back of the seat and dreamily watches a few round clouds go by, clouds so white, so unexpected in the intense blue of the sky. Earlier, she discreetly opened the back window. Granted, the nearby pigsties stink, but every now and then she catches a whiff of the clover, one of her favourite smells. One day as she was getting off the school bus she picked a huge bouquet of clovers to brighten up her room.

"You fool," Madame Lafond screamed as she ripped them out of her hands. "Why in the world would you want to bring in a bunch of weeds full of little bugs?"

No doubt about it, Madame Lafond was right. It was ridiculous to bring those flowers into the house when there were all kinds of them along the side of the road, on the banks of the ditches. It's much more pleasant to gaze at them there, in rows on either side, growing among the blue chicory and goldenrod. Yes, they're really much prettier like that. It was ridiculous to bring them inside...

Dolores suddenly snaps out of her daydream and raises her head because Monsieur Lafond has slowed down. Outside on a porch, a group of adults is rocking back and forth and drinking beer, while a bunch of kids play ball and horseshoes in the yard.

"Looks like the whole Maheu clan is there! That's one family that really knows how to make babies," snickers Monsieur Lafond.

A look of deep hurt crosses Madame Lafond's face. Dolores doesn't really grasp the full meaning of the statement. If Madame Lafond always reacts that way when the topic of large families comes up, maybe it's because she sees them as a sort of curse.

Dolores jumps. Madame Lafond has raised her voice.

"You'd just love to see your porch crawling with your offspring on Sunday afternoon so you could prove your virility, wouldn't you?"

"I never said that, Irma. It was just a bloody joke..."

Dolores has stopped listening. Her only thought now is that this scene buys her a few more moments of respite. She takes a deep breath and returns to that special place in her mind where she can take as much delight in this brilliant Sunday as she pleases.

She watches the houses gently file by as the valley flows past her eyes. She marvels once more at the round cottony clouds, and notices how the colours and types of flowers on the banks of the ditches change.

Although she is thoroughly enjoying the pleasure of this outing, she is not upset when her when Madame Lafond hands her the Bible, saying in her authoritarian voice:

"Start where I put the bookmark. Make sure you don't swallow your words. And read until we get to Thetford, that way we'll be ready for the service."

Dolores takes the book. She's really lucky today, she usually has to start reading the Bible at the turn by the Lagueux house.

"Close your window, I can't stand the smell of the pigs!" shouts Monsieur Lafond.

As she turns the handle, the young girl breathes in the sunny country air one last time, discreetly sighs, and starts reading, raising her voice to speak above the roar of the motor:

"The Gospel according to Mark. Chapter 10. The trip up to Jerusalem. Sixth verse: The sanctity of marriage."

"The sanctity of marriage. Hear that Euclide?

Louder, Dolores," cries Madame Lafond.

Though she raises her voice, Dolores has a hard time making herself heard.

"Jesus! I never said I wanted to get separated."

"No, but you'd sure like to. And stop swearing," snaps his wife.

Madame Lafond chokes with rage as Monsieur Lafond floors the pedal. And Dolores is overcome by fit of laughter, a long overdue release.

APPENDIX B

III. DOLORES, II

Traditionally speaking, Monsieur Lessard is not actually a neighbour of the Lessards. That title is reserved for people who live on the same side of the concession road, either up- or downstream. It carries obligations and privileges which have nothing to do with Monsieur Lessard. He is a neighbour in the broader sense of the term, similar to the way the word "brother" can stir up as much hatred in one person as love in another.

When Monsieur Lafond says: "Ernest Lessard, he's one of my neighbours," you can detect a barely contained condescension hidden beneath the indifferent tone camouflaging his contempt.

Monsieur Lessard's farm is isolated. The land on either side of it has been bought up by city dwellers who longed to have a spot out in the country. The once carefully farmed fields are now nothing more than lots overgrown with weeds and brush. The bleached-cedar house blends well into the countryside of this lost corner of the world. Besides being dilapidated, the house has sunk into the ground, and instead of repairing the foundation, Monsieur Lessard has found it easier to plane down those doors that would no longer close. The windows, roof, and porch are all lop-sided. Monsieur Lessard's house is the

shame of the concession's inhabitants.

Walking up the path that leads to the front steps, Dolores really takes notice of the house for the first time. She also observes the dilapidated buildings and the run-down farming equipment all around her. Along the front of the house, tansies and blue chicory choke the peonies and the columbines. A layer of neglected junk carpets the porch floor. Dolores gets the feeling that she might not be able to go through with it.

Last week, when Madame Lafond informed her that she would be going to work at Monsieur Lessard's place during the day, Dolores was surprised at first: Monsieur Lessard had always managed without a housekeeper, why did he suddenly need one now?

"He's been living like a hermit ever since his mother died," Madame Lafond exclaimed, as if this concept were completely natural. She added: "The saying *Dirty Old Man* doesn't apply to him, so you don't have to be afraid."

Dolores is not afraid of this neighbour of hers who has messy hair, needs a shave and dresses like a bum. She doesn't feel used, because she doesn't know that the Lafonds will pocket her new salary as well as the social assistance money they receive. Naturally, she will continue to work for them in the evening, since they will still be her foster parents.

Nevertheless, she has her doubts as she knocks on the kitchen door.

"Come on in," Monsieur Lafond says in a surprisingly pleasant voice.

Before even crossing the doorway, she freezes in dismay. She never imagined such a mess, so much dirt! But she manages to pull herself together and forces herself to look at Monsieur Lessard with a smile, so as not to humiliate him.

"You think it's awful, eh? Go on, say it. Say it," he repeats in a halting tone, laughing loudly. "I've got the worst kept house in the concession, don't I?"

Dolores thinks he is being effusive out of shyness or awkwardness. Disconcerted, she lowers her eyes and notices her new boss's bare feet. They are so dirty that for a moment she thought he was wearing shoes. Holding back a fit of laughter, she raises her head and resolutely enters the kitchen.

"Put down your bag, Dolores," Monsieur Lessard says in a friendly manner, gesturing with his arm.

"Sure, but where?" asks the young girl.

They break into a spontaneous laughter which kindles a sudden complicity between them. This reassures Dolores, who instinctively feels that Monsieur Lessard is a good man. For Dolores believes that goodness is the ultimate virtue, the one with magical powers. She has never doubted its existence, but she is quite surprised to find it in Monsieur Lessard, a man who looks like misery itself.

She puts her bag down on the floor, next to the wall. Monsieur Lessard scurries over to the sink. All kinds of odds and ends, jars filled with nails, old newspapers, onions, potatoes, and chipped dishes clutter the counter. In amongst this assortment of objects is a bottle of detergent. Monsieur Lessard grabs it, shows it to the girl and jokes:

"As you can see, I went all out!"

He goes over to the stove and turns over the unpeeled potatoes that are cooking on the back burner, causing a faint burning smell to spread through the room. Then he goes and takes down the rags hanging on the wall, pulls out a pail from beneath the stairs and hands everything over to Dolores.

"You can start, if you like," he hesitatingly suggests.

"Sure, but where, with what?"

Monsieur Lesard shrugs.

"Well now, you're the one who has to decide that. Me, the only advice I'm going to give you is to take your time. Don't forget that you have all summer to clean up. When you feel that you have swallowed too much dust, you can just go out on the porch and rock yourself."

She looks at him, surprised at this unfamiliar piece of advice, and after a quick inspection, says:

"If I started off by clearing the table, that would give me room to empty out the cupboards. What do you

think?"

"That's a good idea, but..."

He stops in mid-sentence, approaches the table, and says with a worried look:

"I'd appreciate it if you didn't move anything over there."

He points to a spot in the middle of the inextricable mess that is just as cluttered, but in its own particular way. A death announcement, framed in black, leans against a tiny jam-jar. In the picture, an old lady with smooth bandeaux covering her ears is wearing a blouse with a high collar and puffed-out sleeves. Her mouth is stiff, but she has a gentle and kind look.

To the left of it is a rosary with its beads wrapped around the cross. To the right, there is a small overturned glass with a tiny dried flower. A yellowed newspaper clipping with *Deaths* written across the top lies in the middle of a rectangle bordered with beans.

"Who's that?" Dolores asks with a lump in her throat.

"That's my mother," he answers. "She died ten years ago after living to a ripe old age, the poor dear."

"A ripe old age?"

"Eighty big ones!"

He continues:

"But, you know, she worked as hard as a fifty year old. In her day, you can be sure the house was as clean as a whistle."

"Well, she's been gone ten years, it's only natural that it show a little," Dolores says politely, all the while thinking to herself that the house looks like a dump.

Just as she is about to give in to a feeling of despair, she notes a fervour in Monsieur Lessard's voice that moves her.

"After my father died and my brothers and sisters left, I lived here with her. Ten years we spent farming the land, chatting, working together, taking care of her illnesses. Ten years! The best years of my life!"

As always happens whenever she comes across a case of brotherly and motherly love, Dolores suddenly feels like crying. She has this feeling that she's catching a glimpse of the splendours of a forbidden paradise, where only her imagination can take her, at the Baptist church, during the never-ending service. From amongst the congregation, in order to create the mother and father of her dreams, she chooses that head of hair on the right, that hat on the left, the elongated form of a neck for the mother, a square jaw for the father, the curve of a shoulder here, the colour of that article of clothing there. When the two characters, finally completed, come down the aisle arm in arm, she smiles with pleasure: they are admirable, truly admirable. But right away their beauty seems fragile to her, as if it were already stricken by destiny.

Her parents, surely, must have died right after her birth, snatched away by an epidemic, maybe the Spanish flu or tuberculosis, or in a car crash... It's inconceivable that they might have left her wrapped in a newspaper at an orphanage door, only to take off like common criminals. That's not at all their type, she concludes, looking at the parents that she has just invented herself, as they majestically come down the aisle of the little Baptist church...

Monsieur Lessard clears his throat. Dolores jumps. He steps closer:

"Above all, don't get that discouraged look on your face. I should've never let the house get so filthy. But you know, after my mother's death, I just didn't see any point in picking up and cleaning."

He has wrongly interpreted the young girl's thoughts.

"You can't cast a magic spell and make everything shine. Just do what you can."

Dolores looks at him, moved.

"What I'd like, if it's possible, is for you to give the whole house the once over by the end of the summer. Once the whole thing is clean, I can put away the broom for another ten years," he says, bursting into laughter.

Dolores laughs too, in that childish way of hers. You'd think that an untapped reservoir of happiness had suddenly begun to overflow. She ties around her waist the strings of the twill apron that she has brought with her,

and rolls up her shirtsleeves.

"Let's get the show on the road!" she says.

"Start off by cleaning up a spot on the table for your place settings, but be real careful not to move mother's `square'." And he adds, raising his voice:

"You can throw out anything that's no more good. Throw out! You can throw out..." he repeats, surprised by this sudden innovation.

"Come on now, I understand what you mean," smiles Dolores. "Don't you worry, I know the difference between a jar that's broken and one that isn't."

Monsieur Lessard looks at the young girl, at the potatoes that are browning on the stove, and he announces in a jubilant voice:

"I'll bring back some eggs for lunch, and a few leaves of lettuce for you, even though they're still pretty small."

The door closes. Monsieur Lessard is not at all the man she thought he was. Granted, he's as filthy as his house, but his heart must smell of morning dew, she thinks, deeply moved.

When she gets home for supper, Dolores answers Madame Lafond's questions vaguely: "Yes, Monsieur Lessard is nice... No, he doesn't smell bad... His house isn't all that dirty... Yes, she'll manage to get it all done."

Once the dishes are washed and the table is set for the next morning, she goes up to her room. She's so

exhausted that she has barely enough time to throw on her nighty before falling asleep.

Early the next morning, she leaves silently.

"She's got guts," comments Monsieur Lafond as he watches her retreating figure through the window.

"At that age, you've got a lot of energy," retorts Madame Lafond immediately.

"Even so," replies the husband, "to clean Ernest's house! I was sure that one morning she'd start crying and refuse to go back."

"Well, I think just the opposite: it's stimulating. Imagine when she realizes that the kitchen walls are yellow!"

Unfortunately, they are still grey and the mess seems even worse since Dolores emptied out the cupboards, but the smell of soap is slowly making its way in amongst the rancid odours of the house. And then there is the table: the oilcloth on it is so clean now that you'd think the two table settings were on place mats.

Dolores used a tablecloth to cover up the three quarters of the table that are still cluttered. The side that faces the window has been cleared and is inviting. Near Monsieur Lessard's setting, the funeral enclosure is still displayed, but the small jar has been replaced by a tiny old glass.

Every morning Dolores puts a fresh flower in it. She picks it by the curve in the road. It's also there that

she can quicken her pace. From there, nobody can see that she is running. An eager feeling makes her flow into long, smooth strides. Dolores now has a secret life. Dolores knows the enchantment of the beginning of the world! She works like a horse, but she doesn't even notice it anymore. Her hands work, reddened by the detergents, the bags under her eyes get bigger and bigger, but who cares about fatigue when you don't even feel it! Dolores' spirit has been in ecstasy ever since her second day there.

She and Monsieur Lessard are at the table, each seated in front of a plate that is half-empty even before they start to eat. Dolores looks at the black-bordered announcement. The old woman looks as if she is standing on the other side of a window. Dolores is staring so intently at her that she forgets to eat.

Monsieur Lessard puts down his knife, and pointing at the photo with his fork, he utters the prodigious sentence:

"You know, she knew your grandmother well."

"My grandmother?"

Dolores screamed like a child does at birth. A muffled cry that slowly gets louder and louder.

"My grandmother?"

Monsieur Lessard was sure it would please her, but not to this extent! He's just not good at showing his emotions. After he had picked up his mother's lifeless

body in the highland where she had gone to rake hay and carried it down to the house, nobody noticed how he thought he was going to die of anguish. A neighbour who had rushed over had even remarked: "My God, you'd think you were carrying a doll stuffed with bran."

Faced with little Dolores who is trembling and who is undoubtedly about to cry, he is helpless. He takes a few seconds to pull himself back together and think of a joke that will let him regain control of his emotions, given the circumstances.

"Everyone has a grandmother, you know. Did you think you'd just fallen out of the sky like a meteor?"

"No, of course not, but nobody ever told me I had a family. Never a word to give me a clue where I came from. Never! And now you talk about a grandmother that... that she knew. A grandmother! Is it possible?"

Monsieur Lessard is uncomfortable feeling so emotional. He clears his throat several times, and pretends to be angry:

"If that's as far as your curiosity goes, then we'll just leave it at your grandmother. I can tell you she wasn't a rock either. Her mother gave birth to her, just like she gave birth. But since you seem satisfied just knowing you had a grandmother, well then, let's just leave it at that," he adds, quickly getting up.

The strategy works. Already, Dolores is no longer quite so pale. The colour in her cheeks is coming back,

and her neck has a pink hue to it. Monsieur Lessard breathes a sigh of relief. For a minute he really thought that she was going to pass out. But it's O.K. She looks up at him with an imploring look in her glowing eyes and he sits down again. It was also on that day that he uttered that revolutionary new phrase: "The work can wait; from now on we're taking our time."

Thus began the long recital of the epic of Dolores' family. It carries over from one meal to another, and in Dolores' mind, the days are nothing but one long feast. The slack periods are filled in with revelations.

When noontime rolls around, Dolores glances out the window to see if Monsieur Lessard is coming in from the stable or the fields. While he washes his hands, she hurriedly eats so she can devote all her attention to their conversation. She eagerly asks him questions, like a child who wants to hear the rest of a story.

"And my Uncle Gerard, what was he like? What village did he live in?"

Even if Monsieur Lessard replies that he doesn't know too much about him, except that he left for the States when he was very young, Dolores listens with a look of delight on her face.

Later the meals change. One day, Monsieur Lessard comes back up from the village with a coffee pot and some coffee, and upon entering, declares:

"We'll drink some in the morning and even at noon if you

want!"

Then, one day as he watches her run up the walk, he has a flash of inspiration. He opens the door for her and announces that from now on they are going to raid the garden. Too bad if there are no more vegetables left for the fall. He interrupts her objection.

"I'm going to pluck you a chicken; you look as if you've been getting chicken feed instead of getting fed chicken."

Surprised to hear himself make a pun, with his eyes round, he says it again, overjoyed.

Monsieur Lessard is treading on his principles of austerity with a fervour that enchants him.

But an element of regret also pervades his pleasure: compared to his own lot of relatives, Dolores' is incomplete; and there is nobody left in the parish to help fill in the gaps. Once Dolores' maternal grandmother had passed away, the family spread out to the four corners of the province. As for her father's side of the family, he knows nothing. Does anyone know anything about it? Certainly not his cousin Alicia, who has been living in Montreal for the last twenty years. She would have said something about it in her New Year's card. Alicia really likes to talk. On top of that, for a long time she worked in the same shop as Dolores' mother, who certainly must have told her about the whole affair, but under an oath of secrecy, because Alicia had never written him anything

about Dolores' father. He would remember that. He would really like to be able to give her an answer to her question:

"And my father, did Alicia talk to you about him?"

"I may be a genealogy buff," Monsieur Lessard answers with the confidence of someone who has repeated something for a long time, "I may be a genealogy buff, but my knowledge is more or less limited to this parish. And your family left so long ago..."

"It can't be that long ago, if you knew my uncles and aunts when they were young."

"Distance is worse than time," retorts Monsieur Lessard sententiously.

"When you always live in the same spot, each generation is like a new floor that's added on to the same house. Your family left for Montreal. How can you expect me to know any details?"

He doesn't deny the existence of the father, but buries it in the abstract.

"Montreal is such a big city... a mysterious city... maybe even dangerous, too," he murmurs, staring out the window.

At any rate, Dolores quickly understood that it was useless to ask for any more details or to try to co-ordinate dates and years.

As the weeks go by, she has the beatific smile that contented people have, mainly because of her large new-

found family. When Monsieur Lessard concentrates so as to list off the names of the children of the cousins who have settled in Dorchester or those who left for the States, (an even greater number), she listens in awe.

Her trips to Thetford have left her with a few biblical vestiges. At the end of the summer, when Monsieur Lessard tells her that try as he might to delve into the hidden corners of his memory, he has nothing more to add, she says in a solemn tone:

"My family is as numerous as the sands of the sea and it is blessed by God!"

"I've shovelled all the sand I could, Dolores! Amen."

They start laughing because they don't know how to tell one another that they are happy.

"Maybe after searching and searching I'll be able to find some more memories of your family. Now that the house is clean, I could invite Alicia."

"Yes, we could start all over!"

"But Dolores, we won't have time, you're starting school again next week."

"My goodness, you're right. But as soon as I have a minute, I'll come and see you without anyone knowing."

"It would save you some time if I fixed the old bicycle that's in the barn. Although, you know, it might not be any faster than you. To think that you've managed to turn my kitchen into a page from the Eaton's catalogue!"

Dolores looks around and feels a great sense of pride.

"You were right to tell me that it was ridiculous to go around with rags on my back and that it would be safer to wear boots when I work. You were right, and listening to you was the smartest thing I've ever done."

"That's true," approves Dolores, looking at the man in his fifties with satisfaction.

With his clean clothes, his new shoes, and his shaven face, he's unrecognizable. She's been there for three months, and nothing looks the same. Everything is sparkling clean. The ceramic tiles under the burner of the stove shine, and the flowers that she plucked away from the side of the porch are in full bloom. Even the worn tiles of the orange coloured floor have a waxy shine. The funerary enclosure, now bordered by tiny stones, covers a bigger space, but at the back of the table. The death announcement is in a pretty frame. Everything is transformed. Even Dolores.

She has just gotten back to the Lafonds. The kitchen counter is even more clutttered than usual, the stove filthier. Dolores stops in the doorway, turns to Madame Lafond who is rocking herself in the small room and says:

"You can't be serious! Come and help me or else I'm not going to work."

Shocked, Madame Lafond freezes her rocking chair. Her chest rises as she pushes against the armrest to

stand. She remains in this position for a few seconds, then shouts:

"My God, what's gotten into you?"

"Nothing special," Dolores answers hardily, "but it's too much, it's just too much."

"I can't believe Ernest has brainwashed you. Good God, your dumber than I thought."

There is silence for a moment. Stupefied, Dolores and Madame Lafond eye each other. Dolores manages not to lower her eyes. She continues staring at Madame Lafond with an audacity that is increased tenfold by the pleasure it gives her.

But Dolores hadn't taken into account Madame Lafond's new weapon. The latter straightens herself up quickly and hisses:

"I almost forgot to tell you that the social worker came over this afternoon. She wasn't too keen on the idea of you going to work for a man who lives all alone. I convinced her there was no danger since we're nice enough to keep you here. But now I think she was right. So, tomorrow, you'll just have to tell Ernest that it's your last day at his place. We thought you could keep on working there since we don't have to send you to school now that you're sixteen. But anyway, I'm sure we'll find something to keep you busy."

Dolores stiffens her arms and legs so as not to pass out, start screaming or strangle that little vixen whose

nostrils are flaring as she breathes in deeply. Her eyes glazed with anger, Madame Lafond motions toward the kitchen with her arm, pointing to the sink:

"We've wasted enough time. Go do your work."

Dolores feels overcome by an immense distress. Why doesn't anyone ever ask her how she would like to live her life? She heads to the kitchen, forcing herself to look indifferent. The old bat is already getting enough enjoyment out of this, Dolores thinks, admitting to herself that she has no choice but to grin and bear it all. As usual. But no, not as usual, she suddenly thinks. Sure, she has to put up with it, but she's not all alone. She knows that Monsieur Lessard can't alter her destiny, but at least she can confide her problems in him. The thought of this gives her back her courage.

A courage which, the following day, wanes little by little as she runs like a madman, even before she reaches the curve in the road.

She opens the door and lets it slam shut behind her. Up against the wall, her face buried in her arm, she bursts into tears. Monsieur Lessard goes over to the box of wood, slowly takes out a few logs, all the while watching the young girl over his shoulder. He wants to wait before stopping her. He once read that there was nothing worse than holding back your grief. He patiently waits a few seconds, then putting down the logs, he hobbles over to Dolores. How can he keep to himself the

joy that kept him up half the night?

"Cry if it makes you feel better, but let me know when you're done."

The tone of his voice is so surprising that Dolores immediately turns around.

"Listen to me carefully, Dolores, listen carefully and don't interrupt me. I saw the social worker too. She came here after you left. I told her that your life at the Lafonds wasn't as normal as it seemed. And I convinced her you should continue your education, because an educated lady is more likely to contribute to society than a slave."

Dolores leans her head against the doorframe and looks, dumbfounded, at this special man who is more efficient than Brother André! Now he is close to her and is talking loudly, separating all his syllables.

"She stayed with me for an hour. We've taken care of everything... She knows a family you can board with. Their house is right next to Sainte Martine High School. Do you hear me?"

Dolores nods. It's common knowledge that people lose the faculty of speech when emotions run high. Monsieur Lessard observes the look of joy behind the tears in her eyes. Who would have ever suspected that his mother's death would leave him with the ability to love so much?

"Too bad we won't be able to see the look on the Lafonds' faces when they tell them about it."

Dolores sobs again, saying that she's frightened, that they won't let her leave, and that she wouldn't ever dare. He lets her talk and gives her time to catch her breath. He has put his arm around the young girl's shoulders. He would prefer to hold her close to him, to console her better, but his heart is already pounding hard enough.

"Come on, Dolores, I'm not stupid. When they're told, well, you'll already be gone. You'll take off while they're at the service in Thetford Mines. You'll have rounded up all your things. You'll have brought them over here. You'll be here. In my house."

"And then?" asks Dolores, once again on the verge of panic. "What then?"

"Yours truly, Ernest Lessard himself, will take you down to Sainte Martine."

He has become solemn.

"I'll take you to your new place myself."

"But think, Monsieur Lessard, your mare against a Chevrolet! They'll catch up to us before we even get to the turnoff!"

"Really, you don't have any more faith in me than that?"

"I'm sorry. I'm all upset."

"I've arranged for a cab, Dolores, a cab will be here at eleven o'clock on the dot, just before they get back from the service. It's all planned like in a detective

novel."

"A taxi? I'm going to make my getaway in a taxi? I'm going to continue my studies! And then after, well, we'll see...! All good things come to those who wait."

Monsieur Lessard almost loses his balance as the young girl rushes over to throw her arms around him. He would have never dreamt of such an outburst of joy.

"Calm down, Dolores, will you? And let's finalize the plans over a cup of coffee."

But Dolores is worried:

"I'm going to have to find a way to pay for my meals without working too much for my new foster parents. High school takes up a lot of time..."

This was the moment Monsieur Lessard had been waiting for:

"Don't go putting the cart in front of the horse," he starts off. "You won't be in a foster home anymore. Dolores, I declare thee an orphan and free. You'll only have to worry about your studies. I'll take care of the rest."

Monsieur Lessard had had nothing but a past. He has just guaranteed himself a future.