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As I have stated in Chapter 1 the concept of ‘shift’ may be called a ‘categorial’ quality of translation (Van den Broeck 1984-5: 117), due to the fact that difference is considered constitutive for translation. Shifts from that perspective are the result of the choices made to overcome the structural differences between the linguistic, literary and cultural code systems involved in the translational operation. The concept of ‘shift’, however, is not an absolute one. Shifts are always changes with respect to an invariant core, to something that does not change. Dissimilarities show themselves in opposition to similarities, there is always an ‘invariant under transformation’ (Toury 1980: 12; 1986). The concepts of ‘shift’ and ‘invariant’ are interdependent, to the extent that any classification or definition of shifts entails a definition of the invariant (cf. Bakker & Naaijens 1991: 204-5).

Both concepts may be looked at from a prospective as well as a retrospective point of view. From a prospective point of view definitions of the invariant may be formulated as necessary conditions that have to be met by a translational operation in order to be qualified as a ‘true’ translation. That is, a certain type of invariance is looked upon as a requirement. As a consequence, the corresponding notion of shift is a normative or prescriptive one (cf. also Chapter 6, ‘Normativity’). The requirements may be formulated negatively, as a don’t, in which case a shift is looked upon as something which can and should be avoided, as an error or a mistranslation, or may be formulated positively, as a do, in which case shifts are seen as necessary, as changes which one cannot do without in overcoming the systemic differences (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1990a). The negative attitude towards shifts is often associated with extreme forms of linguistic and/or cultural universalism, whereas the positive attitude is commonly associated with a pragmatic-relativistic view on linguistic and cultural differences, the view taken in this book. A useful distinction in this respect is the one made by Van den Broeck (1984-5: 113-5).
between 'transcoding' and 'intersystemic translation'. Transcoding may be said to take place when the relationship between the code systems involved in the translation of a message is posited on one single semiotic level, and the invariant, therefore, can be related to that level only. This is the case in the relationship between natural languages and the coding systems of Morse and Braille, where only the level of graphemics is involved. On this single level a one-to-one correspondence between related items may be assumed to exist. Intersystemic translation takes place when the systems involved are related to each other in a more complex way and on more than one semiotic level at the same time. In this kind of relationship one-to-one correspondence cannot be assumed to exist. Extreme forms of universalism tend to ignore this distinction to the extent that they postulate the possibility of transcoding taking place between natural languages as well. Consequently, studies performed within the framework of this kind of reasoning are mainly occupied with the loss brought about by translation. In the pragmatic-relativistic view, which takes the case of intersystemic translation as its frame of reference, translation is considered to be a productive effort.

The retrospective point of view
From a retrospective point of view 'shift' and 'invariant' are looked upon as descriptive concepts. The invariant, which in this case functions as the tertium comparationis within the descriptive methodology, is looked upon as a purely heuristic concept, as a methodological tool. In general one might say that, in that respect, shifts may be considered the result of a comparative procedure, in which the concept is related to a specific tertium, which in its turn is derived from the theoretical assumptions underlying the procedure, and a specific unit of comparison. It will not come as a surprise that in this book I will look at both the concept of 'invariant' and 'shift' from a retrospective point of view.

60 A stunningly fundamentalist example of this view is Verstegen 1993, who states that 'the translator functions as the technician who transforms one code into another' (14). To my mind such views belong to the lunatic fringe of Translation Studies.
As their interdependency does not allow for the possibility of separating them entirely, I will do so from two different angles. In this chapter I will attempt at a full-fledged discussion of (some of the contemporary) methods and procedures for the descriptive comparison of target and source texts. The main focus will be on the theoretical frameworks in which the procedures, and the shifts that result from them, are embedded.

Ideally, the three main building blocks of any comparative-descriptive procedure should cohere, in the sense that the concept(s) on which the invariant is based should follow from the theoretical assumptions (cf. also Toury 1995: 80), and that the unit of comparison instrumental in the actual establishment should follow from the tertium. We will see to what extent this is the case in the procedures discussed in this chapter: Toury’s textemic analysis, as well as the procedure that has replaced it, the comparative model devised by Kitty van Leuven-Zwart, and the method of the transfer-oriented approach as presented by its main methodological spokesman Armin Paul Frank.

I will be looking specifically into the way shifts are related to the basic theoretical assumptions underlying the procedures, the analytical questions being asked, to the invariant chosen and to the unit of comparison. The main aim of this chapter is to get a picture of the possible criteria involved in devising a procedure, of the things one has to keep in mind and account for.

In the next chapter, I will look at the concept of ‘shift’ in a more general way, and discuss the various types of shift that are commonly distinguished, and look at the way in which these typological distinctions may be employed.

4.1 GIDEON TOURY: NORMS IN TRANSLATION

With respect to the theoretical assumptions about the phenomenon of translation it has always been Toury’s conviction that the concept of ‘norm’ should have a central position in the study of translation. In his older work Toury justifies this centrality with the assertion that translation is a ‘behavioral activity’ (cf. Toury 1980: 51-2), from which it should follow that norms, which, after all, regulate the possi-
abilities and constraints of behaviour, were to be the actual subject matter of translational research. This notion was traced back to a specific position within the philosophy of language, as voiced by the Rumanian linguist Eugenio Coseriu. This position entails an addition to the traditional linguistic/semiotic dichotomies between langue and parole or competence/system and performance. According to Coseriu, to these two levels the level of the norm has to be added: the level on which it is decided which particular act of performance is selected from the relevant potential acts of performance present in the system. As a consequence this level should be taken into account in any descriptive study of language, and more so, and now we are back with Toury, it should be regarded as the most essential part: since competence (the code systems relevant to the text pair under study) and performance (the actual texts themselves), as well as the requirements related to the poles of adequacy and acceptability, are ‘given quantities’ and the translational norms can be considered the ‘only unknown factor’, it automatically follows that the concept of ‘norm’ should be the focal concept in any study of literary translation and the main object of this study (Toury 1980: 50).

The centrality of the concept of norm is also motivated by its suitability as a descriptive term for a target-oriented approach to translation studies. Since the norms from the target pole determine what is to be taken as translation equivalence,

establishing them is not merely justified by a target-oriented approach but should be seen as its very epitome (Toury 1995: 53).

---

61 In the later work (Toury 1995) this link is downplayed; Coseriu is not so much as mentioned.
62 They are ‘given’ in the sense that they result from preliminary analyses. An analysis of the results should yield the norms. The requirements of adequacy, for instance, are known from a textemic analysis of the source text (cf. infra). Initially, no procedure was established for an analysis of the requirements of acceptability.
In that vein one has to interpret Toury's claim that Translation Studies is an empirical science. This claim was originally also used as a means to broaden the field of translation research and at the same time fence it off from inadequate theories. From its very beginning the target-oriented approach has presented itself as a truly scientific alternative to source text-oriented, normative theories. Source text-oriented theories are rejected because of their normativity: because they start from an a priori definition of what constitutes a translation, they fail to account for all phenomena that are called translation. The alternative, target-oriented, attitude is to consider as a translation any target-language utterance which is presented or regarded as such within the target culture, on whatever grounds (Toury 1985: 20; cf. also 1995: 32).

On the level of methodology this claim amounts to the ‘equivalence postulate:

the assumption that every actual TT does in fact stand in some equivalence to its ST (Toury 1980: 115)64.

The question, then, whether there is an equivalence relationship between a target text and its corresponding source text becomes irrelevant, research should be directed at the question what kind of relationship obtains between the two texts. And, according to Toury

the major factor determining what relationships between TT and ST will be regarded as equivalence relations in any specific case are the translational norms (Toury 1980: 115; cf. also 1995: 61).

63 ‘Since the object-level of translation studies consists of actual facts of ‘real life’ – whether they be actual texts, intertextual relationships, or models and norms of behaviour – rather than the merely speculative outcome of preconceived theoretical hypotheses and models, it is undoubtedly, in essence, an empirical science’ (Toury 1985: 16).

64 In Toury 1995, this postulate was rephrased as the ‘functional-relational postulate of equivalence’ (61).
Closely related with the orientation toward the target pole of the Touryryan programme, is its orientation towards the systemic and functional aspects of translation. Translations are primarily regarded as being functions in a system, and the factors governing the production of a translation are regulated by the demands and rules of that system. From this systemic-functional orientation it follows that

the actual subject-matter for descriptive studies within DTS consists first and foremost of functional-relational concepts (rather than their textual-linguistic representations), such as textual elements or linguistic units in relation to their positions in the translated utterances as systemic wholes; the translated utterances in relation to the target system(s) in which they are situated; or, finally, the translated utterances in relation to the utterances established as their (actual or hypothetical) sources (Toury 1985: 21).

Throughout his work Toury distinguishes between two ‘groups’ of norms, preliminary and operational norms, and one basic category of norm: the initial norm (cf. Toury 1980: 53-57; 1995: 56-61). Preliminary norms determine the selection of texts to be translated (with respect to source languages, genre etc.) and the tolerance for indirect translation. Operational norms are the norms directing

the decisions made during the act of translation (Toury 1995: 58)\textsuperscript{65},

and are further divided into matricial norms, the ones involving decisions concerning

omissions, additions, changes of location and manipulations of segmentation (ibid.: 59),

and textual-linguistic norms, which

govern the selection of material to formulate the target text in, or replace the original textual and linguistic material with (ibid.).

\textsuperscript{65} Or, in 1980 terms ‘the translational process’ (54).
As to the textual-linguistic norms, a subdivision is made between general and particular norms, depending on whether they apply to translation in general, or to particular text-types or modes of translation.

As we have seen earlier, the initial norm pertains to the basic choice made by a translator between 'adequacy', adherence to the norms derived form the source text, and 'acceptability', adherence to the norms active in the target system. The poles of the initial norm, according to Toury, should be considered as 'a basic co-ordinate system for the formulation of explanatory hypotheses' (ibid.: 60). In the earlier publications the explanations were closely linked to the systemic position of translation within the target culture. If in a certain text corpus the pole of adequacy is found to be dominant, this was explained by the primary, innovative function of translation within that cultural polysystem: translation in these circumstances is used in order to import new models, themes or formal structures. Dominance of the pole of acceptability can be explained by the conservative influence of translation, which is then used in order to maintain existing target norms. In the later publications the link with Itamar Even-Zohar's polysystem theory (cf. Even-Zohar 1990) does not seem to be as close. In his latest book, Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond, the aim of the study of translational norms seems to have become the formulation of probabilistic laws of translational behaviour (cf. Toury 1995: 259-279).

**Target text-source text description**

In what way does the description of relationships between target and source texts relate to the concept of translational norms? Particularly with respect to this aspect of translation description, there has been a remarkable development within the methodological considerations of Toury. In the early work, the translational norms were to be reconstructed by way of an evaluation of shifts, but in the later work the concept of shift was explicitly abandoned altogether.

Within the early stage of Toury's thinking (Toury 1980: 89-111,112-121; 1985: 32) the methodological counterpart of the theoretical notion of adequacy, which functions as a *tertium comparationis*, was the methodological construct of the Adequate Translation
(AT). The AT is taken to represent the ‘maximal norm’ (Toury 1980: 116) of adequacy, it constitutes maximum equivalence on the textemic level. The Adequate Translation, then, is a reconstruction of source text textemes, and consists of an ‘explicitation’ of the textual relations and functions to be found in the source text. As such it is not an actual text, but a hypothetical construct, serving only methodological purposes. The zero-degree is adequacy, and shifts are defined as deviations from adequacy.

Purpose of the comparison is to determine the distance between the ‘actual equivalence’ found between target and source texts and the maximal norm of the Adequate Translation, inasmuch as this distance can be attributed to norm-governed behaviour. In this respect Toury distinguishes between obligatory shifts, those that are rule-governed, and optional shifts, those that are norm-governed (1980: 116; 1995: 57) 

Since rule-governed shifts cannot be indicative of translational norms, they are not taken into consideration, but already accounted for within the invariant itself (the ‘weak version’ of adequacy; cf. Toury 1980: 69).

The process of description is as follows. As a first step, the Adequate Translation is established by means of a textemic analysis of the source text (source text description). In the second stage, target text units are compared with these textemes and shifts are noted (target text-source text comparison). During this stage the parameter of comparison initially is textual-functional. When the dominant relationship between source text texteme and target text unit is found at that level, the translational relationship is one of adequacy. When no textual-functional correspondence can be found, the procedure is to look for correspondence at the levels of, respectively, textual means (in which case a relationship of ‘textual formal equivalence’ is established), linguistic functions (relationship of linguistic-functional equivalence), and linguistic means (relationship of linguistic-formal equivalence). In the final stage of the actual comparison, the inventory of these shifts leads to the establishment of the distance between target text-source text equivalence and the Adequate Translation (description of equivalence relationship).

---

66 On this distinction cf. the next chapter.
Ultimately the establishment of individual shifts leads to the establishment of the translational norms governing the target text in question. When, after further generalization and expansion of the investigated corpus, shifts show a certain pattern or statistical regularities, they can be explained by the existence of a historically and culturally determined poetics of translation or translation ideal, which can be linked in the end to the position of the system of translation within the target cultural system.

**The texteme as unit of comparison**

The unit of comparison within this procedure is the texteme, which is defined as a

linguistic unit of any type and level, participating in textual relationships and, as a result, carrying textual functions (Toury 1980: 108).

The texteme, then, pertains to the level of the text function, it is a concept that directly mediates between macrostructure and microstructure. Any texteme can be broken down into elements belonging to a lower order. These elements correspond to the levels represented in the closed class of equivalence relationships mentioned above. Any element contributing to the realization of a specific function, can be analyzed in terms of its material substance, of the textual means it consists of, which in its turn can be analyzed in terms of elements carrying linguistic functions, which in their turn can be analyzed in terms of the linguistic means it consists of:

linguistic elements entering into a literary text carry with them the functions that they possess by virtue of the linguistic and literary systems (codes). But as the text imposes on them its own organization (structuration), the new frame of reference acts as a system in its own right, and these elements turn into textual ones through a network of relations obtaining among themselves and between them and the text as a whole. This textual system of relations lends the textual elements **textual functions** (Toury 1980: 114).

Precisely in what way one should understand the concept of function
does not become clear. One may guess, from the structuralist, or one might even say: formalist, background of Toury (and the previous quote may surely be taken as indicative of this background), that function should be related to structure, rather than to signification, but one cannot be sure\textsuperscript{67}. The lack of descriptive focus that follows from an undifferentiated conception of ‘function’ adds greatly to the impracticability of the actual textemic analysis\textsuperscript{68}.

The distinction between means (pertaining to the microstructural level of a text) and functions (pertaining to the macrostructural level) was also employed by Anton Popović, one of the pioneers of retrospective translation analysis\textsuperscript{69}. Popović’ main concern was with literary translation, and he defines shifts as a stylistic category (‘shifts of expression’). For him ‘a systematic evaluation of the shifts of expression that occur in a translation’ and hence ‘the objective classification of differences between the translation and its original’ (1970: 84), should be based on a ‘theory of expression’. According to him, the linguistic means of the source and target texts cannot be compared to each other in isolation, but only ‘in relation to the entire system of expression’ (Popović 1970: 84). Within the framework of the system one can determine the expressive values of the respective linguistic means, and this forms a necessary precondition for the establishment

\textsuperscript{67} One of the most remarkable features of the Touryan programme, I find, is the total absence of any consideration on the hermeneutic aspects of translation. Nowhere in over twenty years of publications does he ever address that aspect explicitly.

\textsuperscript{68} One may very well wonder, whether there is any use in critically discussing a method which has been forswn emphatically by its maker. But to my mind, a procedure, once it has become public, should be dissociated from its author, and his ideas about it, and be judged on its own merits. Once it has become an established part of the discipline, it stands on its own. The criticisms voiced here, then, are not to be taken as reproaches to the Touryan framework, they are intended as an investigation of its limits and of the possibilities it still might have when employed in other contexts.

\textsuperscript{69} J.C. Catford (1965 [1980]) is generally seen as the first to deal retrospectively with shifts. Because his framework essentially is a linguistic one, and takes the sentence as its upper rank, it is not useful for my purposes; as a consequence he is not included in my discussion.
of shifts ‘in the sphere of style’ (1970: 83). Style, for Popović, is a multilayered, and hierarchically organized concept. Precisely because it covers abstract and general categories and qualities as well as more specific stylistic means, it is suitable as an invariant for the comparison of the source text and the target text. For the evaluation of shifts, it is necessary to examine the respective differentiation of stylistic qualities in the source and target languages and texts.

By relating the distinction between means and functions to the concept of style, and to a specific theory of expression, Popović creates a concrete frame of reference for the comparative analysis of translation and original. Initially, Toury explicitly chose not to create such a frame of reference: his presentation of the early method

... tried its best not to commit itself (...) to one definite theory of the literary text (Toury 1980: 121).

This is one further cause for the impracticability of the analysis. Without any ordering principle, which may be provided by a theory of the literary text, the Adequate Translation consists of a mere enumeration of functions and related means.

With respect to the comparison in itself, there is also a remarkable incongruity as to the rank of the elements compared. The second stage of the procedure provides in a comparison between source text textemes and target text units. The problem at this point, however, is that a texteme is a unit of description rather than a unit of comparison (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1992: 77-78). This amounts to nothing less than a procedural aporia. There is no way of knowing, after only having described the features of the source text, on what rank or level one should look for the target text units, unless one would posit one of the lower levels as the unit of comparison. But the initial step should be, as we have seen, to look at equivalencies at the textual-functional level. In order to be able to do that, however, one also has to have an idea of the functional relationships within the target text as a separate entity. Establishing these would entail a separate textemic

---

70 Popović specifically refers to the theory of expression developed by the Prague structuralist František Miko (cf. for instance Miko 1970).
analysis of the target text, yielding a separate (but again undifferentiated) inventory of relationships between means and functions. In that case the Adequate Translation no longer would serve as a tertium comparationis, but rather the relationship between means and functions in itself would\(^7\). As a (provisional) solution to this problem, Toury does propose an additional comparison of target text textemes to source text units which formally correspond to them (Toury 1980: 120), but it remains unclear how the target text textemes relate to the Adequate Translation, since they presuppose a link with the textual functions of the target text as a separate entity.

The main problem, then, is that the procedure does provide for a way of comparing texts, but not for a practicable way of analyzing the text that should function as the invariant. In that sense, Toury’s early procedure may be classified, in Holmesian terms, as a ‘distinctive feature method’ as opposed to a ‘repertory method’:

In the first, the descriptive scholar, upon studying the two texts, will derive from them a list of distinctive features which strike him as significant and deserving of comparative analysis; frequently he will also determine a hierarchical ordering of the features. [...] A second working method [...] would be [to determine] beforehand a required repertory of features always to be analysed, regardless of what specific text is involved (Holmes 1976 [1988]: 89).

The second method is presented by Holmes as a more workable alternative for the first one, since it

would [...] circumvent the problem of the ad hoc selection of distinctive features (ibid.).

To some extent this problem is anticipated by Toury, as may be shown by a discussion of the position of the early method within the larger framework it was considered part of. The textemic analysis seems to pertain to one of the subgroups of operational norms only:

\(^7\) That this is a practicable point of departure is shown in Hulst 1995, who employs this relationship as a tertium in her functional model for translation criticism.
the textual-linguistic norms. Although nowhere a theoretical explanation can be found for the way in which the shifts should be interpreted in terms of norms, some light can be shed on this problem by looking at the report of a research project on the norms of literary translation into Hebrew (Toury 1980: 122-139). Norm-units are defined as regular patterns in which 'a single behavioural dimension (translational situation, or translational problem)’ is related to an ‘actual type of behaviour’. The behavioural dimension can be located at any level; the examples Toury gives include, for instance, the abundant use of fixed collocations within his corpus, and the specific way of dealing with foreign-language elements inserted in the source texts. The textual norms, then, are presented in terms of patterns in textual relationships; patterns that are established ad hoc. The systematic description of these norms, however, are related to certain preconceived levels of description: they are presented in terms of the ‘linguistic component’, ‘the rhetorical-stylistic component’, and the ‘literary component’. As it turns out, Toury himself does use some kind of ordering principle, which may help to categorize the shifts as well as the translational norms derived from them. Ultimately, even though they are not incorporated into the procedure itself, it is the categories themselves that are linked to the initial norm (cf. Toury 1980: 135-137).

It was, however, not these points of criticism that made Toury abjure his old-time hobbyhorse of the hypothetical construct of the “adequate translation” (Toury 1995: 84).

The main reason for Toury to abandon this procedure was its source text-orientatedness, which may be attributed to it taking the notion of adequacy, the requirements of the source pole, as its starting point. Later I will deal with the arguments for the procedural change in a more extensive way (cf. Chapter 6). I will now discuss the transition from the old to the new procedure.

**Later developments**

In his contribution to the seminal collection *The Manipulation of Literature, ‘A Rationale for Descriptive Translation Studies’* (Toury
1985, which may be considered a prelude to the 1995 book), Toury related the procedure discussed above to a more elaborate one, which he further refined into a fixed procedure consisting of five stages in *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*.

The first step in that procedure consists of the identification of a text from the target system as an ‘assumed translation’\(^\text{72}\). The second step consists of the study of the assumed translation with respect to its acceptability in the target system. In this stage several comparisons may take place between the text(s) under investigation and several other texts presented as translations of the same source text (which may be from the same period or different ones, or in the same language or different ones). In a third stage the identification of the source text has to take place, and in the fourth stage the actual comparison of source and target texts is undertaken. Finally, in the fifth stage, one has to establish the overall concept of translation underlying the text or corpus under study in terms of norms.

A great improvement was that the analysis of the requirements deriving from the acceptability-pole was given its fixed place within the procedure, although no suggestions are made as to how one should go about it. Our main interest, however, lies in the fourth step of the procedure.

In the 1985 article the odd situation arose that in one and the same procedure two separate units of comparison were supposed to be employed, without it being clear in what way they could be related to each other. While introducing as the basic unit of comparative analysis the ‘coupled pair “problem” and “solution”’ (later to be rephrased as ‘coupled pair of replacing and replaced segments’), in which target and source elements contribute simultaneously to the establishment of the invariant of comparison, Toury still adheres to the identification of

---

\(^{72}\) ‘Assumed’, on the grounds that one should accept any text presenting itself as such as a translation, also pseudo-translations. Once a text has been identified as the corresponding source text, the label may be dropped.
shifts exhibited by the target text items in relation to their counterparts in the source text [presumably Toury here refers to the coupled pair], or rather in relation to the hypothetical construct of the 'adequate translation' of that text into the target language/literature in question, which may serve as a convenient tertium comparationis (Toury 1980: 112-121) (Toury 1985: 32).

Apparently the two different ways of comparing textual elements are supposed to bear some relationship to each other, although they depart from entirely different conceptions of the invariant. The incongruity of this combination was solved by simply obliterating the concept of the Adequate Translation altogether, and now substituting it by the 'coupled pair of replacing and replaced segment' (a step which was prepared in Toury 1990).

The coupled pair: a unit of comparison?
One of the more important differences between the textemic analysis and the procedure involving the coupled pair of replacing and replaced segment is that in the latter no longer one of the texts (or parts of it) is taken as the methodological point of departure:

units cannot be established for the two texts in isolation. Rather, segments of both should be defined simultaneously, determining each other, so to speak (Toury 1995: 89)\(^7\).

Since one cannot assume that the replacing entity necessarily will be of the same rank or scope as the replaced entity, the units to be compared have to be established on an ad hoc basis. Toury describes this procedure as follows:

\(^7\) Another difference, which I will not deal with extensively, is that for each separate target text a new tertium has to be established, whereas the Adequate Translation purportedly relates to each target text in the same way.
Thus, the analyst will go about establishing a segment of the target text, for which it would be possible to claim that - beyond its boundaries - there are no leftovers of the solution to a translation problem which is represented by one of the source text’s segments, whether similar or different in rank or scope (ibid.: 79).

As a further step

these coupled pairs would be submitted to further analysis as the study proceeds, and it is the relationships found to obtain between their members which would underlie any generalization concerning the pertinent kind of translation equivalence (ibid.: 89).

Although it is easy to see how this methodological instruction solves the problem of source-orientation, in terms of practical application, as with the source text analysis in the older method, Toury gives us precious little to hold on to. Even though in the end both segments are determined in relation to each other, one still has to begin by defining a segment that starts the process. In other words, one has to have some idea of the scope or rank of the target segment that triggers the coupling mechanism, even if it is the idea to start with the beginning of a text – which seems, by want of a clear instruction, the most logical point of departure. But is one supposed to begin on the level of morphemes, or words, or phrases, or sentences, or should one look initially at textual, rather than linguistic, features, and with respect to form or to function? The ad hoc-principle implies that it could be any level, and that the actual choice would depend on the text pair in question. The main problem, to my mind, with such a tabula rasa-approach is its impracticability. In this case, it is due mainly to the fact that the coupled pair is not so much the unit of comparison, as it is the result of an initial comparison. The new procedure provides us with a comparative principle, but not with a readily available unit of comparison or a related tertium that may serve as a frame of reference guiding the comparison.\(^74\)

\(^74\) In the 1985 article Toury gives an example of a comparison concerning one of the poems from James Joyce’s Chamber Music, which seems to sug-
It would be possible to construct such a frame of reference from the comparative and analytical efforts preceding the target text-source text comparison. As we have seen at the end of Chapter 3, the differences between different translations of one and the same text may provide one with target text units that may function as the trigger of a target text-source text comparison. The same, I presume, will hold for the results of an analysis of the target text from the point of view of its acceptability in the target system, which may yield elements or passages which may be particularly interesting.

One further problem concerning the new method involves the establishment of the kind of equivalence relationships obtaining between the pairs found. This problem, it seems to me, is caused by the shift with respect to the general aim of translation studies we noted earlier concerning the formulation of probabilistic laws of behaviour. The aim of the recent comparative procedure is formulated as

gradually reconstruct[ing] both translation decisions and the constraints under which they were made (ibid.: 88).

Its aim, then, is not directed at the way a translation may be linked to the equivalence postulate, the conception of equivalence to be reconstructed during an instance of comparison, but rather at the level on which the translational consideration may be said to have taken place. In that sense the procedural change reflects a more general tendency in the later work of Toury, constituting a movement away from a product-based functional conception of descriptive translation studies, to a more process-based conception.

This assumption seems to be confirmed by one of the case studies of the 1995 book, ‘Between a “Golden Poem” and a Shakespearean Sonnet’ (Toury 1995: 114-128). As it turns out, in this (highly interesting and detailed) case study on the history of Hebrew translations of Shakespeare’s sonnets, the procedure of the coupled pair is used next to other comparative efforts. The statements based on an exami-

suggest that the grammatical category of phrase should function as such a preliminary unit. But in his later publications this idea, as well as the example, has disappeared.
nation of

the series of coupled pairs of replacing + replaced segments which *emerge* [my italics; CK] through a systematic contrastive analysis of the translations vs. their sources (ibid.: 122)

only concern what Toury calls the 'translational unit'. Separate comparisons, however, are devoted to such matters as rhyme scheme, meter, and the gender of the person addressed in the translated sonnets, all of which serve as a *tertium*, and provide a posited level of invariance, relative to which changes, shifts, are noted. In fact, they constitute an, albeit fairly small, 'repertory of features' in the Holmesian sense; a repertory partly based on the genre of the texts in question, and partly based (*ad hoc*) on features derived from the texts themselves. Be that as it may, it seems that Toury did not abandon the establishment of shifts as radically as he claims.

**Alternatives**

We have discussed two alternative methods, finding both advantages and disadvantages. The textemic analysis, in the conception of Toury, is source-oriented, and it is to a certain extent impracticable, mainly due to its being a distinctive feature method, yet it departs from the basic division between means and functions, and as a consequence enables one to directly relate the microstructural aspects of a text to its macrostructure. The procedure using the coupled pair of replacing and replaced segment solves the problem of the source-orientedness, but steers the comparison towards aspects of the translation process, rather than towards the relationship between the translation product and its source.

---

75 In the case of one of the translator's choices concerning gender of the addressee, for instance, Toury remarks: 'As a result, eleven of the twelve sonnets translated by Schwartz became love poems which are unequivocally directed at a woman, in marked contrast to their original intent' (Toury 1995: 118).

76 In that sense it chimes in with a more general shift of attention in Toury's recent work towards prospective empirical research into the translation proc-
Our concern lies mainly with retrospective product-oriented methodology, and the conception of the coupled pair of replacing and replaced segment as a primarily process-oriented procedure is not in concordance with that concern. In the remainder of this chapter I will look into two descriptive frameworks which do concentrate on the translational product, and which may be discussed as alternatives to the Touryan methods. The methodology proposed by Armin Paul Frank, and his colleagues from the Göttingen Sonderforschungsbereich 'Die literarische Übersetzung', may be looked upon as an alternative to Toury’s earlier method, in the sense that it constitutes an example of the repertory method. The methodology of the comparative model of Kitty van Leuven-Zwart, even though it adheres to the establishment of shifts, may be considered an alternative to the second stage of Toury’s methodological development, in that it also departs from the notion that one should not take either the source or the target text as point of departure for the comparison, but both texts at the same time.

4.2 KITTY VAN LEUVEN-ZWART: RELATIONS VERSUS FEATURES

Given the similarity between Toury’s later method and Van Leuven-Zwart’s model, it is odd, in a sense, that Toury mentions it only briefly (Toury 1995: 85) as a justified example of a method still employing the concept of shift. This is mainly due, probably, to the unfortunate circumstance that in the English presentation of Van Leuven-Zwart’s model in Target (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989, 1990a) most of the general theoretical considerations on translation comparison from the Dutch presentation (Van Leuven-Zwart 1984) have been left out. I will try to summarize them briefly.

The theoretical pronouncements of van Leuven-Zwart mainly derive from the framework of structural semantics, a framework to which the concept of relation is essential. Any comparative description, according to her, involves the establishment of the relation be-
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tween corresponding elements as well as the attribution of features to those elements. From the point of view of this framework, a comparison based on the prior attribution of features is only a 'second degree comparison', since it departs from a descriptive operation, and the relationship between the elements is established only afterwards. In a 'direct comparison' the order is reversed. The concept of 'relationship' is characterized by

the occurrence within two entities of conjunct as well as disjunct aspects (Van Leuven-Zwart 1984: 37; my translation).

The occurrence of conjunct aspects (the similarities) is considered a precondition for the occurrence of disjunct aspects:

the differences that can be discerned are always differences relative to a similarity (ibid.: 36).

If there are no conjunct aspects between entities, one simply cannot compare them. Only a method which departs from the notion of relationship, then, can be 'truly comparative' (cf. ibid.).

Within Van Leuven-Zwart's methodology, which is restricted to the description of narrative texts, two separate comparative stages are distinguished. The establishment of shifts at the level of a text's microstructure takes place by means of the 'truly' comparative model mentioned above, the effects of these shifts at the macrostructural level are examined in a separate, second stage: the descriptive model.

Comparison on the microstructural level

Wholly in line with the principle of direct comparison the invariant of the comparison, at the microstructural level, the architranseme, expresses the aspects of conjunction in the relation between source text and target text transemes; the basic unit of comparison is the tran-

---

77 This is the scheme according to which a texteme would be a unit of description, rather than a unit of comparison (cf. supra 4.1).

78 Next to the works already mentioned cf. also Van Leuven-Zwart 1992, which gives a slightly different account of the procedure.
The actual comparative procedure on this level is as follows.

In a first step, the sentences of both target and source text are broken down into transemes. The method employed for this process is based on certain principles derived from Functional Grammar (cf. Dik 1978; 1983). Van Leuven-Zwart distinguishes between two types of transeme, the state of affairs transeme and the satellite transeme:

the state of affairs transeme is based on Dik’s notion of ‘state of affairs’ (Dik 1978: 26) and consists of a predicate - a lexical verb or a copula - and its arguments. The satellite transeme, which shares some, but not all, of the characteristics of Dik’s ‘satellite’, lacks a predicate and might be described as an adverbial specification or amplification of the state of affairs transeme (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 156).

To both the state of affairs transeme and the satellite transeme certain semantic functions may be attributed: a state of affairs may be either an action, a process, a position or a state, whereas a satellite enters into certain semantic relationships with the state of affairs as a whole. The transeme, according to Van Leuven-Zwart, is suitable as a unit of comparison, since it is not language specific, has a practicable length, and can be established intersubjectively (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1984: 21).

The second step in the microstructural comparison is the establishment of the similarities between corresponding source and target text transemes, the establishment of the architranseme (ATR). The ATR is an explicitation of the semantic similarities, and is expressed by means of lexical items, grammatical items are not included. If no semantic ATR can be found, one has to look for similarities on the situational or pragmatic level. By way of a short illustration, I will copy one of the examples from Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 156-157. The following sentences are broken down into transemes.

---

79 A step that is hardly accounted for is the establishment of the correspondence itself.

80 They are taken from a Spanish translation of a short story by Katherine Mansfield.

81 'The boundaries of a state of affairs transeme are indicated by means of /.../ and those of a satellite transeme by (...)’ (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 156).
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/Linda frowned; she sat up quickly (in her steamer chair) and clasped her ankles. /Linda frunció las cejas; se enderezó (sobre su chaise longue) /y cogió los tobillos (con las manos.)

As examples of architransemes are given:

ATR\textsuperscript{2}: to sit up
ATR\textsuperscript{3}: satellite of location: a lightweight, portable folding chair.

The next step is a comparison between each separate transeme and the ATR in order to establish the disjunct aspect(s) pertaining between them. When no disjunct aspects are found, there is a relation of complete conjunction between the transemes and the architranseme (relation of synonymy between transemes), and no shift is detected. When there are aspects of disjunction between transemes and architranseme this is taken as an indication for the occurrence of a shift. In this respect Van Leuven-Zwart distinguishes three main categories: modulation (source text or target text transeme shows aspect[s] of disjunction with architranseme; relation of hyponymy between transemes\textsuperscript{82}), modification (source text and target text transeme show aspect[s] of disjunction with architranseme; relation of contrast between transemes) and mutation (no aspects of conjunction, therefore no architranseme can be established; no relation between transemes).

Since the purpose of the method is to arrive at hypotheses about the interpretation and the strategy underlying the translation involved in the comparison, shifts that are not indicative of a translator’s interpretation or strategy are not taken into account, only optional\textsuperscript{83} shifts

\textsuperscript{82} In the case of a modulation, if the disjunct aspect occurs in the source text transeme, the shift is classified as a generalization; if the aspect of disjunction occurs in the target text transeme, the shift is classified as a specification.

\textsuperscript{83} As far as the distinction between obligatory and optional shifts is concerned, Van Leuven-Zwart makes a reservation as to its applicability. The decision whether a shift is to be considered optional or obligatory is suspended until the possible effect at the macrostructural level has to be es-
and substantial shifts are. In first instance, all substantial shifts are noted; that is, all the shifts that have their bearing at one of the substantial levels: the semantic, stylistic or pragmatic levels. As far as syntactic shifts are concerned, only the ones that affect one of these levels are taken into account. Purely formal shifts are disregarded. This yields the following refinement in the categorization of shifts: semantic and stylistic modulation, semantic and stylistic modification, syntactic-semantic, syntactic-stylistic and syntactic-pragmatic modification as well as mutation. These eight categories are once more subdivided into several categories according to the specific kind of element involved. This subcategorization results in a list of thirty-seven categories of shifts, which in status is akin to the types of equivalence relationships Toury distinguishes in his early method: it constitutes a closed class of possible translational relationships. Sometimes the categories pertain to certain grammatical or stylistic concepts, as in stylistic-semantic modification concerning tense (category 41), or stylistic modulation or modification concerning register elements (11 and 31)

84 Sometimes they are derived from traditional notions like exoticization or naturalization (stylistic modulation or modification concerning culture-bound elements; 15 and 35). The result of any analysis employing this model is an inventory of the microstructural shifts, stating the amount of shifts according to category and subcategory, as well as the percentage of occurrence.

Description on the macrostructural level
The second stage of the procedure, the description of the consequences on the macrostructural level of the shifts established at the microstructural level, is of an entirely different nature. To the extent that the descriptive model is comparative, it works with an invariant at the macrostructural level as well, but, whereas the architranseme has to be established separately for each pair of transemes, the invariant at the macrostructural level is established a priori. In order to render the 'large, amorphous macrostructural whole' (Van Leuven-Zwart 1992: 83; my translation) describable, she breaks it down into

established (on this distinction cf. also the next chapter).

manageable parts, which together function as the *tertium comparationis* on this level. In this particular case, since the model limits itself to the description of narrative texts, the *tertium* is based on certain notions from narratological theories: the three functional levels of language as devised by Halliday: interpersonal, ideational and textual, as conceived of in Leech & Short 1981\(^85\), and the division of narrative texts into a history level, a story level and a discourse level (cf. Bal 1980). According to Van Leuven-Zwart, in the descriptive model the macrostructure of narrative texts is reduced to six discrete parts (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 173 and 1992: 83):

- *the ideational function on the story level*, which involves the image of the fictional world offered to the reader;
- *the ideational function on the discourse level*, which pertains to the semantic choices expressing this image;
- *the textual function on the story level*, concerning the order in which the events take place in the fictional world;
- *the textual function on the discourse level*, determining the syntactic ordering;
- *the interpersonal function on the story level*, concerning focalization, or the point of view from which the fictional world is presented; and
- *the interpersonal function on the discourse level*, which involves the way in which the communication with the reader is established by the narrator/focalizer\(^86\).

In this stage no further categorization is attempted, the shifts, or rather their consequences, are described in terms of the function of

---

\(^85\) In any strict sense of the word, this tripartite division is not in itself a narratological theory. The way it is employed by Leech & Short, however, within the context of fictional texts, to a certain extent justifies this designation. The way I employ the division in Chapter 3 only superficially bears some relationship with this perspective.

\(^86\) The history level is not deemed relevant for the descriptive model, since it pertains to abstract elements positioned in a system, rather than to concrete elements figuring in a text (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 173).
textual elements within the larger whole. The macrostructural *tertium* only provides the levels on which the consequences can be located. In this respect it functions as a kind of repertory.

The model does not provide a separate analytical procedure as to the macrostructure, at least not in any formalized sense:

the examination of the consequences of microstructural shifts on the level of macrostructure, in principle, can take place "ad hoc". For every translation investigated by means of the comparative model, one can investigate which *high scoring* [my italics, CK] categories of shift are related to for instance a certain character (Van Leuven-Zwart 1984: 86; my translation).

Still, in terms of the potential consequences of microstructural shifts systematic links between microstructural categories and the discrete parts of the macrostructure are posited. For instance,

*semantic modulation*, if frequent and consistent, may bring about a shift in the *mind style* (i.e. in the ideational function as it operates on the discourse level) (Van Leuven-Zwart 1990: 70);

[...]
syntactic-semantical modification involving *verb tenses* may influence the textual function operating on the discourse level: the syntactic ordering in the translation differs from the one in the original text (ibid.: 78)

[...]
syntactic-semantical modification based on the grammatical feature of *person* may bring about a shift in the ideational function operating on the discourse and story levels (ibid.: 79).

The analysis of the macrostructure is mediated by the results of the microstructural analysis. An analysis of *mind style* for instance is based on the semantic information made explicit in the relationship between the transemes and their architransemes constituting semantic modulations. But, even though a fairly intricate and detailed diagram is given as to the potential relationship between (sub)category and 'discrete part' (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1984: 150, as well as 1990: 87), precisely because of the status of potentiality, these relationships can-
not be formalized and put to heuristic use, since their establishment would be unique to the text pair in question; that is, every instance of description sets out to answer the question what relationships holds, rather than departing from preconceived notions about these relationships. As against the categories of shifts pertaining to the micro-structural level, for the description of their consequences on the macro-structural level no closed class of possibilities can be devised. There is no one-to-one relationship between (sub)category of shift and its influence on that specific discrete part of the macrostructure it pertains to.

In a final stage of the procedure, the findings with respect to the relationship between micro- and macrostructural shifts are further generalized in terms of statements about the strategy, the interpretation and the initial norm underlying the translation. There are two different versions of the relationship between these concepts. In Van Leuven-Zwart 1990 an interpretation is described (with reference to Levý 1969) in terms of its being ‘subjective’ or ‘objective’, whereas a strategy is described in terms of orientation towards the source language or the target language. In Van Leuven-Zwart 1992 the concept of strategy is related to Holmes mapping theory, and is described in terms of its being either serial or structural. In the case of a consistent pattern in the shifts, when it is possible to determine their influence on the macrostructural level, one may

reconstruct the map of the source text (the interpretation) as well as the map of the translation-in-progress (the strategy) (Van Leuven-Zwart 1992: 85; my translation).

Strategy within this scheme is a dependent concept:

The strategy employed by a structurally translating translator is dependent on the interpretation of the work in question as well as on what Toury calls the initial norm (ibid.: 85-86; my translation).

87 In Van Leuven-Zwart 1990 this dichotomy was related to the concept of translation method, which is absent in the presentation of the method in Van Leuven-Zwart 1992.
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Architranseme versus coupled pair

As I have stated earlier, the architranseme as a unit of comparison has some striking similarities with the notion of the coupled pair of replacing and replaced segment. For both it is claimed that they are derived from the relationship holding between the corresponding elements. For both, then, it holds that some kind of preliminary analysis has to take place, in order to gain access to that correspondence. As we have seen, Toury has stated that a series of coupled pairs ‘emerge through a systematic contrastive analysis’ (Toury 1995: 122; my italics); a preliminary unit of analysis, however, is not accounted for. What may be said about the procedure involving the architranseme in that respect? In point of fact, the transeme, heuristically speaking, does function as a kind of preliminary unit of analysis. As the very first step in the procedure, the analyst has to break down the sentences of target and source texts into transemes, and this happens on the basis of an analysis of the syntactic and semantic properties of the sentences in question. Sentences are broken down into predicates and into terms, of which one has to determine whether they constitute an argument (in which case they belong to a nuclear predicate, a state of affairs) or a satellite. In the case, for instance, when the predicate of a state of affairs is a lexical verb,

the character of the state of affairs is established by means of the parameters +/-dynamic and +/-control[^88]. On the basis of this, the analyst establishes what arguments are involved in the state of affairs (Van Leuven-Zwart 1984: 25; my translation).

The establishment of a predicate involves the syntactic category of the elements, the establishment of the arguments and satellites is based on the semantic function of the elements.

This may be taken as a relativization of the mechanism of direct comparison. Even though ultimately within the architranseme the similarities between the transemes are made explicit, the establish-

[^88]: To see whether the state of affairs pertains to an action (+dynamic, +control), or a process (+dynamic, -control), or a position (-dynamic, +control) or a state (-dynamic, -control).
ment of features as well as relations seems to be a more circular process than is accounted for. In that sense the difference between a comparison based on the prior attribution of features and a procedure which prioritizes the concept of relation is not as marked as is claimed. As a heuristic tool, a formalized rank-bound procedure for the preliminary analysis proves to be a great advantage. One of the criticisms of the later method of Toury was that its tabula rasa-approach renders the comparison impracticable. As far as this point is concerned in the comparative model of Van Leuven-Zwart’s procedure the opposite is the case; it may be very elaborate, as one of the most frequently voiced criticisms goes, but it remains practicable.

The lack of acknowledgement of circularity may also be applied to Van Leuven-Zwart’s conception of the relationship between the micro- and the macrostructure, which to her mind is unidirectional:

The constituent parts of the macrostructure are microstructural elements: a text consists of words, phrases, clauses and sentences which the reader links together in order to understand them as larger units. Thus, the nature and the attributes of the macrostructure depend largely on the features of the elements constituting the microstructure. It follows that in translation shifts in microstructural elements may result in a macrostructural shift (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989: 171).

This argument is the one used as justification for the bottom-up character of the procedure. This seems to me too rigid a conception of the relationship between parts and wholes. The significance of the parts is as much determined by their position within the whole, as the significance of the whole is determined by its constituent parts, as is acutely exemplified by the mechanism of the hermeneutic circle.

It may be a point of contention, whether or not this circularity should be reflected in a comparative procedure. The pertinent choice seems to be between a top-down and a bottom-up approach, which both are metaphors of unidirectionality. The most important thing, to my mind, is that any procedure should account in some way for the relationship between micro- and macrostructure, and the point at
which one enters the circle seems to me to be of less importance. As far as this point is concerned, however, the relationship between the comparative model and the descriptive model in Van Leuven-Zwart’s procedure is relatively loose. This might be prevented if the semantic information yielded by the preliminary transemic analyses in some way would be explicitly related to the parameters on the macrostructural level. The circularity in the process of signification would be reflected by relating the shifts to that information during the descriptive stage of the procedure.

The main advantage of the textemic analysis, the early version of Toury’s methodology, concerns this point. In the concept of the texteme, because it directly links the concept of means to that of function in the whole, the microstructural element is always directly related to its position in the macrostructure. In that sense it enables one to acknowledge the circularity of any act of signification.

With respect to the epistemological claims underlying Toury’s and Van Leuven-Zwart’s methods, there is a marked difference. Toury is still in search of a general theory of translation, whereas the objective of Van Leuven-Zwart’s model is more modest, since it is restricted to statements about individual text pairs, that is

the formulation of hypotheses concerning the translator’s interpretation of the original text and the strategy adopted during the process of translation (Van Leuven-Zwart 1989:154).

An important, and obvious, difference between Toury’s procedural proposals and Van Leuven-Zwart’s model, which is directly related to this epistemological difference, is that the latter is restricted with respect to genre. Apart from the evident consequences with respect to the scope of the procedure, this delimitation also has far-reaching methodological consequences.

The establishment of a tertium on the macrostructural level, as we

---

89 In that sense the criticism of Linn (1998) on Van Leuven-Zwart’s choice of a bottom-up method seems unjustified, since her proposal to proceed top-down also fails to acknowledge the circularity.
90 Provided that one wishes to think of function in hermeneutic terms.
have seen, is wholly dependent on notions limited to a theory of the genre in question. Van Leuven-Zwart refers to studies in which the model has been used to describe the relationships between texts belonging to other genres than narrative prose (cf. Van Leuven-Zwart 1988: 119) without mentioning the use of separate tertia for the macrostructural level, but it is inconceivable that one might compare a poem or a drama and its translation without the use of additional levels of comparison, and it is highly unlikely that the use of a macrostructural tertium based on narratological notions would yield any useful or relevant results when applied to non-narrative texts.

Because the scope of his epistemological claims is much broader, Toury’s procedures do not take the concept of genre into account on an a priori basis. In the case study concerning the Hebrew translations of Shakespeare’s Sonnets (cf. supra), however, some of the additional levels of analysis smuggled into the comparative procedure, rhyme and metre, are genre-specific. From the point of view of product-oriented translation description it is only logical that at some point matters of genre come into focus. One of the theoretical points of this approach is that translation description should be concerned with actually existing texts in their entirety. Any such comprehensive viewpoint also has to involve the features of those texts that characterize them as belonging to a certain type or genre. The question is in what way this should be done: on an ad hoc basis, as seems to be the case in Toury’s later method, or in a systematic way, as is the case in the model of Van Leuven-Zwart?

The first option does not delimit the scope of the descriptive effort, but renders it impracticable, since it cannot provide for a preliminary unit of analysis. The second option renders the comparative procedure practicable, but forbids generalizing its results beyond the boundaries of the genre involved. In using a tertium limited to a specific genre, one must always assume that target and source text do belong to the same genre, at least to a certain extent. One cannot compare a prose translation of an epic poem with its original using Van Leuven-Zwart’s model, simply because its macrostructural component does not apply to all generic characteristics of an epic. On the other hand, if one is willing to accept the limitations of comparative procedures, and to acknowledge the fact that different aims require different
methods, then there is no problem, as long as the conception of genre is broad enough to include a considerable range of related texts.

The limitation to genre, then, as well as to a specific theory of language function, makes all the difference, when one compares the Touryan procedures to Van Leuven-Zwart's model. The most striking consequence of this delimitation (in methodological terms, that is) is that the concept of genre itself comes to function as a comparative unit of sorts. The descriptive stage of the comparative model does not provide a separate unit of comparison, but provides for levels on which shifts (or to represent Van Leuven-Zwart's conception more precise, the consequences of microstructural shifts) can be located. The tertium in this conception is not directly related to a specific conception of invariance (as is the construct of the Adequate Translation), but provides the levels on which one may look for the relationship between the similarities and the differences between the texts. The concepts used to make those levels describable function as a tertium comparisonis, and for that purpose the tertium has to be established a priori. In that sense it is akin to a repertory method as conceived of by Holmes.

4.3 ARMIN PAUL FRANK: THE TRANSFER-ORIENTED APPROACH

Historically speaking, the programme of the transfer-oriented approach is partly directed against the same kind of theories the target-oriented approach reacted against. In opposition to what he calls 'productive-prescriptive' approaches to translation, Frank introduces his own enterprise as historical-descriptive (cf. Frank 1987: xi-xii)⁹².

---

⁹¹ Since the concept of 'transfer' is not without controversy, the label itself is a matter of contention. Alternative uses of the term can be found for instance in Even-Zohar 1990: 73-78 and Pym 1992.

⁹² There is a danger in equating the work of Frank with that of the descriptive enterprise of the entire 'Sonderforschungsbereich "Die Literarische Übersetzung"'. The Sonderforschungsbereich constitutes what in the sociology of science would be called a research network, which was based at the Georg August Universität in Göttingen. Under its heading many scholars worked on many different topics related to its basic theme. The delimitation to the theo-
Chapter 4: The Establishment of Shifts, Part 1

It is interesting to see that its ‘limitation’ to historical research partly takes care of what within the (early) framework of Toury poses the ‘empirical problem’. The very perspective forced by a purely historical approach is that of looking at what is already there:

it is the job of historical-descriptive translation studies to find out how existing translations have really turned out (Frank 1990: 9).

And it is its interpretative, hermeneutic orientation that compels this approach to take texts in their entirety as point of departure. It is not surprising, then, that the epistemological discussion about Translation Studies being an empirical science, which is dominantly present in Toury’s writing, is totally absent in Frank’s theoretical considerations. But the theoretical considerations of the Sonderforschungsbereich are also directed against the target-oriented approach. Frank sees target-orientation as an ‘Überreaktion’ (ibid.: 13), an overreaction against source text-oriented theories. The transfer approach purportedly takes the middle ground between source text and target text theories (though Frank admits that it is more closely related to the latter) and presents itself as a synthesis between both perspectives.

The very historicity seems to imply a self-imposed limitation as far as the domain of the object is concerned, but quite paradoxically, Frank sees his own enterprise as an extension relative to the target-oriented approach. Frank claims that the transfer-oriented approach is ‘genuinely comparative’ (Frank 1990: 8). It does not concentrate itself solely on the target pole, but its research supposedly covers four
teritical pronouncements of Armin Paul Frank already imply a delimitation to that part of the Göttingen enterprise dealing with the study of American literature. On the other hand my limitation may be justified by Frank’s own claim that the methods used for the description of American-German relationships can be transferred unproblematically to any pair of languages/literatures/cultures (cf. Frank 1990: 8), as well as by the occurrence of a unifying glossary at the end of one the collections of ‘Göttinger Beiträge zur Internationalen Übersetzungsforschung’ (cf. Frank [Hrsg.] 1989: 263-270).

93 It is interesting to see that Toury, in his turn, describes the position the Sonderforschungsbereich has adopted as ‘an (over)reaction to my own program’ (Toury 1995: 36, n8).
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norm areas:

the source text as understood by the translator; the source literature, language and culture as implicated in the text; the state of translation culture (which includes concepts of translation, previous translations of the same and of other texts, etc.); and the target side (for instance in the form of publisher’s policies, local theatre conventions, censorship, etc.) (Frank 1990: 12).

The presentation of itself as an extension relative to the rival approach, I think we must take as a rhetorical twist, for in order to see itself as an extension, transfer-orientation has to seek recourse to a reductive picture of the target-oriented approach\(^{94}\). It is not hard to see that the first two elements just quoted (the source text and the source system, i.e. the supposed extension), within the Touryan framework are accounted for in the concept of adequacy.

**Interpretation and reception**

The most important theoretical assumption of the transfer-oriented approach is

\[ \text{Literatur übersetzen heißt [...] eine Interpretation eines literarischen Werks übersetzen (Frank 1987: xv).} \]

This assumption is not intended as an essentialist definition, but is supposed to represent the ‘heuristische Orientierung’ (ibid.) of the **Sonderforschungsbereich**. With this orientation in mind, a translation is defined as a

\[ \text{jeweils personen- und zeitgebundene, oft die speziellen Rezeptionsbedingungen ihrer Zeit reflektierende integrale Verständnis des Werks [...]}, \]

\[ \text{das freilich nicht, wie eine literaturwissenschaftliche Interpretation, metasprachlich, sondern grundsätzlich literatursprachlich formuliert ist [...]}. \]

\[ \text{So gesehen ist eine literarische Übersetzung grundsätzlich eine – wenn auch nicht immer vorbedachte und konsequente, sondern oft eine je und je } \text{ad hoc vorgenommene – Interpretation} \]

\(^{94}\) As Toury himself rightly points out (cf. Toury 1995: 36 n8).
From this theoretical assumption it follows that a literary translation is regarded as a form of literary reception, and

the way in which a historical translation deviates from the source text permits us to gauge the historical perception which the translator had of the source text as well as the perception which his translation is apt to project to its readers. The discrepancies which might exist between a translated work, regarded as a document of translational reception, and the documents of critical reception (such as essays, reviews, discussions in literary histories and the like) can, under certain circumstances, serve as indices of a readers' [...] history (ibid.: 17).

It is obvious that in this position translational history cannot be separated from the broader context of the literary history of a receiving culture: a translation is also taken to be a contribution to that culture. The, institutionally determined, aim of the Sonderforschungsbereich is to arrive at a cultural history of translation into German, and therefore its main concern [is] to find out as much as possible about translation in the German-speaking countries (Frank 1989: 87).

In itself this concern is of little heuristic value, but several concepts are employed to make that history describable. The most important conceptual distinction is the one between external and internal translation history. External translation history is

95 When we realize that the receiving culture is pretty much the same as the target culture, we can also see that at some points transfer-orientedness and target-orientedness are not all that different.
96 In Frank & team 1986 a set of questions is formulated, which serves as a heuristic guideline: What was translated (and what not), when, how often, in what manner and by whom? (cf. Frank & team 1986: 335-336.)
concerned with the circumstances and the institutions involved in the translational transfer, as well as the agents (Frank 1990: 9),

internal translation history deals

with the texts themselves, with work, author, and period styles, with the modifications and deviations that the works have undergone in translational transfer, and hence with the resultant differences that exist between the potential for imaginative experience which the source text offers to its readers and which the translations offer to theirs (ibid.).

‘Abweichungen’ - ‘deviations’

For our purposes we have to look more closely into the methodological and epistemological aspects of internal translation history, since it is in this realm that the target text-source text relationships are situated. The key concept in this respect is that of ‘deviation’, or, in German: ‘Abweichung’

The aim of a comparison between target and source text is to determine within individual literary translations the ‘culture-productive difference’ (‘kulturschaffende Differenz’) with their original (cf. Frank & team 1986: 336; Frank & Hulpke 1987: 97). Statements about the culture-productive difference are to be derived from a comparison of target and source text resulting in an inventory of productive deviations. A ‘produktive Abweichung’ is defined as a translational enrichment, that

qualitativ oder quantitativ das erschlossene Bedeutungspotential eines Ausgangstextes zielseitig verändert (Frank [Hrsg.] 1989: 263).

---

97 Even though ‘shift’ may be considered a technical term in descriptive translation studies, its usage cannot be considered generally accepted. In presystematic studies, even if they are retrospective, often the general term ‘change’ is resorted to. The semantic relation between ‘deviation’ and ‘shift’ is similar to the one between the German ‘Abweichung’ and ‘Verschiebung’ - the latter term is employed by Stegeman (1991), who uses the method of Van Leuven-Zwart - and between the Dutch ‘afwijking’ and ‘verschuiving’. 
It is distinguished from the supposedly neutral concept of 'translational deviation' ("Übersetzerische Abweichung"). The level of invariance posited for the productive deviation, then, is the meaning potential of the original text; with respect to the translational deviation, the level of invariance is formulated more generally:

Wertfreie Bezeichnung einer [...] Divergenz zwischen Ausgangstext und Zieltex, wobei der Ausgangstext als Norm (=relevanter Kontext) der Beschreibung gilt (ibid.).

The main difference between the two concepts is that the translational deviation is to be considered a descriptive category, whereas the productive deviation is to be considered an interpretative category.

Although within the works studied here there is no explicit justification to be found in terms of a tertium comparationis and a unit of comparison, there is ample reflection on the method resorted to. In one of the earlier presentations of the Sonderforschungsbereich the comparative method is described as follows:

The first step consists of a 'horizontal,' point-by-point and, ideally, exhaustive comparative analysis of source text and translation, arranged in ten categories according to textual elements, from graphemics to overall arrangement. A second step, ideally carried out simultaneously with the first, is to register the effects that local translational deviations have on elements of literary structure ('literary constructs' of diverse kinds: e.g., point of view, character, rhyme, to mention only three). In a third step, the local 'horizontal' findings are collected and sorted to produce a 'vertical diagnosis' designed to determine the relation between the translation, considered as a whole, and the source text (i.e., the translational alteration of the works potential for meaning) (Frank & team 1986: 351).

There is one familiar distinction operative in the method presented here: the textual elements mentioned in the first step pertain to level of microstructure, whereas the 'literary constructs' from the second step pertain to the macrostructure.

In Frank & Hulpke 1987 the 'ten categories of textual elements' pertaining to the microstructure are made explicit in terms of 'zehn
These ‘fields of observation’ function as a comparative checklist in its purest form, a true repertory of features always to be analysed, regardless of what specific text is involved (Holmes 1976 [1988]: 89).

All the traditional levels of linguistic and textual analysis are represented: phonetics (and graphemics) ([1] and [2]), morphology ([5]), lexical semantics ([3] and [4]) and syntax ([9]). Additional levels of analysis are intertextuality ([8])98, rhetoric ([7] and [10])99, and (lexical) stylistics ([6]). As with the descriptive stage in the model of Van Leuven-Zwart, the checklist merely provides for levels of analysis at which shifts can be located, no attempt is made at a categorization of shifts.

As to the macrostructural level no checklist is given, the relevant concept as far as this level is concerned is the general concept of ‘literary construct’, of which only a few examples are given (point of view, character, rhyme), but no attempt at systematization is made. It

---

98 To the extent that ‘Vorgeprägtes’ also includes idiomatic expressions, it has a semantic aspect as well.

99 It is not immediately clear which distinctions are relevant with respect to the difference between (7) and (10): the one between in verbis singulis and in verbis coniunctis, or the one between tropi and figurae (on these terms cf. Lausberg 199010).
appears that at this level the comparison of genre-related aspects is undertaken.

The ultimate statements in which the comparisons result concern the way in which a literary translation can be situated historically. In the case of a systematic accentuation of certain source text features, for instance, a ‘übersetzerische Phasenverschiebung’ may be noted, a change in literary characteristics relatable to period style. To the extent that the deviations concern the constructs pertaining to the text pair in question, they cannot be generalized in terms other than those of the constructs in question.

Units of comparison
As with the Touryan proposals for target text-source text comparison, within the transfer-oriented approach, no analytic procedure, in terms of a set of specified instructions, is provided, but three units of comparison which may serve to guide the analysis on the microstructural level are explicitly posited: word, phrase and sentence. In point of fact, however, every separate level of analysis, implicitly, yields its own unit of comparison. When ‘Wortform’ is posited as a separate level of analysis, the pertinent unit of comparison is the morpheme rather than the word.

On the macrostructural level the various literary constructs serve as tertia. Since there is no further specification (other than in the most general terms) of the kind of constructs that may be relevant, the methodological proposals of the Sonderforschungsbereich, on this level, fail to fulfil the minimum requirement of intersubjectivity: providing for a descriptive apparatus, for terms in which to express the relationship between the texts under study.

A difference with the earlier method of Toury is that in this case there is no mention of a source text analysis preceding the comparison. It is suggested that comparison, source text analysis and target text analysis all take place at the same time in one movement, and that the effects of the translational deviations on the literary structure follow naturally from the comparison. This implies a way of comparing in which no contextualization takes place. Any comparison which proceeds word by word, or phrase by phrase, or sentence by sentence, without already enabling one to somehow relate those lower
level elements to their function within the larger whole it is part of (whether source or target text) is bound to be restricted. And what’s more, before one is able to register the *effect* of local deviations on the literary constructs (the second stage in the procedure sketched above), one must have an idea of the way the constructs are realized within the particular text pairs.

In the idealized presentation of the comparative procedure, then, several descriptive stages are missing, without which is it hard to see how one can compare elements in the first place. If one looks at the way the target text-source text comparison is applied in an actual case study, for instance the pilot study on a dozen 19th century translations of Edgar Allen Poe’s poem ‘The Raven’, one of the major examples of a Göttingen study concerning poetry\(^{100}\), one can see that the descriptive part of the comparative procedure, in point of fact, does take place. The first remarkable divergence from the idealized procedure is that the presentation of the results is preceded by a literary historical exposé full of interpretative statements about the position of the original poem in its period; statements often in terms of elements that gehören wesentlich zu dem, was das Eigentümliche dieses Gedichts ausmacht und was es seinem idealen Leser geben kann (Frank & Hulpke 1987: 110).

The ‘idealen Leser’ (model reader) is related to the source text only. The methodological implication is that a source text analysis must have taken place in some stage of the procedure; an analysis which is not accounted for. That this analysis has a primary role in the procedure is implied by the fact that in their discussion of individual translation solutions, microstructural shifts are not related to the ‘literary construct’ of the target text, but solely to the literary construct of the source text. As a consequence every reference to the target text takes

\(^{100}\) This pilot study constitutes a ‘comet’s tail study’, the Göttingen term for a study of several translations of one single source text. It is presented as the first part in a series; the follow-up, to my knowledge, has never been published.
place within the context of a source text analysis. The effect of target
text elements is measured against the source text potential for mean-
ing. No separate analysis of the target text’s potential for meaning is
provided for. And, although Frank explicitly denounces the concept
of the Adequate Translation (cf. Frank 1987: xiv, n14), the findings of
the source text analysis function as a maximal norm as well.

One of the differences between the textemic analysis and the ac-
tual procedure of the Sonderforschungsbereich, is that the latter, to
some extent, does provide for practicable units of comparison: word,
phrase, and sentence. In that respect it can be compared to Van Leu-
ven-Zwart’s comparative model. As in Van Leuven-Zwart’s macro-
structural, descriptive model, the microstructural units of comparison
within this approach are implicitly present in the levels of analysis. In
that sense the repertory of ‘Beobachtungsfelder’ can be seen as an
explicitation of the possible ranks at which translational relationship
may be described. However, because it takes the source text as a
frame of reference for the description of target text elements, the pro-
cedure cannot avoid the drawbacks of institutionalized source-orien-
tedness.

SUMMARY

In this chapter I have discussed several methods and procedures for
the comparison of target texts and their corresponding source texts.
Several conceptual distinctions have proved to be relevant in this
discussion, some of which seem to be interdependent: source-
orientedness versus target-orientedness, product-orientedness versus
process-orientedness, microstructure versus macrostructure (or means
versus functions), description versus comparison, distinctive feature
analysis versus repertory method, second degree comparison versus
direct comparison. Most of these distinctions can be applied to the
procedures discussed here. I have discussed a source-oriented, dis-
tinctive feature method, entailing a second degree comparison
(Toury’s now abandoned early methodological proposals), a process-
oriented method using direct comparison (Toury’s coupled pair-
procedure), a source-oriented repertory method using second degree
comparison (the Göttingen approach), and the comparative and de-
scriptive stages of the model of Kitty van Leuven-Zwart. At some points I have related these procedures to these concepts, comparing their relative merit, but I have not yet made a general evaluation of them, nor have I looked at them from the point of view of their possible instrumentality within my structural-hermeneutic approach. Before I will proceed to do that, in a separate evaluative chapter, I first want to take a closer look at several of the typological distinctions which have been made with respect to the concept of shift itself, in order to look in a more practical manner at the way in which the concept may be applied.