Jean Delisle

CRITICIZING TRANSLATIONS: THE NOTION OF DISPARITY

"Disparity is endemic to the translator's art."
Georges Mounin, *Les belles infidèles*, 1955.[1]

"Never definitive, a translation, even the best, is a dissonance unresolved!"
Marion Graf, *L'écrivain et son traducteur en Suisse et en Europe*, 1998.

CRITICIZING A LITERARY translation is not about making subjective value judgments, nor about conveying a feeling, an impression, a pleasure in the reading. On the contrary, it is about performing a close analysis of the work, understanding its deeper meaning and how this meaning is rendered in the target language. As Berman demonstrates in reference to a poem by John Donne (Berman, 1995), the undertaking is more demanding than it may appear. The critic must be able to discern the translator's project, for every translator worthy of the name is guided in his re-writing by a purpose, a plan, be it explicit or implicit. This only makes sense, since translating a literary work is rather like pursuing the same writerly task that produced the original.

This global intention determines most of the many decisions the translator makes throughout his re-creation. Style, rhythm, tone, register, syntactic structures and vocabulary are only some of the elements weighed. And if the translation in question is historical, the critic must have equal knowledge of two sets of circumstances: those surrounding the translation itself and those surrounding the source text's creation—the author and his era, the prevailing literary and linguistic conventions, the expectations of the target readership. All aspects of historical context are relevant, be they sociopolitical, literary, linguistic, religious, even economical. Once he or she has determined this general context, the work's original horizon of expectation, the critic can then analyze the text itself.

Although a translation exists as an autonomous work—one should be able to read it independently—it is still, nonetheless, an echo of its source, and that is why comparison has an important, if not exclusive role in criticism. Comparative analysis is not about ensuring that each and every element of the original has been transposed. This petty inventorial approach, this checking to see if every word has been rendered in good and due form: this has nothing to do with real criticism. Such a method is founded, rather, on the false assumption that a translated work must be identical word-for-word to its original, a perfect mirror image. More than one critic has denounced this specular conception, this literal utopia. Translation should not be a "lie trying to pass itself off as something it can never be" (Renken,

2002, 96). In essence, to translate is to tell again, but tell *differently*. A translation is not a photographic reproduction, but rather a *representation.* The distinction is vital, and its consequences for the criticism of translations far reaching.

History tells us that on the whole, excessively literal translations have not been well received or considered successful,[2] unless of course literalism is the norm for a certain type of text: the Bible, for example. Or the norm in a given period or social context. The critic, understanding his task as he should, tries rather to determine whether the translated work offers the same literary properties as the first, the same semantic cohesion, the same esthetic qualities, the same underlying unity. In a word: the same *signifiance.* The work's 'signifiance' is its deepest, most integrated level of meaning. For translators, as most criticism seems to suggest (Delisle, 2001), it's an ideal rarely attained. For the most part, translations actually disconcert, jar, upset the reader, give him what Maurice Gravier has called "translation sickness",[3] a condition resulting from the inevitable "disparity"—sometimes great, sometimes little—that target texts demonstrate with respect to their source.

We might better understand the notion of "disparity", central to translation theory and translation criticism specifically, by first addressing the term's definition in commonly consulted dictionaries. This initial lexical exploration will afford insight into the notion's more important implications.[4]

Appearing in seventeenth century French, *disparate* came from the Latin *disparatus*: "different, dissimilar, unequal". At first the word was used in rhetoric and designated a "contradictory statement". We'll note in passing that the word, from the beginning, is rooted in discourse. It came to French through the Spanish *disparate*, which referred to "an extravagant act, an extravagance, a prank", and took on henceforth its pejorative connotation of "shocking contrast". In French, *disparate* is both an adjective and a noun. From the adjective, two acceptations: "A. [*of two or more objects, persons*] in discord, out of harmony with its surroundings; standing out in shocking, disagreeable, bizarre contrast", and "B. [*of a group, an ensemble*] made up of diverse, dissimilar unmatching elements." (*Le Trésor de la langue française informatisée*, 2002). Marked in modern French dictionaries with the labels *vx* and *litter* ("archaic" and "literary"), the noun *disparate* expresses a discord, a lack of harmony, a contrast, a shocking dissimilarity between two or more things or persons. Now feminine, the word was masculine in Balzac's day.

The French synonyms and quasi-synonyms of *disparate* reinforce the word's pejorative sense: *bigarré, boiteux, composite, décousu, discordant, dissonant, divergent, faux, hétéroclite, hétérogène, incongru, inconsistant, inharmonieux, mélangé*[5], synonyms to which we might add *asymétrique, mal assorti, patchwork,* and even *salmigondis.* The word thus refers to something that clashes with its environment, breaks unity, sounds out of tune, disrupts and upsets. Among its antonyms: *assorti, harmonieux, homogène.*[6]

The English dictionaries record only the adjective *disparate*, which has the same sense as its French homograph. A few rare works, such as *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (4th edition, 2000), include the noun *disparateness*, as describing the character of something "1. *fundamentally distinct or different in kind; entirely dissimilar*" or "2. *containing or composed of dissimilar or opposing elements*".

In French as in English, incongruity is one of the notion's defining properties[7]: "*Containing or made up of fundamentally different and often incongruous elements*" (*Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary*). The English *disparate* translates the French adjective, but it is *disparity* that translates the French noun. Rather than " **This translation contains many disparates*", one would say "*This translation contains many disparities.*" Just what is disparity in translation?

In translation studies, *disparity* describes stylistic incoherencies and discordances affecting the translated work. When compared to the original, the translation demonstrates a lack of linguistic, stylistic and tonal unity, among others. The lack manifests in a juxtaposition of incompatible registers, in semantic distortion (*impropriétés*), anachronisms, archaisms, lexical inconsistencies, breaks from literary convention, an unwarranted conversational tone or dialect. In French, the word has been used indifferently in its singular and plural forms. The translator Paul-Louis Courier (1772-1825), for example, writes: "Vous trouvez que j'ai complété la version d'Amyot [La *Pastorale* de Longus] *si habilement*, dites-vous, qu'on *n'aperçoit point trop de disparate* entre ce qui est de lui et ce que j'y ai ajouté […]" (Courier, 1926, 80-81).[8] Marie Delcourt (1891-1979), translator of Euripides' complete dramatic works into French, sets the term against the notion of homogeneity: "Seventeenth century French classicism, mindful of homogeneity in all things, rejected disparity in any form" (Delcourt, 1925, 13). As for the translator Edmond Cary, he wrote while keeping in mind the historians and critics who would eventually judge the translations of today: "It is not inconceivable that modern translators, who now seem so direct and authentic, will ring doubly false in the near future when the disparities they produce today are compounded with those arising when the acoustics inevitably change." (Cary, 1963, 36). Although absent in specialized dictionaries, the term is nevertheless currency, we can see, among translators, critics, and translation historians.

The notion of "disparity" is one the universals of translation, appearing in the discourse as frequently as Greimas's semantic isotopies, to name one example. All forms of translation are susceptible to disparity, be they source or target oriented, historic or contemporary. Spotting them is a matter of addressing larger units of signification, of examining their particularities systematically. A phrase removed from context is less likely to contain disparities. Here's a rather banal example. Let's say an editor writes the acronym for the United Nations Education Science and Culture Organization in two, even three different forms: UNESCO, U.N.E.S.C.O., Unesco. This kind of inconsistency is the result of editorial

oversight. Disparities, as we will see later on, occur rather on the broader, stylistic level.

Moreover, disparity shouldn't be confused with false sense, even nonsense in translated works. No less than a hundred gaffes of this sort have been counted in the French version of Salinger's *Catcher in the Rye*, or *L'Attrape-cœurs* (Brodin, 1970, 336-337). The translator confused *horserace* with *racehorse*, rendered one for the other. It seems she also confused *terrific* and *figure* with their French cognates *terrible* (*fearsome, awsome*) and *figure* (*face*). *She had a terrific figure* thus became **Elle avait un visage terrible* (*She had a fearsome face*). Then there's the Russian poet, novelist and translator Kornei Chukovsky (1882-1969), who spotted in many Russian translations of English and French works innumerable semantic errors similar to the ones inflicted on the French *Catcher in the Rye.* The Russian rendering of *une adresse de singe* left readers imagining a monkey's place of residence rather than its agility, the intended sense of *adresse* in this case. Another example is the *pont* (*deck*) of a ship, which became the Russian equivalent for *bridge*, not to mention the *plongeur à l'hôtel* (dishwasher) who became a *bather in a hotel* (Chukovsky, 1984, 95).

It goes without saying that this sort of gaffe diminishes a translation's overall quality. But this doesn't necessarily imply disparity. False senses are, rather, the result of the translator's lapsing attention or insufficient knowledge. They point to a lack of training (an amateur or improviser), of experience (a novice), to an insufficient knowledge of the languages in question (a pseudo-bilingual), or to a failure to infer properly, to make appropriate contextual assumptions (an error in methodology or a false conception of translation). Precisely speaking, this is not a stylistic error, although in many pseudo-translations, authors have been known to fabricate disparities to trick their readers into believing they are reading a translation (Toury, 1995, 212-215). In these cases, disparity is literary artifice, a rhetorical device.

Disparities are errors of an altogether different nature. In the ensemble of significations that make up the translated text, a disparity is both "out-of-place" (belonging to another *style* or *genre* of writing), and an "out-of-nature" (an element differing in its very nature from those surrounding it). Kornei Chukovsky says it well: "*The translator's art consists to a significant degree in being guided by a vital sense of style […]. He who is insensitive to style has no right to undertake a translation: it would be like trying to reproduce an opera he has seen but not heard*" *(ibid.* 97). Grammar teaches us how to form and connect words, but there is no teaching the artist's creative agency of words, the very definition of style. Literary talent cannot be taught, even in creative writing programs. Style for the writer, just like color for the painter, is a matter of perspective, vision. "It is an absolute way of looking at things", Flaubert said. Writing with style means understanding the "mechanics" of language and mastering its resources. Style links form with expression. To break form is to break style; to break style is to denature a piece of writing. Even Helen Tracy Lowe-Porter (1876-1963),

translator of Thomas Mann, affirms: "*The translation of a book which is a triumph of style in its own language, is always a piece of effrontery*" (Lowe-Porter, 1973, xxv). Disparities are breaks in style. How and where such breaks occur is relative: one translation's disparity is not necessarily another's. Perhaps the easiest type of disparity to spot in translated texts is the anachronism or archaism. In the second stanza of Hugh Hazelton's poem "Serra do Roncador", for example, the word *path* has been turned into *sente*, an archaism in French. Nothing in the original seems to justify this.

I am coming to you
down from the mountains
mist rising in myriad
pillars from the jungle

I am coming to you
on a path through tall, cooling palms
and giant ferns
smelling fresh with rain

Hugh Hazelton (1982)

Je viens à toi
du fin haut des monts
dans la brume qui lève
entre les mille fûts de la jungle

Je viens à toi
par fraîche sente sous hautes palmes
et fougères géantes
à l'odeur ravivée par la pluie

Translated by Laurent Lachance (ATTLC, 2004)

The word *sente*, dating from the seventeenth century, is rather surprising here. So is the syntax of the verse, which has a medieval ring—"Nécessité fait gens méprendre/ Et faim saillir le loup du bois" (Villon). The following versions, still by no means flawless, fare better by maintaining the simple vocabulary of the original and maintaining a unity of language and tone:[9]

Je m'avance vers toi
du pied de la montagne
la brume se lève myriades
de piliers sortant de la jungle

Je m'avance vers toi
par un sentier ombragé de grands palmiers
et de fougères géantes
sentant bon la pluie

Translated by Jean-Paul Daoust (ATTLC, 2004)

Je viens à toi
en dévalant la montagne
dans la brume qui, de la jungle
s'élève en myriades de piliers

Je viens à toi
sur un chemin traversant les frais palmiers
et les fougères géantes
à la senteur fraîche de pluie

Translated by André Debbané (ATTLC, 2004)

Certain contemporary translators, trying to re-create a style or to apply their own style to a historical text, will try to paint with the colours of far-away times and places, those of the Homeric age, for example. Motivated by artistic intentions, they will juxtapose (often without knowing, we should say in his defense) a variety of incompatible elements: contemporary conversational registers, the language of medieval epic poetry, the noble tones of classical tragedy, a vocabulary dating to feudal times. All of this in an effort, quite commendable in itself, to ring archaic, rustic, to create the *illusion* of historical language and sensibilities. These are the snares awaiting the authors of so-called "learned translations", like many of those published in 19th century France—the period of historical translation—by translators such as Paul-Louis Courier, Émile Littré[10] (1801-1881) and Charles-Marie Leconte de Lisle (1818-1894).

Rare are those who avoid these pitfalls by translating through "coloured glasses" (Mounin, 1994, 91). Unlike the so-called "cibliste" group, who translate through clear glasses, tailoring their texts to the target language and culture, these "sourcier" translators strive to conserve the source text's foreignness, traces of its language, period and culture. Through translucent yet coloured glasses, the text "reads like a translation", but this is a small price to pay for drawing the reader out of his familiar surroundings, sending him or her back to a more exotic time and place. It's easy to see how such translators risk filling their texts with all manner of disparities. Making assumptions about the morays and sensibilities of a remote civilization, and then transposing these assumptions coherently into a target text, is an artistic enterprise fraught with peril. It is difficult to avoid drawing on many and diverse periods of a language's history in the effort to generate a sense of exoticism. This is why so few translators achieve the tour de force of re-creating a work free of disparity, a work poetically coherent, relating to its source synchronically as well as diachronically.

Most of the deforming tendencies that Antoine Berman attributes to literary translation in *La Traduction et la lettre ou l'auberge du lointain* describe disparities. These tendencies, we recall, include: "rationalization, clarification, extension, refinement and vulgarization, qualitative and quantitative depreciation, homogenization, the destruction of rhythms, the destruction of underlying or supporting signifying systems, the destruction of internal text systems, the destruction of vernacular language, the destruction of idioms and idiotisms, the erasure of polyphony or language layering" (Berman, 1999, 53).[11] Moreover, "cibliste" or ethnocentric translations are no less subject to disparity.

Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) also intuited the notion of disparity. On the subject of lexical systems circulating in a literary work like blood in a living organism, he warned translators against what he called a "colorful variety". The translator is to be praised if "he succeeds in maintaining similarity with respect to the more important objects in specific writings (or even in individual parts of them only), so that no single word gets a multiplicity of quite different replacements, or so that a colorful variety does not prevail in the translation where

in the original a clear relationship of expressions is presented without discontinuities…" (Schleiermacher, 1992, 46).[12] Schleiermacher argued in favor of respecting the author's own lexical choices.

This is why Milan Kundera frequently tears into his translators. Put off by his repetitive style, they reflexively resort to synonymy. Repetition is viewed as inelegant, something to be avoided at all costs, so they run to their thesauruses (Ben-Ari, 1998).[13] This reflex may be a way for the translator to show creativity. But its systematic application undermines the lexical systems underpinning the many themes crossing each other in the work. Every disruptive synonym is a disparity. This is why the author of *The Betrayed Testaments* asks the translator to respect "the author's personal style," "his supreme authority" in the matter, instead of bowing to "conventional style" (Kundera, 1993, 132-134). This is because the literary work transgresses the conventional writing style found in pragmatic texts. For Kundera there is only one rule: "a word is repeated because it is important, because it is meant to resound acoustically and symbolically through the paragraph, the page" (*ibid.* 138). Consequently, it should be repeated in the translation. Style is the author's signature. Disparity is the mark of a bad forgery.

The risk of dissonance is just as great in translations produced collectively. Could several collaborators possibly possess the same understanding of a text, turn its style uniformly, coherently? "Having many translators on the same work results inevitably in dissonance" (Mayoux, 1959, 80). Such an endeavor is hopeless if we define translation as the transmission of the original's message while conserving its singular style and force. This is the ideal. It is also translation's ontological paradox. The ambition most often fails, because "each text has a sound, a color, a movement, an atmosphere of its own" (Larbaud, 1946, 69). To avoid disparity, the translator must adapt to the "particular" style of each author.

The idea may be a truism, but its practical consequences are still enormous, for "translating does turn one language into another so much as it turns one style into another, one linguistic singularity into another linguistic singularity" (Rolin 2002, 54). One can't very well dress every stranger in the same outfit. Neither can one go around mixing sartorial styles. Just how would someone look in a top hat, a ruff, a toga and patent-leather shoes? Disparities often lend such a comical appearance to translations. And this also why it is difficult to correct translations and maintain their coherence. The orientalist Jean-Louis Burnouf (1775-1844) was convinced: "I have never believed that a good translation could come of correcting a bad one. At the very least, one will never achieve by this means the same tonal unity and integral harmony essential to any creative work" (Burnouf, 1833, xix).

As we have just seen, disrespecting the source text's lexical patterning can result in disparity. However, the latter can take other forms as well. We know, for example, that every metaphor in a work does not necessarily contribute to an overall esthetic, and that certain commonplace metaphors are better rendered by metaphors equally commonplace in the target language, so that readers of the latter won't afford them any special significance. Conversely, translating literally a

metaphor of no esthetic value often results in disparity. How many translators have succumbed to fascination and invested casual metaphors with undue stylistic importance? Under the spell of strange-seeming yet perfectly commonplace rhetoric, they see exotic wonders and take pains to transpose them in the target text, often violating the target language. Maurice Blanchot is not the only one to have seen that "the language we translate appears richer in imagery and more concrete than the language into which we translate" (Blanchot, 1972, 173).

Here are a few examples. The French translator of George Szanto's novel *La condesa María Victoria* turns the phrase "*For less than a blink, fear took Pitando's eyes*" into "*Pendant moins d'un clignement d'œil, la peur s'empara des yeux de Pitando", a disconcertingly literal formulation, to say the least. Why not the much simpler: "La peur se lit aussitôt dans les yeux de Pitando"? The same translator is behind *Le Libraire a du flair*, the French version of Richard King's novel. He turns the bookseller's words: "*People think books walk into the store and float up onto the shelves*, quite literally into: "Ils [les livres] n'entrent pas tout seuls dans le magasin pour flotter dans les airs jusqu'aux rayons […]". Here as well, the translator's abusive and awkward literalism creates disparity. Would the passage not have been better served by: "Ils n'entrent pas tout seuls dans la librairie et ne se placent pas d'eux-mêmes, comme par magie, sur les rayons"? In this same detective novel, the author marks character dialogue with the usual "*she said*", "*I responded*", "*I asked*", "*she said*", "*I told her*". These verbs don't betray any attempt at stylistic effect. But for whatever reason, the translator alternates between the common inverted tag "a-t-elle dit", "ai-je répondu", "ajouta-t-il", and the non-inverted tag "j'ai demandé", "j'ai répondu", "j'ai grimace", as we see in the following passage: " *'It's Sam, Sam Wiseman,' I told her, shaking her offered hand. 'Maybe you know me from the bookstore, Dickens & Company. I work there,' I added modestly*" (King, 2002, 234). Translation: "Je m'appelle Sam, Sam Wiseman, *j'ai dit* en serrant la main tendue. Vous m'avez peut-être vu à la librairie Dickens&Company. C'est là que je travaille, *j'ai ajouté* modestement. » (King, 2003, 285).[14] Why not "ai-je dit", "ai-je ajouté"? Over the long haul, the repetition of this type of disparity becomes irritating. And we could go on multiplying examples, showing how disparities occur in all lexical and discursive categories.

Conclusion

All things said, disparity, excepting its motivated use in pseudo-translations, affects the esthetic and literary value of a work judged in the light of contemporary norms. They break its unity and, in the worst cases, result in an esthetically displeasing "piecemeal" or "patchwork". At the prosodic, rhythmic, acoustic or "musical" levels (of poetic texts, primarily), a disparity is dissonance, harmonic discord, the false note in the score. A lack of unity that disconcerts the reader, conflicts with his or her linguistic and esthetic sensibility. Having closely examined translations from different historical periods, Georges Mounin (1910-1993) was one of the first, if not the first, to reveal the problem's enormous scale.

In his *Belles infidèles*, he asks translators to be conscious of disparity's depreciative effect on the quality of their work, and to exercise utmost vigilance. For him, disparity is truly "endemic", a defect in the translator himself: "*This near total lack of receptiveness to disparity*," he writes, "must be widely denounced, for it can be found everywhere among learned translators who, fascinated by isolated language problems, lose sight of the whole" (Mounin, 1994 [c1955], 99).[15] However, learned translators are not the only ones who seem insensitive to disparity. Examination of all sorts of contemporary translated texts suggests that all translators are affected, to some extent, by this endemic defect.

When well executed, criticism uncovers "great translations", helps us appreciate the subtleties involved in the translator's art, gives us an idea of the exceptional talent of those able to recreate, following the conventions of the art, the esthetic and the poetic of a literary work. Sometimes the miracle does indeed happen. However, we must keep in mind that the standards of acceptability vary from period to period and from genre to genre. Yesterday's successful translation can be today's tissue of disparities (remember the anachronisms of 17th and 18th century French translations). This is translation's paradox. To the translations of yesterday, not only the standards of today should be applied.

JEAN DELISLE
University of Ottawa
(Canada)

Notes

1. Unless otherwise specified, all quotes referencing works in a language other than English have been translated by us.

2. Throughout history, theorists and practitioners have attested to this. We reference many of these in "Le sens à travers l'histoire: de l'Antiquité au XIXe siècle" (Delisle, 2005). Here is what two literary translators and contemporaries of George Sand (1804-1876) have to say: "A literal translation is more satisfying to academics, but it is a dead translation" (Cary, 1963, 32). "Literal translation is like to love for Marguerite Duras and a few others: necessary but impossible?" (Barilier, 1990, 17). "Some masterpieces are still buried under the icy shroud of literal translation" (Sand, 1860 [c1856], III, 106).

3. "The multiplication of these little bumps and jars [linguistic imprecision, the attribution of false meanings] creates a vague malaise, hard to define, that reminds one of the first symptoms of

sea sickness. One might call it 'translation sickness'" (Gravier, 1973, 42). Two years earlier, Jacques Olivier Grandjouan expressed a similar opinion in his *Linguicides* : "The accumulation of impropriety upon impropriety has the strangest effects" (Grandjouan, 1971, 207-208).

4. The word is absent in dictionaries specializing in literary terms (Cuddon, 1998; Dupriez, 1984; Gorp *et al.*, 2001), in dictionaries of linguistics (Crystal, 2003; Dubois, 1994), and in dictionaries specializing in translation studies (Baker, 1998; Delisle, Lee-Jahnke and Cormier, 1999; Shuttleworth and Cowie, 1997).

5. *motley, ill-assorted, patchwork, disjointed, discordant, dissonant, divergent, false, heterogenous, sundry, incongruous, inconsistent, inharmonious, mixed… asymmetrical, unmatched, patchwork, hodgepodge.*

6. *assorted, harmonious, homogenous.*

7. Which is not the case with the word "eclectic".

8. "You find that I have completed Amyot's version [Longus' *Pastoral*] *with such skill* that one does not notice too much disparity between what is his and what I have added." His italics.

9. Twenty-four translators have tried their hand at this poem. For the word *path*, eleven chose *sentier*, six chemin, one *cheminer*, one *piste* and two *sente.* The others didn't translate the word at all (ATTLC, 2004).

10. On the subject of the historic re-constructionist Émile Littré, who translated Dante's *Inferno* into fourteenth century langue d'oïl as if it were translated by a fourteenth century translator (Littré, 1847), Alain Rey writes: "Romance scholars were quick to discover prosodic anomalies and linguistic oddities" (Rey, 1970, 288). Our translation. The philologist's examination of this sort of translation unearthed a viper's nest of disparities.

11. Our translation. The original: "la rationalisation, la clarification, l'allongement, l'ennoblissement et la vulgarisation, l'appauvrissement qualitatif, l'appauvrissement quantitatif, l'homogénéisation, la destruction des rythmes, la destruction des réseaux signifiants sous-jacents,

la destruction des systématismes textuels, la destruction (ou l'exotisation) des réseaux langagiers vernaculaires, la destruction des locutions et idiotismes, l'effacement des superpositions de langues" (Berman, 1999, 53).

12. English language quote from Friedrich Schleiermacher, "On the Different Methods of Translating", Waltraud Bartscht (Trans.), *Theories of Translation*, Rainer Schulte (Ed.), (University of Chicago Press, 1992).

13. Translators' views on the subject of repetition, Nitsa Ben-Ari demonstrates, seem ambivalent and obey contradictory norms: "There is a tendency not to transfer original repetitions—not out of carelessness nor out of linguistic constraints, but out of normative stylistic considerations, on the assumption that repetitions are not "elegant" and reflect a poor vocabulary; on the other hand, a seemingly contradictory phenomenon occurs, in which new repetitions are introduced by the translators. […] New repetitions are added as a result of other normative considerations, like the wish to embellish or amplify the text" (Ben-Ari, 1998, 77). It is therefore important to address the question of repetition while keeping in mind the target culture's standards of acceptability and the status (canonical or otherwise) of the work at hand.

14. Our italics

15. His italics

References

Primary Sources

King, Richard. 2002. *That Sleep of Death*. Toronto: The Dundurn Group.

King, Richard. 2003. *Le Libraire a du flair*. Trans. François Barcelo. Montreal: Libre Expression, 2003.

Hazelton, Hugh. 1982. "Serra do Roncador." *Ellipse* 71 (2004): 32.

Salinger, Jerome D. 1951a. *The Catcher in the Rye*. Boston: Little, Brown.

Salinger Jerome D. 1951b. *L'Attrape-coeurs*. Trans. Annie Saumont. Paris: Robert Laffont.

Schleiermacher, Friedrich. 1992. "On the Different Methods of Translating." *Theories of Translation.* Trans. Waltraud Bartscht. Ed. Rainer Schulte. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Szanto, George. 2001. *The Condesa of M*. Toronto: Cormorant Books.

Szanto, George. 2003. *La condesa María Victoria.* Trans. François Barcelo. Montreal: XYZ éditeur.

Secondary Sources

Baker, Mona (dir.). 1998. *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. London, New York: Routledge.

Barilier, Étienne. 1990. *Les belles fidèles. Petit essai sur la traduction.* Collection "CTL" 9. Lausanne: Centre de traduction littéraire, Université de Lausanne.

Ben-Ari, Nitsa. 1998. "The Ambivalent Case of Repetitions in Literary Translation. Avoiding Repetitions: A 'Universal' of Translation." *Meta* 43 (1): 68-78.

Berman, Antoine. 1995. *Pour une critique des traductions : John Donne*. Biblothèque des idées. Paris: Gallimard.

Berman, Antoine. 1999. *La Traduction et la lettre ou l'auberge du lointain* [c1985]. Paris: Seuil.

Blanchot, Maurice. 1972. "Traduit de… ." *La Part du feu* [c1949]. Paris: Gallimard.

Brodin, Pierre. 1970. "Traduit de l'Américain." In *The World of Translation*, 335-341. New York: PEN American Center.

Burnouf, Jean-Louis. 1933. Introduction. *Histoires.* By Tacitus. Trans. Henri Bornecque. Paris: Garnier.

Cary, Edmond. 1963. *Les Grands traducteurs français*. Geneva: Librairie de l'Université, Georg.

Cuddon, John A. 1998. *A Dictionary of Literary Terms and Literary Theory*. Fourth edition. Oxford, and Malden (Mass.): Blackwell.

Crystal, David. 2003. *A Dictionary of Linguistics & Phonetics.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Delisle, Jean, Hannelore Lee-Jahnke, and Monique Cormier (dir.). 1999. *Terminologie de la traduction / Translation terminology / Terminología de la traducción / Terminologie der Übersetzung.* FIT Monograph Collection (1). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Delisle, Jean. 2001. "L'évaluation des traductions par l'historien." *Meta* 46 (2): 209-226.

Delisle, Jean. 2005. "Le sens à travers l'histoire de la traduction : de l'Antiquité au XIX^{e} siècle." In *La théorie interprétative de la traduction : regards croisés*. Ed. M. Lederer and F. Israël. Paris: Sorbonne Nouvelle (Paris III). A collection published in tribute to Danica Seleskovitch by the École Supérieure d'Interprètes et de Traducteurs. Forthcoming.

Delisle, Jean, and Gilbert Lafond. 2005. *Histoire de la traduction*. CD-ROM. Gatineau (Quebec): Jean Delisle and Gilbert Lafond. Reserved exclusively for didactic purposes by Professor Delisle, School of Translation and Interpretation, University of Ottawa.

Dubois, Jean et al. 1994. *Dictionnaire de linguistique et des sciences du langage*. Paris: Librairie Larousse.

Dupriez, Bernard. 1984. *GRADUS – Les Procédés littéraires* [c1977]. Collection "10/18" 1370. Paris, Union Générale d'Éditions.

Gorp, Hendrik van et al. (dir.). 2001. *Dictionnaire des termes littéraires*. Paris, Honoré Champion.

Gravier, Maurice. 1973. "La traduction des textes dramatiques." "Exégèse et traduction." *Études de linguistique appliquée* (12): 39-49.

Kundera, Milan. 1993. *Les Testaments trahis.* Paris: Gallimard.

Larbaud, Valery. 1946. *Sous l'invocation de saint Jérôme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Littré, Émile. 1847. "La poésie homérique et l'ancienne poésie française." *Revue des Deux mondes*, t. XIX, year 17. Paris, July 1. p. 109-161.

Lowe-Porter, Helen Tracy. (1973). "Translator's Note." In Thomas Mann. *Buddenbrooks* [c1902; transl. c1924], transl. by Helen Tracy Lowe-Porter and *Lübeck as a Way of Life and Thought*, transl. by Richard and Clara Winston, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Mayoux, Jean-Jacques. 1959. "Enquête de la FIT sur la qualité des traductions." *Babel* 5 (2): 80.

Mounin, Georges. 1994. *Les Belles infidels* [c1955]. Collection "Étude de la traduction." Lille: Presses Universitaires de Lille. .

Renken, Arno. 2002. *La Représentation de l'étranger. Une réflexion herméneutique sur la notion de traduction*. Collection "CTL" 42. Lausanne: Centre de traduction littéraire.

Rey, Alain. 1970. *Littré, l'humaniste et les mots*. Collection "Les essais" 150. Paris: Gallimard.

Rolin, Olivier. 2002. "Écriture et traduction." In *Du Pareil au Même : l'auteur face à son traducteur*, Henri Awaiss *et al.* (ed.), 53-54. Collection "Sources et Cibles". Beyrouth: ETIB, Université Saint-Joseph.

Sand, George. 1860. "À Monsieur Régnier" [c1856]. In *Théâtre de George Sand*, Paris: Michel Lévy / Leipzig, Alphonse Durr, t. 3: 97-109.

Shuttleworth, Mark, and Moira Cowie. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Translation Library 4. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

3. Internet Sources

The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, http://www.bartleby.com/61/. Fourth Edition (consulted June 6, 2004).

ATTLC. 2004. "Mots en mouvement." Association des traducteurs et traductrices littéraires du Canada, http://www.attlc-ltac.org/move.htm (June 21, 2004 version. Consulted July 21, 2004).

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary, (2004 version. Consulted June 30, 2004).

Roget's New Millennium Thesaurus, http://thesaurus.reference.com (1.0.5 version. Consulted June 30, 2004).

Trésor de la langue française informatisé, au mot « disparate », http://atilf.atilf.fr/tlf.htm (October 12, 2002 version. Consulted June 6, 2004).