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Chapter 5

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF SHIFTS
PART II: THE CONCEPT - TYPOLOGICAL DISTINCTIONS

In the preceding survey of comparative procedures several typologi-
cal distinctions of shifts were discussed that are instrumental in the
interpretation of the relationship between source and target text seg-
ments or elements. The main aim of these distinctions is to account
for the occurrence of shifts that cannot be considered indicative of
what one is looking for, be it in terms of translational norms, transla-
tional strategy or translational interpretation, and which, therefore, do
not have to be taken into consideration in the evaluation of the net-
work of correspondences and shifts established between target and
source text. Toury and Van Leuven-Zwart made a distinction between
obligatory and optional shifts, Van Leuven-Zwart also made a dis-
tinction between formal and substantial shifts, and Frank differ-
entiated between translational and productive deviations. Van den
Broeck & Lefevere (1984: 88-93) also discuss the second and third
distinctions mentioned here and add to these the oppositional pairs of
'motivated versus unmotivated shifts' and 'conscious versus uncon-
scious shifts' (cf. also Van den Broeck 1999). Since these distinctions
by definition are limited to the prospective point of view on shifts
only, I will not include them in my discussion.

Obligatory versus optional shifts

Van Leuven-Zwart characterizes obligatory shifts as language-
bound, and she defines optional shifts as shifts that are caused by the
choice of the translator (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1984: 20). Within the
framework of Toury the pertinent difference is between rule-governed
(obligatory) and norm-governed (optional) shifts (Toury 1980: 116;

These distinctions may be related to a similar distinction made by

101 The terms employed to denote this distinction in Toury 1995 are
‘obligatory versus non-obligatory’ shifts.
Popović: the one between constitutive shifts and individual shifts. Popović defines a constitutive shift as

an inevitable shift that takes place in the translation as a consequence of differences between the two languages, the two poetics and the two styles of original and translation (1976a: 16);

individual shifts are to be considered as

deviations motivated by the translator’s expressive propensities and his subjective idiolect (ibid.).

One might also conceive of shifts as constitutive in the sense that they are constitutive for the style of the translation (shifts as a ‘categorial quality’ of translation). According to Popović, the style of the translation, conceived of as the ‘integrative principle’ in the development of its structure (1970: 79), is necessarily determined by shifts, because of its ‘dual character’ (1970: 82): it has to comply both with the norm of the original and with a given target ‘translation ideal’

Both the distinction between obligatory and optional shifts and between constitutive and individual shifts go to the very heart of the asymmetric relationship between the code systems involved in the translation of a text. The first distinction only pertains to the level of the linguistic systems, whereas the scope of the latter is defined much broader.

In Popović’ definition the distinction not only pertains to the different linguistic systems, but also to the differences between the two

---

102 When changes at the level of macrostylistics cause the translation to fit another literary genre than that of the original, Popović speaks of a ‘generic shift’ (cf. also Van den Broeck 1986). In another context, he has distinguished the concept of ‘negative shift’: ‘An incorrect solution of information caused by a misunderstanding of the translation. It may be motivated by an unfamiliarity with the language or by a superficial interpretation of the original structure. The negative shifts may be characterized in the translation text as the so-called ‘mistranslation’ or subinterpretation of the original text (a neglect of the depth structure of topic)’ (1976a: 16). In my framework this type of shift will not be taken into consideration.
literary systems ('poetics') involved. With respect to the third element ('the differences between the two styles of original and translation') one may well ask whether it is tautological. It is hard to see how shifts should be caused by the difference between the two styles, where the style of the target text, at least partly, is itself determined by the shifts. Still, for my purposes, Popović' distinction is more useful than the purely linguistic one. In this book I will make use of the distinction constitutive versus individual shifts, in which the difference between obligatory and optional shifts is supposed to be included. Constitutive shifts, then, may be seen as those shifts which are caused by the differences between the code systems involved in the translation of a literary text. They can be located on three different levels of systemic relationships: the level of the linguistic systems, the textual (in this case: literary) systems or the cultural systems involved. But, as we will see in a moment, the distinction is by no means unproblematic.

**Formal versus substantial shifts**

The distinction between formal and substantial shifts serves the same purpose as the one between constitutive and individual shifts, but is made in terms of the consequences of lower level shifts for higher level elements.

Van Leuven-Zwart considers only those shifts substantial which have their bearing on the semantic, stylistic and pragmatic functions of microstructural elements (cf. 1984: 20). Only when shifts may be said to have consequences on those three levels, they are taken into consideration. Formal shifts are supposed not to be indicative of a translator's strategy and interpretation. The question whether a shift is substantial or formal has priority over the question whether a shift is (in her terms) obligatory or optional.

According to Van den Broeck & Lefevere the distinction is based on the idea that some changes directly involve the text's semantics, or, to be more general, its communicative value, whereas others are of a more formal (or 'syntactical-informational') nature and only indirectly have their bearing on the communicative value of the text (1984: 89; my translation).
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About the extent to which formal shifts have their influence on the communicative value, they say that there is a direct relationship with the relative importance that can be attributed to formal elements in the texts. The importance may vary according to the genre to which the text belongs. The difference between formality and substantiality of shifts, then, is not a question of whether they have their bearing on a higher level, but in the way in which they contribute to the establishment of higher level shifts. Within the context of a specific descriptive apparatus the distinction between direct and indirect influence poses a problem, because the circumstance that a shift should have its bearing is more important than the matter of its directness. Within a coherent descriptive apparatus it is much more productive to relate substantiality directly to the purpose of the procedure. In terms of my purpose, then, I will define substantial shifts as those shifts that have their bearing on the realization of the text world. Formal shifts are considered to be neutral with respect to the text world, and do not have to be taken into consideration.

Constitutive versus individual revisited

The general idea behind the distinction between constitutive and individual shifts is that one can differentiate, retrospectively, between the reconstruction of a situation in which a translator has had a choice and the reconstruction of a situation in which there was no choice. In that respect it links up with the relationship between the actual and the possible. One may only posit the possibility of choice when one can presuppose the availability of more than one option. The application of the concepts, however, even in their adjusted definition, is by no means as straightforward as it may seem. Van Leuven-Zwart explicitly states that

> generally it is not easy to determine whether a shift is language-bound or translator-bound (1984: 3; my translation),

and Toury questions the validity of his own distinction between optional shifts as norm-governed and obligatory shifts as rule-governed by stating that the
realization of so-called obligatory shifts (...) is already truly norm-governed (1995: 57, cf. also 173).

The main question is whether, from a descriptive point of view, it is justified to assume that there can be situations in which there is no choice. With respect to the Popovićian distinction, this point has been made by Van den Broeck. According to him the view that constitutive shifts are inevitable does not imply that

individual translators in this matter cannot take a free decision, for instance by consciously opting for a translation that, relative to the source text, does not shift (1984-5: 130).

In discussing the category of syntactic shift Van Leuven-Zwart takes the opposite position. In her view translators have a limited choice on the level of syntax, because syntactic phenomena to a large extent are language-specific:

A translator, during the translation process, cannot but apply the syntactic rules of the target language, and because these rules are different from those of the source language it is inevitable that syntactic changes occur in a translation (Van Leuven-Zwart 1984: 70-1; my translation).

It seems to me that this is not necessarily the case. It is very well conceivable, and therefore a theoretical possibility, that a translator, for whatever reason, goes against the syntactic rules of the target language. In terms of the initial norm, this kind of strategy can be located at the extreme end of the adequacy pole. Not only is it a theoretical possibility, it is also a frequently realized possibility, particularly in the translation of classical and/or sacred texts. Famous examples are Hölderlin's or Heidegger's translations of ancient Greek texts, or the translations, in many languages, of (parts of) the Old Testament in the manner of Martin Buber and Franz Rosenzweig.

Still, Van Leuven-Zwart's remark points to a problem that is crucial in the establishment of shifts, and which concerns the question where one can draw the line between what is possible and what is not.
Van Leuven-Zwart’s remark is normative to the extent that it departs from a ‘restricted’ notion of translatability. The opposite position, a purely pragmatic one, which departs from a general concept of translatability\(^{103}\), is taken by Van den Broeck and Popović. The ultimate consequence of that position is that one takes anything to be possible; from that point of view the distinction between constitutive and individual shifts in practice becomes superfluous, because there always is a choice. The view of Van Leuven-Zwart, on the other hand, seems too restricted, and can be countered by empirical material. To my mind, however, it does make some sense, to the extent that it may make one aware of the principle that there is a limit to that pragmatic approach. If one would go one linguistic level deeper, and would substitute ‘syntax’ by ‘morphology’, I think her statement would become more valid. It is probably possible to ignore the morphological rules of a language in translation. There is a limit, however, to this possibility, since, theoretically speaking, there must be a point beyond which one would render a message incomprehensible, because it is no longer clear to which linguistic code system it should be correlated. Still, it is a possibility that somehow has to be accounted for.

Van den Broeck (1984-85: 132) implicitly proposes a kind of litmus test for the decision to classify a shift as individual or constitutive. According to him the differences between translations in different languages of one and the same source text will give an indication of the constitutive shifts, whereas the differences between various translations in one single language made by different translators in more or less the same period would point to the individual shifts. The problem with this view is that it equates differences between translations with differences between target and source texts. But it is by no means necessarily the case that any element from target text A that differs from the corresponding element in target text B constitutes a shift in relation to the source text. That would only be the case if one would choose to derive the level of invariance from target text B, but only then.

\(^{103}\) On the difference between restricted and general notions of translatability and the relation with normativity cf. Toury 1980: 19-34; for a critical discussion of this distinction cf. Bakker 1995.
The distinction, then, between constitutive and individual, is profoundly complicated, even to the point that one may doubt whether it can be made altogether, and it seems worthwhile to have a closer look at the way it may be put to use. In the following paragraphs I will try to exemplify and elucidate the problems and pitfalls with respect to this distinction by looking at the ways in which it may be applied on the different system levels I have distinguished earlier.

**Shifts pertaining to the level of the linguistic systems**

As we have seen, it is generally agreed upon that the relationship between two linguistic systems is characterized by its anisomorphism: no two systems are completely symmetric as to structure. With respect to single linguistic elements several types of systemic correspondences are distinguished. Koller (1983: 157-168), for instance, distinguishes the following types of systemic (lexical) relationships: one-to-one relationships, one-to-many relationships, many-to-one relationships, one-to-zero relationships and one-to-part relationships. Using the parameters 'many', 'one', 'zero' and 'part', one may posit a whole range of possibilities for other linguistic levels as well. Let us take a look at some of those systemic relationships, in order to see in what way the distinction between constitutive and individual shifts may be problematic.

With respect to the system of pronouns, one of the differences between English and Dutch (as well as many other languages) concerns the markedness in terms of social relationship between sender and addressee expressed in the second person personal pronoun singular: where English speakers use 'you', Dutch speakers can use either 'je/jij' or 'u'. The use of 'je/jij' is restricted to contexts in which the relationship between communicative participants is characterized by social equality, whereas the use of 'u' is restricted to

---

104 There are of course other forms that this grammatical category can take: 'thee/thou' as against 'ge/gij'. In terms of their contemporary usage, these forms are far less context-sensitive, however, in the sense that they are almost exclusively used in jocular contexts, in contexts of extreme reverence, or in contexts of regionally marked language use. In this example these forms are not relevant.
situations involving social inequality, that is, when the addressee is considered to be socially superior. In those situations in which social inequality is not relevant, ‘u’ may be considered a polite form of address.

The relationship between the two systems with respect to this feature is asymmetric. The fact that in translating an English text into Dutch a choice has to be made is caused by this asymmetry, and in that sense a shift relatable to that choice can be considered constitutive, or, if you will, obligatory. But there still is a choice, and the choice of either option may be motivated by individual considerations.

An interesting case concerning this feature can be found in a comparison of several Dutch translations of Lewis Carroll’s Victorian classic *Alice in Wonderland* (cf. Cillekens 1996), which focuses on the representation of Alice’s girlhood. An analysis of the protagonist’s utterances in the novel shows that she may be characterized particularly by her curiosity, her inventiveness as well as her politeness. Taking these three character traits, *ad hoc* textual features, relatable to different linguistic elements, of which the use of personal pronouns is only one, as a *tertium*, the target utterances were compared to the source utterances. With respect to her politeness, a marked difference can be discerned between the various translations. In her manifold conversations with the menagerie of characters she encounters, the inquisitive Alice very frequently uses the singular second person personal pronoun. As it turns out, all translators have chosen to retain that form of address (which allows for the possibility of positing it as a level of invariance), but in the distribution of ‘u’ en ‘jij’ they differ considerably. All these choices have their bearing on the representation of Alice’s politeness, and on the way she may be said to perceive the ‘social order’ in her world: to some of the characters she is relatively more polite than to others, and the extent of her politeness also differs between translations.

The choices may be attributed to the view on the position of Alice in the text world to be constructed from *Alice*, that is, on the translational interpretation of that specific aspect. For our purposes, it would be counterproductive to consider such a shift constitutive, since not taking it into account would impede the establishment of the transla-
tional interpretation. The shifts may be constitutive from the linguistic point of view, but from the textual point of view it is justified to say that they do give an indication of the translational interpretation.

Theoretically speaking, one may assume that, as far as the other direction is concerned (Dutch text into English), the asymmetric relationship with respect to this feature does cause shifts to be constitutive, because it may be characterized as a many-to-one relationship. However, if a shift occurs in this direction, it is not likely to be a purely linguistic shift, but rather a textual one. Another complicated situation arises in the case of a systemic one-to-zero correspondence. The following example will show that, whenever a void tends to occur (relative to the number of possibilities) a solution is looked for elsewhere.

The example\textsuperscript{105} may be found in a comparison of several Dutch translations of the poem ‘En una noche oscura’ by the 16th century Spanish mystic poet San Juan de la Cruz (for the Spanish text cf. infra). The relevant incongruity in the relationship between the Spanish and Dutch languages in this case concerns the way in which gender is encoded. In Spanish it is possible to express the gender of a subject by declension of adjectives which may be semantically or pragmatically connected to the subject; in Dutch this is not possible. In the original poem the context of reference pertains to two lovers, a first person female lover (‘amada’), and her male counterpart (‘amado’). The identification of the first person lover’s gender mainly rests on the co-referentiality between pronouns and lexical items that are marked for gender; the pronouns themselves, however are not marked for gender. In the translations the lovers are referred to predominantly by means of first and third person singular pronouns, both occurring in subject as well as object positions. In Dutch, third person singular pronouns are marked with respect to gender and in the translations the third person lover can be unproblematically identified as male. First person singular pronouns, however, are not marked for gender, and consequently in all translations gender has to be identified either positively, by way of lexical items co-referential with the persona, or

\textsuperscript{105} The example is taken from an unpublished paper, presented at Las Palmas University (Koster 1994b).
negatively, in relation to the gender of the second lover. One of the striking differences, now, between the translations concerns the different strategies that are resorted to in order to express the gender difference between the lovers. None of the translations, obviously, uses gender-marked nouns and adjectives, which goes to show that all of them contain shifts with respect to this linguistic (morphologic) feature. Yet, there is a marked difference between the options chosen to overcome the systemic difference. Again, one might say, that from the linguistic point of view the shifts may be called constitutive, but the differences between the translations still give an indication of the translational interpretation that can be reconstructed from the target texts. In this case the interpretations centre around the question whether the consequences of the shifts lead to a context of reference that is primarily religious or one that is secular, and the question whether it is possible to read into the translations a homo-erotic dimension.

Both these examples confirm the statement that whether or not one can identify a shift very much depends on the level on which one posits the invariant. If one takes the linguistic level as the invariant, in both these cases one can establish local shifts that may be considered constitutive. If one takes a higher level invariant, however, an invariant pertaining to the textual function of a linguistic feature (in these cases ‘politeness’ and ‘gender’), the relevant target text linguistic item not necessarily has to be considered a constitutive shift, or for that matter, doesn’t even have to be considered a shift at all, that is, a substantial shift. This in itself may be taken as a justification for the decision to give priority to the question whether a shift is substantial or formal, over the question whether it is constitutive or individual.

**Shifts pertaining to the level of the literary systems**

One of the topics related to the translation of poetry on which is oftentimes reflected is the relationship between the various systems of versification. Jiří Levý, for instance, devotes several paragraphs of the second part of his classic *Die literarische Übersetzung* (1969: 188-198) to the differences between ‘nichtverwandten Verssystemen’, and Holmes touches upon the subject in his pioneering essay ‘Forms of Verse Translation and the Translation of Verse Forms’ (1969a [1988:...
There are several possible ways of describing the relationship between systems of versification and of describing the possibilities of translating features of one system into the other. Levý discusses four types of system that can be distinguished according to rhythmic-metric features. In quantitative verse syllables differ according to duration, rhythmical patterning is based on the alternation of long and short syllables. Characteristic for syllabic poetry is the amount of syllables in a line and the organization of stanzas according to patterns of equal length lines. In tonic verse, stress is the basic principle of organisation. Finally, syllabo-tonic verse rests on two features of patterning, amount of syllables and stress. Poetic texts from any of these systems may be translated with features of any of the other systems, although between some systems translation occurs more frequently than between others. In his (prospectively biased) considerations, Levý elaborates on the translation of quantitative verse into syllabo-tonic verse (for instance classical poetry into English, or Dutch) and creates a small paradigm of possible relationships: 1) retainment of metre, in which one has to account for the different ways the metre is realized, the principle of alternating syllable length is substituted by the principle of stress alternation, 2) adaptation to a metre that in the target poetic tradition is bound to the genre of the source text, and 3) translation into free verse.

Holmes looks at the subject from a slightly different angle and takes as his point of departure the form of a poem. His, historically oriented, design for a paradigm of possible solutions comprises four strategies\textsuperscript{106}: the form of the translation can be mimetic, in which case the original form is retained, it can be analogical in which case the function of the form within the source poetic tradition is retained, it can be content-derivative (or: organic), in which case the form of the translation is derived from the translation of the semantic material, or the form of the translation can be extraneous, a form that

\textsuperscript{106} Holmes also mentions a fifth possibility (poetry into prose) which he does not include in his typology.
is in no way implicit in either the form or the content of the original (1969a [1988]: 27).

With respect to the first possibility Holmes makes the reservation that since a verse form cannot exist outside language, it follows that no form can be ‘retained’ by the translator as he moves from a source language to his target language (ibid.: 25).

As a consequence he prefers to use the term ‘mimetic form’ instead of ‘identical form’.

Both these small paradigms may be considered, in a way, as small-scale descriptive apparatuses instrumental in the establishment of shifts with respect to a strictly defined tertium: verse form, or, in the case of Levy’s division, one specific aspect of it. Whether or not these paradigms are exhaustive (relative to their limited purpose) is not the point here107, but they are remarkably similar. One point of similarity is the way in which the differences between the systems, or traditions, of versification are treated. Both Holmes and Levy take these differences into account within the apparatus itself.

This mechanism may best be illustrated by the case of translations from classical poetry into modern Germanic languages. Both Greek and Roman poetry were written in quantitative verse, whereas the poetic systems of German, English and Dutch are syllabo-tonic. Unsurprisingly, given the fundamental difference between the two types of system, throughout history a wealth of literature has been devoted to the subject of the formal aspects of translating the classics, mainly from a prospective point of view. Levy takes it for an empirical fact that

107 Armin Paul Frank quite extensively elaborated on Holmes’s scheme in his contribution to the First James S Holmes Symposium on Translation Studies (Frank 1991).
beim Übersetzen des quantitierenden Verses in den syllabotonischen [...] meist in groben Zügen das metrische Schema des Originals bewahrt [wird], wobei man für die langen Silben betont und für die kurzen unbetont einsetzt (1969: 188).

The relevant question for my purpose is whether one has to assess such a strategy as a shift or not. Levý surely doesn’t do so, within his division of possibilities this option must be headed under the retention of the metrical scheme of the original. The difference in phonological realization of the recurrent metrical pattern does not come into it. The same goes for Holmes’s view that the mimetic form consists of

constructing German hexameters for Greek, or English terza rima for Italian (1969a [1988]: 26).

A quite paradoxical mechanism, then, can be discerned here: because a given difference between two systems is considered constitutive, it is already accounted for within the invariant of the comparison and therefore the actual translational choice is not considered a shift from the formal point of view. The question of whether a shift has to be considered constitutive or individual in that case becomes superfluous, because the change is not identified as a shift. Paradoxical though it may seem, this is not uncommon practice among translation describers. Toury, for instance, by distinguishing between a ‘strong’ and a ‘weak’ version of adequacy (in the early method) also proposes to account for the differences between systems within the invariant itself.

Again, this example shows that it is first and foremost the point of view of the describer, manifest in the invariant chosen, which determines whether or not the relationship pertaining between corresponding target and source textual elements constitutes a shift. In this particular case the point of view may be either on the phonological feature (the vocal cores of a syllable differ according to length or according to amount of stress), in which case the difference could be identified as a shift about which the question arises whether it is con-
stitutive or not, or on the metrical grid, irrespective of the way the metre is phonologically realized. Throughout history both positions have been taken, although nowadays it seems to be a matter of convention to adhere to the latter position, even from a single language perspective:

The classical approach to English metre takes as its fundamental unit the foot, a group of syllables each of which is defined as stressed or unstressed, matching the 'long' and 'short' of the classic originals (Attridge 1982: 6).

From the point of view of translation description this seems to be the most productive approach, since it enables one to compare the various systems in the first place. One has to bear in mind, however, that any such position should be justified theoretically in terms of the purpose of the comparative procedure.

**Shifts pertaining to the level of cultural systems**

An interesting phenomenon that may be used to exemplify the problems on this level is intertextuality. One may wonder, perhaps, whether this is a cultural phenomenon, and not, rather, a textual one. As we will see, however, it is also possible to describe this phenomenon according to the cultural environment the intertextual elements are part of.

For our purpose the most relevant concept is that of *specific* intertextuality, as opposed to *generic* intertextuality. The latter concept refers to those common features in texts that are characteristic of genres, whereas specific intertextuality occurs when the intertextual element refers to a specific, single text. As to the type of element, I will use the distinction between 'quotation' and 'allusion'. A quotation can be defined as a graphic repetition of elements from an architext in a fenotext, and an allusion as a non-graphic repetition of elements. The *fenotext* is the text at the beginning of the intertextual chain, that is: the text in which the element occurs that refers to another text. The text referred to will be called *architext*. The textual element that
functions as the signal of intertextuality is called the marker\textsuperscript{108}.

As to the relationships between architexts and fenotexts one can make a distinction between local and structural relationships. Ben-Porat (1976) makes this distinction in terms of the dichotomy between metaphoric and metonymic relationships. Feno- and architexts may be said to stand in a metaphoric relationship when

in terms of their fictional worlds [they have] no common elements, except for the marker (1976: 117),

whereas they may be said to stand in a metonymic relationship, when

many major elements which constitute the fictional world are common to both texts; [and] all those elements act as markers (ibid.).

Relevant for our purpose is the relationship between the translation and its original in their function as fenotext, and the possible differences in the way a textual element may serve as a marker. Whether or not an intertextual relationship between a feno- and an architext is actualized depends on the interplay between the explicitness of the marker, and the position (central or peripheral) of the architext within the reader's cultural environment\textsuperscript{109}. With respect to this final aspect, taking into account that both source and target texts act as fenotexts and that linguistic boundaries do not necessarily coincide with cultural boundaries, we may distinguish between four types of relationships with an architext: (1) relationships with architexts that have a peripheral position in the target culture but a central position in the source culture, (2) relationships with architexts that have a peripheral position in both target and source culture, (3) relationships

\textsuperscript{108} Terminology is taken from Claes 1988.

\textsuperscript{109} It goes without saying that from a pragmatic point of view, the encyclopaedic competence of a reader comes into it as well. If a marker is not recognized, no relationship can be established in the first place. However, since we are concerned here with the possibility of its establishment, rather than with the question whether or not it is actualized, we need not deal with this theoretical problem at this point.
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with architexts that have a central position in both target and source culture, and (4) relationships with architexts that have a central position in the target culture but a peripheral position in the source culture.

Taking this basic division as a point of departure, I will now look into some examples of translated allusions and quotations, involving both local and structural relationships. The first fenotext I will deal with is ‘Skunk Hour’, of which I will quote the original in full:

Skunk Hour
(For Elizabeth Bishop)

Nautilus Island’s hermit
heirress still lives through winter in her Spartan cottage;
her sheep still graze above the sea.
Her son’s a bishop. Her farmer
is first selectman in our village;
she’s in her dotage.

Thirsting for
the hierarchic privacy
of Queen Victoria’s century,
she buys up all
the eyesores facing her shore,
and lets them fall.

The season’s ill—
we’ve lost our summer millionaire,
who seemed to leap from an L.L. Bean
catalogue. His nine-knot yawl
was auctioned off to lobstermen.
A red fox stain covers Blue Hill.

110 This division pertains only to those cases in which an intertextual relationship can be discerned in both source and target texts. From a target oriented methodological point of view, however, one also has to provide for the possible occurrence of clear-cut additions or deletions (cf. Toury 1985: 26-27 and 1995: 81-84 on the study of metaphor in translation; and cf. also the next chapter). For the present argument these possibilities are not relevant.
And now our fairy
20  decorator brightens his shop for fall;
his fishnet's filled with orange cork,
orange, his cobbler's bench and awl;
there is no money in his work,
he'd rather marry.

25  One dark night,
my Tudor Ford climbed the hill's skull;
I watched for love-cars. Lights turned down,
they lay together, hull to hull,
where the graveyard shelves on the town....

30  My mind's not right.

A car radio bleats,
'Love, O careless Love....' I hear
my ill-spirit sob in each blood cell,
as if my hand were at its throat....

35  I myself am hell;
nobody's here-

only skunks, that search
in the moonlight for a bite to eat.
They march on their soles up Main Street:

40  white stripes, moonstruck eyes' red fire
under the chalk-dry and spar spire
of the Trinitarian Church.

I stand on top
of our back steps and breathe the rich air-

45  a mother skunk with her column of kittens swills
the garbage pail.
She jabs her wedge-head in a cup
of sour cream, drops her ostrich tail,
and will not scare.

In the penultimate line in the sixth stanza (l. 35) the poignant self-loathing of the persona reaches its climax when she (or he) reflects 'I
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myself am hell’. This line may be read as an allusion, a local one, to the fourth book of Milton’s *Paradise Lost*, the book in which Satan ‘falls into many doubts with himself, and many passions, fear, envy, and despair’ (*Paradise Lost*, Book IV, The Argument). The line in question, ‘Which way I fly is Hell; myself am Hell;’ (Book IV, l. 75) is from a passage in which Satan reflects on the impossibility of escaping his fate after his fall from Heaven. The allusion adds to the sense of inevitability pervading this stanza and also serves to locate the persona on the negative pole of traditional Christian values. In that sense it belongs to a paradigm of textual features relating to the religious dimensions of the text world, which also include the metaphor ‘the hill’s skull’ (l. 26) which links the scene of the fifth stanza to Golgotha, and the location of the seventh stanza (‘under ... the Trinitarian Church’).

The Dutch translation, by Jan Eijkelboom, of Lowell’s line runs ‘Zelf ben ik de hel’ (cf. Chapter 3 for the text of the translation), which structurally differs from the original in the sense that it uses a demonstrative pronoun (‘zelf’) where the original uses a reflexive pronoun, but semantically it has the same effect of highlighting the opposition between the persona and the ‘others’, between ‘self’ and ‘world’. In that sense, both lines also constitute an allusion to the existentialist motto ‘L’enfer, ce sont les autres’, from Sartre’s *Huis Clos*.

From our point of view, however, it is more interesting to look at the interplay between the relative explicitness of the lines as markers of intertextuality, and at the position of the architext in source and target culture. As to the explicitness of the source text line, one may rate it as high, because the line constitutes a near-quotation, and because both the architext and its author (‘a towering figure in English literature’ [Robson 1982: 239]) have a central position in the source culture\(^\text{111}\). With respect to the graphic representation of the architext

\(^\text{111}\) There is of course a marked difference between American and English literature. To a certain extent, however, it is justifiable to consider the canon of ‘pre-colonial’ English literature as part of the tradition of American culture, if only in terms of its position in the educational system, for instance by its presence in educational anthologies of literature published in the United
within the target fenotext, a shift has to be established because of the different linguistic code system used\textsuperscript{112}. In that respect the marker in the target text is less explicit, and the question remains what the position is of the architext within the target literary and cultural tradition. One way of measuring this position is by looking at the translational history of the architext within the target language.

We have to go back to as far as 1930 to find a comprehensive, authoritative study on the translations of Milton’s epic into Dutch (Niewenhous 1930); a study which still serves as the basis for the odd piece of contemporary criticism (Verhoeff 1990). As it turns out,

between the years 1728 and 1912 eight complete or partial translations of *Paradise Lost* appeared in Holland (Niewenhous 1930: 88).

Three of those were published in the eighteenth century, three in the nineteenth century, and one in the early twentieth century\textsuperscript{113}. This final translation was published for the first time in 1911, a reprint appeared 1912\textsuperscript{114}. It was the last translation of *Paradise Lost* to appear in the Netherlands. The early translations were well received, and played a significant role in Dutch literature, mainly because of its religious purport. The early translations

States.

\textsuperscript{112} Cf. Claes 1988: ‘Strictly speaking a translated quotation already is an allusion’ (106, my translation).

\textsuperscript{113} The missing one is a French translation that was published in The Hague in 1740.

\textsuperscript{114} The translation in question was made by Alex Gutteling and comprised the first six books only. After publishing them separately in the Dutch literary periodical *De Beweging*, they were published in a single volume by Uitgeverij De Wereldbibliotheek. Gutteling died in 1910 before he could finish his work, and it was continued by his mentor, the leading Dutch poet, critic and translator Albert Verwey. The latter’s translation of the final six books of *Paradise Lost* and of *Paradise Regained* were published in *De Beweging* (of which Verwey was the editor) in 1911-1913. Both Niewenhous and Verhoeff failed to notice these translations, which were never published in a separate volume.
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made an overwhelming impression on its first readers in Holland, for in the early eighteenth century admiration for an epic was still in proportion to the amount of learning it contained and *Paradise Lost* was esteemed a purely protestant biblical poem replete with knowledge of science and art as well as moral instruction (Niewenhouw 1930: 88).

The late nineteenth century translation, by the poet considered to be the epitome of Dutch nineteenth-century religious poetry, J.J.L. ten Kate, went to as many as seven editions.

The significance of *Paradise Lost* within Dutch literature, then, shifted from a relatively central position in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries to a peripheral position in the early twentieth century. As far as the post-war period is concerned, one may infer that it virtually has moved out of sight. As a consequence the recognizability of the marker decreases relative to that of the source fenotext. The Dutch translation, then, ‘Zelf ben ik de hel’, which semantically speaking does not constitute a shift, on the level of intertextuality, does constitute a shift. From the intratextual point of view, this shift may be considered truly constitutive, since it concerns the cultural tradition that is translated into. It might have been compensated for paratextually, however, as was done in the case of the German and Spanish translations of Lowell’s text, which both add footnotes to point to the allusion. The difference in paratextual strategy in this case may point to a difference in function of the anthologies. Both the Spanish and the German anthologies are bilingual editions with extensive annotations and introductory essays on Lowell’s life and work by the translators. Since the poems are selected from the entire oeuvre of Lowell, both serve as panoramic, representative anthologies. The Dutch anthology is a monolingual edition, containing only two footnotes and an essay on Lowell by the Dutch poet J. Bernlef that was originally conceived as an obituary for a Dutch weekly magazine, some seven years before the anthology was published. This anthology, in contradistinction to the German and Spanish ones, does not contain poetry from Lowell’s pre-confessional period. It serves less as a book representing the work of Lowell (even though on the cover of the book it claims to be just that), and more as a book testifying to the thematic kinship between
the translator/confessional poet Jan Eijkelboom and Robert Lowell.

An example of the second type of relationship between fenotexts and architext may be taken from the same poem, and concerns the structural relationship between Lowell’s ‘Skunk Hour’ and San Juan de la Cruz’s ‘En una noche oscura’, which I will quote here in full as well:

```
En una noche oscura
con ansias en amores inflamada
¡o dichosa ventura!
sali sin ser notada
5  estando ya mi casa sosegada.

ascuras y segura
por la secreta escala, disfraçada
¡o dichosa ventura!
a escuras y en celada
10  estando ya mi casa sosegada.

En la noche dischosa
en secreto que naide me veña
ni yo mirava cosa
sin otra luz y guía
15  sino la que en el corazón ardía.

Asquésta me guiava
más cierto que la luz de mediodía
adonde me esperava
quien yo bien me saviá
20  en parte donde naida parecía

¡O noche, que guiaste!
¡O noche amable más que la alborada!
¡O noche que juntaste
amado con amada,
25  amada en el amado transformada!

En mi pecho florido,
que entero para él solo se guardaba
```
The relationship between the two poems are structural, in the sense that one can find many lexical and thematic parallels between Lowell’s poem and San Juan’s (cf. Axelrod 1978: 128). The late night meeting of the lovers in their car, ‘they lay together, hull to hull’ (1. 28), may be considered an ironic parallel with the scene of the final three stanzas of the San Juan poem in which the lovers meet and unite, the isolation of the persona (‘nobody’s here [1. 36]) echoes the invisibility expressed in ‘salí sin ser notada’ (1. 4), the ‘back steps’ (1. 44) on which the persona finds herself back may be linked to the ‘secretá escala’ (1. 7). All the parallels serve to link the darkness surrounding the mystical union, as opposed to the light that shines from the heart burning with desire, with the darkness of the persona’s soul; the mystical experience is equalled to the hallucinatory experience of insanity, which is reflected in the spatio-temporal inconsistencies pervading the poem (cf. Koster 1994a: 160-161).

By far the most explicit link with San Juan’s poem is Lowell’s line ‘One dark night’ (1. 25), which may be considered a local allusion. The Dutch translation of this line runs ‘Op een donkere avond’. With respect to the position of San Juan’s text in the source and target culture one might say that it is similar: it is known, but not at the
centre of the predominantly protestant cultural heritage. In Dutch it has been translated frequently this century, in the United States it was made familiar by the psychological study of William James, *Varieties of Religious Experience*, which is also an authoritative source on the similarities between mystical experiences and madness. As to their explicitness as markers, then, both lines are comparable, and if a shift can be established it must be considered individual. As it turns out, the use of ‘avond’, for ‘night’ does constitute a shift relative to the invariant of intertextuality. The relationship between Dutch lexemes ‘avond’ en ‘nacht’ is comparable to the relationship between English ‘evening’ and ‘night’, that is, to the extent that the members of both pairs show the same overlap. ‘Avond’, however, cannot cover the time after midnight, and in the Dutch and English translations of San Juan’s poem, it is invariably translated as ‘nacht’ and ‘night’. The choice of ‘avond’, then, makes the function of this line as marker less explicit.

In the Spanish translation of ‘Skunk Hour’ the situation is entirely different, because within the Spanish culture the architext has the status of a canonized poem, it is a text central to the cultural heritage. In that sense, it is an example of the fourth type of relationship I distinguished earlier. As a result, the line ‘en una noche oscura’, in the Spanish translation, though semantically it does not constitute a shift, on the level of the intertextual relationships does constitute a shift, since the allusion has become an outright quotation. This shift, however, has to be considered constitutive. Unsurprisingly, in this case a difference occurs between the German and Spanish translations with regard to the paratextual level: the German translation has a footnote to point to the allusion in ‘In einer dunklen Nacht’, whereas the Spanish translation leaves the corresponding line uncommented.

It makes an important difference, then, with respect to the possibility of establishing a shift on this level, whether the position of the architext in source and target culture is in any way comparable. In the case of ‘transcultural’ relationships between feno- and architext, when the positions are comparable, any shift detected on this level is

For this term cf. (the prospectively biased) Leppihalme 1994: 179.
bound to be individual. This also holds for those cases that pertain to
the third type of relationship I distinguished above, the relationships
with architexts that have a central position in both source and target
culture. A typical example of this type of relationship would be an
allusion to the Bible. Every major western culture belonging to the
Judeo-Christian tradition has a long history of Bible translations, sev-
eral of which may belong to the canon of that culture. This makes it
possible to relate the target text to a target architext in the same way
as one can relate the source text to a source architext.

Levels of invariance: evaluation
It is apparent from the preceding considerations and examples that the
distinction between individual and constitutive shifts is indeed prob-
lematical. Only in connection to certain aspects of intertextuality did
we find some shifts to be constitutive, but these shifts were bound to
the relationship between the target text in its capacity as a fenotext
and an architext, and not to the relationship between the target and the
source text per se. On the levels of the linguistic and literary systems
we found that as soon as textual features were linked to textual func-
tions, it became problematical to decide whether what at first sight
seemed a constitutive shift could also be looked upon as an individual
shift.

The mechanism seems to be that the ‘lower’ one posits the level of
invariance - that is to say, the more one looks to the relationship be-
 tween the elements compared and their positions in the respective
code system(s) pertaining to them - the easier it becomes to decide
whether a shift established at that level may be considered constitu-
tive. But, if one looks at the functional relationships those elements
enter into with other elements of their co-text and context, the more
problematical it becomes to rule out the possibility of choice. And, as
we have seen, whenever there is the possibility of choice, a shift has
to be classified as individual.

The question then is whether there is any sense in applying the dis-
tinction at all. To be able to answer that question we have to look into
the purpose of the procedure the distinction has to be incorporated
into, and to the rationale of the typological distinctions in themselves.

One has to bear in mind that in describing the relationship between
From World to World

a target text and its corresponding source text it is always the highest, functional level which ultimately matters. Any lower level target text element always has to be considered with respect to its function in the target text as a whole. As we have seen, the difference between formal and substantial shifts precisely pertains to the distinction between lower and higher levels. As a consequence it seems wise to follow Van Leuven-Zwart’s procedure in giving priority to the question whether a shift is substantial over the question whether it is constitutive or individual.

The main aim of the typological distinctions discussed in this chapter (constitutive versus individual as well as formal versus substantial) is to enable one to distinguish between shifts that are not and shifts that are indicative of what one is looking for, be it in terms of translational norms, translational strategy or translational interpretation. If one gives priority to the distinction between formal and substantial shifts, and one only takes substantial shifts in consideration, than one only has to decide of those shifts whether they are constitutive or individual. Since substantiality is related to the higher levels, these shifts are more likely to be individual.

It may seem then, that the question of whether a shift is substantial or formal, makes the question whether a shift is constitutive or individual superfluous, but the complexity of the matter forbids that we take this as a rule. Rather it constitutes an interesting research topic. That topic is not at stake here, but it will be kept in mind in the remainder of this book.

Summary
In this chapter various types of translational shifts and various levels on which shifts can be located were examined. The point was made that a shift can only be defined relative to the invariant of the comparison instrumental in establishing it. A single textual element which may be considered a shift on one particular level, does not necessarily constitute a shift on another level. In the establishment of shifts, then, one should always explicitly state on which textual, linguistic or cultural level the invariant is posited.

I discussed three typological distinctions: obligatory vs. optional shifts, constitutive vs. individual shifts, and formal vs. substantial
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shifts. The latter distinction is posited to be the most important one, and I have defined substantial shifts in the context of this study as those shifts which have their bearing on the realization of the text world. I consider the distinction between optional and obligatory shifts as subordinate to the distinction between constitutive and individual. The question whether a shift is formal or substantial, however, has to be given priority over the question whether a shift is constitutive or individual, be it on the linguistic, textual or cultural level. Although the latter question has proven to be problematical, it will not be neglected altogether.