

◀ 外研社翻译研究文库 ▶

# 翻译与文学批评： 翻译作为分析手段

TRANSLATION AND LITERARY CRITICISM

Translation as Analysis

(美) Marilyn Gaddis Rose 著



外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

◀ 外研社翻译研究文库 ▶

# 翻译与文学批评： 翻译作为分析手段

TRANSLATION AND LITERARY CRITICISM

Translation as Analysis

(美) Marilyn Gaddis Rose 著



外语教学与研究出版社

FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHING AND RESEARCH PRESS

北京 BEIJING

京权图字: 01 - 2006 - 1833

© Marilyn Gaddis Rose 1997

All Rights Reserved, including those of translation into foreign languages. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without either the prior written permission of the Publisher or a license permitting restricted copying issued by the Copyright Licensing Agency (CLA), 90 Tottenham Court Road, London, W1P 9HE. In North America, registered users may contact the Copyright Clearance Center (CCC): 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers MA 01923, USA.

First published by St. Jerome Publishing Ltd. Manchester, United Kingdom

This edition is authorized for sale in the People's Republic of China only, excluding Hong Kong SAR, Macao SAR and Taiwan, and may not be bought for export therefrom.

版权所有。未经许可不得以任何方式,在世界任何地区,以任何文字,作全部和局部之翻印、仿制或转载。

本书由英国圣哲罗姆出版有限公司授权外语教学与研究出版社出版影印版。此版本仅限在中华人民共和国境内(不包括香港、澳门特别行政区及台湾省)销售,不得出口。

## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

翻译与文学批评: 翻译作为分析手段 = Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis / (美)罗斯(Rose, M. G.)著. — 北京: 外语教学与研究出版社, 2007. 1

(外研社翻译研究文库)

ISBN 978 - 7 - 5600 - 6192 - 4

I. 翻… II. 罗… III. ①翻译—研究—英文 ②比较文学—文学研究—英文 IV. ①H059 ②I10 - 03

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2006) 第 154345 号

出 版 人: 李朋义

责任编辑: 唐 辉

封面设计: 袁 璐

出版发行: 外语教学与研究出版社

社 址: 北京市西三环北路 19 号 (100089)

网 址: <http://www.fltrp.com>

印 刷: 北京市鑫霸印务有限公司

开 本: 650 × 980 1/16

印 张: 7.25

版 次: 2007 年 1 月第 1 版 2007 年 1 月第 1 次印刷

书 号: ISBN 978 - 7 - 5600 - 6192 - 4

定 价: 11.90 元

\* \* \*

如有印刷、装订质量问题出版社负责调换

制售盗版必究 举报查实奖励

版权保护办公室举报电话: (010)88817519

# 外研社翻译研究文库

## 专家委员会

(按姓氏笔画排列)

王东风	王克非	王宏印	毛思慧
文 军	方梦之	申 丹	申雨平
冯庆华	冯志伟	吕 俊	朱志瑜
朱纯深	庄绎传	刘士聪	许 钧
孙艺风	孙致礼	李亚舒	李德凤
李德超	杨自俭	连淑能	汪榕培
张柏然	张美芳	陈宏薇	陈国华
陈德彰	范守义	柯 平	郭建中
黄忠廉	黄振定	辜正坤	程镇球
谢天振	廖七一	谭载喜	潘文国
穆 雷			

## 外研社翻译研究文库\*

现有书目:

About Translation P. Newmark

《论翻译》

A Practical Guide for Translators G. Samuelsson-Brown

《译者实用指南》

Can Theory Help Translators? A Dialogue Between the Ivory Tower and the Wordface A. Chesterman & E. Wagner

《理论对译者有用吗? 象牙塔与语言工作面之间的对话》

Corpora in Translator Education F. Zanettin et al.

《语料库与译者培养》

Corpus-based Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies

S. Granger

《基于语料库的语言对比和翻译研究》

Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II, Historical and Ideological Issues T. Hermans

《跨文化侵越——翻译学研究模式 (II): 历史与意识形态问题》

Electronic Tools for Translators F. Austerlühl

《译者的电子工具》

Intercultural Faultlines: Research Models in Translation Studies I, Textual and Cognitive Aspects M. Olohan

《超越文化断裂——翻译学研究模式 (I): 文本与认知的译学研究》

Method in Translation History A. Pym

《翻译史研究方法》

Text Analysis in Translation: Theory, Methodology, and Didactic Application of a Model for Translation-Oriented Text Analysis (Second Edition) C. Nord

《翻译的文本分析模式: 理论、方法及教学应用》(第二版)

The Translator's Turn D. Robinson

《译者登场》

Translated! Papers on Literary Translation and Translation Studies J. S. Holmes

《译稿杀青! 文学翻译与翻译研究文集》

---

\* 本文库采用开放式结构, 今后还将陆续添加其他有影响的翻译研究著作。

Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context  
A. Lefevere

《文学翻译: 比较文学背景下的理论与实践》

Translation and Empire: Postcolonial Theories Explained D. Robinson

《翻译与帝国: 后殖民理论解读》

Translation and Language: Linguistic Theories Explained P. Fawcett

《翻译与语言: 语言学理论解读》

Translation and Literary Criticism: Translation as Analysis M. G. Rose

《翻译与文学批评: 翻译作为分析手段》

Translation and Nation: Towards a Cultural Politics of Englishness

R. Ellis & L. Oakley-Brown

《翻译与民族: 英格兰的文化政治》

Translation and Norms C. Schäffner

《翻译与规范》

Translation, Power, Subversion R. Álvarez & M. Vidal

《翻译, 权力, 颠覆》

Translation Today: Trends and Perspectives G. Anderman & M. Rogers

《今日翻译: 趋向与视角》

Unity in Diversity? Current Trends in Translation Studies L. Bowker et al.

《多元下的统一? 当代翻译研究潮流》

Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche D. Robinson

《西方翻译理论: 从希罗多德到尼采》

# 翻译与文学批评：翻译作为分析手段 导 读

外研社翻译研究文库

本书作者 M.G. 罗斯女士，是位于宾厄姆顿的纽约州立大学著名比较文学教授，翻译研究中心（包括翻译研究与教学项目）主任。《翻译与文学批评：翻译作为分析手段》是罗斯教授出版于 1997 年的一部著作。作者在书中阐发了翻译与比较文学的关系，并通过丰富的个案研究和实例分析，令人信服地说明了翻译可作为分析手段应用于比较文学的教学与研究，并得出翻译因揭示文学作品的内涵而使文学意义不但不会丧失反而有所获得的结论。

本书共有三大部分，具体内容和观点陈述如下：

## 第一部分：前言后语

在前言中，作者考察了翻译与文学批评的关系，认为二者之间多有联系，相互依赖，不论是直译还是意译，只要将翻译研究和文学批评联系起来，就可以促进和丰富文学阅读。进一步而言，按照 20 世纪后半期后现代主义者的观点，翻译可以用作进入比较文学的钥匙，为之提供分析的工具和比较的视野。作者将这一基本观点推进到文学教学领域，认为翻译本身不仅是理解文学作品的手段和机制，而且可以作为文学教学和研究的手段。尽管书中的教学专指美国教育体制下中等程度以上水平的文学阅读与教学，本书的基本观点和做法仍然具有普遍意义，对于我国目前正值热点的文学翻译批评的学科建设，必将起到有力的推动作用。

在后语中，作者就两个问题作了进一步说明。其一是关于书中例证的选取。作者基于自己的教学与研究经验，在书中选用的是不至于将研究复杂化的中性西方文学经典作品。另一是关于翻译的态度。作者认为，翻译在进一步丰富文学阅读的同时，也使文学阅读复杂化，引发了更多棘手的问题，我们在研究中必会涉及对翻译标准等问题的认识。对于翻译错误，作者建议采取宽容的态度。

## 第二部分：正文八章

第一章讲述了文学批评的基本设定。作者考察了各种翻译理论注重实践、过程、作品、本质的不同倾向，说明自己的理论依靠对于翻译本质的直觉知识，注重过程与作品并强调翻译令文学有所得的观点。

作者对翻译理论史的划分阶段如下：

1. 现代翻译研究始于奈达发表于 1947 年的关于翻译原则的文章。
2. 出版于 1975 年的斯坦纳的《巴别塔之后》一书，回应了本雅明 1923 年的论文《译者的任务》。
3. 继承多元系统论的描写学派的实证研究开始于 1976 年，可作为翻译分析的系统化策略。作者指出，回应本雅明的理论对于翻译实践和文学批评影响深远，可以作为分析的基础。

本书选取诗歌和散文作品作为分析资料而没有选择戏剧，就此，作者的说明是：戏剧离不开导演和观众的参与，而她本人的兴趣只在于文学阅读。

第二章论述了翻译和文学批评的可兼容性。首先，联系到文学史和翻译的关系，作者指出：古希腊和罗马文学经典得以保留，在很大程度上取决于翻译，而稍后古典语言的教学甚至依赖于所谓粗俗语言的翻译。今日所谓世界语言的存在和发展，也可以说是对于古典语言的继续——通过翻译的中介使其得以存在。其次，在理论上，一方面，由于任何批评家都不可能通晓所有语言，因此，文学必须依赖于翻译，并从翻译中获得细节和精妙之处；另一方面，翻译和批评都会促进文学的理解和领悟以及二者的结合。但这并不意味着在翻译和批评之间存在谁高于谁的问题，恰恰相反，翻译和批评都依赖于作品，因为作品是第一位的、原发的，而翻译和批评都是第二位的、派生的。创作第一性的观点便由此建立。翻译和创作与批评的关系又是复杂的，值得深思的。在作者看来，文学翻译一方面是进入文学的一种途径，另一方面也是文学批评的一种方式，因为翻译提供给读者重新思考文学作品的空间和视角。

第三章进行历史回顾，另外还包括一个个案研究。对于文学史和翻译史的关系，作者指出，后者似乎包含在前者之中，但正在日益清晰地分离出来。进一步而言，区分翻译史和翻译研究史也是不容易的事情。就文学批评而言，翻译研究史无非是一系列迎合文学情趣的导引记录，而传统意义上的翻译理论，未必能达到 20 世纪的理论要求。在许多情况下，这些翻译理论不过是一系列希望译文能符合大众修辞习惯的要求和建议，而语



言的标准和修辞习惯则因时代不同和个人见解差异而各不相同。这一章的个案研究,选取了法国存在主义作家加缪 1942 年的作品《陌生人》的两个英译本,一个是英国现代主义者吉尔伯特 1945 年的译本,另一个是美国后现代主义者沃德 1988 年的译本。两个译本不仅质量相当,容易获得,而且体现了直译和意译、归化和异化以及语言翻译和语义翻译的不同侧重,因而具有可比性和研究价值。作者分析了其中的典型片段。

第四章进一步讨论了文学翻译及批评的相关问题。作者认为,文学史的发展和文学运动的规律,是平衡——不平衡——重归平衡的过程。类似于黑格尔的正题——反题——合题的逻辑表现。每一个文学运动和流派,都需要经历一个由诞生、发展,到衰落、消亡的过程,但并非彻底的消亡,而是以新的形式存在于新的流派和运动中。翻译作为反常行为,在文学史上屡见不鲜,将源语言中的零碎作品编辑或编译为一体,可能是最初的形式,接着是假托翻译之名而行创作之实的做法,主要是为了逃避官方的检查和文字狱。伏尔泰的《老实人》和塞万提斯的《堂吉珂德》都属于这种情况。真正的伪译,在文学史上更是屡见不鲜,而且起着重要的作用。即便不是传统的、严格意义上的翻译,外国文学翻译,甚至包括模仿性拟作在内,对于本民族文学都具有唤醒和促进作用。例如,庞德翻译的大量中国古典诗歌,对于意象派和现代派诗歌在美国的发展起了关键作用。此外,本章还讨论了德语、法语、英语等语言状况和各国不同的文学传统,以及翻译理论中的二元对立等问题。

第五章专门讨论了波德莱尔作为诗人和翻译家的翻译情况。他对于美国诗人艾伦·坡作品的翻译,适应了法语的特点和需要。他在翻译过程中对原作进行的微妙改变使得法语译作并不能直接地、很容易地回译到英文原作。

第六章讨论了波德莱尔诗歌被翻译的情况,并在某些方面将波德莱尔和朗费罗作了比较。作为本章的重要内容,作者还讨论和评论了伊文·佐哈的多元系统论和德里达的解构主义翻译观。虽然讨论并不系统、深入,但给人以启发。例如,作者认为,最初提出多元系统论的人大多转向描写译学,但他们对于严肃文学关注不足,不过也有人借鉴他们的观点和策略继续应用于比较文学研究。对于波德莱尔的翻译研究表明,这是一片十分丰富而复杂的跨语言的互文性研究领域。从乔治和本雅明的翻译活动中我们可以看到德语和英语文学的复杂关系,甚至可以看到英美现代主义和后现代主义文学中波德莱尔的影子和影响。

第七章转向散文的翻译，以相当的篇幅分析了三个例证：斯丹达尔作品《巴马修道院》(1838—1840)的1928年译本；福楼拜的《情感教育》(1869)的1964年译本；波德莱尔的《芳法洛》(1847, 1869)的1996年译本。当然，这里的散文是和诗歌相对而言的，主要指小说。作者认为，诗歌的阅读少于散文，而译诗的阅读最少。双语短片小说集的读者主要是大学生和研究生，阅读是他们保持外语能力的一种方式。不过，实际的阅读效果却并非如此简单。通过原本和译本的双重阅读，读者在比较和对照中对于原本和译本的理解会深化和扩大。

第八章结论部分首先讨论了原本和译本的对等问题。作者认为，在文学批评那里，原作与译作理应居于平等地位，但并不意味着二者之间的地位相等。实际上，对等概念本身，往往使人联想到奈达的形式对等和功能对等，是谁都可以理解但又说不清楚的。这里包含对于经典重译的理解问题，就连英国国王詹姆斯钦定的《圣经》英译本，也难以避免重译的命运。这一章还结合上一章的三种散文作品翻译，提出三种翻译模式：即过于考究的形式主义翻译模式，忽视形式的翻译模式，以及温和的新直译模式。这就涉及叙事和风格等深层问题了。不过，作者认为，文学翻译受制于文化史和文学批评的传统与潮流，取决于读者的接受兴趣和时代风尚，因而每个时代对于译作价值的评价也不一样。一时间受到推崇的东西在另一时间可能过时或不受欢迎。尽管如此，我们对于文学作品的批评性阅读，则始终需要依赖具有理论深度与分析倾向的翻译。

### 第三部分：教学附录

这里的附录有关教学方面。作者借用波德莱尔的用词“忧郁”，说明了一种普遍的现象：从事翻译教学的人员，多年面对同样的材料、同样的学生，心情忧郁，缺乏热情和新鲜感，势必会影响教学的气氛。因此，为了保持活力，必须常教常新，材料和教法不断革新。于是，作者讨论了下列几个问题：

1. 跨语言的课程设置：即运用不同的语言教授不同的课程，使其产生交错和融合效果。例如，用意大利语教授文艺复兴的艺术史，或者招收不同文化和语言背景的留学生，使其相互影响，产生有利的教学氛围。

2. 比较文学与一般文学：所谓比较文学与一般文学的关系，在教学层面上指的是可将英语语言文学和翻译文学课程同时进行。这在本科阶段可望有所改观，而在研究生阶段则采用讨论式教学、教师指导下的分组讨论

等形式，可望获得丰硕的成果。

3. 文学翻译与非文学翻译工作室：文学创作和戏剧创作有工作室，同样，文学翻译和非文学翻译也可以有工作室。在文学翻译工作室中，每一个参与的人都是翻译者、批评者和编辑者。在非文学翻译工作室中，非文学专业的学生和不同语言背景的学生在一起工作和学习，可以获得更多的乐趣和收益。

最后，返回到如何克服忧郁因素的主题上来，那就是一方面和理论家结合，请他们作兼职教授；另一方面，广泛结合不同学术背景的人员，进行跨学科研究。相互尊重和畅所欲言是十分重要的两个方面。

另外，本书还附有专业术语表和各部分参考书目，可供参考。

我们相信，这本书对于我国翻译界的学科建设十分有意义并颇具启发性。它不仅在概念上有助于我们传统的翻译观念、批评观念和教学观念的更新，而且在实践和实证研究方面，给我们以具体的例证和文学翻译批评的示范，在跨学科研究和分析方法方面也具有启发作用。相信本书将受到学界的欢迎和读者的好评。

**王宏印**

南开大学外国语学院英语系教授、博士生导师

# *Contents*

Preface	<i>To Musers ... to Mockers</i>	1
1.	Postulates of Literary Criticism	5
2.	The Compatibility of Translation and Literary Criticism	11
3.	Illustrated Historical Overview	15
4.	The Recurring Rhythms	24
5.	Baudelaire: Poet and Translator	31
6.	Baudelaire: Poet Translated	39
7.	Turning to Prose	55
8.	Conclusion: The Text and Translation Equation	71
Afterword	<i>To Contemplators ... to Cavillers</i>	74
Appendix on Pedagogy:	The <i>Ennui</i> Factor	77
	Languages Across the Curriculum	78
	Comparative and General Literature	79
	Literary and Non-Literary Translation Workshops	80
	Returning to the <i>Ennui</i> Factor: A Final Manifesto	82
Glossary		85
Bibliographical References		91

## Preface

### *To Musers ... to Mockers*

“Aux rêveurs... Aux railleurs”, so reads Villiers de l’Isle-Adam’s dedication to *L’Eve future* (1885), his novel about a fictitious Thomas Alva Edison. The above heading is from my translation, which I entitled perhaps a little too unambiguously, *Eve of the Future Eden* (1981).

That translation was published over fifteen years ago. Now the coupling ‘dreamers/deriders’ immediately comes to mind, but I am glad I did not use it. Euphonically, it may not be much more jarring than ‘musers/mockers’, but semantically it summons ‘impractical’ (from dreamers) and ‘derisive’ (from deriders) and makes of a dichotomy a unity. That is, Villiers is not so much addressing this astonishingly clairvoyant novel to two types of readers, both the sympathetic and the critical, as to two groups of readers whom he merges as objects of his irony.

But as we live through another *fin-de-siècle*, I would now incline to ‘in reverie and railery’.

First, I am so inclined because the ambivalence in the novel leads me to believe that Villiers included himself in both camps. Not only would his intended audience be comprised of readers who reflect and readers who reject, but his implicit narrator would be engaged in both dreaming and debunking.

Second, since Villiers de l’Isle-Adam is secure as an important minor writer, partly because the definition of French literary ‘Decadence’ was inferred from his example, perhaps we should try to be as close as possible to his actual words as the two languages permit. In particular, if his eerie fluctuation between ellipsis and redundancy defines Decadent style, then perhaps we should let his French echo through our English.

(Third, as one of the ‘Amis de Villiers de l’Isle-Adam’, I look back on his star-crossed career with affection and pity.)

All the near-synonymy and alliteration just marshalled demonstrates that even between two languages so historically and culturally intertwined as French and English, there is a great deal of meaning and melody. The enhancement of literary experience by translation comes not only from what the author genially wrote and what the translator felicitously found but also from other words or ways they – or we – might have

used instead.

That is what this essay in the *Translation Theories Explained* series sets out to do: to demonstrate by example how the linking of translation studies and literary criticism enriches the reading of literature and other serious pieces of rhetoric throughout the humanities and social sciences. Ultimately I advocate a way of reading literature. This is a 'stereoscopic' strategy that will accommodate whatever mode of translating is being followed from the most literal to the most free.

Such an essay should empower those best qualified to engage in it: translators and teachers of comparative and general literature. Thus, although I hope anyone who deals with texts that have literary pretensions will find something provocative in the pages to follow, this essay is principally addressed to translators, comparatists and their advanced students. In American postsecondary institutions, these faculty will be on the same team, playing interchangeable positions. In such a team some members will teach languages other than English and will often teach in languages other than English. Some members of the team will take turns leading translation workshops or creative writing workshops. However it should be stressed that I have seen the strategies of stereoscopic reading used productively throughout the humanities and social sciences wherever the interpretation of texts is at stake. Literature, after all, can and should be very broadly defined.

Translation and literary criticism, our main terms here, have always been historically interdependent. But over the past quarter century, proponents of both literary criticism and post-Heideggerian philosophy, when classified together as Postmodernists, have found in translation a key to literary theory. Their use of translation, although it stops short of the use to be made of it in the following pages, can be a cue and a justification (if such is needed) for using translation as a critical method both for analyzing literature and teaching it, not to mention translating it. Translating brings us *into* a literary work, in the usual sense of immersion and identification.

In our teaching and research a translation does not only allow access to a literary work that would otherwise be closed. A translation challenges readers with a boundary. But in setting a provisional boundary, it also establishes an interliminal space of sound, allusion and meaning where readers must collaborate, criticize and rewrite, thereby enriching their experience of literature. From this perspective, literature can only gain in translation.

In this connection Villiers' *L'Eve future* is a mirror image of reception

## Preface

and process. Except for the inventions ascribed to him, Villiers' Edison is ahistorical. Nor does the Menlo Park of the novel, a baronial late nineteenth-century manor from the ground floor up and a Rosicrucian temple cum laboratory below, resemble the New Jersey Memorial State Park and Museum devoted to Edison. As translator, I received and returned the novel via English-language dissemination. (By now I have lived with the novel four times as long as the author, who died when he was just past fifty.) Villiers' novel was a Frenchman's allegorical dramatization of inventiveness, but as readers we witness relatively little action and overhear very few dramatic lines exchanged. Rather we listen to alternating monologues that describe, after the fact, what has happened. These monologues are verbal representations in which the words themselves are almost as important as what they represent. Villiers intended the novel for the *rêveurs* and the *raillieurs*.

My essay is an American's discussion of translation studies and literary criticism, in which much space is accorded to writers like Villiers and his better remembered sometime contemporaries like Baudelaire, Flaubert, George, Poe, Stendhal and Yeats. Although American, I am a lifelong Francophile and Hibernophile, yet irremediably a Missourian wherever I live, and Missourians begin their lives occupying simultaneously the Midwest, the Border South, and the Show-Me State. In the language of translation, we are used to living amidst disjunctive cognitive mappings.

Hence, this essay will be an American perspective based on an American's reading and an American's experience as a teacher and trainer in the American postsecondary educational system. It is a perspective offered with the hope it can be shared with colleagues elsewhere from whom she has learned so much. Offered in reverie and raillery.





# 1. Postulates of Literary Criticism

“Congratulations on rediscovering the 1939 interpretation of ‘Sailing to Byzantium’.” So wrote a senior scholar in 1975 to a doctoral student preparing to defend his dissertation at the State University of New York at Binghamton. As the outside member of the dissertation committee, I shared the candidate’s chagrin. Now, decades later, the sarcasm no longer seems the ultimate deflating insult. If not a compliment, it was at least an open acknowledgement of something that exists in literary criticism, and an implicit acknowledgement of a claim of literary knowledge. Obviously, the graduate student, who subsequently became as well-established in Modernist scholarship as his critic, was being told that his Postmodernist critical strategies, new at the time, had revealed nothing new about the Yeats poem. We receive new critical approaches with mixed expectations. They should justify themselves by uncovering new facets of familiar works; but should not such approaches also touch upon, even reinforce, consensus? What the senior critic was also implying, possibly unwittingly, was that there is a stable core of something—call it meaning—in ‘Sailing to Byzantium’ and, by extension, in literature generally. A literary work, while capable of eliciting ever new reading experiences, still has an irreducible integrity. Its manifestation is a certain ordering of certain words in a certain language.

But beyond those words in that order the literary work has at any moment and with any reader a certain ‘aura’. The greater the work, the harder it is to describe that aura, let alone articulate it. We can, however, translate it. We do so by replicating its lexical and syntactical cues. Not that a translation will transfer the aura. Neither completely nor for all time. Have we all not agreed that literary translation is flawed by nature and that poetry translation is almost always a contradiction in terms? Put another way, if a translation is successful, has it not become something else? Yes, yes, yes. But the translation will demarcate the boundary thresholds between the work itself, the translation, and the interliminal space that the translator has enclosed both as proxy author and as proxy reader.

This is true for verbal expression in any genre, at any level of discourse. But since ‘Sailing to Byzantium’ has been mentioned, let us merely try putting into French the short, simple declarative sentence of the first line: *That is no country for old men*. An interlinear might be *Ce pays-là*