BILINGUAL INTERFERENCE AND MODES OF REPRESENTATION

L.G. Kelly

University of Ottawa

Translators have long wondered why it is easier for a rich man to enter Heaven than for a bilingual to eliminate native features from his second language. Though attention to this problem has traditionally been normative rather than descriptive, by the end of the eighteenth century there had come into being an important body of linguistic doctrine pertaining to translation and contrastive rhetoric. This eighteenth-century rhetorical tradition gave way to the theories of the German Romantic circle, who postulated that each language had its peculiar modes of representation. Both eighteenth-century and Romantic streams of theory reappear in Stylistique comparée (Vinay and Darbelnet), which, in spite of its success as a linguistics of translation, has had little effect on interference theory.

Its basic concept, which, though receiving its first precise formulation in the work of Charles Bally, was developed from Humboldt through Völkerpsychologie, is that

> ...il y a deux grands types de représentation dans le langage, l'un où nous essayons de nous représenter les faits et les événements tels qu'ils sont, objectivés dans le réel, l'autre où nous essayons de nous expliquer ces faits et ces événements, de les saisir, de les manier plus rapidement, en les reconstruisant sur un plan à nous, sur une scène subjective, en les arrangeant, en les simplifiant, en leur donnant un aspect qui non seulement nous soit utile, mais qui s'accommode à nous-mêmes, à notre caractère et à notre intelligence comme à notre affectivité et à notre activité. (Malblanc 1944:7)

The first type of representation, "objectivé dans le réel", Malblanc terms le plan du réel; the second, "construit sur une scène subjective", he terms le plan de l'entendement. Significantly, a similar contrast is central to the translation theories of the French poet, Yves Bonnefoy (1962:239):

> ...le mot anglais est ouverture (ou surface) et le mot français fermeture. D'une part un mot appelant la précision ou l'enrichissement d'autres mots (plus de 21.000 mots chez Shakespeare, remarque Jespersen) et de l'autre un lexique aussi réduit que possible pour protéger une unique et essentielle expérience.

As does Malblanc (1968:83), Bonnefoy develops the theme that, while English evokes "l'aspect tangible des choses" (1962:236), "le mot français, dans son emploi classique, ne posait son objet que pour exclure le monde et la diversité des existences réelles" (1962:243).

Though these discussions of the modes of representation on which languages depend are practical, even normative, by them is postulated a deep structure from which interference can flow. This structure rests on three major differences in modes of representation. The first is what Malblanc (1944:7) ascribes to mot-image and mot-signe. Le mot-image evokes immediate sense-impression, while the mot-signe rests on intellectual mediation of perception, so that "le français réussit moins bien que l'anglais à rendre le détail de la réalité concrète." (Darbelnet 1972:7). Again, compare Bonnefoy (1962:237):

> ...l'anglais peut saisir le plus concret, le plus immédiat, le plus instinctif de l'acte d'être... Tout autre, vraiment tout autre, est la poésie française-...il est sûr que le mot ne semble poser ce qu'il désigne que pour exclure aussitôt de l'espace du poème tout ce qui n'est pas désigné.

This implies another characteristic of French, noted witheringly by Bally (1932) in particular, that it finds generalities more congenial than particularities (cf. Darbelnet 1972:8). One consequence of this is different perceptions of the role of sound in the word. The lexical richness of English onomatopoeia is kept in being by the English ability to conceive sensorially, cf. thump, bang, slither, etc. As it takes more account of the appearance of the word, there is in English a higher degree of what Saussure called "motivation"; for example, blindness is derived from blind, length from long, etc. French, on the other hand, conceiving intellectually, exploits phonological shape less in both derivation and kinaesthesis. Where, therefore, English has a wide repertoire of words denoting sound or movement, French relies heavily on general words to cover the range.

Our second point is that French representation is basically static, and that of Germanic languages kinetic (cf. Bally 1932:Sect 580):

> a. le verbe allemand trace le trajectoire du mouvement et de l'action;

> b. certaines prépositions composées de l'allemand insistent sur la direction du mouvement.

In English such kinesis is most usually expressed morphologically, especially by present participles, and by phrasal verbs. This most characteristic method of indicating kinesis in the English verb usually is handled lexically in French: e.g. get out/sortir; get in/entrer; get up/se lever; get across/traverser; etc.

The third difference was gleefully epitomised by Eléazar de Mauvillon in his Lettres françois et germaniques (1740:90):

> ...les François veulent qu'on leur parle clair et net, qu'on ne leur donne rien à deviner, en un mot, qu'on leur parle François.

This is still a rhetorician's commonplace, cf. Bonnefoy (1962:247): "...la langue française exige qu'on décompose logiquement et qu'on développe ce qui est implicite..."

This dependence of la clarté française on explicitation has evoked considerable research during the twentieth century. Wandruszka (1967:329) makes the point that this tendency is common to Romance languages, and the opposite to Germanic in both internal linguistic relationships and messages embodied in the sentence, (cf. Gode 1962:75): "English tends never to _say_ what it supposes the second party in communication to _know_." To a far greater extent than French, English is context-bound, the instrument of the plan du réel being juxtaposition of linguistic units. To attain clarity of message, the plan du réel demands that inferences be drawn from the stream of speech, while the plan de l'entendement makes explicit only what is absolutely necessary for understanding. French inevitably aims for a lower colour than English or German. Indeed, while the plan de l'entendement demands mediation of perception before creating a linguistic sign, the plan du réel demands it after. Inherent in the opposing characteristics of these "plans de représentation", as Bally (1965:82) points out, is the different role affectivity plays:

> Le langage, intellectuel dans sa racine, ne peut traduire l'émotion qu'en la transposant par le jeu d'associations implicites. Les signes de la langue étant arbitraires dans leur forme -- leur signifiant -- et dans leur valeur -- leur signifié -- les associations s'attachent soit au signifiant, de manière à en faire jaillir une impression sensorielle, soit au signifié, de manière à transformer le concept en représentation imaginative. Ces associations se chargent d'expressivité dans la mesure où la perception sensorielle ou la représentation imaginative concorde avec le contenu émotif de la pensée.

How do these "plans" work? Let us consider the following:

> The proposal was laughed off the floor. 'L'assistance a tué la proposition par le ridicule.'

In English, the message is embodied in the mot-images, laughed off the floor, which the French replaces by a more congenial mot-signe, tuer, (cf. Vinay and Darbelnet 1958:sect. 41), metaphor though it is. Second, through the kinesis in the vectorial preposition, off, and the passivisation of this normally intransitive

verb, laughter becomes a process of rejection: specification of agent is not necessary. In contrast, the French translation avoids kinesis by lexical choice and, owing to the exigencies of its grammatical shape, specifies agent. Third, the intended message in English is inferred from both image itself and its kinesis. The metonymy of <u>floor</u> implies the human presence made explicit in the French <u>assistance</u>, and the kinesis in the phrasal verb connotes result, which the French explicitates by the word, <u>tuer</u>. Seeing that explicitation demands choice between possible alternatives, the French takes as read that the reception of the idea was rough, admittedly, the most reasonable of the English implicitations, though certainly not the only natural one. And the affective statement in English becomes objectivised in French.

Though the term, plan de l'entendement, is clearly apt, the above example would indicate that plan du réel is inadequate as a technical term. For, far from being completely objective, as Malblanc implies, it is rather a subjectivity mediated through sense-impression: one never perceives the whole of a reality, and therefore, in a communicative act governed by the plan du réel one symbolises what is perceived through speech reflecting the impressions most striking to the senses. In our English example, metonymy is the representational instrument by which impression passes to expression. Metonymy and synecdoche are so deeply rooted in the meaning system of this "plan" and so instinctive, that they are rarely adverted to. One ruling characteristic of the plan du réel is the value accorded the approximate from which workably exact senses can be inferred. The plan de l'entendement, however, aims at exactitude to ensure that the act of interpretation referred to by Malblanc can be unambiguously made. Elsewhere it has been suggested that plan du visuel should be substituted for plan du réel (Kelly 1979:18). But on further consideration, plan du sensoriel reflects the representation mechanism better.

This leaves us, then, with three possible bases of interference in the representation level: predominance of sign and image in different languages, the contrast between stasis and kinesis in representation, and the balance meaning systems keep between implicitation and explicitation.

> Take, for example, this howler from one of my students:
> <u>Elle a glissé sur un pantalon et ainsi est sortie au jardin.</u> (She slipped on a pair of slacks and went out into the garden.)

Explaining this as a fault in segmentation merely isolates symptoms. In Malblanc's terms, the root cause is taking mot-image as mot-signe, thereby misinterpreting the English metonymy, which, through the visual and tactile aspects of fast movement, depicts the act of clothing oneself at speed. Much interpretative interference on the part of French speakers rises from such misplaced Cartesian precision. Take, for instance, Simone Wyss's discussion of <u>The book fell open</u>... Her recommended translation, <u>Le livre</u>

s'est ouvert en tombant..., in taking _fell_ in its full literal
sense, misses the point of the modal use of _fall_, which, in modern
English, merely sketches an impression of spontaneous downward
movement, not, as is implied in the French version given, a change
of position (Wyss 1975:134). My classes suggested a translation
based on the phrase, _Le livre s'est ouvert de lui-même..._, which
it may be remarked, is satisfactory only under certain circum-
stances. The same Cartesian reflex results in the translator of
the exercise headings in Marcel Moyse's flute method, _De la
sonorité_, constantly missing the pictorial aspect of English.
Veillez sur l'égalité du mécanisme becomes _Watch over the even-
ness of the mechanism_, where _fingering, finger-work_ or even
fingers is what is meant. Or again: _...the rhythmic poise which
could be troubled by this inverted articulation_ is _...l'équilibre
rythmique qui peut être troublé par cette articulation invertie._
My own preference would be _upset_. In each case, Moyse's trans-
lator has violated the Fowler brothers' rule that the Anglo-Saxon
word is to be preferred to the Romance. This consideration gives
weight to Bonnefoy (1962:236) who hints that, in his view, the
English "croyance à la réalité de ce qui s'offre au regard" is due
in large measure to the Anglo-Saxon wordstock.

The counterpart in French is misplaced pictorialism. For
example, the French text of the 1971 Arts Calendar of the
University of Ottawa is highly influenced by English patterns of
symbolisation through mots-image, e.g.:

> _Il ne pourra être réinstallé dans ses droits que par
> l'autorité du Conseil de la Faculté._ (He may be reinstated
> in his academic rights only by the authority of the Council
> of the Faculty of Arts).

The English pictorial representation is due largely to the
legalistic collocation, _reinstated in his rights_, which the French
tries to reproduce through the preposition _dans_, which cannot
carry the semantic load. Likewise the constant phrase _exigeant
une pleine année scolaire_ (requiring a full academic year) uses
the mot-image, _pleine_, whose status as such is confirmed by its
being placed before the noun, a position which reinforces the
emotivity inherent in the plan du sensoriel. My own suggestion
here would be _une année complète_.

The plan du sensoriel is almost inevitably kinetic. Though
the notorious difference between French and English in frequency
of verbs and nouns often produces little else than stylistic
stiffness, it can also cause error. Again, Marcel Moyse's
translator: _During the slow work of this study,..._ (Pendant le
travail lent de cette étude,...). A correct English version will
introduce kinesis, either by substituting verb for noun, or by
changing the preposition: _While practising this study slowly,..._
or _During slow work on this study,..._ Compare this example from
the programme of films shown under the aegis of the Students'
Federation, _Antonio makes a false testimony_ (Antonio fait un faux

témoignage).   My own translation would be <u>Antonio gives false evidence</u>, contrasting the kinesis of <u>gives</u> with the stasis of <u>fait</u>.   Even when a French-speaker is sensitive enough to the nuances of English to give a kinetic equivalent when it is appropriate, he often opts for a less marked alternative.   Thus, <u>Les prix continuaient à monter</u> was correctly translated in class as <u>Prices kept going up</u>, where <u>kept on</u> is equally possible, and more graphic.   This loss of colour is more comfortable for the plan de l'entendement, thus illustrating a point made by Levenston (1971).

For an English-speaker, there is a consistent temptation to use verbs where good grammar and style would assume nouns.   Again the 1971 Arts Calendar: <u>Le candidat qui désire obtenir un baccalauréat ès arts</u>...This is a direct crib of the corresponding English sentence.   The noun <u>obtention</u> is required: <u>Le candidat qui vise l'obtention d'un baccalauréat</u>...   When we consider interference in the opposite direction, one very revealing index of the French preference for stasis is the constant announcement over the PA system of the Morisset Library at the University of Ottawa: <u>Will John Smith please come at the Circulation Desk?</u>   The French pattern preposition is obviously <u>à</u> which can be translated both ways.

Our third point is the high degree of implicitation in English as against the French need for explicitation referred to so solemnly by de Mauvillon.   In the Wyss example, for instance, there are traces of the older meaning of <u>fall, to happen</u> (cf. <u>befall</u>), which appear in the translation suggested by my class. And in one of the translations suggested for the Marcel Moyse example, <u>the evenness of the fingers</u>, the implicitation of movement in the fingers is obvious.   One of the more amusing features of the example, <u>to come at the Circulation Desk</u>, is that this preposition implies hostility.   Nuances of implicitation often surfaced unexpectedly in class.   Paul Valéry, speaking about his translation of Vergil's <u>Eclogues</u> says, <u>Je n'ai même pas songé à faire rimer ces alexandrins</u>... Those who translated <u>I did not even think to rhyme these Alexandrines</u>... were quite unconscious that they were putting into Valéry's mouth a penitence that was not in any way intended.

Juxtaposition being the instrument of the plan du sensoriel, English structural words carry a heavier semantic loading than their French equivalents.   Hence English-influenced French will omit structural units that explicitate grammatical relationships: again the 1971 Calendar, <u>On peut obtenir un grade de diverses manières et dans différentes branches du savoir</u>.   The opposed French reflex shows the opposite tendency.   From the Student film catalogue again: <u>...she complains to the police...to protest and to work in favour of other forms of social relations</u>.   (...elle porte plainte..pour élever une protestation et militer en faveur d'autres relations sociales).   I would write <u>work for</u>.   Not that this impulse to be kind to prepositions always produces mistakes. Again, Marcel Moyse: <u>Set a light accent on the marked note in order to restore the rhythmic poise</u> (Donner un léger accent à la

note marquée de façon à rétablir l'équilibre rhythmique). A
simple <u>to restore</u> would be enough. This reflex also transfers the
specifying function of the French article into English: The men
<u>are all the same.</u> (Les hommes sont tous les mêmes), a common
fault in class. One other salient problem was the idiomatic use
of the verb <u>to be</u> followed by a preposition, a juxtaposition that
leaves much to be inferred. In the sentence, <u>L'industrie se</u>
<u>trouve dans une position pénible</u>, the majority of French-speakers
to whom this was offered translated the verb quite literally:
<u>Industry finds itself in a difficult position</u>, a version that is
not unacceptable. But English-speakers used the more natural
<u>Industry is in a difficult position</u>, an example of what Vinay and
Darbelnet call dépouillement, a translation technique by which
lexical units are changed into implicit structural relationships.
The importance of the opposite tendency in French is illustrated
by a sign outside the Financial Aid Office at the University of
Ottawa:

> <u>Tous les étudiants de l'Ontario doivent présenter leur</u>
> <u>feuille d'autorisation émise par ce bureau.</u>
> <u>All Ontario students must present their authorisation</u>
> <u>emitted by this office.</u>

This notice is not hand-written, but produced with all the sophis-
tication the visual aids section of the university is capable of.
Between drafting and posting, the original text obviously passed
through a fair number of hands, who it seems, found this padded
preposition natural.

My classes in contrastive grammar of French and English who
furnished some of these examples acted inadvertently as an inter-
ference laboratory. The standard exercise was translation of sen-
tences and extracts from one language to the other and exegetical
comment on the texts produced. Even where translations furnished
were acceptable, important differences between what was expected
by French and English speakers were illustrated many times by
remarks made as part of the exercise. For instance, on our first
point, that of the difference in pictorial quality between mot-
image and mot-signe: in the French version of <u>John helped me saw</u>
<u>the firewood into useable lengths</u>, by common consent <u>useable</u>
<u>lengths</u> became <u>bûches de longueur convenable.</u> <u>Length</u> here was
taken by the French-speakers of the class to be an abstract noun,
and therefore "c'était impossible de scier du bois en longueurs,"
which came as somewhat of a surprise to the English-speakers
present; the plural, <u>lengths</u>, makes the noun into a mot-image,
thus concretising it. <u>Bûches</u>, though concrete, rejects the visual
and imposes the logical boundaries discussed by Bonnefoy. Hence,
the suggestion from an English-speaker that <u>longueurs utilisables</u>
was an appropriate translation was rejected as an inadmissible
mixture of abstract and concrete. Attitudes showed that, though
the boundary between mot-signe and mot-image is quite strict in
French, the extensive use of fossilised and near-fossilised meta-
phor in English means that this boundary is not felt with anywhere

near the same cogency by the average speaker of English. The juxtaposition by which the plan du sensoriel creates images must be interpreted by an adept translator to avoid faulty segmentation: a considerable number of students could not decide whether a large, black-hatted man was a large man in a black hat, or a man in a large black hat.

On our second point of stasis or kinesis, the known preference of French for nouns over verbs often produces hypercorrection. In A lawn must be watered for three weeks after turfing it, the preferred version for to turf was poser la tourbe, and there was a strongly held opinion that the verb, gazonner, a normal commercial word, and listed in Robert to boot, was incorrect, and, worst of all, un anglicisme. Though vectors can be made pictorially explicit, as in the sentence, I am sending you across to Slavic Studies, few translators from French to English trouble to add such vectors to simple verbs. The fact itself is hardly a reliable indicator of interference, but again, attitudes were revealing: the reason often given for not reproducing across in French was that "it was not necessary." As well as reflecting the economy of linguistic resource in French as against the prodigality of English, it shows a lack of the need for affectivity. But before the necessary vectors of Come in out of the rain, the general consensus was that the movements represented by in and out were logically contradictory. There was general refusal to think of this sentence in pictorial terms: in and out are two moments on the same vector, in specifying goal, and out the starting point of movement. The commonest way of transforming this kinetic representation into a more abstract French one was invoking intellectual representations of action and purpose. The two vectors were lexicalised according to the logical priorities of the plan de l'entendement: Entrez et abritez-vous de la pluie! One other popular suggestion was Entrer pour vous abriter de la pluie. The value given the approximate by the plan du sensoriel was sensed and explained away thus: pictorially, one can be "in the rain", but logically, one can only be "sous la pluie." Consequently out of cannot be translated by a preposition. As one might expect, there was constant suspicion of the verb to be, especially when followed by a structural adverb or preposition. Though le livre est sur le lit is correct, it was clear that le livre se trouve sur le lit was more natural. And in response to John is on the bed the natural reaction was Jean est couché sur le lit, although assis is possible too, given a context demanding it.

Bonnefoy (1962:247) sees implicitation as the major problem in English. The classes would agree. Howlers could come about by over-generalisation: Clean your teeth down after eating. (Brossez vos dents à fond après les repas). This after discussing the ramifications of cleaning down a house before repainting. Where the implicit was unambiguous there was no problem: the type of howler represented by glisser sur un pantalon was rare. But most revealing of all was the slightly annoyed reaction to sentences of multiple, and, at times, incompatible, implicitations.

For example, <u>The building time for this ship was two years</u>. Out of context this sentence can mean either time taken or time projected. Hence, <u>il a fallu trois années pour construire ce navire</u>, or, <u>on a prévu trois années</u>.... Admittedly, the first meaning is more natural. Similarly, in dealing with this fragment of a sentence from Kipling: "The Elephant's Child sat back on his little haunches", the class took the implication here to be comfort, on the model of <u>he sat back and lit a pipe</u>. But, on production of the context, "and pulled, and pulled, and pulled", the opposing explicitation of effort became clear. Similarly kinesis has its own affectivity. <u>To slip something on</u> is not completely translated by <u>passer</u>: the sense of speed in <u>passer</u> is not quite that of urgency or carelessness one has in the English.

Especially with the vectorial preposition that is part of the phrasal verb, it is difficult to escape affectivity. For instance, the word <u>across</u> in <u>I am sending you across to Slavic Studies</u>, through sketching a visual impression of separation and underlining the kinesis of going, also indicates a certain feeling of difference. There is asperity in the sentence, <u>Will you come in out of the rain</u>! that is only partly due to the pseudo-courteous imperative used: the emphatic double vector also plays its part. In class there was long discussion on whether it was possible to go up or down to Montreal from Ottawa. Most French-speakers opted for <u>down</u>, because Montreal is downstream. This is only partially the point, because <u>up to Montreal</u> and <u>up to Quebec</u> are both possible by an affectivity that is not really definable. And indeed, the expression <u>up to Toronto</u> was rejected with suspicious heat by a dyed-in-the-wool English Montrealer. But one of my English-speakers made the point that, even if the direction of the vector was controlled intellectually (i.e. by compass points, terrain, etc.), these vectors were added only where the places concerned were familiar or had some emotive value. He proposed the locution <u>out to Vancouver</u> as an example of emotive attitude towards the distance and direction involved.

What does this approach have to offer? Various attempts have been made recently to widen horizons, for example Schachter and Rutherford (1979:1):

> Our conclusion is that for any research that purports to shed light on the dynamic processes of language acquisition, it is necessary that the researcher focus attention on that particular property that makes of language itself a dynamic phenomenon: namely discourse.

Agreed, but controlling discourse is the more dynamic process of symbolisation, which has long been taken as the basis of grammar and style. The choice of a native grammatical pattern over one more appropriate to the language being spoken, or a hypercorrection, is largely controlled by a symbolisation reflex akin to that postulated by a long line of linguist-philosophers beginning with von Humboldt. In terms of stylistique comparée, interference reflects mishandling of both "servitudes" and "options". This

issue has already been raised in Levenston (1971), who points out
that interference often comes from the comfortable use of the
familiar. One danger is forgetting that, like grammars, modes of
symbolisation leak. For example, French does have a plan du sen-
soriel as in C'est toujours difficile de mettre le nom sur le
visage (It is always hard to put a name to a face). And English
does have a plan de l'entendement. But, seeing that their fre-
quency is reversed, not only can one be mistaken for the other,
but also the plans themselves differ from language to language.

Second, from the differences between plan de l'entendement et
plan du sensoriel come shifting priorities between signification
and valeur. Owing to its Aristotelian history, the Saussurean
theory of meaning fosters the assumption that signification is
intellectually based and valeur affective. Obviously, in a
language whose symbolisation is predominantly mot-signe, affectiv-
ity will be occasional, and furthermore, the boundary between
affective and intellectual meaning will be strict, as indeed will
be that between mot-signe and mot-image. On the other hand, in a
language depending on mot-image, there will be considerable
affective elements central to signification, the boundary between
the plans being somewhat permeable.

The importance paid the sensorial aspects of language will be
reflected in the freedom of derivation, or to put it in Saussurean
terms, the relative frequency of motivated and unmotivated vocabu-
lary and grammar. The Symbolist collapsing of the traditional
Aristotelian distinction between signifiant and signifié (cf.
Kelly 1979:29-31) was a protest against the mot-signe, which
abstracts completely from phonological shape. As the Symbolists
saw it, the sound of a mot-image contributes an essential part of
its meaning. In languages like English, for which the mot-image
forms the predominant language reflex, words easily acquire mean-
ing through the suggestive power of sound, for instance, thud
among British children, the common British term, clot, and clunk
in my own schooldays in New Zealand, to mean a dimwit. It is the
tangible phonological qualities of a word that are exploited by
Saussure's motivation. In this light, the connection made by
Bally between affectivity and sound in very much to our purpose.
English, in opting for the surface representation of the plan du
sensoriel, has entered on a circular process where sound-values
reinforce affectivity and vice-versa; French has entered on
another circular process, where the intellectual values of the
language devalue sound to some extent, and lack of concentration
of sound reinforces the intellectualist reflex.

Since France first discovered English literature in the
seventeenth century, the high colour of English and its compara-
tive freedom of structure have aroused comment. The usual expres-
sions of envy or reprobation are beside the point. Each language
has its own customs: French attitudes are akin to the classicism
that will produce the disciplined but compelling use of restricted
resources in a Mozart symphony, and the English akin to the full-
blooded Romantic prodigality of Elgar or Nielsen. Through such

markedly different attitudes, the plan du sensoriel exploits the approximate to make an exact point, while the plan de l'entendement demands exactitude, and even pointillism, in representing intent. Therefore, while languages like French, for the sake of la clarté, put the main weight of meaning transmission on the semantic units themselves, English and German habitually rely on context to filter the message, cf. building time and sat back on his little haunches. In a word, while French and other Romance languages aim for clarity, English and Germanic languages seek transparency. This was evident in class discussion, especially in the way both linguistic groups sought linguistic effects: the French sought elegance, precision and exact proportion between means and effect, the English sought force rather than elegance, sensorial appropriateness rather than intellectual precision.

Our treatment of interference takes a leaf from the book of the French linguist, Gustave Guillaume: "C'est un principe de mon enseignement ... qu'on exprime à partir du représenté" (quoted in Garnier 1975:181). Agreement with this does not entail adoption of strong forms of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis: the themes we have taken from Stylistique comparée merely indicate that grammatical and discourse systems rest on habitual forms of representation. That these ideas find confirmation outside linguistics argues for their completeness. It is important, as both Levenston and Schachter and Rutherford point out, to widen the scope of interference studies beyond the grammatically wrong. Indeed, this double concern has been evident in translation studies since the Roman orator, Cicero. It is equally important to find a way of relating the interference studies of Weinreich, his structuralist successors, and his transformational successors to work in translation which seeks a different and complementary explanatory adequacy. The sketch above, based largely on the mentalist structuralism of Saussure, Bally, and those influenced by them, suggests that further investigation of the stylistics and linguistics of translation may usefully supplement more familiar work on contrastive linguistics and interference.

REFERENCES

Bally, C.. 1935. La langue et la vie, Geneva: Droz.

_____. 1939. Traité de stylistique française, 2d ed., 2 vols. Paris: Klincksieck & Heidelberg: Winter.

_____. 1965. Linguistique générale et linguistique française, 4th ed. Berne: Francke.

Bonnefoy, Y. 1962. <u>Hamlet</u>. Paris: Mercure de France.

Darbelnet, Jean. 1972. Le français face à l'anglais comme langue de communication. <u>Etudes</u>: 6-9.

Garnier, G. 1975. Time and Tense in French and English: Some Translation Problems. In A. Joly and T. Fraser, eds., <u>Studies in English Grammar</u> (Paris: Presses Universitaires de Lille), pp165-184.

Gode, G. 1962. Knowledge Assumed: A Category of English Grammar. <u>Babel</u> 8: 72-75.

Grandcombe, F. de. 1949, 1951. Réflexions sur la traduction. <u>French Studies</u> 3: 345-50, 5: 253-63.

Kelly, L.G. 1979. <u>The True Interpreter</u>. Oxford: Blackwells.

Levenston, E.A. 1971. Over-indulgence and Under-representation. In G. Nickel, ed., <u>Papers in Contrastive Linguistics</u> (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press), pp115-121.

Malblanc, A. 1944. <u>Vers une stylistique comparée du français et de l'allemand</u>. Paris: Didier.

_____. 1968. <u>Stylistique comparée du français et de l'allemand</u>. Paris: Didier.

Saussure, F. de. 1915. <u>Cours de linguistique générale</u>. Paris: Payot.

Schachter, J., and W. Rutherford. 1979. Discourse Function and Language Transfer. <u>Working Papers in Bilingualism</u> 19: 1-12.

Vinay, J.-P., and J. Darbelnet. 1958. <u>Stylistique comparée du français et de l'anglais</u>. Paris: Didier.

Wandruszka, M. 1967. Implicitation et explicitation. <u>Revue de linguistique romane</u> 31: 316-330.

Wyss, Simone. 1975. A Problem in Contrastive Linguistics: 'Chassé-croisé' Sentences of Deep Instrumentals as Surface Verbs. In A. Joly and T. Fraser, eds., <u>Studies in English Grammar</u> (Paris: Presses de l'université de Lille), pp129-162.