

This article first appeared in *Translating Slavery: Gender and Race in French Women's Writing, 1783-1823*. (co-editor Françoise Massardier-Kenney). Kent, Ohio: Kent State University Press. 1994.

OURIKA'S THREE VERSIONS: A COMPARISON

This analysis contextualizes the translation of *Ourika* that has been provided here by comparing it with two previous translations of that work: an anonymous translation that was published in 1829 and a translation by the British novelist John Fowles that was published in 1977. (1) It needs to be pointed out that both of these previous translations are hard to locate (2) and that, as explained in chapter 1, the translators of *Ourika* for this volume chose not to consult those earlier translations, preferring to produce a completely new and independent text. It is worth looking at those earlier translations now, however: not to judge their accuracy, or to evaluate comprehensively their translation strategies, but rather to discover representative examples in them of the complex mixture of ideological effects that inevitably arise in translating gender and race. These effects vary interestingly, according to the historical moment when the translation is produced as well as to the gender, race, class, or ethnicity of the translator or reader. Looking at those earlier translations of *Ourika* and comparing them with the one provided in this volume makes it possible to reflect about the choices that translators make and thus to open up the process of translation to the kind of interrogation and dialogue that needs to be practiced by translators, translation critics, and readers alike. A comparative analysis will also help readers to assess the success and the possible limitations of the translation provided here.

We can begin by focusing on the anonymous 1829 translation and by drawing attention to a representative sample of its "resistant" and "compliant" features: that is, features that seem, from our vantage point in the 1990s, to be indicative of either resistance against or compliance with stereotypical or regressive notions of gender or race. Although only a small sample of such features can be examined here, that sample has been chosen from among many other ideological elements that together form a consistent pattern within the translations that will be discussed. The first such feature occurs, curiously, before the narration of *Ourika's* story even begins. The title page of the 1829 translation reads *Ourika; A Tale, From the French*, with no mention of Claire de Duras, whose name is similarly absent from the title page of the original. What does appear on the title page in both the translation and the original is an epigraph, in English in both cases, bearing the words and signature of Byron. That epigraph from a male poet, placed before and outside of a novel by and about a woman, anticipates the role of the male voice within the novel: in the opening pages of the story, a male doctor introduces, and in some sense legitimizes, *Ourika's* narration in the rest of the novel. An interesting difference between the original and the 1829 translation occurs, and a significant resistant effect is produced in the translation on the page following the title page. In addition to the name of the woman author, Duras, that appears in the original and the 1829 translation, the translation additionally contains a quotation from the *Mémoires* of Mme de Genlis. Through its evocation of a woman writer, that quotation could be said to counterbalance the authority of Byron and the English poetic tradition evoked on the title

page by introducing a competing authority, that of feminine writing and the French narrative tradition, in which Mme de Genlis played an important role. And although the anonymity of the 1829 translation of course precludes any knowledge about the intentions or gender of the translator, the additional epigraph raises the distinct possibility that the translator may have been attentive to issues of gender and may have sought to capture or even enhance in the translation some of the resistant force of the woman writer's original work.

Another resistant feature of the 1829 translation is its tendency to accentuate the relatively muted abolitionist thrust of the original. That tendency can undoubtedly be explained in part by the publication of this translation at a time when abolitionism was an active force both in France and the United States, especially in Boston where this work was published. The abolitionist tendencies of the translation could also derive from the possible feminine gender of the translator. For, as the numerous examples of women translators and authors provided in this volume demonstrate, there has been a long tradition of women's special interest in the issue of antislavery and sensitivity in treating that issue.

To demonstrate the kind of abolitionist tone present in the 1829 translation and illustrate the differences that occur in translating racially charged passages it will be useful to look at the first sentence of Ourika's first-person narration, which occurs after the frame narration by the doctor, and to subject that sentence to a kind of microscopic analysis that will enable us to perceive and assess the significance of small and subtle differences. (3) The distinctive features of the 1829 translation can be illuminated by comparing the four numbered elements in the following passages with those same elements in the 1977 and 1993 translations.

Je fus rapportée [1] du Sénégal, à l'âge de deux ans, par M. le chevalier de B., qui en était gouverneur. Il eut pitié de moi [2], un jour qu'il voyait embarquer des esclaves sur un bâtiment négrier [3] qui allait bientôt quitter le port: ma mère était morte, et on m'emportait [4] dans le vaisseau, malgré mes cris. (1824, 25-26)

I was carried away [1] from Senegal at the age of two years, by the Chevalier de B., who was a Governor of that place. He pitied my miseries [2], when he one day saw some slaves carried on board a negro vessel [3] which was soon to leave the port: my mother was dead, and they forced me on board [4], notwithstanding my cries. (1829, 13-14)

I was brought here [1] from Senegal when I was two years old by the chevalier de B. who was then governor there. One day he saw me being taken aboard a slaver [3] that was soon to leave port. My mother had died and in spite of my cries I was being carried to the ship [4]. He took pity [2] and bought me . . . (1977, 17)

I was brought back (1) from Senegal, at the age of two, by Monsieur le chevalier de B., the governor of that colony. He took pity on me (2) one day when he saw slaves being taken aboard a slave ship (3) which was about to leave the harbor: my mother was dead, and they were taking me away (4) despite my cries. (1993)

The four elements underlined in these passages reveal the subtle ways in which an intensification of abolitionist sentiment can occur in translation. In the case of the first element, a neutral term--

"rapporté" (1824), "brought here" (1977), "brought back" (1993)--is heightened to a small degree in the 1829 version by the rendering "carried away," which suggests less of a voluntary compliance with the voyage on the part of the natives than in the other versions and which duplicates the word "carried" also used for the deportation of slaves. Similarly for the second element, "il eut pitié de moi" (1824), the choice made in the 1829 translation--"He pitied my miseries"--is considerably stronger and more emotionally charged than in either the original or the other translations: "He took pity" (1977) and "He took pity on me" (1993). Fowles chooses to further downplay the emotional effect of this expression by shifting it to the end of the passage. In the case of the third element, in the original slaves embark on a slave ship ("il voyait embarquer des esclaves"), which creates an ambiguity as to whether they were coerced or whether, as in Mérimimée's *Tamango*, they participated in their own enslavement by being drunk or overly trusting of the slave dealers who lured them on board. All three translations remove that ambiguity by specifying that Ourika was "carried on board" or "taken aboard" a slave ship. Only the 1829 and 1993 versions specify, however, that the context for Ourika's voyage was that slaves were being carried on board the slave ship, whereas Fowles's "one day he saw me being taken aboard" places the emphasis on her personal fate rather than on the more general situation of transporting slaves. For the fourth element, finally, the phrase "on m'emportait" (1824) is exaggerated in "they forced me on board" (1829), rendered fairly literally in "I was being carried" (1977), and articulated as an abolitionist issue but in a less emotional way than in the 1829 translation by "they were taking me away" (1993).

Along with the more resistant elements of the 1829 translation that have just been observed, other elements bearing on the closely intertwined issues of race and gender indicate that translation's ideological limitations and compliance with the social institutions of its time. Those limitations are especially apparent with the issue of interracial coupling, or what has been referred to historically as miscegenation. That issue is raised in a revealing passage in which Ourika overhears a friend of her benefactress' say that as an African woman Ourika has no hopes of marrying because no man would agree to have negro children:

Qui voudra jamais épouser une négresse? Et si, à force d'argent, vous trouvez quelqu'un qui consente à avoir des enfants nègres, ce sera un homme d'une condition inférieure. . . . (1824, 48-49)

Who would wish to marry a negress? And if, by the gift of wealth, you can find one who will bear the relation of father to her children, he must be one of a condition inferior to her own. . . . (1829, 25)

What kind of man would marry a negress? Even supposing you could bribe some fellow to father mulatto children, he could only be of low birth. . . . (1977, 22)

Who will ever want to marry a negress? Even if you can find a man who, for a sum, will consent to be the father of Negro children, this man will be of a lower condition. . . . (1993)

A revealing change occurs in the 1829 translation in the shift from the white man's willingness to have black children ("qui consente à avoir des enfants nègres") to his willingness to "bear the

relation of father to her children." By translating "des enfants" as "her children," the 1829 translator shifts the responsibility for interracial children from the couple to the black woman.

That same shift is repeated later when Ourika reflects upon what the friend of her benefactress said about a man's willingness to bear negro children. In her reflections, Ourika repeats the friend's words twice, almost word for word:

cet homme qui, à prix d'argent, consentirait peut-être que ses enfants fussent nègres! (1824, 53);
Un homme, à prix d'argent, consentirait peut-être que ses enfants fussent nègres! (1824, 58)

the man, who for the price of gold, might perhaps consent to call my children his own. . . . (1829, 27); For the reward of gold one may perhaps consent that my children should call him father! (1829, 29)

I saw myself . . . destined to be the bride of some venal `fellow' who might condescend to get half-breed children on me . . . (1977, 23); A fellow would be paid and might condescend to give me mulatto children! (1977, 24)

the man who, for a large dowry, would perhaps consent to his children being Negroes! . . . (1993); Some man, for a large dowry, would perhaps consent to his children being Negroes! (1993)

In the original, Duras uses the possessive pronoun "ses," which, although it can mean "his" or "her," clearly denotes "his" in this context: "cet homme qui . . . consentirait peut-être que ses enfants fussent nègres!"; "Un homme . . . consentirait peut-être que ses enfants fussent nègres." By translating "ses" as "her," the 1829 translator shifts the responsibility for the practice of interracial coupling away from white men, who by virtue of their control over black women were historically the perpetrators of that practice. The translator also promotes and endorses the stereotypical identification of women as mothers and their primary association with reproduction. This example shows that although the translator endorsed abolition on the political level, he or she was still thinking on the personal level along the traditional racist or sexist lines of the dominant ideology of the times.

To further emphasize the ideological limitations at work in the 1829 translation it is helpful to compare it to Fowles's 1977 and our 1993 translations. Fowles translation of the friend's comment--"What kind of man would marry a negress? Even supposing you could bribe some fellow to father mulatto children, he could only be of low birth" (1977, 22)--does not go as far as the 1829 version in attributing the children to her alone. However, it introduces a social class distinction ("some fellow," "of low birth"), and it fails to capture the sense of shared and consensual parenthood contained in the original. Ourika's repeated versions of that comment accentuate that classist element and firmly place the accent on her as carrying the burden and responsibility of bearing children: "I saw myself . . . destined to be the bride of some venal `fellow' who might condescend to get half-breed children on me" (1977, 23); "A fellow would be paid and might condescend to give me mulatto children!" (1977, 24) In contrast, the translators of this volume's Ourika captured the sense of the white man's fathering multiracial children that is contained in the original by translating the initial comment as "Who will ever want to marry a

negress? Even if you can find a man who, for a large dowry, will consent to be the father of Negro children, this man will be of a lower condition." (1993) That same sense is captured in the translations of Ourika's reflections: "the man who, for a large dowry, would perhaps consent to his children being negroes!"; "Some man, for a large dowry, would perhaps consent to his children being negroes!" (1993)

Having seen examples of the mixture of resistant and compliant effects in the 1829 version of *Ourika*, we now turn our attention directly to Fowles's translation, which similarly displays a combination of resistance and compliance. As I showed in the first example, Fowles's translation often tends either to downplay the issue of race or to diminish the resistant thrust of Duras's treatment of that issue. An interesting example that can be added to those already mentioned occurs when the doctor, seeing *Ourika* for the first time, observes that "son grand voile noir l'enveloppait presque tout entière" (10), which Fowles translates as her being "almost entirely hidden by her large black veil." (13) Whereas Duras thematically foregrounds color by using the active voice to attribute agency to the symbolic black veil that envelops *Ourika*'s physical and social existence, Fowles minimizes the importance of the veil by the use of the passive voice, as does the translator of the 1829 version. In contrast, the 1993 translation retains the sense of agency in the original with the phrase "her long black veil covered her entirely." Fowles's translation of this small detail is revealing because it is part of a larger pattern of paying less attention to race than either the original or the other translations.

It is indeed apparent from the remarks in the foreword and epilogue of Fowles's *Ourika* that he had some awareness of his own ideological limitations with respect to race, although he did not connect them specifically to his practice of translation. Speculating that *Ourika* may have had a profound effect on his writing of *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, he calls attention to having chosen the name of *Ourika*'s beloved Charles for his male protagonist; and he observes, moreover, that "though I could have sworn I had never had the African figure of *Ourika* herself in mind during the writing of *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, I am now certain in retrospect that she was very active in my unconscious." (1977, 7) He goes on to explain that when, some years after writing that novel, he along with other novelists were asked to comment on the origins of their works, he replied that "the seed of mine had come in a half-waking dream and consisted of an image of a woman standing with her back to me. She was in black, and her stance had a disturbing mixture of both rejection and accusation." (8) That his preoccupation with this "woman who had been unfairly exiled from society" (8) had little to do with race becomes apparent to him at the moment when he writes the foreword to the translation of *Ourika*. At that moment, he realizes that in his earlier response to the question about the origins of his novel he had failed to recognize that the woman in black standing with her back to him was *Ourika*, an African woman: "I'm afraid it has revealed to me a remnant of colour prejudice, since something in my unconscious cheated on the essential clue. The woman in my mind who would not turn had black clothes, but a white face." (8)

With regard to gender, Fowles's translation also contains a mix of resistant and compliant elements. From a feminist perspective, the ideological effects are mixed when Fowles targets religion as an oppressive institution for women and accentuates the antireligious, materialist sense of the novel. To return to the microscopic analysis of small details practiced earlier in this

essay, we can look at some sentences from the doctor's frame narrative at the beginning of the novel, several sentences after his first glimpse of the black veil.

je me figurais que j'allais contempler une nouvelle victime des cloîtres; les préjugés de ma jeunesse [1] venaient de se réveiller, et mon intérêt s'exaltait pour celle que j'allais visiter, en proportion du genre de malheur que je lui supposais [2]. Elle se tourna vers moi, et je fus étrangement surpris en apercevant une négresse! . . . Je la questionnai sur sa maladie [3]. J'éprouve, me dit-elle, une oppression continuelle, je n'ai plus de sommeil, et la fièvre ne me quitte pas. Son aspect ne confirmait que trop cette triste description de son état [4]: sa maigreur était excessive, ses yeux brillants et fort grands [5], ses dents d'une blancheur éblouissante, éclairaient seuls sa physionomie . . . et elle portait toutes les marques d'un long et violent chagrin [6]. (1824, 11-13)

I supposed I was about to behold a new victim of the cloisters. All the prejudices of my youth [1] were revived; and my interest in her whom I came to visit was the more increased, as I thought on the malady with which I supposed she was afflicted [2]. She turned herself toward me, and how great was my surprise at beholding a negress! I questioned her upon the nature of her complaints [3]. "I suffer," said she, "a constant oppression, my fever never leaves me, and I cannot sleep." Her appearance but too well confirmed what she had told me [4]. She was extremely emaciated, her eyes were very bright and large [5], and her teeth, of a dazzling whiteness, of themselves lit up her countenance . . . and she bore all the marks of a long and violent sorrow [6]. (1829, vii-ix)

I imagined I was about to meet a new victim of the convent system. The anticlerical prejudices of my early years [1] had been reawakened; and my concern for the woman I was to treat rose in sympathy with my views on the kind of injustice I supposed her to have suffered [2]. She turned towards me. I had a strange shock. I was looking at a negress. I asked her for her symptoms [3]. "I experience a constant feeling of being weighed down," she said. "I can't sleep any more. And I have a persistent fever." Her appearance only too exactly confirmed this unpromising syndrome [4]. She was excessively thin. The sole things that gave light to her face were her abnormally large and luminous eyes [5] and her dazzlingly white teeth . . . She showed every sign of having suffered from prolonged and acute melancholia [6]. (1977, 13-14)

I thought I was to behold yet another victim of the cloisters. The prejudices of my youth [1] had awakened, and my interest in the woman whom I came to see was doubled by the misfortune that I attributed to her [2]. She turned toward me, and I was strangely surprised when I saw a Negress. . . I asked her a few questions about her illness [3]. "I feel," she said, "a constant oppression, I cannot sleep, and I have an unrelenting fever." Her appearance only confirmed this sad description of her state of health [4]: she was excessively thin, her large and shiny eyes [5], her brilliant white teeth were the only light in her face. Her soul was still alive, but her body was destroyed, and she showed all the marks of a long and acute grief [6]. (1993)

In the first element, the doctor acknowledges the ambivalent feelings he has upon visiting a cloistered nun due to "les préjugés" (1824) of his youth. That expression, which is translated simply as "the prejudices of my youth" in the 1829 and 1993 versions, is intensified in Fowles's translation of it as the "anticlerical prejudices of my early years." (1977) In the same vein, in the

case of the second element, the doctor states that his interest in the sick nun was triggered by the "genre de malheur que je lui supposais" (1824), with "malheur" connoting vaguely either physical, mental, or moral illness. In contrast with translations of that phrase that capture the vagueness of the original--"the malady with which I supposed she was afflicted" (1829) and "the misfortune that I attributed to her" (1993)--Fowles specifies that convents functioned as oppressive institutions for women in his translation of the phrase as "the kind of injustice I supposed her to have suffered." (1977) With respect to gender, however, the ideological effect of Fowles's translation of these elements is not clearcut. It is undeniable that convents functioned historically as oppressive institutions where women were in many cases confined against their will. It is also the case, however, that, as observed in chapter 2, religion was an integral part of, and driving force behind, the antislavery movement and antislavery writings by women. For Gouges, Staël, and Duras as well as the other women discussed earlier in this volume such as Behn, Sand, and Stowe, injustice to blacks was one piece in the larger picture of issues that humanitarian and evangelical groups within religious institutions addressed. From a historical perspective, then, religion was in many ways an empowering institution in the nineteenth century for women of color and their allies in the antislavery movement.

A similarly mixed ideological effect results from Fowles's use of scientific and medical terms in a far more explicit way than in the original or either the 1829 or the 1993 translations and his general downplaying of the importance of religion for Ourika in the novel. In the description of the doctor's first visit to the convent discussed above, for example, one finds a series of terms that are far more clinical in Fowles's translation than in the original or the other translations: [3] "sa maladie" becomes "her symptoms" (1977), in contrast with "her complaints" (1829) or "her illness" (1993); [4] "cette triste description de son état" is translated as "this unpromising syndrome" (1977), as compared to "what she had told me" (1829) or "this sad description of her state of health" (1993); [5] "ses yeux brillants et fort grands" turns into "her abnormally large and luminous eyes" (1977), unlike "her eyes were very bright and large" (1829) and "her large and shiny eyes" (1993); [6] "un long et violent chagrin," finally, is rendered as "prolonged and acute melancholia" (1977), in opposition to "a long and violent sorrow" (1829) and "a long and acute grief" (1993). From a feminist perspective, privileging the scientific over the religious as Fowles does can be a resistant strategy inasmuch as religion often functioned historically as a repressive force which blocked the liberatory effects of scientific and medical discoveries that helped women and prolonged their and their children's lives. From that same perspective, however, Fowles's insistence on science and medicine can be said to produce a compliant effect inasmuch as science and medicine have also often functioned as repressive, patriarchal institutions that have been insensitive to women's needs and desires. In addition, his use of details that emphasize Ourika's clinical abnormality suggests a psychoanalytic discourse about hysteria and neurosis that has often been repressively applied to women.

It is also worth noting with regard to gender that Fowles's antireligious ideology at times results in the silencing of the feminine voice in Ourika. Fowles modifies the direct addresses to God in the second person that appear increasingly as the novel draws to an end and Ourika finds her chief consolation in religion. In the original, Duras accentuates the closeness of the second-person address and enables us to hear Ourika's voice in speaking to God: "Grand Dieu! vous êtes témoin que j'étais heureuse du bonheur de Charles." (1824) The 1829 and 1993 translations similarly capture that closeness: "Great God! thou dost bear witness that I rejoiced in the

happiness of Charles" (1829); "Lord! You are witness that I was happy for Charles's happiness." (1993) Fowles, in contrast, uses a more impersonal third-person construction that mutes Ourika's voice: "God will bear witness, I was happy for Charles." (1977) A comparison of his translation of the following passage with the original and the other translations also shows that at times he omits the mention of God altogether:

Quelle lumière affreuse avait-elle jetée sur l'abîme de mes douleurs! Grand Dieu! c'était comme la lumière qui pénétra une fois au fond des enfers, et qui fit regretter les ténèbres à ses malheureux habitants. (1824, 157)

What she had just revealed to me threw a terrifying illumination over the depths of my suffering. It was like the shaft of light that once penetrated to the bottom of hell and made the miserable beings there weep for the darkness of their existence. (1977, 46)

What frightening light had been darted into the abyss of my sorrows! `Great God! such light didst thou once cast into the depths of hell, and the darkness mourned for its miserable inhabitants' (1829, 77)

What terrible light had she thrown on the abyss of my sorrows! O Lord; it was like the light that once reached the bottom of hell and made its unfortunate inhabitants wish for darkness. (1993)

It is also important to stress, however, that Fowles also often demonstrates a distinct sensitivity to the modalities of translating gender. Indeed, his translation of *Ourika* at times reveals the seeds of the feminist outlook that appears fully grown in *The French Lieutenant's Woman*, in which plot and thematic meaning revolve around the birth of feminism in the nineteenth century. That sensitivity can be illustrated specifically through a small but striking detail: the translation of "patrie" in the following key passage from *Ourika*:

L'opinion est comme une patrie; c'est un bien dont on jouit ensemble; on est frère pour la soutenir et pour la défendre. Je me disais quelquefois, que moi, pauvre négresse, je tenais pourtant à toutes les âmes élevées, par le besoin de la justice que j'éprouvais en commun avec elles. (1824, 84)

A view of life is like a motherland. It is a possession mutually shared. Those who uphold and defend it are like brothers. Sometimes I used to tell myself that, poor negress though I was, I still belonged with all the noblest spirits, because of our shared longing for justice. (1977, 30)

One's opinions, like one's native country, to bring happiness must be enjoyed with others; he who supports, who defends them, is a brother. I said sometimes to myself, that I, a poor negress, was bound to the most exalted minds by the unjust sufferings we equally endured" (1829, 42)

Opinion is like a mother-country; it is something that people enjoy together; people are united as a family to support and defend it. I sometimes said to myself that I, a poor negress, nonetheless was like all elevated souls, and had in common with them the need for justice. (1993)

What is special in this passage according to Fowles's comments in the Epilogue is its egalitarian message, to wit, that "Mankind has only one true frontier, that of our common humanity--be it black, brown or white in face. This is the subversive proposition at the heart of Ourika." (1977, 64) What is interesting is the way in which in the practice of translation Fowles uses gender rather than race to express that message. The choice of translating "patrie" as "motherland" (or "mother-country," as in our 1993 translation, as opposed to "native country" in the 1829 version) is an example of the kind of choices that translators are called on to make. It is an intelligent and effective choice which restores the feminine quality that stems in the original from the presence of numerous feminine nouns (opinion, patrie, âme, justice) and numerous articles, pronouns, and adjectives indicating feminine gender (une patrie, pour la soutenir et pour la défendre, âmes élevées, la justice, avec elles.) In order to make that choice, however, the translator has to possess sensitivity to the role of gender in the novel and the ideological implications of translation.

In closing, there have been numerous occasions in the comparison of versions of Ourika presented here and throughout the volume *Translating Slavery* to observe the benefits that translators derive from an awareness of ideology. Consider one salient example highlighted in this essay, the translation in our 1993 version of "consentirait que ses enfants fussent nègres" as "will consent to be the father of negro children." What is important is not only the improvement that the 1993 version makes upon such earlier versions as "will bear the relation of father to her children" or "might condescend to give me mulatto children." Equally important is the fact that that improvement reflects the translators' understanding of the theoretical, practical, and historical issues relevant to translating sexually or racially charged passages such as this one. Undoubtedly other ideological issues exist to which the translators have not been equally attuned. It is up to our readers to discover the compliant elements in the version of Ourika and the other translations that appear in this volume, as we have sought to uncover those compliant elements along with the resistant features of the translations produced by Fowles, La Place, La Bédollière, Belloc, and the other translators discussed here. If there is no escaping ideology, there is at least a way of developing an awareness of its effects on translation.

Doris Y. Kadish

NOTES

1. Claire de Duras, *Ourika: A Tale from the French* (Boston: Carter and Hendee, 1829) and *Ourika*, trans. John Fowles (Austin, Texas: W. T. Taylor Company, 1977). I was not able to obtain the earliest translation, which was published in London in 1824. The original text referred to is the one published by Ladvocat in 1824. I was not able to obtain or consult the 1823 edition referred to earlier.
2. Among the few existing copies of the 1829 translation, I was able to consult the one found at the American Antiquarian Society in Worcester, Massachusetts. Fowles's translation, although recent, was published as a collector's item in a small printing of only 500 copies. Those libraries that hold copies are often unwilling to lend them.
3. Here and elsewhere in this essay, I have underlined the elements for comparison in Duras's 1824 original, in the anonymous 1829 translation, in Fowles's 1977 translation, and in this volume's 1993 translation. These and other passages from the four versions of *Ourika* quoted in this essay are identified within the text according to their date.