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Chapter 7

THE ARMAMENTARIUM

In positing the notion of ‘text world’ as a tertium, I have created the minimum condition for a comparison between a source and target text with respect to the translational interpretation that can be constructed from the target text. Obviously, in order to be able to describe the relationship between the texts on this point, I have to substantiate that notion, assign it its place within the armamentarium, and relate it to the levels of analysis relevant to my purpose. In doing so, I will gradually unfold the procedure for the comparative analysis of poetic discourse in translation. Throughout this chapter I will illustrate the methodological proposals with analyses involving the relationship between Robert Lowell’s ‘Skunk Hour’ and its Dutch translation ‘Uur van het stinkdier’. In the next chapter I will present a case study in essay form in which the armamentarium is put to use in a contextualized descriptive enterprise.

The analysis of text worlds
In Chapter 3 I have stated that interpretation takes place by creating plausible contexts from a text, by trying to attribute a degree of semantic and pragmatic coherence between textual elements. ‘Text world’ is a notion that may help to make explicit that coherence, in the sense that it may provide the terms in which coherence can be expressed.

As we have seen in Chapter 3 (‘The ideational level’), a text world may be said to consist of entities. As to a division of the kind of entities that may be distinguished, opinion differs\(^{128}\). There is sufficient agreement, however, to enable one to make a fairly uncontroversial division into discriminate text world elements. For my purpose I will borrow the main notions figuring in Werth (1994, 1995) as ‘world-building elements’:

\(^{128}\) Cf. also Chapter 3, note 48.
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The world-building elements designate the parameters of the textworld: its time, place, characters[129] and objects, and any relevant relationships between them (1994: 91).

These relationships may be made explicit in terms of the situation(s), whether static or dynamic (Lyons' second-order entities), pertaining to the elements[130].

An idealized representation of the process of interpretation would be that one proceeds by identifying expressions that refer to entities, by situating them spatio-temporally, by ascribing qualities or properties to that entities, and by establishing relationships between them. A text, then, can be analyzed in terms of the way in which textual elements may be linked to world-building elements, and to the relationships between them.

To a certain extent a fixed relationship may be posited between certain linguistic categories and the five elements functioning as analytic parameters. Definite noun phrases for instance, together with proper names and personal pronouns, in Dutch and English are typically used as singular definite referring expressions, which are linked to first-order entities. Werth (1995: 76-77) also establishes some links between certain parameters and grammatical categories: noun phrases ('of all structures and in any position') to entities, and specific types of adverbs or adverbial clauses to time and location. The scope and range of these relationships, however, is so broad that it is impossible to formalize their analysis in any meaningful way. I will address this issue in a later stage in terms of the units of comparison pertinent to the armamentarium.

[129] For my purposes, the description of poetic text worlds, I will replace this notion by that of 'subject', which may be helpful in justifying the special position of the persona relative to the text world.

[130] Werth also includes the category of 'assumptions' (a category which is, roughly speaking, equivalent to the notion of 'presupposition'), which I will ignore, because it can be made explicit in the description of the relations, and the subcategories of 'o/l: locative element, functioning as object', 'l/o: object, but with a locative function', and 'c/o: object functioning as character' (1994: 92), which may also be described in terms of the main category.
‘Text world’, to be sure, is a macrostructural notion. In that sense it covers the levels of semantics (partly) and pragmatics I posited as relevant at the end of the last chapter. Because of their link to the encompassing (in this procedure, that is) notion of text world, they stand out from the other levels of analysis, to the extent that they constitute the levels on which the effects of the shifts on the other levels are expressed. On the one hand this may be justified with reference to the hierarchy of instrumentality underlying the functional theory of language as conceived of by Leech and Halliday. It may also be justified with reference to the theory of the iconicity of the literary text, Lotman’s theory of the semanticization of formal elements (Lotman 1976, 1977). Because these are considered the top-most levels of analysis, they cannot be linked to a specific unit of comparison.

If I give these levels a place at the end of the process of description, I must ask myself in what way one may arrive at them. This question concerns the choice of directional orientation of the procedure: should it proceed bottom-up or top-down? Earlier I have stated that a rigid unidirectional conception of the relationship between microstructure and macrostructure runs counter to the principle manifest in the hermeneutic circle. In terms of part-whole relationships, interpretation always is a circular process. This circularity may be accounted for in the descriptive procedure by moving in both directions: from the macrostructural level, to the microstructural level, back again to the macrostructure.

Taking the macrostructural notion of text world as point of departure for the descriptive procedure has one important methodological consequence: the initial analysis necessarily is general and provisional. This does constitute a limitation as to the scope of the initial analysis, but that need not be a problem if one doesn’t stretch its methodological status beyond that limit.

Within the armamentarium the provisional analysis on the semantic and pragmatic levels takes place by means of the establishment of a pragmatic-semantic skeleton131.

131 This notion is loosely based on Lotman’s (pre-systematic) notion of ‘semantisches Skelett’ in the sense of a ‘Grundbedeutungsschema’ (Lotman 1986: 439; cf. also Koster 1994a: 155).
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The semantic-pragmatic skeleton
The first step in the procedure is directed, then, towards the identification in the text of expressions that can be linked to the analytic parameters of subject and object (the animate and inanimate physical objects inhabiting the text world), as well as time and location. In this initial, preliminary stage the identification necessarily takes place on an ad hoc basis, depending on the hierarchy of the entities with respect to their position in the text world. Even so, the analysis may be made explicit according to the different parameters.

One of the linguistic phenomena to be located on the interface between semantics and pragmatics is deixis. The relevance of this notion for our purpose lies in its interdependency with the notion of reference. It may be used as a trigger for the initial analysis, in the sense that the deictic aspects of a text may help to gain access to the world-building elements. Green 1995 distinguishes several categories of deixis, some of which may be considered relevant at this level of analysis: referential deixis, origo-deixis, and spatio-temporal deixis.

Referential deixis (to be found typically in noun phrases including demonstrative pronouns or the definite article) most directly links up with expressions referring to subjects and objects. Its analysis clearly must be linked to the analysis of descriptive reference.

Origo-deixis pertains to the interpersonal aspects of a text, or in my terms: to the situational dimension of the context of reference. It involves first and second person pronouns and vocatives. This aspect of deixis, then, most clearly links up with the position of the persona and may be analyzed in connection with the textual elements concerning poetic voice.

Spatio-temporal deixis (present in temporal and locative adverbs and adverbials, non-calendrical time units, and tense - when used deictically) pertains to the 'here' and 'now' relative to which the other world-building elements may be located. It may be expressed in terms of the relationship between on the one hand coding time and

132 He further distinguishes subjective deixis (primarily modality), discourse deixis (intratextual reference) and syntactic deixis (for instance the implicit inclusion of an addressee in the interrogative or imperative mode) (Green 1995: 21-22).
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coding place, the time and place at which the utterance is transmitted, and on the other hand content time and content place: the time(s) and place(s) to which the utterance refers (cf. Green 1992: 126-127)

I posited deixis as an analytical tool that may function as a trigger for the establishment of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton of a text. Although it is not to be considered the only relevant linguistic phenomenon, it may provide the frame of reference for the initial analysis. Sometimes the analysis of deixis will yield a wealth of information in itself. If we take for an example the first line of Brockway’s translation of Kopland’s ‘Een lege plek om te blijven’: ‘Go now into the garden dear, and lie’, we will see that almost every constituent has a deictic aspect to it. The imperatives ‘go’ and ‘lie’ are examples of syntactic deixis, ‘now’ is an example of spatio-temporal deixis, the definite referring expression ‘the garden’ of referential deixis, and the vocative ‘dear’ of origo-deixis. On the other hand, in Chapter 3, in discussing the first two stanza’s of Philip Larkin’s ‘Aubade’ we have seen that even if very few deictic elements occur, they still may be decisive in the interpretation of their co-text.

Next to the identification of the subjects and objects present in the text world, then, the first stage in the procedure consists of the identification of the deictic centre of the discourse, the zero-point relative to which the subjects and objects, place and time can be located. The following questions may be helpful in the identification of the aspects towards which the analysis at this stage is directed.

Which are the most important subjects (persons, animals, and animated, personified objects) and objects referred to? What are the most important relations between these text world elements?
The assessment of the hierarchy within the categories of entities may be expressed in terms of the centrality of the position in the text world, or, in the case of subjects, in terms of the degree of complete-

133 Usually these notions are dealt with in relation to the notion of receiving time and receiving place as well, but in our situation these are given as 1) the time and place of the production of the target text, and 2) the time and place of the production of the description, which all are to be accounted for as preliminary data.
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ness and individuation

In what way are the participant roles of sender and addressee represented in the text?
This question pertains to the situational dimension of the context of reference. It has been dealt with in extenso in Chapter 3. Subsequent questions concerning this point are:

- Is the persona explicitly present in the discourse, or is she merely present as a speaking voice?
- Does the persona describe a world outside herself, or is she included in the context of reference?
- Is there any form of direct address?
- Are there any first and second person personal pronouns (singular or plural)?
- Do vocatives occur in the text? Are there any interrogative or imperative sentences?

These questions mainly pertain to subjects and objects; the following questions involve the parameters of time and location:

How can the text world be located spatio-temporally?

- Relative to which ‘here’ and ‘now’, which deictic centre, can the text world be located?
- What is the relationship between coding time and content time and between coding place and content place?

With respect to location:

- What locative elements occur?
- What locative adverbs and adverbials?
- What objects having a locative function?
- What is the locative range? Is there a single location, or are there any locative shifts?

With respect to time:

134 On these terms cf. Ronen 1994.
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- What is the time span of the text world?
- What tenses are predominantly used?
- What temporal adverbs and adverbials occur?

With respect to the relationships between the parameters, the following question may be asked:

*In general, what situation pertains to the text world. Is it predominantly static or dynamic? What are the most important states, processes, actions or events? What is the text about?*

This question is the most general one, and in that sense perhaps the hardest to answer. It also is the one in which the interpretative moment seems most explicit. As we have seen in Chapter 6, it is impossible to avoid these moments. There is some formalization in the other questions, which should provide a descriptive framework for answering the final questions.

These questions do not pertain to discrete text parts: the information yielded by them will sometimes overlap. They must not be considered methodologically foolproof, in the sense that every question will be equally relevant in every instance of description and that they cover every possible aspect of analysis. They are questions guiding the analysis. The real work only begins after the questions have been answered. The relevant tools of the *armamentarium* in this stage are the analytic parameters in themselves, to which they can be related. At this stage of the procedure the analysis may also be directed at matters of structure.

Before dealing in more detail with the methodological status of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton, I will now, by way of example, present a fairly extensive one (because it is a rich poem) of ‘Uur van het stinkdier’, followed by a schematic representation of the most important world-building elements. For the reader’s convenience I will

---

135 In that sense their methodological status differs from the questions in Linn 1998. In that method the full weight of the method is entirely on the questions.
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once more quote both target and source text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch Text</th>
<th>English Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Uur van het stinkdier</strong> (voor Elizabeth Bishop)</td>
<td><strong>Skunk Hour</strong> <em>(For Elizabeth Bishop)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De rijke dame van Nautilus Eiland overwintert als kluizenaar in haar Spartaanse huisje; haar schapen grazen nog boven de zee. Haar zoon is bisschop. Haar pachter is raadslid in ons dorp, terwijl zij kindser wordt.</td>
<td>Nautilus Island's hermit heiress 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hongerend naar</strong> de hierarchie en rust van Victoria's tijd koopt zij alles wat stoot voor haar kust, en breekt het af.</td>
<td>Thirsting for the hierarchic privacy of Queen Victoria's century, she buys up all the eyesores facing her shore, and lets them fall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'t Seizoen is ziek – wij verloren onze zomermiljardair, die zo leek te komen uit een L.L. Bean-catalogus. Zijn snelle jacht werd bij opbod verkocht aan kreeftenvissers. Een rode vossevlek bedekt Blue Hill.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>En thans knapt onze nicht</strong> de decorateur zijn winkel op voor de herfst; zijn visnet met oranje kurken volgestouwd, zijn schoenlappersbank en els; zijn werk levert niets op, hij was liever getrouwd.</td>
<td>And now our fairy 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Op een donkere avond</strong> klom mijn oude Ford de schedel van de heuvel op; ik keek uit naar minnaars in auto's. Zij lagen romp naast romp in het donker, Waar het kerkhof helt naar de stad...</td>
<td>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....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijn geest is niet in orde.</td>
<td>My mind's not right.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Semantic-pragmatic skeleton ‘Uur van het stinkdier’

With respect to most of the analytic parameters, the poem can be divided into two halves. In the first four stanzas the reader is confronted with a fairly realistic landscape, inhabited by strange people, but still realistic. In the last four stanzas the tone seems to be that of realism too; here we get a view of the ‘naked ego’ of the persona, full of self-loathing. Yet, the landscape is anything but realistic; this holds for the geographical landscape as well as for the landscape of the persona’s mind. Both seem to have a somewhat hallucinatory character.

The first half of the poem consists of a description – all sentences in the poem, both in the first and the second half, are declaratives – of three inhabitants belonging to a single community: the rich lady from Nautilus Island, a summer millionaire, and a ‘fairy decorator’. The rich, aristocratic lady seems to own everything, given the abundance of possessive pronouns: ‘haar schapen’ (l. 3), ‘haar pachter’ (l. 4),
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‘haar kust’ (l. 11). Oddly enough, the prepositional construction in the first line suggests that she belongs to the island. Her economic position gives her a certain control over her environment, but she has no real control over herself: she is senile. Furthermore, she seems to be misplaced, out of time, for she longs for the aristocratic privileges of the Victorian age. The summer millionaire is as idiosyncratic a character as the rich lady. His appearance was that of a model in a catalogue for mail-order sporting goods. He is lost to the community, but it is not clear in what way: he might have died, or have lost his money. At any rate he is as much past his prime as the senile old woman. The fourth stanza is about a homosexual decorator, who is preparing his shop for the fall season, by turning workman’s tools into decorations. He knows his attempts are in vain, because there is no money to be made with his work. And although he is a homosexual, he would rather marry for the money.

As to the place where these subjects can be located, we have seen in Chapter 3 that a difference can be made between locative elements which may enable one to relate the text world to a specific geographical area in the extratextual (‘actual’) world: an out of season resort town in New England, and those locative elements which are related to objects in the text world: sea, coast, the house of the rich lady, the decorator’s shop, and so on.

At the beginning of the fifth stanza, a shift occurs in the orientation of the poem from present to past, and from outside to inside.

The first four stanzas are almost entirely set in the present tense, with the temporal adverb ‘thans’ (l. 19) establishing the deictic zero-point as the time span covering the end of the summer season. Only the lines about the summer millionaire are set in the past tense, but what counts most in these cases is the aspect of perfectivity. Within the stanza the sentences are embedded in the present tense clauses ‘t

136 For those who wish to play the biographical card in the coherence game, which in the case of Lowell’s confessional poetry may be quite a profitable one to play, the town may even be identified as Castine, Maine, very near Nautilus Island and Blue Hill, where Lowell regularly stayed for the summer during the period he worked on Life Studies, the collection in which ‘Skunk Hour’ was to be published.
Seizoen is ziek--' (l. 13) and 'Een rode vossevlek bedekt Blue Hill' (l. 18). Both these sentences stand out from the rest of the first half, to the extent they do not ascribe properties to any of the subjects, but express more general states.

In 'klom' (l. 26) a seemingly unmotivated shift occurs from the present tenses of the first half of the poem to the simple past tense. It seems as if the situation is suddenly transferred to the memory of 'een donkere avond' (l. 25), when the persona went watching for 'minnaars in auto's' (l. 27) near a graveyard. In the last line of the same stanza there is a shift back to the present tense ('helt' [l. 29]), and this situation remains for the rest of the poem. The inconsistency caused by the shift is exceedingly subtle, almost 'hidden'. The tense of 'helt' is a timeless present: it expresses a permanent, static situation, a state-of-the-world. In 'Mijn geest is niet in orde' (l. 30) it is not clear whether the tense expresses a temporary or permanent situation. In 'blaat' (l. 31), however, the nature of the present tense is completely different, it is an instantaneous present, which expresses an act taking place at the moment of speech, or thought. The remarkable thing, now, is that the location does not shift together with the tense. The first line of the sixth stanza ('Een autoradio blaat') implies that the persona is still near the 'minnaars in auto's' of the memory, but the nature of the tense of the finite verb is not in accordance with the memory of the previous stanza (which does not hold for the finite verbs in lines 28 and 29). 'Blaat' could still refer to the same temporal situation, when it is regarded as a kind of 'praesens historicum'. The persona would then focus more closely to the situation of the memory and report it as if he was experiencing it again. But in the last stanza there is a shift of location from the graveyard to 'onze achtertrap', while the tense remains the same. This would be explicitly coherent when the finite verb had been accompanied by a time adverbial (like 'nu') that would enable the reader to distinguish between two different temporal situations, between a 'praesens historicum' and an ordinary present. But there is no such time marker. The result is that past and present (as well as reality and appearance) get mixed up. The reason for this (almost literal) disorientation, emotionally as well as spiritually, is quite explicitly attributed to the persona's state of mind: 'Mijn geest is niet in orde' (l. 30). The spatio-temporal inconsistenc-
cies have rendered the deictic centre unreliable. When the fully deictic locative adverb ‘hier’ (l. 36) is used, one can no longer be sure where to locate the centre.

The shift from outside to inside concerns the position of the persona within the text world. In the first four stanzas the persona is only implicitly present in the possessive forms of the first person plural; there is a discrepancy so to speak between the context of utterance and the context of reference. This discrepancy is dissolved in the second half of the poem, in which, as his presence becomes manifest in the use of the first person singular, the persona becomes the centre of the context of reference. The relative instability of the persona’s position in the text world points to a certain ambivalence in the relationship between the persona and the outside world. On the one hand he sees himself as completely isolated: ‘Zelf ben ik de hel; niemand is hier’ (l. 35-6) (self as opposed to other), but on the other hand he also has a sense of belonging to communities that imply a varying degree of intimacy: ‘ons dorp’ (l. 5) and even ‘ons achtertrap’ (l. 44).

In the fifth and sixth stanzas the hallucinatory landscape of the persona’s mind is very much at the centre of attention. The ‘donkere avond’ of the past to which the reader is directed is a dark one indeed. The self-reflection of the voyeuristic persona culminates in an acute sense of self-loathing. Love immediately links up with death, lovers’ lane is situated near a graveyard. The sound of a love song mingles with the sound of utter despair: ‘Een autoradio blaat/ “Love, o careless love...” Ik hoor/ mijn boze geest snikken in iedere bloedcel’ (l. 31-3). The sound of despair originates from the inner core of the persona’s being. ‘Bloedcel’ here may be said to reflect the sense of inescapability the persona has about the situation, which, however, is abruptly dissolved with the appearance of the skunks in the penultimate stanza.

The finality of the dash at the end of the sixth stanza once more constitutes a sudden transition, this time from inside back to outside. The persona’s perception is no longer directed towards his inner self, but to the outside world. The skunks can be considered highly individuated subjects, representing an ambivalent position. On the one hand they represent life and survival, for they are ‘op zoek/ in het maanlicht naar een hap voer’ (l. 37-8), whereas the persona is preoc-
cupied by death. The skunks also represent life in the sense that they are a family, a community: ‘een moederstinkdier met haar rij jongen’ (l. 45). In that respect they can be regarded as a metaphor for the continuation of love by a kind of natural, uncomplicated ‘careless’ love that procreates life, as against the persona’s idea of a love that procreates death. On the other hand they may be regarded as a source of identification. Just as the persona, only in a more literal way, they live on garbage. They show that the digestion of garbage also may mean survival, may be productive.

The confrontation with the skunks points to the synecdochal nature of the persona’s perception. He only sees those parts that can be projected onto himself, the lunar association (‘de maan slaat rood vuur uit hun ogen’ [l. 40]) can be transferred to his own lunacy, his madness. Yet, the appearance of the skunks brings about a certain convergence between inside and outside. In the first two lines of the final stanza, the singular and plural forms of the first person pronouns are combined. The origo-deixis in ‘Onze achtertrap’ presupposes the existence of a family, of an intimate social community to which the persona belongs, just as the skunks. The strong deictic nature of these lines is not only due to the origo-deixis, but also to the spatio-temporal deixis. Particularly the deictic nature of the present tense in ‘sta’ re-establishes the stability of the deictic centre. This passage is also the first one in which the persona is associated with a positive connotation: ‘Ik sta bovenaan’ (l. 43). In the final lines the behaviour of the mother skunk brings about a certain restoration of self-assurance. Eventually, she sees no need to defend herself, she will not be scared by the persona’s presence.

SUBJECTS: rich lady, summer millionaire, decorator, persona, lovers in cars, skunks

OBJECTS: cars, garbage pail; (see also under locations)

LOCATIONS: text world location: New England resort town within text world: island, sea, coast, rich lady’s house, shop, hill, near graveyard, Main Street, near church, back stairs near house
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TIME:
- end of summer; unspecified past; temporal inconsistencies; time sequence: present-past-present;
- dynamic relation between content and coding time;
- unreliable deictic centre

THEMATIC RELATIONS:
- present against past; inside against outside; persona’s state of mind; spatio-temporal disorientation; madness; relation persona-skunks; love against death; self against world;

Methodological function of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton

Within the circular motion from macrostructure to microstructure and back, the semantic-pragmatic skeleton serves as a provisional description of the text world, which, as we have seen, must be considered a macrostructural notion. Methodologically speaking, the function of the skeleton is twofold. Firstly, as a provisional description, it has to function as a frame of reference for the analysis of the translational relationships on the microstructural level. On the one hand, the function of the microstructural elements is to be expressed in terms of the way they contribute to the text world pertinent to them, and the results of the provisional analysis may serve to provide the means for that operation. On the other hand, the skeleton itself is the basis for a further analysis of both target and source text world, of a more detailed description in terms of the various world-building elements.

This brings me to the second function of the skeleton: that of a comprehensive, initial tertium. Since the skeleton has to be relatable to both text worlds, in order to enable one to gauge the differences between the way the microstructural elements of the source text relate to the source text world and the way the microstructural elements of the target text relate to the target text world, one has to make sure that the elements figuring in the semantic-pragmatic skeleton can serve as an invariant of the comparison. This makes acute the question as to which text should be initially analysed to establish the skeleton. In principle one might suggest that, since it should serve as a tertium it is no matter of great import which text should be the trigger of its establishment. If the procedure is to first analyse one of the texts, and then check the other text to see if it is applicable to that one as well, it
should make no difference whether one takes the source or target text as initial object of analysis. However, because it is eventually the target text world which is the main object of investigation, the target text world should be the object of the initial, provisional analysis. Still, this is not as straightforward as it may seem. One has to account, in establishing whether the skeleton may function as an initial tertium, for a certain margin of non-invariance at some level, and hence for the possibility of manipulation in order to make it function that way.

Take, for instance, the phrase ‘minnaars in auto’s’ from the skeleton of ‘Uur van het stinkdier’, which corresponds to ‘love-cars’ in the source text. At several levels the target text element of this pair clearly constitutes a shift. Though both elements are noun phrases, the source element is a compound noun, whereas the target element is a complex phrase consisting of a head postmodified by a prepositional phrase which in its turn has a noun as its head. A more substantial difference concerns their status as world-building elements, a difference which can be noted when one compiles a list of noun phrases in subject positions which is ordered according to world-building element. The head of the source element is characterized by its inanimateness, and should therefore count as an object, whereas ‘minnaars’ can be counted as subjects. But since within both text worlds the very distinction between animateness and inanimateness is questioned by the persona’s projective perception, there still is sufficient semantic correspondence between the component parts of the phrases, for the element to have a place in the skeleton. The shift itself can be discussed on the level of rhetorical means, as a shift from a metonym to a non-metonym.

One has to account, however, for the impossibility of establishing a level of invariance that may be sufficient to justify the incorporation of an element into the semantic-pragmatic skeleton. The justification

137 Normally speaking, it would be wise to put the semantic-pragmatic skeleton in a language other than that of the source text (preferably the target language, since that text is at the centre of attention); within the context of this book, however, for obvious reasons, it is not possible to apply that principle in any satisfactory way.
of the example just mentioned also involves its position in the hierarchy of world-building elements, which is relatively low. If a shift from one type of element to another (in this case from object to subject) should occur on a higher order element, let’s say the persona, it should be accounted for within the framework of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton itself. Either by manipulating the skeleton to make it serve as an invariant, by trying to find hyponyms that can be relatable to both source and target elements (much in the same way as within the model of Van Leuven-Zwart the architransememe is established), or by establishing a substantial shift in this preliminary stage, that has to be evaluated instantly. Still, theoretically speaking, there must be a point beyond which such a manipulative move no longer can be justified. In that case one would encounter the limit of the possibilities of this procedure, and the comparison would fail to yield a useful result.

The other levels of analysis: lexis and syntax

With respect to the other levels of analysis I have posited as potentially relevant – lexis, syntax, prosody, rhetorical means and intertextuality – a distinction has to be made according to the way they relate to the dichotomy microstructure-macrostructure. Only the first two levels may be said to pertain to the microstructure only, whereas the other three relate to the macrostructure in a more direct way. In that sense, the relevant units of comparison on the levels of syntax and lexis may also be employed as units of comparison for the other levels of analysis. The analyses on these levels may provide the tools for the analysis on the other ones. As a consequence they should be analyzed before the other three.

Several units of comparison may be relevant with respect to the analysis on these levels. As we have seen in Chapter 6, potential units as to the level of lexis are the word in its lexemic status, paralexemes and any possible set of semantically related (para)lexemes. As to the level of syntax, any grammatical unit higher than the word, up to and including the sentence may be a potential unit of comparison.

In principle it would be possible to analyse both texts with respect to these units, relate the units to their function in the text they belong to and compare them. This, however, is not going to be very useful in every instance of comparison. The relevance of a specific unit is de-
dependent on its importance relative to the findings of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton, and to a certain extent has to be established *ad hoc*. There are however some analytical efforts that may be more productive *per se* in gaining access to the relevant features, and that may therefore be undertaken in every instance of description.

It seems wise to start the analysis with respect to these levels with a grammatical unit that may be attributed an intermediary position between word and (sub)clause or sentence: the phrase. In the process of establishing a level of invariance one might then easily move upwards or downwards if necessary. Each text, then, may be broken down into the constituent parts of noun phrase, verb phrase, adjective phrase, adverb phrase and prepositional phrase\(^\text{138}\). Each of these phrases may be marked according to its syntactic function and to the world-building element to which it pertains. In conjunction with these lists, a sure way of gaining access to lexical patterns is to break the text down according to the distinction between lexical and grammatical words, and to subdivide the lexical words further into nouns, adjectives, adverbs and verbs. There will be a certain overlap between the inventories, but this may also be looked upon as an advantage, since it will make it easier to move from one level to another.

In principle these lists constitute the tools of the comparative effort. The lists yielded by such an inventory can be mapped onto each other to establish the differences and similarities between them or between corresponding items, and to establish the extent to which any possible shift has its bearing on the target text world. If necessary, or relevant, the lists can be further broken down according to any relevant criterion, in terms of the way the items they contain contribute to the realization of the text world. In the case of noun phrases, for instance, it may be useful to make lists of those noun phrases which occupy a subject or an object position or according to the type of head: noun, pronoun or adjective. And verb phrases may be marked with respect to tense and aspect, which is always relevant in relation to the element of time, but it may also be relevant to mark them with

\(^{138}\) Obviously this list will contain overlaps in the sense that it is very likely that phrases will occur within phrases. Since any level may be relevant, it seems wise to list them all.
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respect to voice and transitivity. However, no general rule or instruction can be given for this analysis beyond the possible relationship with world-building elements.

Within the scope of this study, it is not necessary to try to establish any formalized procedure for the analysis on these levels beyond the establishment of the lists mentioned above. For the analysis of the lists themselves I refer to existing checklists that might prove to be useful: Leech and Short 1981 (75-82), the most extensive one, and Fowler 1981 (40-44)\(^\text{139}\).

In order to get an idea of the way a comparison on these levels may work and the way the establishment of shifts takes place, let us look at some examples from our sample texts. If we take from our ad hoc repertory the pronouns with specific reference from both texts, the following inventory is the result:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uur van het Stinkdier’</th>
<th>‘Skunk Hour’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>possessive pronouns</strong></td>
<td><strong>possessive pronouns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: haar (2); haar (3); haar (4); haar (5); ons (5)</td>
<td>I: her (2); her (3); her (4); her (4); our (5); her (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: haar (11)</td>
<td>II: her (11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III: onze (14); zijn (16)</td>
<td>III: our (14); his (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV: onze (19); zijn (20); zijn (21); zijn (22); zijn (23)</td>
<td>IV: our (19); his (20); his (21); his (22); his (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V: mijn (26); mijn (30)</td>
<td>V: my (26); my (30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI: mijn (33); mijn (34); zijn (34)</td>
<td>VI: my (33); my (34); its (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII: hun (39); hun (40)</td>
<td>VII: their (39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII: onze (44); haar (45); haar (46); haar (47)</td>
<td>VIII: our (44); her (45); her (46); her (47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{139}\) These checklists or analytical inventories are compiled from a monolingual perspective. They still might be useful in a bilingual context, but may have to be modified at certain points.
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By comparing the two lists one can make an inventory of the differences and similarities on the grounds of which one can establish potential shifts. Only after linking the items to their broader co-text, it is possible to see whether a potential shift can be considered a substantial shift, or whether in both texts the world-building elements (or their attributes, properties or relations) may be said to correspond.

In the paragraph on the semantic-pragmatic skeleton I stated that there is ambivalence in the relationship between the persona and the outside world, and that one aspect of its position concerned the sense of belonging to communities implying a varying degree of intimacy, which was attributed to certain noun phrases premodifed by the first person plural possessive pronoun. If we derive from the above list, and from the list with the noun phrases, the entire paradigm of these noun phrases, we can see that concerning this point no substantial
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Shifts occur, because as far as this aspect is concerned both text worlds relate to the semantic-pragmatic skeleton in the same way:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uur van het Stinkdier’</th>
<th>‘Skunk Hour’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ons dorp (5)</td>
<td>our village (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze zomermiljonair (14)</td>
<td>our summer millionaire (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze nicht de decorateur (19-20)</td>
<td>our fairy decorator (19-20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze achtertrap (44)</td>
<td>our back steps (44)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the lists of possessive pronouns we can see that the third person possessive pronoun female in the sixth line of the original has a zero correspondence in the translation. As the relevant co-text in this case we can take the clause in which it occurs, which may be compared to the corresponding clause in the target text:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uur van het Stinkdier’</th>
<th>‘Skunk Hour’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terwijl zij kindser wordt (6)¹⁴⁰</td>
<td>she’s in her dotage (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the source text the noun phrase in which the pronoun functions as a premodifier constitutes the climax of a pattern in the first stanza:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uur van het Stinkdier’</th>
<th>‘Skunk Hour’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haar Spartaanse huisje (2)</td>
<td>her Spartan cottage (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haar schapen (3)</td>
<td>her sheep (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haar zoon (4)</td>
<td>her son (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haar pachter (5)</td>
<td>her farmer (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ø</td>
<td>her dotage (6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁴⁰ The use of the conjunction ‘terwijl’, as well as the replacement of the stative copula ‘be’ (denoting a [temporary] state in this context) by the dynamic auxiliary ‘worden’ (denoting a process in this context) can both be considered shifts. But since they are shifts relative to another invariant, they need not be dealt with at this point. It does show, however, that a comparison at one level may be helpful in finding other relevant levels of comparison.
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The possessives relate the old aristocratic lady to her property (animate and inanimate), to someone with which she has a family relationship and to someone with which she has an economic relationship. The effect of abundant use of the possessives is to attribute to her a position of power, of control. In the original, in the final line of the first stanza, exactly the opposite is the case: ‘her dotage’ refers to the phase of life in which one loses control of oneself. The repetition of the pronoun has a profoundly ironic ring to it. Because of the zero translation a shift has to be established with respect to this element of irony. The question, however, is whether the shift has to be considered substantial, that is, whether it affects the function of the subject within the text world. Since the effect of the irony is local rather than structural, and the antithesis between control and loss of control is still present in the target text clause, the subject of the old lady within the target text still contributes to the sense of incongruity which may be linked to the persona’s projective way of perceiving. With respect to that aspect of the text world, then, it does not constitute a substantial shift. As a consequence, the question whether or not it could be classified as an obligatory shift need not be addressed.

The list of personal pronouns is mainly relevant as a subset of the lists with noun phrases in subject positions; with the exception of ‘them’ in the second stanza all the personal pronouns function as subjects:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uur van het Stinkdier’</th>
<th>‘Skunk Hour’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>subject positions</strong></td>
<td><strong>subject positions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I: De rijke dame van Nautilus</td>
<td>I: Nautilus Island’s hermit heiress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eiland (1)</td>
<td>(1-2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haar schapen (3)</td>
<td>her sheep (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haar zoon (4)</td>
<td>her son (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>haar pachtter (4)</td>
<td>her farmer (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zij (6)</td>
<td>she (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II: zij (10)</td>
<td>II: she (10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ‘Uur van het Stinkdier’

**subject positions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'t seizoen (13)</td>
<td>onze niet de decorateur (19-20)</td>
<td>mijn oude Ford (26)</td>
<td>Een autoradio (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wij (14)</td>
<td>zijn visnet (21)</td>
<td>ik (28)</td>
<td>ik (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zijn snelle jacht (16)</td>
<td>zijn werk (23)</td>
<td>zij (28)</td>
<td>mijn boze geest (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Een rode vossevlek (18)</td>
<td>hij (24)</td>
<td>het kerkhof (29)</td>
<td>mijn hand (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ‘Skunk Hour’

**subject positions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>IV</th>
<th>V</th>
<th>VI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>¿the season? (13)</td>
<td>our fairy decorator (19-20)</td>
<td>my Tudor Ford (26)</td>
<td>A car radio (31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>we (14)</td>
<td>his fishnet (21)</td>
<td>I (27)</td>
<td>I (32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>his nine-knot yawl (16)</td>
<td>there (23)</td>
<td>they (28)</td>
<td>¿my ill-spirit? (33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a red fox stain (18)</td>
<td>he (24)</td>
<td>the graveyard (29)</td>
<td>my hand (34)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

141 The question marks indicate that the inclusion of the item in this form is open to discussion. In this case, ‘The season’s ill’ is ambiguous between a noun phrase and a clause, due to the ambiguity of ‘’s’ between a genitive and the contracted form of ‘is’. The ambiguity is inherent to the linguistic system, but it is also textual: the ‘’s’ occurs no less than 9 times in the text (ll. 1, 4, 5, 9, 21, 22, 26, 30, 36) in both functions. In this case, if one interprets the entire line as a noun phrase with ‘ill’ as its head, the line would count as an elliptic clause and would not be included in the list. In that case a potential shift would have to be established.

142 ‘Ill-spirit’ is ambiguous between a noun functioning as a subject linking up with the finite verb phrase ‘sob’ and an adjective phrase functioning as a premodifier to the noun phrase head ‘sob’.
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From a list like this it is relatively easy to compile a corresponding list according to world-building elements, which can then be combined with other lists that may render semantically and stylistically relevant information that can be linked to the way in which in both texts the text world is realized, for instance the kind of verbs with which the subjects link up:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'Uur van het stinkdier'</th>
<th>'Skunk Hour'</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>subject + verb (selection)</strong></td>
<td><strong>subject + verb (selection)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Persona:</strong></td>
<td><strong>persona:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mijn oude Ford (26) + klimmen</td>
<td>my Tudor Ford (26) + to climb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik (28) + uitkijken naar</td>
<td>I (27) + to watch for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mijn geest (30) + zijn</td>
<td>my mind (30) + to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik (32) + horen</td>
<td>I (32) + to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mijn boze geest (33) + snikken</td>
<td>¿my ill-spirit (33) + to sob?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mijn hand (34) + omsluiten (+ irrealis)</td>
<td>my hand (34) + to be at (+ irrealis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik (35) + zijn</td>
<td>I (35) + to be</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>niemand (36) + zijn</td>
<td>¿nobody (36) + to be?(^{143})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik (43) + staan</td>
<td>I (43) + to stand + to breathe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik (44) + inademen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stinkdieren:</strong></td>
<td><strong>skunks:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stinkdieren (37) + [op zoek zijn]</td>
<td>skunks (37) + to search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ze (39) + lopen</td>
<td>they (39) + march</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Een moederstinkdier met haar rij jongen (45) + legen</td>
<td>a mother skunk with her column of kittens (45) + to swill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ze (46) + stoten + strijken + laten aanjagen (negation)</td>
<td>she (46) + to jab + to drop + will scare (negation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these lists several striking features may be derived concerning the relation between the persona and the skunks. Of the verbs linking up with grammatical subjects referring to the persona (nine in the target text, ten in the source text), only two are activity verbs. One of those does not predicate an expression that refers to the persona itself, but an expression that refers to an attribute ('my Tudor Ford', which

\(^{143}\) 'Nobody' may also be interpreted as a noun instead of a pronoun, in which case it is co-referential with the preceding 'I'. The interpretation of the line then runs that not only nobody else is there, but that the one who is there is a nobody. Although in Dutch, on the system level, 'niemand' cannot be designated as a noun, but only as an indefinite pronoun, in this construction it is made to function as a noun. In that sense no shift can be established in this instance. The normal grammatical structure would be: 'Er is niemand hier'.
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forms a subparadigm with ‘my mind’, ¿my ill-spirit? and ‘my hand’, just as ‘mijn oude Ford’ with ‘mijn geest’, ‘mijn boze geest’ en ‘mijn hand’). The activity of the agent is transferred to the instrument; the clause contains a metonymy (cf. infra). The only action the persona can be accounted for directly is his voyeuristic behaviour. Most of the verbs denote either states (the copulas) or events, in which the persona is not an agent. In contradistinction, the subjects referring to the skunks, both in target and source text, predominantly link up with activity verbs in the simple present. The only exception to this pattern is the final line:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uur van het stinkdier’</th>
<th>‘Skunk Hour’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[zij] laat zich geen schrik aanjagen (48)</td>
<td>and [she] will not scare (48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pertinent difference between the verbs in this case concerns transitivity and voice. ‘Aanjagen’ is a transitive verb, and should therefore take an object. In this construction, however, with the auxiliary ‘laten’ (which is obligatory reflexive with a verbal complement), the infinitive gets a passive meaning. The object, in this case, is suppressed, is made implicit, but in this context it can only be an expression referring to the persona (the phrase ‘door mij’). The verb ‘to scare’ can be used both transitive, in which case it means ‘to frighten’ and intransitive, in which case the meaning would be the passive ‘to become frightened’. Being intransitive in this context, the second meaning would be the more obvious one. However, it is also possible to interpret the verb as being used transitively, having its place in the pattern of active verbs, in which case the suppressed direct object would have to be a noun phrase referring to the persona. The final situation in the source text world, then, would be one in which persona and mother skunk do not frighten each other: a precarious balance between inside and outside, in which the skunks represent both the outside world and the persona’s projection of the outside world’s views. The combination of the modal ‘will’, in this context expressing a confident assumption about a future event, and the syntactically ambiguous verb, in the source text, implies the possibility of a restora-
tion of the persona’s self-confidence and position within the outside world, rather than outside of it. Because of the choice of a syntactically unambiguous construction, within the target text world, in the end the focus is more on the persona’s effect on the mother skunks, rather than on the effect of the skunk on the persona. As to this aspect, a substantial shift can be noted which profoundly influences the way the relationship between the text world subjects is represented.

The level of lexis is the one most suited to link to the analysis of the context of culture. As I have stated in Chapter 3, this was one of the two aspects of the context of reference deserving of special attention. From the lists of lexical words, it is possible to draw up sets of lexical items which are source culture-specific (source text and target text) and; if present, of items which are target culture-specific (target text). From the shifts that may result from a comparison of these lists, one may note whether the dominant strategy is one of naturalization or exoticization, and whether the general tendency towards one of those has its bearing on the text world144.

An interesting lexical feature of the texts is, as we have seen in Chapter 3, the paradigm of animal references (which I quote here with the phrase in which they are included; the animal names are in italics):

---

144 For an illustration I refer to the analysis at the end of Chapter 3.
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According to Fein 'like the heiress and her sheep, the millionaire selling his boat to lobstermen, and the decorator's use of fishing equipment, the poet [sic] has his own animal through which we can come to understand him' (Fein 1979: 83). Whether or not we can come to understand the position in the text world of the 'summer millionaire' by the lobstermen, may be a matter of contention, but the list does show us that in order to try to understand the position of the persona in the text world we have to understand the relationship between the persona and the skunks, and what they stand for. Fein’s remark, to be sure, concerns the source text, but as we can see from the list it holds for the target text as well. In both text worlds this lexical feature is present in the same way.

To finish up this paragraph on the analytical levels of lexis and syntax, let me briefly summarize this part of the procedure. As potentially relevant units of comparison I have posited, as far as the lexical level is concerned: lexeme, paralexeme, and the possible sets of semantically related (para)lexemes, and as far as the level of syntax is concerned: any grammatical unit higher than the word, up to and including the sentence. With respect to lexis, a necessary step is to break down the text in words, which can be listed according to the division between lexical and grammatical words; lexical words can be further divided into nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs. With re-
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spect to syntax, a necessary step is to break the text down into phrases (noun phrases, verb phrases, adjective phrases, adverbials, prepositional phrases). The items on the resulting list can be marked with respect to the world-building element they pertain to, and in the case of the grammatical units, according to syntactic function. The lists constitute the tools employed in the comparative analysis of both text worlds. The lists can be further broken down according to any relevant criterion or level of invariance; possible relevance can be determined *ad hoc* on the grounds of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton. Any two lists (or separate items on a list) of a pair should be mapped onto each other in order to establish the differences and similarities between them, and to establish potential shifts relative to the pertinent *tertium*. The question as to whether a shift is substantial can only be answered after an assessment of the way the two items contribute to the realization of the text world to which they pertain, that is: of their textual function relative to the *tertium* of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton.

The additional levels of analysis

Of the additional levels of analysis posited at the end of Chapter 6 prosody and intertextuality have all been dealt with in some form and to some extent in the earlier chapters. It will suffice here to briefly sum up some of the theoretical points concerning the status of these levels as ‘problem-restricted’ areas of study. The level of rhetorical means will be discussed in some length in a separate paragraph. Each level on the repertory in itself is initially posited as a comprehensive unit of comparison, a specific aspect of textual analysis. In order to be able to perform a comparison, one would need a specific theory of that aspect, in principle any theory, on the grounds of which the text can be broken down into discriminate parts. The comparison of the lists yielded by these analyses works in the same way as sketched above. The lists themselves are based on a level of invariance relative to which shifts may be established, but any item on a list should be described in terms of its function within the larger whole it is part of, before the actual establishment can take place.

Due to their status as ‘problem-restricted’ areas of study, it is also possible to take each level as an object of study in itself. The only
condition to be fulfilled with respect to the purpose posited here is that one still would need the semantic-pragmatic skeleton to be able to relate the results of any such analysis to, in order to be able to express the shifts in terms of their effect on the realization of the text world. Needless to say, the scope of such an analysis would be limited, though it might still be useful for certain purposes.

**The additional levels of analysis: prosody**

Under the heading 'prosody' those aspects of analysis can be dealt with which are related to the typographical aspects of poetry as a discourse genre, and to the phonological level of analysis. Without making too fine a point about the possibility of distinguishing between text types (cf. also Chapter 3), the elements dealt with on this level include poetic form, stanzaic segmentation, enjambment, rhyme and sound, and rhythm and metre.

The relevant unit of comparison for the aspect of poetic form is the entire text and includes such features as typographical organization, number of lines etc.; stanzaic segmentation may be considered a sub-category of poetic form. Rhyme and sound comprise the phonological patterning as an aspect of analysis; rhythm and metre have been dealt with to some extent in Chapter 5 ('Shifts pertaining to the level of literary systems'). Some comprehensive studies which may be helpful in the analysis of this level are Leech 1969, Ludwig 1990 and Bronzwaer 1993.

About the extent to which shifts established with respect to these aspects can be substantial in terms of our purpose, no generalizations can be made beyond the principle of iconicity. As to our mini-corpus, one may say that the translator’s decision not to retain the end-rhyme (just as in the German, which only makes occasional use of it, and Spanish translations) is of no influence, since the effect of the rhyme pattern in this instance bears no direct relationship to the text world. The opposite is the case with the metrical-rhythmical patterning. Taking this prosodic aspect for an invariant one may note a substantial shift with respect to the function of the alternation between metrical and nonmetrical passages in the poem.

Throughout the source text purely metrical passages are alternated with non-metrical passages. For instance line 3 ‘her sheep still gráze
above the séa' is a iambic tetrameter, with an ametrical second foot, whereas '[I hear] my ill-spirit sób in each blöod cell' (l. 33) is a clearly non-metrical line in which the rhythm is dictated by the string of heavy stresses. The pattern seems to be that in the first four stanzas the metrical passages are dominant, while the fifth and the sixth stanzas are dominated by non-metrical passages, where in the last two stanzas the regularity once again prevails. The effect of this alternation is highly significant. In passages where there is a more or less regular alternation of stressed and unstressed syllables, the tone is obviously much calmer than in the passages dominated by the heavy stresses. The part in the poem where the heavy stresses occur most frequently is the part in which the persona suffers the burden of his madness most intensely. The most important effect however is in the return to a calmer tone in the two final stanzas. In the target text metrical passages are also alternated with non-metrical passages, but here the alternation does not serve the same purpose. A metrical analysis of passages in the fifth and sixth stanza of the target text have the following results: 'óp een dónkere ávond/ klóm mijn Fórd de schédel van de héuvel óp; [...] Mijn géest is niet in órde' (25-26, 30) and '[...] Ik höor/ mijn bóze géest snikken in iedere blóedcel,/ alsóf mijn hánd om zijn kéel slóot.../ Zélf bén ik de hél' (32-35). One can see that in these passages there are about as many stressed syllables as unstressed ones. Within the source text, the stress pattern may be said to be iconic of the persona's state of mind, an effect that is not present in the target text on this level.

The additional levels of analysis: intertextuality

Much of what can be said of the description of this aspect, has been said in Chapter 5 ('Shifts pertaining to the level of the cultural systems'), in which it also has been exemplified with reference to our sample texts. I will limit myself in this paragraph to a short survey of the concepts that may be used for a comparison of this level.

As to the type of intertextual element, a distinction may be made 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{145}.

As to the way in which the types of relationships with an architext
may be described a distinction can be made between: (1) relationships
with architexts that have a peripheral position in the target culture but
a central position in the source culture, (2) relationships with ar-
chiperts that have a peripheral position in both target and source cul-
ture, (3) relationships 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 posi-
tion in the source culture. On this level shifts may be noted which are
due to the difference in position, but due to the target-oriented reper-
tory principle of analysing both texts with respect to this feature, one
also may note additions or deletions.

The additional levels of analysis: rhetorical means
Within the framework adopted here, all that is needed in order to be
able to describe the relationships between source and target text on
this level is a theory of rhetoric. In principle any theory that has the
potential to yield discreet units of comparison will do. It has to be
practicable, it has to provide for a way of identifying rhetorical fea-
tures in a text as well as for the terms in which to describe them.
There is no lack of such theories, but not all fit in well with my pur-
poses. One might, for instance, take the exhaustive apparatus of
Lausberg, a comprehensive enumeration of almost any trope and fig-
ure ever thought of and describe translational relationships in those
terms. There have been studies in which the relationship between a
target text and its corresponding source has been described solely in
terms of rhetoric (Zwaneveld 1995\textsuperscript{146}), but for my purposes this will
not do because interference would occur with the other levels of

\textsuperscript{145} As stated in Chapter 5, these terms are taken from Claes 1988. Another
descriptively useful study on this subject is Broich & Pfister 1985.

\textsuperscript{146} This kind of approach seems particularly attractive when the focus is on
pre-nineteenth century translation. Zwaneveld bases her approach on Rener
(1989), who describes the entire translation process in terms of rhetoric.
analysis. I will seek recourse to a theory of a more limited scope (Rice & Schofer 1983), but of great descriptive richness. The basic semantic categories employed in Rice and Schofer’s descriptive apparatus also fit in nicely with my approach.

They focus mainly on four basic tropes: metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche and irony. Point of departure is the conception of a trope as the

semantic transposition from a sign in praesentia to a sign or signs in absentia and (1) based on the perception of a relationship between one or more semantic features of each signified, (2) marked by the semantic incompatibility of microcontext and the macrocontext\(^{147}\), (3) motivated by a referential relationship of resemblance or causality or inclusion or opposition (Rice and Schofer 1983: 19).

They then go on to define metaphor as the trope that is

characterized by a semantic and referential relationship of resemblance made possible by the possession of one or more common semantic features (ibid.: 21),

metonymy as a trope characterized by a

relationship of causality made possible by the category of semantic features (ibid.: 24),

and synecdoche as a trope characterized by

a relationship of inclusion made possible by the fact that one of the signifieds is also a semantic feature of the other signified (ibid.: 28).\(^{148}\)

\(^{147}\) ‘The microcontext is the segment of the signifying chain which the trope occupies; in the case of one-word tropes, it would be the sign in praesentia itself. The macrocontext includes those parts of the signifying chain necessary for the determination of the sign in absentia’ (ibid.: 19).

\(^{148}\) I find the inclusion of irony in this scheme somewhat unconvincing, because irony is defined as ‘not semantically marked, because there is no incompatibility between microcontext and immediate macrocontext’ (ibid.: 31).
For my purposes, there are two considerable advantages to the approach of Rice & Schofer. Firstly, their conceptualization of the operators involved in the process of establishing tropes is quite satisfying from a descriptive point of view. They describe the tropical operation a reader performs as follows:

Confronted with a sign (S') in a text in the form of a signifier whose signified(s) [which consist of a series of semantic features (x₁, x₂, ..., xₙ); my addition, CK] is (are) incompatible with the signifieds immediately surrounding it, the reader, using the textual and extratextual information at his disposal, seeks a second sign (S") whose signified can resolve the incompatibility. Whether they are lexical, conceptual or cultural in origin, these semantic features form the intermediary (I) which permit the association between S' and S" (ibid.: 21).

If one is able to establish the operators involved in the operation (S', S", and I) the instruments for description and, at a later stage, comparison are there.

The second advantage of Rice & Schofer's scheme lies in their elaborate subclassification of the three basic tropes. As to metaphor they distinguish between: 'pure' metaphor, unmotivated identification, motivated identification, unmotivated comparison, and motivated comparison. The differences between the concepts lie in the explicitness of the operators. In the case of a 'pure metaphor', only S' is present, as in 'my flame' for 'my love'. In a case of motivated identification, either I and S' are explicitly present, as in 'My ardent (I) flame (S')', or all three operators, as in 'My love (S"), ardent (I) flame (S')'; in a case of unmotivated identification only the signs are explicitly present, as in 'My love (S"), flame (S')'. In an unmotivated comparison both S' and S" are present ('My love is like a flame'), whereas in a motivated comparison again all three operators are made explicit ('My love burns like a flame').

Metonymy is not defined in the traditional way as a relationship of contiguity between signs, but rather in terms of the concept of causality. The main difference in comparison with a metaphor is that in

---

I will not take it into consideration here.

149 All examples in this paragraph are taken from Rice & Schofer.
metonymy the two signs involved remain ‘separate and distinct’ (ibid.: 25). The relationship between both signs can be defined as a metonymy when one of the semantic features of S' belongs to ‘the general category of causality’ (ibid.). The general category is expressed in terms of causation, production and action, and the relationships between the signs may be a relationship of cause-effect, of producer-product, of agent-instrument, of agent-action or of instrument-action. Taking into account that S' may have either an active or a passive role, Rice & Schofer arrive at the following subclassification of metonymical relationships:

- cause for effect (‘I recognized Venus and her fearful effects’: the goddess for the emotion she controls),
- effect for cause (‘O my son! O my joy!’: the emotion for its source)
- instrument for agent (‘The clarinets forgot to come in’: musical instruments for the people who play them),
- instrument for action (‘He has a delicate brush’: the painter’s brush for his manner of painting),
- action for instrument (‘Vengeance in his hand’: the act of vengeance for sword),
- agent for action (‘He pulled a Houdini’: The magician for the act he performed),
- action for agent (‘There is beautiful Helen, the infamy of the Greeks’: the crime for the criminal),
- producer for produced (‘Take out your César’: the author for his work),

and

- produced for producer (‘Computers lose 10 points on Wall Street’: product for the company).

Synecdoche differs from metaphor and metonymy in that there is no separate intermediary:
because one of the signifieds is also a semantic feature of the other, the intermediary is simply that signified as semantic feature (ibid.: 28).

Since they define the synecdochal relationship as one of inclusion, not only the traditional part-whole relationship is headed under this term, but also the container-contained relationship. Rice & Schofer arrive at the following subclassification of synecdoche:

physical (or: spatial) synecdoche’s:

- physical part for the whole (‘head for body’),
- physical attribute for the whole (‘black for Negro’),
- object or physical attribute for possessor (‘crown for king’),
- material or physical attribute for object (‘steel for sword’),
- container for contained (‘Paris for Parisians’);

categorical (or: abstract) synecdoche’s:

- attribute for possessor (‘youth for young people’),
- singular for plural (‘man for men’),
- species for genus (‘lion for all animals’),
- genus for species (‘animal for bear’), and
- common name for proper name (‘the Trojan for Aeneas’).

As stated before, in the general paragraph on the additional levels of analysis, the analytical category itself may function as a comprehensive unit of comparison: one may compile lists of the tropes found in the texts. The establishment of the lists takes place in terms of the operators involved in the establishment of the tropes. Each item on the list may then be taken as point of departure of a more detailed comparison that is centred around the operators involved in that specific item and the textual function of that item, that is, the way it contributes to the realization of the text world.

By way of illustration let us look at some of the possible lists that can be made during a comparison of our sample texts concerning this feature. In looking at the metonyms and synecdoche’s functioning to
highlight the perception of the persona the following semantically corresponding passages are relevant:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘Uur van het stinkdier’</th>
<th>‘Skunk Hour’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>klom mijn oude Ford de schedel van de heuvel op (26)</td>
<td>my Tudor Ford climbed the hill’s skull (26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ik keek uit naar minnaars in auto’s/ Zij lagen romp naast romp in het donker (27-28)</td>
<td>I watched for love-cars. Lights turned down, they lay together, hull to hull (27-28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the second pair I already noted (cf. supra, ‘Methodological function of the semantic-pragmatic skeleton’) that a shift from metonym to non-metonym can be established. The effect of the shift from the object in the compound ‘love-cars’, in which the head is inanimate, to the ‘noun + preposition + noun’-type phrase ‘minnaars in auto’s’, in which the head is animate, is profound. Both in the original poem and the translation, the phrases are co-referential with the plural third person personal pronouns, ‘they’ and ‘zij’ respectively. In the original the consequence is that the sexual connotation in ‘they lay’ is transferred entirely to the object, which is reinforced even more by the use of ‘hull’, which is contextually restricted to objects. One may also look upon this transference as a transference of agency from a subject to an object. In the translation the text is in this respect is less marked: ‘zij’ may refer to both ‘minnaars’ and ‘auto’s’; syntactically speaking the closest antecedent (‘auto’s’) is the most likely, but semantically speaking ‘minnaars’ is the more obvious candidate, the more so because of the combination with ‘lagen’. There is no doubt, then, that the local effect (let’s say, within the stanza) of the shift is profound. Whether it can be noted down as a substantial shift, depends on its influence on the text world as a whole. And to be able to answer that question, one has to relate it to possible other shifts relatable to the same textual feature. The first pair on the list is an example of a correspondence on the levels of both semantics and rhetoric. Both in ‘klom mijn oude Ford’ and ‘My Tudor Ford climbed’ there is a transference of agency from a subject (the driver of a car) to an object (the car); in the terms of Rice & Schofer this would go down as a transfer-
ence from agent to instrument. In both text worlds, then, the projective perception of the persona is present, but in the source text world it is more compelling – on this level, that is. A full examination would involve an analysis of the ad hoc textual feature of agency in general, and the particular point of view of the persona.

**Translational interpretation ‘Uur van het stinkdier’**

Although the examples in this chapter do not constitute a full-fledged case study\(^{150}\), I still want to attempt, also by way of illustration, at the end of this chapter, to make some tentative concluding remarks on the view on the text world of ‘Skunk Hour’ that can be constructed from the pattern of choices emerging from the relationships obtaining between ‘Uur van het stinkdier’ en ‘Skunk Hour’.

In Chapter 5 I noted a marked difference between the anthology in which the Dutch translation of ‘Skunk Hour’ was published and the German and Spanish anthologies. The Dutch anthology (*Dolfijn en zeemeermin*; Lowell 1984) was monolingual and did not contain any poems from Lowell’s pre-confessional period. Eijkelboom’s career as a poet more or less runs parallel with his career as a translator. He published his first collection of poetry in 1979, at the age of 51. His first separate collection of verse translation was the 1982 Yeats selection *Geef nooit het hele hart* (cf. Chapter 2). From that time on he has published six volumes of poetry and sixteen volumes of poetry translations (mostly anthologies of works by poets from English speaking cultures). At the time of publication of *Dolfijn en zeemeermin*, Eijkelboom had published two collections of his own poetry, in which he had proved himself to be somewhat of a confessional poet; that is, if you define a confessional poem as a

> dramatic monologue in which the *persona* is [a] naked ego involved in a very personal world and with particular, private experiences (A.R. Jones, quoted from Perloff 1973: 192).

Most of the poetry of Eijkelboom of that period is purely anecdotal. The selection of poems translated in Eijkelboom’s Lowell collection,
then, may point to a kinship in poetics, the pattern of choices to a specific view on how a particular confessional poem may turn out.

The pattern seems to be that the level of the anecdote, ‘the private experience’ has been accentuated, rather than the poetical subtext. Although it has been possible to establish a fairly extensive pragmatic-semantic skeleton, which points to a fairly close correspondence on that level, the several shifts I noted point towards a less complex text world in the target text, particularly with respect to the relationship between the skunks and the persona. In the source text world, ambivalence between a socially and a poetically affirmative role of the skunks prevails, whereas in the target text world the socially affirmative role seems to be dominant. The ambiguity I noted in the final line of the source text (who frightens who) allows for a reading in which the persona identifies with the skunks, in which the persona finds affirmation of the self. Apart from the anecdotal reading there is also room for a poetical reading, in which the skunks show the poet the productivity of swilling the garbage pail of his own life, of creating art out of the turmoil of his (lost) mind, of making poetry out of the anecdotes of a private life.

To be sure, this final explanation is highly speculative, but not unfounded. Since the aim of the description in this chapter has been purely illustrative, it has not been as comprehensive as it could have been. Still, the explanation itself may serve as an illustration of the possibilities of contextualizing the description of the relationship between a single target and source text. In the next chapter I will present a fully contextualized case study on the translations by the German poet Paul Celan of some of William Shakespeare’s sonnets. In the ninth chapter, I will finish this book with some concluding, evaluative remarks.