

The Duet of the Author and the Translator: Looking at Style through Shifts in Literary Translation

Hilkka Pekkanen
University of Helsinki

ABSTRACT

This is a report on a study proposing a flexible, easily replicable method for looking at the translator's style in literary translation. Four literary English-language narrative texts and their Finnish translations are analysed to identify and categorize recurring patterns of optional translation shifts, with emphasis on non-semantic aspects. It is argued that the recurring patterns of optional choices made by the translator represent features of the translator's personal 'style', 'voice', or (local and global) 'strategies', which constitute a 'translator profile'.

KEYWORDS: literary translation, translation shifts, translator's profile, translator's style, translator's voice.

Introduction

The translation of a literary text is a product of two principal actors: the author of the original and the translator. It could be described as a duet of two parallel voices, a musical performance of the author's work with features added by the translator's interpretation. The metaphor of a duet or musical interpretation is a way of illustrating that the target text is always a version of the original that has been filtered through the person of the translator. The distance between the original work and its interpretation can be characterized from various angles: the angle of the source text and culture, the angle of the target text and culture and the angle of the individual translator, for instance. This paper focuses on two central concepts involved in all translation: style and shifts.

Style

The term style is often associated with the distinctive way an individual uses language, but another common way of looking at the concept is to categorize styles as types of discourse used by a group or groups of people and based on the functions of language, i.e. types of language used for specific purposes (functional categorization). Style can refer to broad categories such as written and spoken language, or fact and fiction, or such main categories may be divided into subcategories depending on purpose and situation.

Are these categories of style independent of the content they convey? It is tempting to define style categories as sets of linguistic means applied for a certain purpose and separate from the content, since this would make analysis simpler, but form and content cannot be regarded as two separate concepts. Content interacts with linguistic form, and not only in the sphere of semantics, since content elements are communicated also through syntax and phonology. While content in the form of referents and their relations exists independently of linguistic form, meaning is not entirely independent of it. In other words, form cannot exist without the meaning it carries.

Leech and Short (1981: 29-71) point out that style can refer to a larger domain of language use common to a number of users or to the style of an individual writer. There is no one model of prose style applicable to all texts. Style, to them, is a selection from the total linguistic repertoire. They see literary style as the relation between linguistic form and literary function (i.e. artistic effect), and point out that aspects of style are studied in order to explain this relation. Linguistic form is rarely studied for its own sake. Linguistics does not provide an objective, mechanical technique of stylistic analysis and furthermore does not replace the reader's intuition; yet all linguistic choices are meaningful and stylistic. We study linguistic description to understand artistic effect better and analyse artistic effect to seek linguistic evidence to support it. Leech and Short address style in terms of significant linguistic characteristics recurring in a text, style markers, and their artistic macro-level effect. They base their model for analysing literary style on Halliday's ideational, interpersonal and textual functions making up stylistic value.

Leech & Short (1981) present a multi-level model of written style consisting of the semantic, syntactic and graphological levels as opposed to the levels of spoken language, where phonology replaces graphology. It would seem to me, however, that while in literary texts graphological means are used to express phonological features, the phonological aspect is present in written language as well, and not only because speech is represented through it. Reading literary texts is thus not merely a visual experience, it also involves hearing. Thus mere graphological representation cannot fully account for the phonological effect, i.e. what the reader 'hears'. The term 'phonological' will therefore be used below.

In the case of translated literature, style can be understood to refer to (1) the typical features of the source text, (2) the typical features of the translated text, or (3) the features characterizing the translation process itself, defined either through various situational and methodological aspects typical of the translation process or through comparing the source text with the target text and thereby arriving at the translator's local and global strategies (i.e. various conscious or unconscious principles applied in making recurring choices). The terms 'global' and 'macro-level' will be used here as synonyms referring to general features of a whole text (a complete novel, for instance), and 'local' and 'micro-level' as synonyms referring to specific single instances of linguistic choice at text level. Thus recurring local, or micro-level choices at linguistic level are considered to result in global, or macro-level stylistic effects, or stylistic value, which consist of interaction between form and content.

Literary translation is a particularly interesting subject for stylistic study, since it offers more material for interpretation than non-fiction texts: stratification, allusions, metaphors, styles within styles etc. Parks (1998: 101) refers to the complexity and ambivalence of literary texts, explaining that these characteristics are the result of syntactic and lexical combination or contradiction, the very purpose of which is to achieve ambivalence, richness and stratification. This feature also makes literary style difficult to study. As far as methodology is concerned, Leech & Short's model, which was originally designed for describing style within the framework of a single language, can easily be applied to translated texts as well. Leech and Short (1981) propose a checklist that includes linguistic and stylistic categories (lexical and grammatical categories, figures of speech, cohesion and context) and can be used in studying the features of a translation. The list is fairly extensive, however, and an exhaustive study of a novel would be much too laborious to carry out within a single project: the solution is to concentrate on a few features and study them in closer detail. Baker (2000: 248-255) proposes that identifying recurring linguistic patterns based on corpus analysis might be one way of tackling the style of a translated text. Corpus analysis has the advantage of statistical clout,

and computerized analysis indeed saves a great deal of time in the initial stages of analysing large texts. Baker (2000) and Munday (1998: 4-5) both suggest, however, that a closer analysis of the units chosen and specific attention to their text environment is needed in order to account for stylistic variation. Large literary texts, such as novels, tend to contain passages with very different styles, both in narrative and speech. When statistical figures are used to represent entities containing a variety of styles, opposite characteristics in these styles tend to cancel each other out. A closer analysis of units in their particular contexts will help avoid this.

Shifts

A shift is a change that takes place in the process of carrying over source text meanings into the target language and is thus a central concept in the study of translations. Shifts take place at different levels: (1) the level of entire language systems, i.e. the change from one language to another, (2) the local level in either syntactic or semantic elements (sentences, clauses, phrases, words, phonemes) or (syntactic-)stylistic elements (repetition, rhythm, word order etc.), and (3) the macro-level of the entire work reflecting the effects of the first two. Although shifting is part of the translation process, it is usually studied through its product: what happens in the process is identified by comparing the source and the target. Concepts previously applied in such research are (1) equivalence (and lack of equivalence), (2) similarity (and dissimilarity) and (3) invariance, all aspects of essentially one and the same thing. Shifting results in dissimilarity between the source and the target, while invariance often results in similarity or equivalence. Catford (1965: 27) used the term equivalence in defining translation shifts as linguistic deviations from formal equivalence. It is a clear enough definition, but not very fruitful, since (lack of) formal equivalence can often be explained in terms of (dissimilarities and) similarities between language systems. Toury (1980: 89-121) makes things more complicated by defining shifts as deviations from adequacy, illustrating the distance between actual equivalence and a hypothetical maximal norm of adequate translation: Toury's equivalence is not the same as Catford's. The question is, how are we to define adequacy for purposes of research? Both equivalence and adequacy are evasive concepts and it is because of this that in this paper we approach shifts through similarity and dissimilarity.

The study of shifts needs to distinguish between (1) obligatory and (2) optional shifts, not forgetting that the process also involves (3) non-shifts. Each category may increase or decrease the distance between the source and the target text. Obligatory shifts, even if unavoidable as a result of differences between language systems, inevitably have an impact on the final product, and non-shifts, i.e. parts of the text where no shift takes place (except for the change of language system), may have shift-like impacts, since they involve the transfer of an unchanging element (e.g. sentence, clause, phrase, word, image or metaphor) into a different language and culture. Thus, a non-shift may also act as a means of foreignization.

Obligatory shifts can be described as arising from (1) structural-syntactic, (2) semantic, and (3) phonological differences between two languages and (4) cultural differences. For instance, when translating 'there were several people in the room' into Finnish, the translator must leave out the word 'there' (no equivalent structure exists in the Finnish language) and say 'in the room were several people'. There is no other feasible alternative. *Optional* shifts, on the other hand, may take place without any linguistic or cultural necessity. If a shift is obligatory, but there are two or more alternative translations for the translator to choose from, the resulting shift is considered optional for the purposes of this study. Optional shifts thus

always involve the agency of the translator (see examples 1 and 2). Factors that may influence translators' decisions include language and translation skills, cultural awareness, the translators' own idiolects, the author's style, source language interference and various other extralinguistic and extraliterary factors, such as the translation brief, which Nord (1997: 43) regards as a decisive factor.

Shifts may be looked at as representing universal tendencies such as concentration, amplification, explicitation, implicitation, normalization and interference. The terminology referring to universals is not quite unequivocal, however, and terms used for universal tendencies are often also applied to local linguistic choices. (This is understandable, since a universal tendency becomes concrete through linguistic means at text level.) For instance Klaudy (2003) uses explicitation and implicitation not only when referring to universal translation strategies but also when discussing local expansion and contraction of lexical meaning and grammatical form. Lucía Molina and Hurtado Albir (2002) also discuss terminological confusion, arguing for greater clarity and uniformity of usage. Their terms include concept pairs such as 'amplification' and 'reduction' on the one hand, and 'linguistic amplification' and 'linguistic compression' on the other. It might be a good idea always to specify which level – local, global or universal – is being referred to. For the sake of further clarity, I should like to propose another specification: 'Explicitation' and 'implicitation' are content-oriented terms referring to the explicitness or implicitness of content elements, whereas 'expansion' and 'contraction' (in other words, linguistic amplification and reduction) are formally-oriented terms referring to linguistic means that can be measured quantitatively and applied to achieve various content-level effects, e.g. explicitness or implicitness. It should also be noted that expansion at formal level does not always result in explicitation (or increase in the amount of information provided) at content level but instead, may result in content-level implicitation, and that contraction does not necessarily produce content-level implicitness. Thus the role of formal representation as a selection of linguistic tools for mediating intended content is not straightforward.

Shifts and the study of style

Popovič (1970: 16-84) regarded shifts as a stylistic category and called them 'shifts of expression'. In Popovič's view, linguistic features of source and target texts could not be compared in isolation; he recommended the study of the entire system of expression based on the expressive values of the respective linguistic devices. What Popovič calls 'constitutive shifts' are close to language-bound obligatory shifts and his 'individual shifts' are equivalent to optional shifts reflecting the translator's stylistic propensities and idiolects. Thus Popovič already links style and shifts.

Four major problems arise in the study of shifts: (1) choosing the unit of comparison for the source and target text, (2) categorization of the shifts found, (3) finding a method that is both easily replicable and applicable to more than one language pair, and (4) linking (local) micro-level shifts to (global) macro-level effects in the translated work.

Shifts may take place at the level of the smallest possible morphological units and range to ones that carry large entities of meaning, even units beyond sentences and paragraphs, as van Leuven-Zwart (1989: 154-155) points out.

The most sophisticated categorization for the study of shifts is probably that developed by van Leuven-Zwart (1989), who speaks of comprehensible textual units that can be related to a

tertium comparationis ('architranseme'). Her framework comprises three main categories of micro-structural shifts: modulation (one or more aspects of disjunction in the comparison of *either* the ST *or* TT unit with the architranseme), modification (one or more aspects of disjunction in the comparison of *both* the ST *and* TT unit with the architranseme) and mutation (no conjunction, no architranseme), and eight further categories with 37 sub-categories. van Leuven-Zwart's model provides a theoretical framework for the study of shifts and has to be admired for its comprehensiveness, but has also been criticized as overly complicated (Munday 1998: 2). It is indeed laborious: a simpler classification and a method allowing direct focus on the most commonly recurring shifts would be more practical.

When the existence of certain categories of recurring local shifts has been established, a way must be found for relating them to the global (stylistic or artistic) effect. Leech and Short (1981) separate stylistic variation at the semantic, syntactic and phonological micro-levels on one hand, and stylistic value, which is created at macro-level through the functions of language defined by Halliday (1973) on the other. Halliday's three macro-level functions of language comprise the interpersonal, ideational and textual functions. The interpersonal function relates to the communication between the sender and the receiver, the ideational function to the way of providing information about the world and the textual function to the construction and arrangement of information through language. On the basis of Halliday's functions of language, Leech and Short's (1981: 119-138) levels of language and Bal's (1980) levels of narrative, van Leuven-Zwart (1989: 171-179) develops a model for relating local features to global effects in the study of literary works. Apart from the language functions, the model comprises three levels of narrative prose: the history level, the story level and the discourse level. The history level refers to actual events, actors, place and time. The story level contains action taking place in a certain order in a fictional place at a fictional time. The discourse level is the linguistic expression of the fictional world, the story level as created through language. Focalization (point-of view and various other ways of directing the reader's focus – including implicitation and explicitation) is a central concept in van Leuven-Zwart's model for moving from micro-level to macro-level.

Voice and visibility – shifts as markers of the translator's style

A translation's stylistic features have not only the dual function of representing the author's style and the translator's style: numerous textual and extratextual factors are at work in the translation process. The problem, as Baker (2000: 245-246) points out, is in distinguishing the translator's stylistic characteristics from other features. Concepts such as visibility and voice have been used to illustrate the translator's role (Venuti 1995; Hermans 1996). The key issues are choice and, as Baker (2000: 245) points out, recurrence. If a translator opts for the same type of shift repeatedly from among a number of alternatives, that can be considered a characteristic of that particular translator and regarded as a style feature. Without differentiating between idiolectal and other characteristics, Hermans (1996) takes the view that the translator's voice is heard despite all efforts to achieve invisibility, whereas Venuti (1995) wants translators to become more visible, to raise their voices. Venuti goes even further, urging translators to go beyond their personal style and to lay stress on the social by releasing the remainder, or the power relationships and tensions within a language (Venuti 1998), but even the remainder cannot be released without linguistic means and the choices made by the individual translator.

Research questions

The first research question explored in this paper arises from the need to take a closer look at the definition of a translation shift, to find applicable units of comparison for comparative analysis and to categorize the shifts that occur:

1. What kind of recurring shifts related to syntactic units (such as sentences, clauses, etc.) take place in the translation of English literary texts into Finnish?

The second and third questions are based on the optional nature of the shifts analysed here, and the hypothesized tendency of translators to adopt certain characteristic practices:

2. What kind of intersubjective differences can be found between the recurring patterns characterizing the individual translators?

3. Can we draw up 'profiles' for individual translators or talk about style in translation?

A fourth question, which will be dealt with more extensively in a follow-up article, concerns the global impact of the local tendencies referred to in questions 2 and 3:

4. What kind of stylistic macro-level implications can be detected?

Methodology

The research material comprises four literary English-language narrative texts and their translations into Finnish. There are two works by James Joyce: *Dubliners* (1914), translated into Finnish by Pentti Saarikoski in 1965 and *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* (1916), translated into Finnish by Alex Matson in 1964; and two by Ernest Hemingway: *A Farewell to Arms* (1929), translated into Finnish by Hugo L. Mäkinen in 1946 and *The Sun Also Rises* (1926), translated into Finnish by Jouko Linturi in 1954. It is assumed that the choice of two novels by the same author will help eliminate the effect of the author's style on the translator. The novels and their translations are also fairly close in terms of time.

The entire research material comprises approximately 120 pages of narrative, 30 pages (= 1240 lines of 60 characters) from each of the four novels (beginning, middle and end), a total of 240 pages in all, including the translations. In gathering the quantitative data, representation of spoken language, punctuation and semantic shifts were ignored and the focus was on narrative passages (all prose excluding direct speech).

The first phase of the study comprised a comparative micro-level analysis of the texts chosen. The number of optional shifts made by each translator was counted manually. If there was any doubt about the optional nature of a shift, it was not included in the statistics. Two examples are given below (with back translations (BT) of the Finnish provided) to illustrate optional shifts:

(1)

ST: ...were pebbles and boulders, **dry and white in the sun**, and...

TT: ...oli sora ja vierinkiviä, jotka hohtivat auringossa kuivina ja valkoisina, ja...

BT: ...were pebbles and boulders, **which shone in the sun dry and white**, and...

An alternative not requiring any shift and several other shift options were also available to the translator. A few examples:

TT1: ...oli soraa ja vierinkiviä, kuivia ja valkoisia auringonpaisteessa, ja...

BT1: ...were pebbles and boulders, **dry and white in the sun**, and...

TT2: ...oli soraa ja vierinkiviä, jotka olivat kuivia ja valkoisia auringossa, ja...

BT2: ...were pebbles and boulders, **which were dry and white in the sun**, and...

TT3: ...oli soraa ja vierinkiviä, ne olivat kuivia ja valkoisia auringossa, ja...

BT3: ... were pebbles and boulders, **they were dry and white in the sun**, and...

TT4: ...oli soraa ja vierinkiviä, auringon kuivattamia ja valkaisemia, ja...

BT4: ...were pebbles and boulders, **dried and whitened by the sun**, and...

(2)

ST: **That was a very queer thing.**

TT: *Omituista.*

BT: **Queer.**

Some alternative solutions:

TT1: *Se oli hyvin omituinen juttu.*

BT1: **That was a very queer thing.**

TT2: *Se oli hyvin omituista.*

BT2: **That was very queer.**

TT3: *Omituinen juttu tosiaan.*

BT3: **A queer thing indeed.**

TT4: *Hyvin omituista.*

BT4: **Very queer.**

Before the optional shifts could be analysed, a system was needed to categorize the findings. The system had to work at sentence, clause, phrase and word level. Drawing on grounded theory (Glaser and Strauss 1967), no pre-determined categorization was applied. Categories were allowed to emerge naturally – in this respect the method resembles cluster analysis. A preliminary study showed that the categories that emerged from the analysis of shifts followed the pattern of van Leuven-Zwart's stylistic and syntactic categories (van Leuven-Zwart 1989) and had similarities with the categories introduced by Catford as early as in 1965 (Catford 1965). This was encouraging, since the aim was to establish a simple, widely applicable system that is easy to replicate: the principal categories must be fairly basic to be applicable to data derived from different texts and languages, while at the same time providing a way of zooming in on more specific features.

A short example of the method for classifying shifts is given below. The example source text is James Joyce's *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, translated into Finnish by Matson.

(The back translations make use of articles and prepositions to illustrate the relations between the words, although the Finnish text does not apply to them.)

(3)

ST: The bell rang for night prayers and he **filed (a) /out of the studyhall after the others (b)/ and down the staircase (c) and along the corridors (d)** to the chapel. **The corridors were darkly lit (e) /and the chapel was darkly lit (f)/**. Soon **all would (g)** be dark and **sleeping (h)**./

TT: *Kello soi iltarukoukseen ja hän marssi jonossa muiden mukana luokahuoneesta ja portaita alas ja käytävää pitkin kappeliin. Käytävissä oli valaistus himmeä, kappelissa myös. Pian olisi kaikki pimeänä ja talo nukkuisi.*

BT: *The bell rang for night prayers and he **marched in file (a) /others with out of the studyhall (b)/ and the staircase down (c) and the corridor along (d)** to the chapel. **In the corridors the lighting was dark (e), /in the chapel too (f)/**. Soon **would all (g)** be dark and **the house would sleep (h)**./*

(a) **... filed... -> ... marched in file...**

The translation is *more expansive*, but no new content element has been added. A word has been *replaced* by a number of words. This was not included in the statistics, however, since it could be argued that the alternative use of a single word (**marched**, or equivalent verb) does not necessarily convey the idea of a file. In order to convey the full meaning of the verb, the translator had to add a word.

(b) **...out of the studyhall after the others... -> ... others with out of the studyhall...**

The translator has changed the *order* of the phrases. The conversion of the preposition into a postposition is obligatory and is not recorded. The conversion of **after** into **with** is not recorded either, since semantic shifts are not being considered at this stage.

(c) **... down the staircase... -> ... the staircase down**

The change of *order* is optional and is recorded.

(d) **...along the corridors... -> ... the corridor along...**

The change of *order* is recorded, as is the shift from plural into singular. The latter is classified under *miscellaneous* shifts.

(e) **The corridors were darkly lit... -> In the corridors the lighting was dark...**

There is no actual content shift, but a shift from the passive into the active voice is recorded under *miscellaneous* shifts.

(f) **...and the chapel was darkly lit -> ... in the chapel too**

This shift was recorded as *deleted repetition*. Since no content information is lost, the shift could be recorded as a *contraction* shift, too, but repetition was considered a more distinctive style element and was therefore chosen.

(g) **... all would... -> ... would all...**

A shift of *order*.

(h) ... **sleeping** -> ... **the house would sleep...**

This is a clear *addition*.

The shift chosen for the statistics was always the largest entity that changed, up to sentence level. A shift expanding a non-finite phrase into a clause, for instance, was recorded as belonging to the clause level rather than as an addition of words at the phrase level.

When the recurring shifts had been placed into categories, the quantitative data was organized in the form of tables. The main categories were then divided into a number of sub-categories. The three sections studied per novel were analysed separately to ensure that the individual translators' styles did not vary distinctively between the various sections and that the results were consistent throughout the book. Tendencies characterizing each translator and major intersubjective differences were recorded and used in the construction of 'profiles'.

Findings

The total number of optional shifts made varied greatly according to translator: Saarikoski made a total of 559 shifts, Matson 1,385, Mäkinen 447 and Linturi 1,237 (see Table 1). This would suggest that the effect of the author's style does not override intersubjective differences.

Main categories of shifts

The recurring shifts fell into three broad categories: (1) expansion, (2) contraction, and (3) shifts of order. This finding is supported by a number of previous classifications, for instance Klaudy's classification for grammatical transfer operations (Klaudy 2003). A further category was added for miscellaneous shifts that did not fit into any of the other three.

Below, examples are given of the main categories with back translations into English:

Expansion

(4) ST: **To remember** that and the white look...

TT: *Kun hän muisteli sitä sekä...*

BT: **When he remembered** that and...

(5) ST: ...a thin line...

TT: ...**hyvin** ohut viiva

BT: ...*(a)* **very thin line**

Contraction

(6) ST: ...so that he might not go into hell **when he died**.

TT: ...*ettei kuoltuaan joutuisi helvettiin.*

BT: ...*that not (he) (after) dying would go (to) hell.*

(7) ST: He had written to his father **that I was coming** and they...

TT: *Hän oli kirjoittanut isälleen ja he...*

BT: He had written (to) his father and they...

Order

(8) ST: Someone waved at me from a table.

TT: Erästä pöydästä heilutti minulle joku.

BT: (From) a table waved (at) me someone.

Table 1 gives the numbers and percentages of the types of shift used by each translator. All of the translators used more expansion (40-49% of all shifts) than contraction (19-33% of all shifts). Shifts of order accounted for 18-27% and miscellaneous shifts for 4-9% of the total. Because of space constraints here, attention will be drawn only to the most salient shifts.

Table 1: Numbers of shifts

Shifts	Saarikoski	Matson	Mäkinen	Linturi
Expansion	246 (44.0%)	557 (40.2%)	207 (46.3%)	602 (48.7%)
Contraction	159 (28.5%)	449 (32.4%)	104 (23.3%)	242 (19.6%)
Order	131 (23.4%)	252 (18.2%)	119 (26.6%)	291 (23.5%)
Miscellaneous	23 (4.1%)	127 (9.2%)	17 (3.8%)	102 (8.2%)
Total	559 (100%)	1,385 (100%)	447 (100%)	1,237 (100%)

Expansion

Expansion is the most popular type of shift, but there are major differences in the numbers of expansion shifts across individual translators. For instance, Linturi uses three times as many expansion shifts as Mäkinen.

Expansion shifts would appear to fall into two main sub-categories: replacement of a unit with a longer one (more words) without actually adding any information that was not in the original, and addition of a new element (sentence, clause, phrase or word) that adds to the information provided in the source text. Table 2 illustrates the division of expansion shifts into these sub-categories. Although all four translators used a great deal of expansion, there were differences in the type of expansion they favoured: Saarikoski preferred replacement to addition (148/98), while all the others favoured addition.

Table 2: Expansion shifts

Shifts	Saarikoski	Matson	Mäkinen	Linturi
Replacement	148 (60.2%)	186 (33.4%)	51 (24.6%)	87 (14.5%)
Addition	98 (39.8%)	371 (66.6%)	156 (75.4%)	515 (85.5%)
Total expansion	246 (100%)	557 (100%)	207 (100%)	602 (100%)

A further breakdown presented in Table 3 shows one way of dividing the category of replacement shifts: replacement of a non-finite phrase (NFP), word (W), noun phrase (NP) or some other phrase (P) with a subordinate (S) or main (M) clause (CL).

Table 3: Expansion by replacement

Replacement	Saarikoski	Matson	Mäkinen	Linturi
W/P->MCL	55 (37.2%)	61 (32.8%)	14 (27.5%)	31 (35.6%)
W/NP->SCL	30 (20.3%)	61 (32.8%)	18 (35.3%)	22 (25.3%)
NFP->SCL	60 (40.5%)	54 (29.0%)	17 (33.3%)	26 (29.9%)
W->P	3 (2.0%)	10 (5.4%)	2 (3.9%)	8 (9.2%)
Total replacement	148 (100%)	186 (100%)	51 (100%)	87 (100%)

Addition consisted mostly of additions of single words, although the translators favouring addition also added a sentence or clause occasionally.

Table 4 shows the distribution of the most commonly occurring additions. Saarikoski's additions were distributed fairly equally between word classes (a slight preference for verbs), Matson showed a preference for verbs and nouns, and Mäkinen favoured verbs (61% of all additions). In terms of overall quantity, Linturi added the most, including 19 clauses and 24 phrases. Miscellaneous additions varied, and the recurrence frequency per type was small.

Table 4: Expansion by addition

Addition	Saarikoski	Matson	Mäkinen	Linturi
CL	3 (3.1%)	7 (1.9%)	3 (1.9%)	19 (3.7%)
P	-	5 (1.3%)	3 (1.9%)	24 (4.6%)
Verb	25 (25.5%)	102 (27.5%)	96 (61.6%)	89 (17.3%)
Noun	21 (21.4%)	97 (26.1%)	12 (7.7%)	107 (20.8%)
Adverb	20 (20.4%)	85 (22.9%)	20 (12.8%)	196 (38.1%)
Misc	29 (29.6%)	75 (20.2%)	22 (14.1%)	80 (15.5%)
Total addition	98 (100%)	371 (100%)	156 (100%)	515 (100%)

Contraction

In line with previous research on shifts (Baker 1996; Klaudy 2003), Table 5 shows that contraction was less popular than expansion in all cases. Matson used the most contraction (449) and Mäkinen the least (104). Linturi, who used the most expansion also used a fair amount of contraction (242). Saarikoski and Mäkinen applied less contraction than Matson and Linturi. One might be inclined to think that there is not much to contract in Hemingway's stripped style, but Linturi had 242 cases of contraction, while Saarikoski did not allow Joyce's wordy style to tempt him to contract a lot. This may suggest that the author's style carries less weight than the translator's inclination.

Table 5: Contraction shifts

Shifts	Saarikoski	Matson	Mäkinen	Linturi
Replacement	60 (37.7%)	75 (16.7%)	51 (49.0%)	116 (48.0%)
Deletion	99 (62.3%)	374 (83.3%)	53 (51.0%)	126 (52.0%)
Total contraction	159 (100%)	449 (100%)	104 (100%)	242 (100%)

More differences emerge when the category of contraction is broken down into two sub-categories: replacement of a unit with a shorter one (fewer words) without actually leaving out any content element present in the source text, and deletion of an element of the original source text (sentence, clause, phrase, word or some other feature, such as repetition). Matson stands out in this respect: 374 deletions compared with 75 replacements. As an example of the kind of detailed analysis that can be carried on at this stage it is worth mentioning that Saarikoski and Linturi tend to contract clauses into phrases (53 out of a total of 60 contraction replacements and 101 out of 116 respectively). Since this method for a more detailed analysis has already been illustrated in connection with expansion, these findings will not be explored further here. Instead, let us focus on the expansion versus contraction divide.

Expansion versus contraction

Table 6 sets expansion shifts against contraction shifts. To what extent is the impact of expansion offset by contraction of a similar type? Linturi had a surplus of +360 cases of expansion compared with contraction, while Saarikoski shows a surplus of +87.

Table 6: Difference between expansion and contraction shifts

Shift	Saarikoski	Matson	Mäkinen	Linturi
Replacement (expansion less contraction)	148-60 = +88	186-75 = +111	51-51 = 0	87-116 = -29
Addition less deletion	98-99 = -1	371-374 = -3	156-53 = +103	515-126 = +389
Difference	+87	+108	+103	+360

Saarikoski and Matson favoured replacement against addition/deletion, while replacement played a minor role in the work of Mäkinen and Linturi. Most of Mäkinen's replacements concerned contraction of a subordinate clause into a non-finite phrase (42 out of 51), but only 17 non-finite phrases were expanded into clauses. Linturi used slightly more contraction than expansion in the category of replacement, and more than half of his contraction replacements were subordinate clauses turned into non-finite phrases.

Saarikoski almost never added or deleted a clause or a phrase, and Mäkinen did so very seldom, while Matson deleted 7 clauses and 42 phrases more than he added. Of Mäkinen's total addition surplus of +103, 94 were additions of a verb. Linturi had the highest addition surplus: +389 (+8 sentences, +7 phrases, +154 adverbs, +91 nouns and +80 verbs).

Order

Table 7 illustrates shifts of order. Saarikoski and Mäkinen made 131 and 119 shifts respectively in this category, while Linturi's score was the highest: 291. Matson covered the middle ground with his 252 shifts. Table 7 breaks down shifts of order into: (a) shifts that take place in the subject-verb-object (SVO) sequence, b) shifts that involve a change in the place of an adverb or adverbial phrase, c) shifts in the order of sentences or clauses, and d) other shifts of order. Adverbs and adverbial phrases accounted for a majority of the shifts, and Linturi scored the highest: 220 compared with Mäkinen 182, Matson 97 and Saarikoski 90. Mäkinen's shifts of order took place predominantly in adverbial expressions of place (47.1%), while the percentages representing adverbial shifting were considerably lower for the other translators throughout. Saarikoski favoured shifts in the SVO sequence. The sub-category for other shifts of order is quite large and calls for a closer analysis to reveal any less obvious patterns.

Table 7: Order

Shifts	Saarikoski	Matson	Mäkinen	Linturi
SVO	35 (26.7%)	50 (19.9%)	16 (13.5%)	55 (18.9%)
CL	6 (4.6%)	20 (7.9%)	6 (5.0%)	16 (5.5%)
Time	25 (19.1%)	48 (19.0%)	15 (12.6%)	66 (22.7%)
Place	14 (10.7%)	49 (19.5%)	56 (47.1%)	69 (23.7%)
Other	51 (38.9%)	85 (33.7%)	26 (21.8%)	85 (29.2%)
Total order	131 (100%)	252 (100%)	119 (100%)	291 (100%)

Miscellaneous shifts

Saarikoski made only 23 miscellaneous shifts, Matson 127, Mäkinen 17 and Linturi 102. The frequencies were not very high compared with the other categories, which indicates that the main categories are fairly comprehensive, but Matson's and Linturi's relatively high scores called for further analysis. As many as 51 of Matson's 127 miscellaneous shifts were cases of deleted repetition, while 24 were shifts of tense or mood. In Linturi's case, 26 of the total 102 miscellaneous shifts were instances of deleted repetition, with 15 cases of shift of tense or mood. These features are clearly characteristic of Matson and Linturi and will require more attention.

Quantitative translator profiles

The tendencies revealed in the quantitative analysis indicate that when the data is added up, 'translator profiles' will indeed emerge. Tables 8 and 9 below are one way of illustrating the individual translators' profiles on the basis of the quantitative data presented above.

Table 8: Profiles

Saarikoski	Matson
Low number of shifts 559	High number of shifts 1,385
Expansion 246, contraction 148	Expansion 557, contraction 449
Difference between expansion and contraction in the category of replacement : +88	Difference between expansion and contraction in the category of replacement : + 111
Difference between addition and deletion : -1 Most sub-categories break even	Difference between addition and deletion : -3 verbs and nouns are added clauses and phrases are deleted
Few miscellaneous shifts: 23	Miscellaneous shifts 127 51 cases of deleted repetition 24 shifts of tense or mood
Conclusion: follows ST fairly closely	Conclusion: distance from ST greater than with Saarikoski

Saarikoski scored lower than Matson in all four main categories and in the total number of shifts. His most distinctive feature is that he favoured replacement shifts. Thus, in spite of expanding, he did not tend to add any content that was not present in the source text. He expanded mostly by replacing phrases with main clauses or subordinate clauses. His deletions cancelled out the few additions. He used very few miscellaneous shifts. The translation appears to follow the original closely in view of the features studied.

Matson used more than twice as many shifts as Saarikoski. He expanded mainly through replacement (thus not adding information content). His deletion shifts offset addition but were divided unevenly: his surplus for verbs was +48 and for clauses and phrases +51. The total number of expansion shifts was high, 557, as was the number of contraction shifts: 449, suggesting that shifts at the macro-level in terms of the information contained in the ST and TT are likely. Significant features in the miscellaneous category are deleted repetition (51) and shifts of tense and mood (24). The distance from the source text appears greater than in the case of Saarikoski.

Table 9: Profiles

Mäkinen	Linturi
Low number of shifts 447	High number of shifts 1,237
Expansion 207, contraction 104	Expansion 602, contraction 242
Difference between expansion and contraction in the category of replacement 0	Difference between expansion and contraction in the category of replacement -29
Difference between addition and deletion +103 verbs +94	Difference between addition and deletion +389 verbs +80 nouns +91 adverbs +154 phrases and clauses +15
Order: adverbial expressions of place 56 (total 119)	Order: SVO 55, time adverbial 66, place 69 (total 291)
- not significant-	Miscellaneous: 26 cases of deleted repetition , 15 tense or mood
Conclusion: fairly close to ST, but it is to be expected that information is added, since there is a fairly high addition surplus	Conclusion: adds a great deal, even larger units, ergo information is added and distance from ST is fairly great

Mäkinen's total shifts score was the lowest: 447. He did not score very high or low in any of the main shift categories. This places him in roughly the same league as Saarikoski. Close on one half of all his shifts were expansion, predominantly addition. His additions outweighed his deletions with a difference of +103. He tended to add verbs (+94). Adverbs and adverbial phrases of place accounted for half of all his shifts of order.

Linturi made 1,237 shifts, nearly three times as many as Mäkinen. He also had the biggest difference between expansion and contraction (+360). Most of the expansion shifts involved addition (+389) rather than replacement (-29). He added mostly adverbs (+154 on balance) but also verbs (+80) and nouns (+91), including larger units (phrases and clauses +15). Most shifts of order concerned the place of an adverb or adverbial phrase and the SVO sequence. Furthermore, Linturi had 26 cases of deleted repetition and 15 tense and mood shifts.

From micro-level to macro-level

Although the above profiles have been outlined on a formal and quantitative basis, certain deductions can be made on the basis of such data alone. The number of shifts is a good overall measure of distance from the source text. Various types of shifts, such as removing certain types of information and adding others, and shifts of order, can be assumed to affect focalization, i.e. the way the fictional world is presented.

The method presented so far forms a mere foundation for further study. When the quantitative data has been dealt with, attention should be focused on the interaction between the formal and content elements which constitute the discourse level of a literary work and are a reflection of the story level (here semantics re-enters the picture). It is through this interaction that the experience of the reader is created.

As an example illustrating the step from micro-level through content-related analysis to macro-level, a quick look is taken at the patterns found in Linturi's 30 verb additions in the first 10-page section. In 7 cases Linturi adds a verb to specify the meaning of another verb:

- (9) ST: ... I **had** somebody **verify** the story...
TT: ...*sain houkutelluksi jonkun kysymään...*
BT: ... *I **managed to persuade** someone **to ask**...*
- (10) ST: I **was** a little drunk.
TT: *Aloin olla hiukan humalassa.*
BT: *I **was beginning to be** a little drunk.*
- (11) ST: ... (he) **talked** of... how...
TT: ... *antoi ymmärtää...*
BT: *(he) **gave to understand**...*

The three examples above illustrate the tendency of the translator to explain the original by providing more information. In example 9, the translation implies that a certain amount of persuasion was required before the person concerned consented to verify the fact. In question This need for persuasion is not present in the source text. Hemingway's style is clipped and he describes the fictional world as if through the eye of a camera, by stating simple facts, not as an involved person focalizer. He does not explain people's intentions as in translation example 11. The translator's interpretation of the content of the narrative makes the reader see the fictional events in a slightly different light, as it directs the reader's interpretation of what is described. Incidentally, this tendency is confirmed by the use of a more specific verb to translate a more general one as in the example below. This type of shift occurs 12 times in the first 10 pages.

- (12) ST: **write** -> TT: *raapustaa* (BT: *scribble*)
ST: **work** -> TT: *raataa* (BT: *toil*)
ST: **talk** -> TT: *pauhata* (BT: *rant*)

At macro-level, these tendencies make the neutral camera-eye presentation more emotive, giving laconic expressions a more involved descriptive content, thus reducing the focalizer's distance from the fictional world.

There are also 14 clear cases of verb being added where none were used in the ST. A few illustrative examples are given below:

- (13)
ST: I suppose she only wanted what she couldn't have.
TT: *Brett taisi vain haluta sitä, minkä **tiesi** mahdottomaksi saada.*
BT: *I suppose Brett only wanted what she **knew** (to be) impossible to have.*
- (14)
ST: It had a funny name in Italian.
TT: *Sillä oli hassulta **kajahtava** italiankielinen nimi.*
BT: *It had a funny-**ringing** Italian name.*

(15)

ST: At five o'clock I was...

TT: *Kellon lyödessä viisi minä...*

BT: The clock **striking** five I...

(16)

ST: (I wondered where Cohn got that incapacity to enjoy Paris.) Possibly from Mencken.

TT: *Mencken ehkä oli tartuttanut hänet.*

BT: Mencken possibly **had infected** him.

In example 14 and 15, the translator draws attention to sounds that are only implicit in the original. Example 13 adds the verb *knew*, turning the neutral, external point of view of the expression *what she couldn't have* into Brett's personal point of view. Example 16 adds the idea of infection, with all its negative connotations and association with disease. Sensory information is added, point-of-view and distance changed and sentence rhythm altered through these shifts. Such shifts reduce the effect of the unadorned, simple, almost bleak presentation of the original through an impersonal focalizer.

Discussion

The first two research questions concerned recurring shifts and intersubjective differences between translators. Recurring shift patterns were indeed found, and distinct differences were found between the translators. As for the third question concerning the existence of translator profiles, it would seem that an inclination to translate in a certain manner, i.e. style, can be detected and that it is indeed possible to outline profiles for translators. Further study of translations of works written by different authors and translated by the same translator will throw more light on the issue of profiles. Although content-related impacts can already be pointed out on the basis of the current data, a more comprehensive answer to the fourth research question relating to macro-level implications cannot be offered within the limits of the present paper, but are part of my current work (Pekkanen, in progress) and will be discussed in future publications.

This paper suggests a method for the study of the style of translations. It puts the spotlight on syntactic-stylistic features at the formal level, which I have found highly significant in my own work as a practising literary translator and teacher of literary translation. The method could also be applied to approaches tackling translation style from other angles, with focus on semantics, phonology, connectives, punctuation, etc. The key is the recurrence of formal features constituting a foundation for further content-oriented analysis.

The method is simple and easily replicable. The fact that at the stage of collecting quantitative data researchers may make differing decisions regarding the eligibility of borderline cases as optional shifts (there might be disagreement on what is an acceptable/possible alternative) may give rise to some criticism. This should not present an insurmountable problem, however, since borderline cases are a minority among the recurring features and tend not to emerge as distinctive characteristics in a translation. The requirement of recurrence ensures that only characteristics typical of the translator's idiolect are considered.

The principal categories of shifts found are relatively general and as such not very informative. What is important, however, is that the method makes it possible to reveal and direct focus on individual differences through gradual sub-categorization. It should also be noted that although the category labelled as miscellaneous is fairly small in all the four translations, it may contain significant recurring shifts such as deletion of repetition, which may carry a great deal of stylistic weight.

This kind of analysis allows the researcher to go into more and more detail in a systematic way and adopt a supplementary methodology in the process. Thus a stylistic profile emerges and the translator becomes more visible, raising his/her voice to join the author in a duet.

Author's address

Hilkka.Pekkanen(a)englishcentre.fi

References

Primary sources

- Hemingway, Ernest (1929) *A Farewell to Arms*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
(translation into Finnish by Hugo L. Mäkinen (1946) *Jäähyväiset aseille*, Helsinki: Tammi)
- Hemingway, Ernest (1926) *The Sun Also Rises*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
(translation into Finnish by Jouko Linturi (1954) *Ja aurinko nousee*, Helsinki: Tammi)
- Joyce, James (1916) *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, New York: BW Huebsch.
(translation into Finnish by Alex Matson (1964) *Taiteilijan omakuva nuoruuden vuosilta*, Helsinki: Tammi)
- Joyce, James (1914) *Dubliners*, London: Grant Richards.
(translation into Finnish by Pentti Saarikoski (1965) *Dublinilaisia*, Helsinki, Tammi)

Secondary sources

- Baker, Mona (2000) 'Towards a Methodology for Investigating the Style of a Literary Translator', *Target* 12(2): 241-265.
- Baker, Mona (1996) 'Corpus-based Translation Studies: the Challenges that Lie Ahead', in Harold Somers (ed.) *Terminology, LSP and Translation*, Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Bal, Mieke (1980) *De theorie van vertellen en verhalen. Inleidning in de narratologie*, Muiderberg: Coutinho.
- Catford, J.C. (1965) *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Glaser, Barney G. and Anselm L. Strauss (1967) *The discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Chicago: Aldine.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1973) *Explorations in the Functions of Language*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Hermans, Theo (1996) 'The Translator's Voice in Translated Narrative', *Target* 8(1): 23-48.
- Klaudy, Kinga (2003) *Languages in Translation*, Budapest: Scholastica.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Michael Short (1981) *Style in Fiction*, London: Longman.
- Leuven-Zwart, Kitty, van (1989) 'Translation and Original: Similarities and Dissimilarities I', *Target* 1(2): 151-181.
- Molina, Lucía and Hurtado Albir (2002) 'Translation Techniques Revisited: A Dynamic and Functionalist Approach', *Meta* 47(4): 498-512.
- Munday, Jeremy (1998) 'A Computer-assisted Approach to the Analysis of Translation Shifts', *Meta* 43(4): 1-16.
- Nord, Christiane (1997) 'Functional Translation Units', in Anna Mauranen and Tiina Puurtinen (eds.) *Translation – Acquisition – Use*, Jyväskylä: AfinLa Yearbook 1997. Publications de l'Association Finlandaise de Linguistique Appliquée 55: 41-50.
- Parks, Tim (1998) *Translating Style*, London: Cassell.
- Pekkanen, Hilkka (in progress) *The Duet of the Author and the Translator: Looking at Style through Shifts in Literary Translation*, doctoral dissertation, University of Helsinki.

- Popovič, Anton (1970) 'The Concept 'Shift of Expression' in Translation Analysis', in James Holmes (ed) *The Nature of Translation. Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, The Hague & Paris /Bratislava: Mouton / Slovak Academy of Sciences.
- Toury, Gideon (1980) *In Search of a Theory of Translation*, Tel Aviv: The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1998) *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*, London: Routledge.
- Venuti, Lawrence (1995) *The Translator's Invisibility*, London: Routledge.