

“Turning the Telescope the Other Way Round”:

A *Reflexive* Case Study

Martin Boyd
Glendon College
York University
martinb@yorku.ca

In her article “Translation Studies, Ethnography and the Production of Knowledge”, H el ene Buzelin calls for more *reflexive* studies of the translation process. The basic idea of a *reflexive* analysis is one in which the translator turns the focus of analysis on herself, rather than the text, which has been the traditional focus in translation theory. The exclusion of the translator from translation analysis is symptomatic of most traditional approaches to translation studies, typified by the attitude of Gideon Toury, who dismisses critical formulations made by translators as merely “extra-textual” sources, which are “partial and biased, and should therefore be treated with every possible circumspection” (Toury 1995: 207). My purpose with this paper is to respond to Buzelin’s call for more *reflexive* studies with an analysis of my own translation of the book *El revuelo de la serpiente: Quetzalc otl resucitado* by Mexican academic Jos e Luis D iaz. In this paper, I consider some of the limitations of traditional, linguistics-based approaches by applying just such an approach to my own translation. In doing so, I hope to demonstrate that the most valuable contribution to the analysis of any given translation can be provided by the translator herself.

Keywords: reflexive analysis, conflict of subjectivities, translator agency, norms, cultural turn

1 Introduction

“... [T]he formation of norms depends on a complex process, which, to be understood, must be apprehended from the point of view of the agent or, more exactly, of the agents, involved.” (Buzelin 2007: 51)

In her article “Translation Studies, Ethnography and the Production of Knowledge”, H el ene Buzelin makes reference to the very limited number of *reflexive* analyses of the translation process carried out to date. Buzelin develops a definition of this *reflexive* approach drawing from the transformation of anthropology in the post-colonial era, with the adoption of a methodology that called upon the anthropologist to “turn the telescope the other way round”, to consider the investigator as an object of study (Douglas 1995: 24). The application of this concept to translation studies could be interpreted in two

ways: on the one hand, it might refer to turning the telescope away from the translated text (the traditional focus in translation studies) and onto the translator and other agents involved in producing it; on the other, it could refer to the creation of “observational reciprocity” (ibid. 24), that is, that translation scholars share control of the telescope with translators, who in many theoretical models are treated as mere components of a system in a manner analogous to the way European anthropologists treated their objects of study in colonial times. Buzelin cites a number of studies which she describes as genuinely *reflexive*, including Suzanne Jill Levine’s *The Subversive Scribe* (1991), or Buzelin’s own analysis (2004) of her translation of Samuel Selvon’s novel *The Lonely Londoners*. She suggests that what these studies have revealed is the “constitutive role played by the ‘conflict of subjectivities’” (Buzelin 2007: 52), the interplay between the different agents in the translation process. My purpose in this study is to offer my own small contribution to this short but growing list of *reflexive* studies, with an analysis of the factors that influenced my translation of *El revuelo de la serpiente: Quetzalcóatl resucitado* (translated as *The Whirling of the Serpent: Quetzalcoatl Resurrected*) by Mexican academic José Luis Díaz¹.

My decision to take a *reflexive* approach to the analysis of my own translation is based on my personal view of the translator as primary agent, at the very heart of the translation process, making deliberate and deliberated decisions based on her own subjective interpretation of the source text, of the target audience, and of translation itself. As such, *the perspective of the translator should be an essential consideration in determining the norms that influenced any given translation.*

2 Literature review

The above assertion may seem obvious to some, but in fact it is a notion that is relatively new to translation studies, being largely absent from theory drawing on the formalist, linguistics and semiotics-based approaches that have dominated translation studies until quite recently. Gideon Toury, for example, asserts that the translated text must be

¹ Jose Luis Díaz’s book consists of a series of essays exploring how the myth of Quetzalcoatl, the plumed serpent of the pre-Hispanic Mexicans, has become a recurring motif in Mexican history, and has played a significant role in the construction of the Mexican nation.

considered the *primary* source for identifying norm-regulated behaviour, while critical formulations or statements made by translators are merely “extra-textual” sources, which “are partial and biased, and should therefore be treated with every possible circumspection” (Toury 1995: 207). I would argue that Toury’s dismissive attitude towards the point of view of the translator underestimates both the ability of translators to reflect objectively on their own work, and the subjective nature of textual analysis, as it would be naive to assume that any analysis of a translation could possibly be free of the kind of partiality and bias that Toury ascribes to “extra-textual” sources.

Toury’s view is reflective of what Buzelin refers to as “the cult of the text” (Buzelin 2007: 55), the traditional paradigm in translation theory that focuses on the translated text “to the exclusion of people and their material environments” (Cronin 2003: 66). The view has been challenged in recent years, particularly in light of the so-called “cultural turn” in translation studies, represented by authors like André Lefevre, Susan Bassnet, and Lawrence Venuti, marking a shift in focus from the text to “the whole language and culture in which that text was constituted” (Trivedi 2007: 280). The encounter with cultural studies has propelled translation studies beyond the limitations of applied linguistics to which J.C. Catford circumscribed it with his landmark “linguistic theory of translation” in 1965. It is evident that Toury’s work has also been affected by the “cultural turn”; as Daniel Simeoni notes, in comparing Toury’s *In Search of Translation* (1980) with his later and better known *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond* (1995), a clear shift can be observed towards a more sociological outlook, and in the latter work Toury makes a point of specifying that translation activities need to be regarded as “having cultural significance” (Simeoni 2007: 19). But in spite of such concessions, Toury’s concept of Descriptive Translation Studies, which remains a major influence on translation theory today, is clearly based on a formalist, text-centred perspective (ibid. 15).

I do not wish to undervalue Toury’s considerable contribution to the development of translation studies. On the contrary, it is beyond dispute that Toury’s application of polysystem theory to translation studies, and particularly his introduction of the concept of translation norms (conceived as sociocultural constraints on the translation process), in many respects paved the way for the “cultural turn” in the discipline. But I also believe

that there are serious problems with his assertion of the primacy of textual analysis in identifying such norms, because any analysis of a translation that is not supported by the perspective of the primary agent of that particular translation – i.e. the translator – can only result in a jigsaw puzzle missing various pieces; pieces which, as Buzelin suggests, are essential to understanding the translation process but “which do not appear directly in the finished project” (Buzelin 2007: 51). My intention with this study is to illustrate some of the limitations of Toury’s model of descriptive textual analysis by applying just such an approach to one of my own translations. But first, I will offer a few brief comments about that translation and the different agents involved in its production.

3 A Self-Reflexive Study

3.1 The Translation Project

The book *El revuelo de la serpiente* by José Luis Díaz was published by Herder Publications in Mexico in 2006. The year after its publication, the author, for whom I had translated several articles for academic journals, gave me a copy of the book and asked me whether I would be interested in translating it. The book is a kind of biography of the many lives of the Aztec god Quetzalcoatl, the Plumed Serpent, examining how this ancient myth has reasserted itself over the course of Mexican history, from its pre-Hispanic origins to its significant role in the construction of the modern Mexican nation. I was at once drawn to the book for what it had to offer English-speaking readers: an insight into Mexican culture, about which most English speakers still know very little beyond the simplistic and often harmful stereotypes filtered to them through the US media.

In speaking of the different agents participating in the translation process, Buzelin uses the term “conflict of subjectivities”, a phrase drawn from Gillian Lane-Mercier’s reflexive study on the project to re-translate William Faulkner’s *The Hamlet* by the GRETI (Groupe de recherche en traductologie) at McGill University. In a group project like the GRETI, the “pluralité de sujets traduisants” produces an obvious conflict of subjectivities. Yet the concept is equally valid – although in different ways – for translation projects involving a single “sujet traduisant”.

In the case of the translation of *El revuelo de la serpiente*, I have identified four agents who participated in the process. I locate my position in the middle of this

particular encounter of subjectivities; this is not to suggest that translators are always necessarily positioned as central agent, but in this case my involvement extended beyond that of carrying out the translation itself, as I also played an active role in seeking a publisher and funding for the project. As such, I was the primary point of contact for the other three agents, the one through whom their perspectives were largely channelled.

As for my own perspective, I view my role as translator as being an advocate for the source culture in the target culture. My approach to translating is succinctly captured in Gayatri Spivak’s notion of translation as “the most intimate act of reading” and of the translator’s need to “surrender to the text” (Spivak 1993: 183). Such intimacy requires a sensitivity on the part of the translator to what Lawrence Venuti calls the inevitable “ethnocentric violence” of translation (Venuti 1995: 310), a violence which I believe the translator has an ethical responsibility to compensate for by giving careful attention to the ways target culture readers may construe the source culture through the translated text. This perspective stands in sharp contrast to more traditional metaphors for translation, such as George Steiner’s notion that the translator “invades, extracts and brings home” (Steiner: 2004: 194) in the manner of a plundering Viking.

The agent who initiated this project was the author, who initially hired me to translate the book with a view to publishing selected chapters in North American academic journals. Having worked for several years at Harvard, the author is fluent in English and so was in a position to be able to review the translated text closely and make comments and suggestions for changes. Although the author had great faith in my ability and rarely questioned my decisions, his participation in the process had the effect of augmenting my sense of loyalty to the source text. In this sense, in Toury’s terms, the initial norms I adopted for this project gave clear priority to “adequacy” over “acceptability”.

However, this priority was mitigated considerably by the entry of the publisher into the project. In early 2008, I proposed the publication of the translation to Antares Publishing House of Spanish Culture, a small publishing house based at York University’s Glendon College dedicated to the publication of works in Spanish, as well as English and French translations of works by Hispanic authors, under the direction of Margarita Feliciano. Antares agreed to publish the translation subject to receipt of a grant

from the Mexican government, which we applied for in September 2008. By the time Antares came on board, I had already completed the first draft of the translation and had begun proofreading. The entry of this agent suddenly redirected my focus onto the importance of the translation’s “acceptability” (again, employing Toury’s terminology), and the involvement of the editor in the final review of the text provoked a series of “conflicts, tensions and negotiations” (Buzelin 2007: 52), which were further complicated by the fact that the author also continued to participate in reviewing and commenting on the revised translation. In these negotiations, I had to choose my battles carefully, conceding to some changes I deemed less important in order to give me the bargaining power to reject others that I felt would seriously compromise the “adequacy” of the translation. In the negotiations on text changes with the publisher, I often positioned myself as advocate for the author, the source text and source culture, in opposition to the perspective of the publishers, who was heavily oriented towards what they perceived to be the needs of the target culture reader.

Hovering in the background of these negotiations was another agent, without whom the translation would never have been published. The Fondo Nacional para la Cultura y las Artes (FONCA), the Mexican government’s council for the promotion of arts and culture in Mexico and abroad, sponsored the publication with their PROTRAD grant for translations of Mexican works into foreign languages. In her article “Revealing the Soul of Which Nation?” Luise von Flotow identifies initiatives like PROTRAD as efforts at “cultural diplomacy” or what is more cynically referred to as “nation branding”, a form of cultural policy which “seeks to attract attention and pays attention to the image, reputation and attitude a country may present” (Flotow 2007: 194). Although they did not participate directly in the translation process, my awareness of the Mexican government’s investment in this project as an event in “cultural diplomacy” informed my revision of the translation, prompting a re-reading of the source text in terms of its representation of Mexican identity. In the text, evidence of this influence is perhaps most clearly visible in the translator’s footnotes. No footnotes were present in the original text, but the publisher requested that I add some footnotes to clarify certain cultural references that might be unfamiliar to North American readers. I was given considerable freedom to choose the cultural references I felt required explication, and both my choices and my manner of

explicating them reflect what I would like English speakers to know about Mexican culture.

3.2 Textual Analysis

For the purposes of my descriptive textual analysis, my definition of norms is drawn from Toury, who describes them as “socio-cultural constraints” (Toury 1995: 54) that “determine the (type and extent of) equivalence manifested by actual translations” (ibid. 61). According to Toury, the degree to which a translation is subjected to the norms of source or target culture will determine its degree of “adequacy” (conformity to source-culture norms) or “acceptability” (conformity to target-culture norms). In order to identify the priorities of the translator in this respect, Toury posits a method of comparison of source and target text that involves the use of a “*hypothetical entity* constructable on the basis of a systemic (textemic) analysis of the ST” which is to be used as “*the invariant of the comparison* (i.e. as a *tertium comparationis*)” (Toury 1980: 49). This *tertium comparationis* is essentially the “maximal norm of adequate translation” (Baker and Saldanha 2008: 272), a hypothetical translation in complete conformity to source culture norms, against which the actual translation can be compared to identify the influence of target-culture norms in the translation process.

As Edwin Gentzler points out, this notion of the *tertium comparationis* seems to contradict Toury’s own claim that no translation can ever be wholly adequate “to the source text because of the new cultural context in which it finds itself” (Gentzler 1993: 131). In practical terms, given that the *tertium comparationis* is itself a translation, its value as an “invariant of comparison” is necessarily negated by the fact that it is just as subjectively determined and historically conditioned as any other translation. The problems associated with this concept, which is evidently based on Catford’s equally problematic notion of the existence of “formal correspondence” between linguistic systems (Catford 1965: 73), reveals fundamental flaws in Toury’s adequacy/acceptability opposition. One of these problems is illustrated in the sample discussed below.

3.2.1 Sample Passage

For the purposes of this study, I randomly chose eight passages from the translation for analysis. The sample passage shown below (Table 1) is taken from the chapter on the King of Tula, considered to be one of the incarnations of the god Quetzalcoatl in pre-

Columbian history. The passage recounts the story of the King’s downfall, when he is dressed up in eagle’s feathers by priests of the rival god Tezcatlipoca, who seduce him into taking part in a drunken orgy.

The first of two shifts (or departures from the *tertium comparationis*) in this passage is semantic, related to the word *pulque*, which is an alcoholic beverage made from the Mexican maguey plant. For the purposes of understanding the passage, what is important about *pulque* is that it is intoxicating, and so I chose to explicate the meaning by adding the qualifier “intoxicating” and modifying the verb “savour” to “drink”, to make it clear to the reader that pulque is an intoxicating beverage without interrupting the flow of the narrative. The fact that *pulque* has no English equivalent raises questions about how to represent it in the *tertium comparationis*, as the same information conveyed by the one word in Spanish can only be conveyed through the use of a circumlocution like the one shown in the table. Ironically, my choice to use the Spanish word in the translation could thus be viewed as a significant departure from “formal correspondence” with the source text, in spite of the fact I have rendered the word verbatim.

Source Text Passage	“Alegoría casi literal de una serpiente emplumada, el rey complace en su disfraz y consiente en saborear el pulque que le ofrecen los seductores magos.” (p. 30)
<i>Tertium Comparationis</i>	[Almost literal allegory] [of a serpent plumed], [the king] [pleases] [in his costume] and [consents to savour] [the viscous alcoholic beverage made from the fermented sap of the maguey plant] [that to-him] [offer] [the wizard seducers.]
Target Text Passage	“An almost literal allegory of a plumed serpent, the king <u>took</u> pleasure in his costume and <u>agreed to drink</u> the <u>intoxicating pulque</u> offered to him by the seducing wizards.” (p. 23)

Table 1. Sample passage for textual analysis (shifts are underlined)

The other shift is a grammatical shift: as shown in the *tertium comparationis*, the source text uses the present tense to narrate this event. While in Spanish, both historical events and mythological tales can be recounted using the present tense, in English the use of tense is more rigid: the past tense is reserved for historical events; mythology (and fiction) is *always* recounted using the present tense. The translator is therefore compelled to make a decision: is this account of the King of Tula to be conveyed to the English reader as history or myth? The fact that the same tense can be used for both in Spanish hints at divergent cultural perspectives with regard to the significance of such a distinction. In English, a clear line is drawn between history and myth, and the former is

generally valued more highly than the latter, as being somehow more “real”. By choosing to shift this and other pre-Hispanic legends recounted in the book into the past tense, I took the decision to convey them in English as historical events, in a conscious attempt to collapse the divide between pre-Columbian *myth* and post-Columbian *history*.

What is particularly interesting about this “shift” is that if I’d made the choice to use the present tense and mark this story as myth, a descriptive analysis would have missed it altogether; no shift would be identified, because the present tense in the ST would appear as present tense in the TT. And yet, a shift would have occurred, not because of any visible change to the text, but because of “the new cultural context in which the text finds itself” (Gentzler 1993: 131). The translator who chooses to maintain the present tense of the ST in this case would be making a (hopefully conscious) decision that would drastically change the way the information is understood, and yet a descriptive analysis would label it as faithful to source-culture norms – a thoroughly “adequate” translation.

4 Conclusions: New Paradigms

Buzelin notes that the few reflexive analyses of translations published to date “confirm the uncertain, not to say unpredictable, nature” of the translation process (2007: 51). Although the descriptive analysis I conducted for this case study was admittedly not extensive, it seems to support the conclusion that isolated analysis of the translation product is not sufficient to make sense of the translation process.

The other passages I analyzed for this study (see Appendix) revealed other significant factors that would be overlooked in a descriptive analysis unsupported by the reflections of the translator, such as conscious decisions I made to resist domestication of the text, modified passages that were the product of three-way negotiation between author, translator and publisher, and minor copy-editing changes made after I delivered the final version of the translation. Without the benefit of translator testimony, a descriptive analysis could draw misguided conclusions about what really happened in the translation process.

With this in mind, I would suggest that further reflexive studies by translators would be of great benefit to the future development of translation studies. While Toury

dismisses the translator’s views as “partial and biased”, he does concede that such views may in fact offer “a possible key to the analysis of actual behaviour” (Toury 1995: 66); what he is acknowledging (although I believe he drastically underestimates its value) is the fact that the very partiality and bias of the translator is of vital importance in the translation process, and is worthy of greater consideration in translation studies in order to address what a number of authors have identified as one of the main hurdles to be overcome in the field of translation studies: the estrangement between translation theory and practice (Buzelin 2007: 41).

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Professor Lyse Hébert of Glendon College (York University), for her support and guidance in this project.

References

- Baker, Mona and Gabriela Saldanha, eds. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd Edition. London: Routledge, 2008.
- Bassnett, Susan. *Translation Studies*. London & New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Buzelin, Hélène . “*The Lonely Londoners* en français : l’épreuve du métissage.” *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction*, 13.2 (2004): 203-243.
- Buzelin, Hélène . “Translation Studies, Ethnography and the Production of Knowledge.” Eds. Paul St.-Pierre and Prafulla C. Kar. *In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. 39-56.
- Catford, John C. *A Linguistic Theory of Translation: An Essay in Applied Linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press, 1965.
- Cronin, Michael. *Translation and Globalization*. London: Routledge, 2003.
- Díaz, José Luis. *El revuelo de la serpiente. Quetzalcóatl resucitado*. Mexico: Herder, 2006.
- Díaz, José Luis. *The Whirling of the Serpent: Quetzalcoatl Resurrected*. Trans. Martin Boyd. Toronto: Antares, 2009.
- Douglas, Mary. “Forgotten Knowledge.” Ed. Marilyn Strathern. *Shifting Contexts: Transformations in Anthropological Knowledge*. London: Routledge, 1995. 13-30.
- Flotow, Louise von. “Revealing the ‘Soul of Which Nation?’: Translated Literature as Cultural Diplomacy.” Eds. Paul St.-Pierre and Prafulla C. Kar. *In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. 187-200.
- Gentzler, Edwin. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Lane-Mercier, Gillian. “L’impossible unicité: le conflit des subjectivités et des réceptions.” Eds. Annick Chapdelaine and Gillian Lane-Mercier. *Faulkner: Une expérience de retraduction*. Montreal: Press de l’Université de Montréal, 2001. 131-178.
- Simeoni, Daniel. “The Pivotal Status of the Translator’s Habitus.” *Target*. 10.1 (1998): 1-39.

- Simeoni, Daniel. “Translation and Society: The Emergence of a Conceptual Relationship.” Eds. Paul St.-Pierre and Prafulla C. Kar. *In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. 13-26.
- Simon, Sherry. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. London: Routledge, 1996.
- Spivak, Gayatri. “The Politics of Translation.” *Outside in the Teaching Machine*. London: Routledge, 1993. 179-200.
- Steiner, George. “The Hermeneutic Motion.” *The Translation Studies Reader*. Ed. Lawrence Venuti. 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2004. 193-198.
- Toury, Gideon. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics, 1980.
- Toury, Gideon. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1995.
- Trivedi, Haresh. “Translating Culture vs. Cultural Translation.” Eds. Paul St.-Pierre and Prafulla C. Kar. *In Translation: Reflections, Refractions, Transformations*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007. 277-288.
- Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator’s Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Author’s biography

Martin Boyd holds a Bachelor of Arts in Literature and Linguistics and a Bachelor of Teaching from Deakin University (Melbourne, Australia), and is currently a graduate student in Translation Studies at York University in Toronto. He is a Spanish-English translator certified by the American Translators’ Association and the director of a Toronto-based translation agency. His research interests include the influence of ideology on translation, particularly in relation to the translation of Mexican literature into English.

Appendix: Passages from translation analysis

Sample 1

Source Text Passage	“Alegoría casi literal de una serpiente emplumada, el rey complace en su disfraz y consiente en saborear el pulque que le ofrecen los seductores magos.” (p. 30)
Tertium Comparationis	[Allegory almost literal] [of a serpent plumed], [the king] [to please] [in his costume] and [to consent to savour] [the pulque] [that to-him] [to offer] [the seducers-wizards.]
Target Text Passage	“An almost literal allegory of a plumed serpent, the king <u>took</u> pleasure in his costume and <u>agreed to drink</u> the <u>intoxicating pulque</u> offered to him by the seducing wizards.” (p. 23)

Shifts: 3 – 1 Grammatical, 2 Semantic

1 tense change

1 mutation (savour→drink),

1 addition (“intoxicating”)

Sample 2

Source Text Passage	“Hay en este contraste entre historia y mito una extraña y triste ligazón de significados que es típica de la conquista y el expolio del Continente.” (p. 110)
Tertium	[There is] [in this contrast between history and myth] [a strange and sad link of

Comparationis	<i>meanings] [that is typical of the conquest and the plundering of the <u>Continent.</u>]</i>
Target Text Passage	“There is in this contrast between history and myth a strange and sad connection of meanings that is typical of the conquest and the plundering of the <u>Americas.</u> ” (p. 102)

Shifts: 1 – 1 Semantic

1 explicitation, or mutation? (“Continente” → “Americas”)

Sample 3

Source Text Passage	“La máscara de plumas y risas no debe engañarnos: la muerte vestida de seda, sierpe se queda.” (p. 138)
Tertium Comparationis	<i>[The mask of feathers and laughs][must not trick] [us]: [the death <u>dressed in silk</u>], [snake] [remains]</i>
Target Text Passage	“The mask of feathers and <u>laughter</u> should not fool us; death <u>in a silken dress is a snake nevertheless.</u> ” (p. 137)

Shifts: 3 – 1 Grammatical, 2 Semantic

1 Category change (dressed in silk→silken dress),

1 modification [laughs→laughter] 1 addition (“nevertheless”)

Sample 4

Source Text Passage	“Tiempo después, en la agitada Nueva España previa a la independencia, Quetzalcóatl-Santo Tomás se convierte en uno de los ejemplos más precoces del sincretismo tan característico de la evangelización y, con el tiempo, en una poderosa fuerza ideológica que serviría para separar a la Nueva España de la vieja.” (pp. 67-68)
Tertium Comparationis	<i>[Time later] [in the agitated] [New Spain] [prior to] [independence],[Quetzalcoatl-Saint Thomas] [converts itself into] [one of] [the most precocious] [examples][of the syncretism] [so characteristic] [of evangelization] [and], [with time], [into] [a powerful] [force] [ideological] [that] [would serve] [to separate] [the New Spain] [from the old].</i>
Target Text Passage	“Some time later, in the tumultuous New Spain <u>just</u> prior to independence, Quetzalcoatl-Saint Thomas <u>became</u> one of the earliest examples of the syncretism so characteristic of evangelism, and, in time, a powerful ideological force that would help separate the New Spain from <u>Peninsular Spain.</u> ” (p. 59)

Shifts: 3 – 2 Semantic, Grammatical

1 tense change (converts→became)

1 addition (“just”)

1 explicitation (“the old [Spain]”→”Peninsular Spain”)

Sample 5

Source Text Passage	“Las exhaustivas indagaciones de Jacques Lafaye han resultado de extraordinario valor para comprender el papel que jugaron Quetzalcoatl y la Virgen de Guadalupe en la formación de la nueva nacionalidad mexicana.” (p. 63)
Tertium Comparationis	<i>[The exhaustive inquiries of Jacques-Lafaye] [have-resulted] [of extraordinary value] for [to understand] [the-role that played Quetzalcoatl and the-Virgin-of-Guadalupe] [in the-formation of the-new <u>nationality Mexican.</u>]</i>
Target Text Passage	“The exhaustive inquiries of Jacques Lafaye have proved to be of extraordinary value for understanding the role that Quetzalcoatl and the Virgin of Guadalupe[FOOTNOTE] played in the formation of the <u>nascent Mexican nationalism.</u> ” (p. 9)

Shifts: 1 – 2 Semantic

2 modifications (new-nascent; nationality→nationalism)

Sample 6

Source Text Passage	“¡La Gran Tollán!... majestuoso apelativo para una Jerusalén de Mesoamérica” (p. 11)
Tertium Comparationis	<i>[The Great Tollan] [majestic appellation] [for a Jerusalem of Mesoamerica]</i>
Target Text Passage	“The Great Tollán is <u>thus a suitably</u> majestic <u>name</u> for a <u>kind of</u> Mesoamerican Jerusalem.” (p. 3)

Shifts: 4 – 4 Semantic

1 modification (appellation→name)

3 additions (“thus”, “a suitably”, “a kind of”)

Note: punctuation change

Sample 7

Source Text Passage	“Entre el caudillismo, la revolución sandinista, el cine y los pachucos revolotea dando tumbos la serpiente.” (p. 92)
Tertium Comparationis	<i>[Among chieftainism] [the Sandinista revolution] [the cinema] and [the Pachucos] [swirls making tumbles] [the serpent]</i>
Target Text Passage	“Amidst <u>presidential politics</u> , the Sandinista revolution, the <u>movies</u> and the Chicanos, the <u>whirling serpent continues to tumble and swirl</u> .” (p. 84)

Shifts: 4 – 1 grammatical, 3 semantic

1 category change (“tumble” from noun to verb)

1 mutation (chieftainism→presidential politics), 1 modification (cinema→movies), 1 addition (“continues to”)

Sample 8

Source Text Passage	“El revoloteo de la serpiente constituye no sólo un torbellino sino una epifanía por la cual se funden dos órdenes antitéticos” (p. 171)
Tertium Comparationis	<i>[The swirling of the serpent] [constitutes not only a whirlwind/whirling] [but an epiphany] which [to fuse] [two antithetical orders]</i>
Target Text Passage	“The <u>flapping</u> of the serpent’s <u>wings</u> constitutes not only turmoil but an epiphany by which two antithetical orders are fused.” (p. 166)

Shifts: 2 – 2 Semantic

1 explicitation (flapping of... wing’s); 1 modification (whirlwind→turmoil)