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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Systemic Notation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( a \rightarrow _x^y )</td>
<td>There is a system (set of options) whose terms are ([x]/[y]) and whose entry condition is ([a]). In other words, if ([a]), then either ([x]) or ([y]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a \rightarrow _x^y \hspace{2cm} _m^n )</td>
<td>There are two ‘simultaneous’ systems, ([x]/[y]) and ([m]/[n]), both having the entry condition ([a]). In other words, if ([a]), then both (I) either ([x]) or ([y]) or (II) either ([m]) or ([n]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a \rightarrow _x^y \hspace{2cm} _m^n )</td>
<td>There are two systems, ([x]/[y]) and ([m]/[n]), one dependent on the other. ([x]/[y]) has the entry condition ([a]), and ([m]/[n]) has the entry condition ([x]). In other words, if ([a]), then either ([x]) or ([y]). If ([x]), then ([m]) or ([n]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p \rightarrow _x^y \hspace{2cm} q \rightarrow _m^n )</td>
<td>There is a system ([x]/[y]) with a conjunct entry condition ([p]) and ([q]). In other words, if both ([p]) and ([q]), then either ([x]) or ([y]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( p \rightarrow _x^y \hspace{2cm} q \rightarrow _m^n )</td>
<td>There is a system ([x]/[y]) with a disjunct entry condition ([p]) and ([q]). In other words, if either ([p]) or ([q]), then either ([x]) or ([y]).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( a \rightarrow _x^y \hspace{2cm} T^U )</td>
<td>In system graphs, realization statements are represented in boxes (here: (T^U)) below terms. For a list of realization statements, see below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Types of realization statements:
- insertion: \(+ X\) (insert function \(X\))
- conflation: \(X/Y\) (conflate function \(X\) with function \(Y\))
- ordering: \(X^Y\) (order \(Y\) after \(X\))
- preselection: \(\_w\) (preselect feature \(w\))

Note:
Names of systems are written in small capitals, such as MOOD TYPE.
Names of systemic terms (options in systems) are written in lower case, but inside square brackets, e.g. [indicative].
Names of functions are written with capital initial, e.g. Subject.
Lexicogrammatical representations (wordings) are italicized, e.g. be, whereas semantic representations (meanings) take single quotes.
Clausal dependency status is indicated as follows:

Greek letters (bracketed) = hypotactic relations
Numbers (bracketed) = paratactic relations
Double square brackets = embedded clause
Double arrowheads, i.e. << >>, indicate a hypotactic enhancing ('non-defining relative') clause.
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Chapter 1. Introduction

The particular research object in this thesis is the phenomenon known as *intralingual translation* (henceforth INTRA), i.e. the rewording of a text in a different style within the same language. The motivation behind the project is three-fold, encompassing a personal, a social and an academic element. As for the personal component, my own interest in the research object stems from a decade of teaching at upper secondary level in Denmark. When later, after having left upper-secondary teaching behind me, I met the theoretical concept of INTRA, I was struck by the centrality of this phenomenon to the pedagogic process - how integral to teaching practice must necessarily be the constant attempt to rephrase abstract theory in terms more likely to be accessible to young students. As for the societal impetus, Zethsen (2007: 282-283) draws attention to the multi-faceted manifestations of INTRA in modern culture, arguing that INTRA is in fact an expanding phenomenon, owing to demands from the public in the role of consumers, taxpayers, patients etc. that the knowledge of experts and the decisions of bureaucrats should be communicated in language accessible to lay persons (ibid.: 301). Such demands find support in a study by Wodak, Menz et al. (1989), who uncover an outright crisis of understanding (*Verständigungskrise*) in modern society, especially between experts like medical and legal professionals on the one hand and members of the public on the other. However, despite the need for and the growth of INTRA, the academic interest in the phenomenon has been lagging behind. Within Translation Studies (henceforth TS), INTRA has always been a marginal research object, as noted in the preface to *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*:

[...intralingual translation is not such a minor issue as the existing literature on translation might suggest. [...I know of no research that looks specifically at the phenomena of intralingual or intersemiotic translation. We do have classifications such as Jakobson's, which alert us to the possibility of such things as intersemiotic and intralingual translation, but we do not make any genuine use of such classifications in our research. (Baker and Saldanha 2009: xviii)]

Zethsen (2009: 795-796) likewise points out the research gap, and therefore exhorts

[...translation scholars to carry out research within the field. [...]We need much more empirically-based research to provide a thorough and comprehensive description of intralingual translation and of the similarities and differences between intralingual and interlingual translation. (Zethsen 2009: 810)]

In response to this ‘call for action’, the aim of the present project is thus to fill an empirical and theoretical gap: on the basis of an empirical investigation into the transformation of an expert text type into a lay-oriented one, the goal of the present thesis is to identity some of the central mechanisms involved in INTRA, and thereby to contribute to the development of theory within an underresearched area of Translation Studies (TS).

It should be made clear from the outset, however, that just as interlingual translation is a highly diverse phenomenon (see section 4.2), INTRA is no uniform category either. The present investigation is concerned with a specific sub-type for which I have chosen the term *lay-oriented INTRA*, i.e. the rewriting between registers, or text types, of naturally occurring language, more specifically LSP texts (for a sub-categorization of INTRA, see section 4.3). This choice places the investigation at the intersection between TS on the one
hand and the linguistic field of register studies (e.g. Biber 1993; 1995; Biber, Conrad et al. 1998; Teich 2009) on the other. Yet it must be emphasized that since the research interest of the present project is in the derivation of one text type from another, and not in any linguistic profiling of the two registers involved, the investigation is firmly situated within TS.

1.1. Theoretical foundations
The present study is premised on the assumption that intralingual rewriting may be conceptualized as a type of translation. The assumption is traceable to the classification referred to in the above quotation from The Routledge Encyclopedia, which is Roman Jakobson's famous tripartite typology of translation:

1. Intralingual translation or rewording is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of other signs of the same language.
2. Interlingual translation or translation proper\(^1\) is an interpretation of verbal signs by means of some other language.
3. Intersemiotic translation or transmutation is the interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems. (Jakobson 1959/2012: 127)

Moreover, in its conception of translation as well as in its methodology (see section 1.4 and chapters 2 and 5), the present project is functionalist in orientation: translation-theoretically, the study is informed by Skopos theory (Vermeer 1986; 1996; 1989/2000; Reiss and Vermeer 1984/2013; Nord 1997), which emphasizes the goal-orientedness of translating, i.e. the belief that the creation of a target text is, and should always be guided by the prospective context in which it is to function. This axiom allows for so-called heterofunctional translation, i.e. translations (target texts) representing a shift in text type as compared with the source text (ST), and it rejects the notion of semantic equivalence as the paramount objective for translation as such.

1.2. Data
Empirically, the study is centred on related sets of texts from the field of medicine, more specifically the so-called Summary of Product Characteristics as source texts (STs) and the Patient Information Leaflet (PIL) as target texts (TTs). The latter text type is the one which accompanies packages of medicinal products and which is aimed at the end consumer (the patient). As mandated by EU law, PILs are derived from a specialized text type known as the Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC), which sets out the technical particulars relevant for healthcare professionals handling the product (doctors and pharmacists).

1.3. Research aim and questions
The aim of the study is to chart the derivational strategies behind the genesis of the above-mentioned target texts (the PILs), and, on that basis, to infer the key principles on which lay-oriented INTRA is based. The research questions, therefore, are:

\(^1\) The concept of 'translation proper' will be problematized in a later section, but as a label the expression is handy (because graphologically completely distinct from the label intralingual, which is only two graphs removed from interlingual) and will be abbreviated as TRP in this thesis.

\(^2\) A detailed critique and examination of the implications of Jakobson's typology will be undertaken in a later chapter.
RQ1: What is the range, nature and relative prominence of the specific types of micro-level strategies identifiable in the derivation of PILs from SPCs?

RQ2: On the basis of the nature and range of micro-level strategies identified in answer to RQ1, what genera (of strategies) may be induced as key principles of lay-oriented INTRA?

The research design of the project, as reflected in the above research questions, makes the investigation a predominantly qualitative study, based on a hermeneutic approach (see section 1.6.1), but with a quantitative element: it is a textual study in which the identification of micro-level strategies relies on the comparative interpretation of grammatical structures and lexical items in derivationally related ST and TT micro-segments, and, at the level of generalization, it is a study aimed at the generation of descriptive hypotheses. For an answer to the question of relative prominence (see RQ1) to be possible, a quantitative element is necessary (the frequencies of the individual types will be counted), but it should be made absolutely clear that no statistical methods will be employed. The sample is much too small and the phenomena identified much too heterogeneous in size and nature to allow any proper statistical analysis.

As already indicated, the hypotheses sought are descriptive/interpretive rather than explanatory ones (for a typology of hypotheses, see section 1.6.1). In terms of a causal explanation for the linguistic make-up of the TTs, a macro-level, extratextual one is readily at hand in the shape of the legal framework which lays down the requirements for PILs as being aimed at the general public. A main requirement in this connection is readability for the average member of the public (see section 7.2 for more detail).

At the level of intratextual micro-segments, on the other hand, causal explanations would be cognitive ones, i.e. attempts to explain TT wordings as the results of cognitive processes on the part of the translator. Whereas much translation research in later decades has been devoted to this aspect of translating (see e.g. Tirkkonen-Condit and Jääskeläinen 2002; Shreve and Angelone 2010), it should be made clear that cognitive processes are in no way the concern of this thesis. The textual analyses reflected later in this thesis (chapter 8) represent interpretations of the TTs as derivational products, i.e. as results of choices, as these are observable in the make-up of the textual material. The object of analysis in this investigation, therefore, is wordings, and derivational strategies are to be understood as the linguistic changes identifiable through a comparison of related ST and TT segments (see section 6.1 for a detailed examination of the concept of translation strategy).

1.4. Methodology

Although the project is firmly situated in TS, as noted above, the methodology adopted for the investigation is linguistic in orientation, being largely based on the linguistic 'school'

3 Chesterman (2008a: 371) distinguishes between a number of different types of causal explanations, of which the legal framework referred to would be a 'formal cause', with reference to which 'the explanandum is as it is because of the formal requirements of what is expected.' (ibid.). The purpose of achieving readability, on the other hand, which, as noted, is legally enjoined on the PIL text producer as one of the key goals of her task, may rather be viewed as a 'final cause', in the sense that it explains the nature of the texts with reference to '[...] the goal of the agent(s) producing it.' (ibid.). This 'goal' is synonymous with the concept of skopos in H. J. Vermeer's translation theory (1996), as also pointed out by Chesterman (2008a: 371) (see section 3.4 for a more detailed account of skopos theory).
known as Systemic-Functional Linguistics (SFL), whose 'founder' is the British-Australian linguist M. A. K. Halliday. As a methodology for an investigation into registerial derivation, SFL offers the following advantages:

- It is a holistic linguistic theory, offering a complete model of the 'architecture' of language (e.g. Halliday 2003), as well as a theory of linguistic variation (e.g. Halliday 1978), including variation between registers.
- One of the reasons why SFL is able to incorporate a theory of linguistic variation is, in terms borrowed from another prominent systemic-functional (SF) theoretician, Ruqaiya Hasan (1999a: 12-13), that it is an exotropic theory, as opposed to endotropic ones. As an example of the latter type, Hasan (ibid.: 13) mentions formal linguistics of the Chomskyan tradition, which views language as an autonomous phenomenon, for the study of which linguistics needs no dialogue with other disciplines. Exotropic theories, on the other hand, are ones open to interdisciplinary dialogue, seeking inspiration in the concepts developed in other disciplines that may shed light on the research object in question (ibid.). Thus, as a linguistic 'school', SFL is markedly sociological in orientation, emphasizing the situatedness in social context as the key to understanding the nature of linguistic phenomena (e.g. Halliday 1978; 1972/2003; Halliday and Hasan 1989). Since the differences as well as the similarities between the two text types under consideration here are obviously a product of extra-linguistic factors such as communicative purpose, target readership and subject matter (see below), a contextualist theory of language such as SFL was deemed the most appropriate type of methodology.
- SFL is designed to be, in Halliday's own words, an appliable theory (2008: 7; 2009: 61) that may contribute to the solution of problems outside linguistics proper:

> Systemic functional linguistics may be characterized as a problem-oriented theory, in the sense that it is designed to assist towards identifying and tackling problems that arise from outside itself - that is, not problems that the theory identifies for itself. Typically therefore the questions it sets out to answer are questions faced by people who are not linguists but are engaged in, or at least interested in, some activity in which language plays a key role. [...] For these reasons SFL tends to neutralize the boundary between (theoretical) linguistics and applied linguistics. (Halliday 2009: 61)

The applicability (or 'appliability') of the theory is probably the reason why it - or at least parts of it - has in fact enjoyed long-time recognition within TS as a provider of valuable analytical concepts. The application, however, has mostly been within translation quality assessment (see e.g. House 1997; Jiang 2010; Kim 2009), and as a tool for source-text analysis to support the practice of translation (see e.g. Hatim and Mason 1990; Kim 2007). In the present investigation, Systemic-Functional Grammar (SFG) will be used as a framework for purely descriptive purposes, viz. the comparative analysis of derivationally related segments in STs and TTs (see below).
- Finally, SFL views language as a resource for making meaning, and language production (meaning-making) as choice, which means that text generation is to be understood as repeated choice among paradigmatic sets of options (e.g. Halliday 1994/2003). In this way,
the theory is well suited to the analysis of translation, particularly when the act of translating - as in the present study - is conceptualized as serial choice on the part of the (in this case intralingual) translator (cf. Delabastita 2008: 234).

1.5. Method
The research method adopted for the present study is the so-called coupled-pairs method (Toury 1995), consisting in manual, comparative analysis of related ST and TT micro-segments (for a more detailed description, see section 8.1). It should be noted that the use of computational tools was considered (and suggested to me several times during the preparation phase of the project) but rejected. It was found that electronic tools might have been valuable, even indispensable, had the project consisted in the registral profiling and comparison of two corpora as a whole. The analysis of derivation, on the other hand, could only be done manually.

1.6. Epistemological considerations

1.6.1. Hypotheses typologized
As noted above, the sole method relied on in the present study is hermeneutic, but, in accordance with Chesterman (2008b: 49), one informed by Popperian principles of scientific inquiry. Popper's recommendations for the pursuit of scientific knowledge are well-known: scientific investigation should be founded on the formulation and critical testing of hypotheses (Popper 1963: 33-59), and, although Popper's philosophy of science may be compatible with the natural sciences first and foremost, the view taken here will be that a humanistic study like the present is equally founded on the construction and testing of hypotheses, viz. the particular type labelled interpretive ones by Chesterman (2008b). These represent a subset in the following typology:

- Descriptive hypotheses: all Xs have feature F / belong to class Y.
- Explanatory hypotheses: X is caused by / made possible by, Y; Y explains X.
- Predictive hypotheses: in conditions ABC, X will (tend to) occur.
- Interpretive hypotheses: X can be (usefully) interpreted as Y. (Chesterman 2007a: 4)

In Chesterman's own view (2007a: 4), the first three types are self-explanatory, which may be true of descriptive and predictive hypotheses, but perhaps less true of explanatory ones, as indicated by the fact that another entire paper is devoted by Chesterman (2008a) to a clarification of the concept of explanation. As reflected in Chesterman's own gloss above ('X is caused by ...'), causal explanations may likely be viewed as the prototypical kind of explanatory hypothesis. Explanatory hypotheses, however, are only relevant to the present investigation in so far as the conditioning factors (cf. Toury 2004a; cf. Toury 2004b) behind the genesis of PILs need to be identified, which was done above in the reference to the legal requirements and the hypothesized goals of the text producer.

As for interpretive hypotheses, the natural province is humanistic research method, but it is a type of hypothesis which is nevertheless integral to the natural sciences as well (Chesterman 2008b: 55). Chesterman's definition is the following (ibid: 52): interpretation consists in linking the object of analysis with some other concept, which means to perceive it as something - to see 'X as [...]Y' (ibid.. Emphasis as in the original). Taking his point of
departure in what he terms *the hermeneutic AS* (ibid.: 51 et passim), Chesterman (ibid.: 53-54) proposes the following typology:

- the prototypical type of interpretation is anchored in the *symbolic as*, being the most prevalent type within art and literature. A rose is typically interpreted *as* a symbol of love, a cross as a symbol of Christianity, etc. (my examples).

- next is the *metaphorical or analogical as*, i.e. interpretation as comparison. Elsewhere, Chesterman (2007a: 6) lists some of the metaphorical interpretations of the very phenomenon of translation down through times: 'translation is (like) imitation' / 'is following in the footsteps of the original' / 'is the servant or slave of the original', etc.

- the third type is the *classificatory as*, by virtue of which a phenomenon is interpreted as a subcategory of a superordinate concept. The cardinal assumption on which the present study is based is one such, viz. the hypothesis that intralingual rewriting may be seen a subcategory of translation.

- the fourth type, which is the *compositional as*, is the reverse of the previous category: a phenomenon is interpreted as consisting of a given number of subcategories. An example has already been given in the shape of Jakobson's tripartite typology of the concept of translation.

- finally, the fifth type is the *definitional as*. The mathematical concept \(\pi\), e.g., is defined *as* \(22/7\) (my example). Examples will abound in the methodological section (chapters 5 and 6), where the content of analytical categories will be defined in detail.

Chesterman's typology, however, is not without its problems: first of all, it is not clear whether separate categories are really needed for classification and composition, or whether they should rather be interpreted (!) as two different aspects of the same category, for which I propose the label *the taxonomic as*. The two subcategories, then, represent opposite 'directions' in a taxonomizing interpretation: classification, or subordination, as I prefer to label it for reasons to appear below, means relating a phenomenon to a superordinate category, whereas composition means specifying the subcategories of a phenomenon. This is also the reason why *the compositional as* is an unfortunate term: Chesterman's own definition makes it clear that the identification of subcategories is the purpose or result of a compositional interpretation: 'If I define equivalence as consisting of two types, or five types, I am positing "equivalence" as a hypernym and the various types as its hyponyms. I am in effect proposing an interpretation about the composition of this hypernym' (2008b: 54). However, the status of the individual subtypes of e.g. equivalence (or whatever phenomenon) is not that of parts that serve together to form a whole, but that of species of a genus. The relationship is not meronymy, but subordination, and I therefore propose the term *the typological as* instead.

What is more, there appear to be two underlying categories at work in Chesterman's typology, viz. ones suited for the interpretation of empirical phenomena and ones for the interpretation of conceptual entities. Of these, the *symbolic as* belongs in the empirical category: as indicated, this is the type of interpretation performed by e.g. a literary exegete in the encounter with certain types of textual phenomena (a rose taken to stand for love, etc.). The other kinds, on the other hand, rather appear to be aspects of conceptual investi-
gation: this applies to metaphorical hypotheses, to taxonomizing ones (to use my own term) and to definition. Moreover, if symbolic interpretation is concerned with the uncovering of meaning hidden behind an 'exterior' or beneath a 'surface', it follows that this type of interpretation consists in the decoding of signs. As is well-known from semiotic theory, however, signs are manifold, including such categories as signals, symptoms, indexes and icons, apart from symbols (Sebeok 1994), which raises at least the possibility that different subtypes of interpretive hypotheses may be needed for the decoding of each of the individual sign types. Thus, the decoding of indices (signs which function as the mark of, and 'pointers' to the existence/action of some other phenomenon (ibid.: 31-33), such as smoke→fire, footprint→footstep) is of course the essence of criminal investigation (cf. ibid.: 63-64), which must proceed through the generation of hypotheses consisting in abduction or deduction (ibid.: 63). The decoding of symptoms, on the other hand, is the natural province of medicine (ibid.: 24-28), and might be termed diagnostic hypotheses. As for the interpretation of iconic signs (signs representing a phenomenon through similarity, as in a picture (ibid.: 28-31)), a possible term would be hypotheses of resemblance. These are merely intimations of possibilities, however, and no real typologizing of decoding according to sign type is deemed relevant here.

What is important, on the other hand, is a different kind of analytical operation associated with the interpretation of empirical phenomena, and one not appearing in Chesterman's typology, which is the assignment of class membership, i.e. the categorization of a particular research object as an instance of a class of phenomena. I propose the term categorizing hypothesis for this type of interpretation, which would appear to be fundamental to science, across individual disciplines. Categorization is the type of interpretation performed when a legal professional identifies a particular violent episode with the legal concept grievous bodily harm; when a botanist counts x instances of (what he interprets as) the category orchid in some habitat; when a zoologist determines the species of an animal under observation; or when a grammarian decides that a given verb form in a text belongs to the category imperative. In fact, much empirical investigation would appear to consist in a dual interpretive operation, viz. in some type of decoding (see above) and in the simultaneous generation of a categorizing hypothesis. Thus, a psychiatrist, faced with a patient whose manifest behaviour consists in excessive cleanliness, may generate the diagnostic hypothesis that the behaviour is a symptom of OCD. However, selecting OCD as the 'content' (signifié) of the symptomatic behaviour (the signifiant) simultaneously amounts to the generation of a categorizing hypothesis, viz. the assignment of this particular psychiatric case to the class OCD. In other words, it is the analytical act of selecting a concept to fit some kind

---

5 Cf. the fictional, but famed 'science of deduction' introduced by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle in the very first Sherlock Holmes novel, A Study in Scarlet (1887).

6 As previously noted, Chesterman (2008b: 55), too, acknowledges that 'interpretive hypotheses are also relevant to the natural sciences,' pointing out that e.g. '[...definitions and category classifications are used in data analysis'. It is not clear, however, if by 'category classification' Chesterman refers to the type of hypothesis he himself refers to as 'classificatory', which has been shown really to consist in subordination, or to the one I have defined as the assignment of class membership and termed categorizing hypothesis. The wording 'category classifications' gives rise to a suspicion that the intent behind 'the classificatory as' is in fact the assignment of class membership. This, of course, must remain speculation, and it must be maintained that, following Chesterman's own definition, the 'classificatory as' consists in subordination and not the identification of class belonging: 'Here X is interpreted as a kind of Y. In other words, this as postulates a hypernym under which X can be classified [...] ' (ibid. 53).
of surface manifestation which constitutes the categorization.

A modified version of Chesterman's typology of interpretive hypotheses thus takes the following shape:

![Fig. 1.6.1. A tentative typology of interpretive hypotheses]

Whether the above suggestions make Chesterman's typology of interpretive hypotheses complete must be left an undecided question. What matters here is that the extension of the typology enables identification of those specific types of interpretation on which the present study will depend: 1) the analytical part of the study, i.e. the analyses of the derivationally related textual segments in STs and TTs, will consist in categorization, through the assignment of specific instances of micro-level strategies to pre-defined types. 2) The generalizations will have as their ultimate goal the generation of a typological hypothesis (in answer to RQ2): the induction of regularities in the shape of a number of general mechanisms which will be posited as central characteristics of lay-oriented INTRA.

While especially the first of the two typologies of Chesterman's introduced above (the typology of hypotheses as such, encompassing descriptive, predictive, explanatory and interpretive ones) is a valuable tool for clarifying the specific nature of the hermeneutic approach adopted here, it is at the same time to be noted that any strict division between interpretive and descriptive hypotheses does not appear maintainable: there is no denying that the formulation of 'central characteristics' amounts to description as much as interpretation, which is why the aims of this thesis were earlier referred to as 'descriptive/interpretive'. A possible solution would be to locate the two types of hypothesis in separate parts of the study: interpretation in analysis and description in conclusions. Such a separation, however, is not supportable, since the interpretive hypotheses generated at the lower levels of analysis may equally be said to entail description, and similarly the typological 'end hypothesis' aimed at is still interpretive in kind, as argued above. The research method as well as the overall purpose of the study, therefore, must be maintained as being 'descriptive/interpretive'. It should be noted, however, that there is in fact a predictive element to the study as well, to be elaborated on below (see section 1.6.2)

Another question that needs consideration is whether the hermeneutic approach adopted here is really in accordance with Popperian principles, as previously posited. In so far as all levels of interpretation in the present study will be driven by a continual interplay between generation and testing of hypotheses, the stance adopted here is that it does conform to
these principles, but it is to be acknowledged that the method will not amount to fully-fledged falsificationism, since interpretive hypotheses, as Chesterman points out (2008b: 55), are not falsifiable. In each individual instance, they may and will be tested through careful consideration of the degree to which the data in question match a hypothesized category, and through comparison with alternative hypotheses (cf. ibid.: 56). In this way, a graduation of the explanatory power offered by the individual alternatives will be sought with the aim of selecting the most sustainable one, but true falsification is not possible.

1.6.2. Generalization
Since the search for regularities is a key objective in scientific inquiry, including TS (Chesterman 2008a: 367), it remains to be considered in what sense the research aims of the present study consist in generalization. For this question to be answerable, the following types of generalization must be distinguished from each other: representational, inferential and theoretical (Ritchie and Lewis 2003: 264-270). Of these, the two former types are interpretable as subtypes of Chesterman's predictive hypotheses, being concerned with generalization from a sample to a wider context, either to the parent population from which the sample is drawn, or to other related contexts. In quantitative approaches, representational generalization usually consists in statistical inference from the sample to the parent population, i.e. the prediction that the statistical frequencies identified in the sample will match those in the population as a whole (cf. ibid.: 269). This, obviously, is a favoured type of generalization in the natural sciences. In the present investigation, this type would entail inference from the frequencies identified in the text sample to all SPC-into-PIL translations. Given the degree of linguistic standardization observable in SPCs and PILs, the two text types give reason to believe that the relative frequencies observable in the analyses are to some degree indicative of the entire population, but not in any statistical sense. Since the sample is much too small and the phenomena counted much too heterogeneous in nature, as already noted, statistical generalization is not relevant to the present study (cf. Justesen and Mik-Meyer 2012: 42). Nevertheless, some predictive significance will be attributed to the frequencies, in that they will be interpreted as indicators of the likelihood with which individual strategy types can be assumed to be prominent in the population as a whole. In other words, the higher the frequency of a type, the higher the likelihood of its prominence in SPC-into-PIL INTRA in general. Exactly how prominent is the question that the investigation cannot answer.7

As for inferential generalization, this second type of prediction is irrelevant to the present investigation: it means inferring from a specific context to related ones (Ritchie and Lewis 2003: 267-268). In the present study, this would mean predicting the recurrence of the range and relative prominence of strategy types observed in SPC-into-PIL INTRA in other types of lay-oriented INTRA, e.g. in other LSP fields such as finance or law. The present study gives no grounds for such inference.

The type of generalization most obviously relevant to the present study is the third type, which is concerned with the formulation of theoretical categories (Ritchie and Lewis 2003: 266-267), and which must be taken to correspond to the formulation of general, interpre-

---

7 Representational generalization is also relevant to the present study in a different, completely non-quantitative sense. This will be specified below.
tive hypotheses in Chesterman's sense. The generalizations sought in the present study, therefore, are theoretical in the first instance and representational in the second: 1) they are theoretical, in that the answer to RQ2 will consist in a 'chart' of generic concepts intended to further the theoretical understanding of lay-oriented INTRA. 2) They are representation- al in two ways: first, as already noted, the quantitative results will be assumed to indicate likelihood of prominence, and, second, the range of specific strategy types to be identified will be deemed representative in the sense of inclusiveness (cf. Ritchie and Lewis 2003: 269). This is because the generic 'chart' will be distilled from what is likely to be the full scope and diversity of strategy types in SPC-into-PIL INTRA (the answer to RQ1). This is another predictive element: the prediction that the range of phenomena identified in the sample will apply to the population as a whole, albeit with likely variation between the individual texts. In the words of Ritchie and Lewis:

Qualitative research cannot be generalised on any statistical basis [...]. Rather, it is the content or 'map' of the range of views, experiences, outcomes or other phenomena under study [...] that can be inferred to the researched population. Although variants of circumstances, views or experiences would undoubtedly be found within the parent population, it is at the level of categories, concepts and explanation that generalisation can take place. (Ritchie and Lewis 2003: 269)

The likelihood that the range of specific types of strategies identified in the sample is indeed inclusive can be argued with reference to two factors: 1) the sampling method, which is the type aimed at maximum variety (see section 7.3), and 2) the high degree of standard- ization that characterizes the two text types. This high degree of uniformity is traceable to the detailed guidelines regulating the texts (see section 7.2 for more detail).

1.7. Overview of the thesis

Chapter 2 introduces the SF interpretation of the organization and functioning of lan- guage. By giving an account of the fundamental SFL tenets, including the central concept of register, the chapter has the specific purpose of paving the way for the methodological chapters (5 and 6), where the SF interpretation of the structure of grammar and lexis will be examined in more detail. A more general purpose, however, is to introduce SF terms as early as possible, to enable the use of consistent terminology as well the particular notation developed in SFL from the outset of the thesis. This is the reason why this chapter is brought at this early stage.

Chapter 3 is a theoretical chapter devoted to arguing for the inclusion of INTRA into the object field of TS. Conceptions that would either limit translation to interlingual transfer or concede INTRA (and intersemiotic translation) a marginal status only are critically re- viewed.

Chapter 4 is a further theoretical chapter aimed at identifying the taxonomic relation of lay-oriented INTRA to other sub-types of translation. To this end, a holistic typology of translation formulated by the Danish translation scholar H. Gottlieb will be examined. As part of, and in continuation of this examination, the extant (but sparse) empirical literature on INTRA, including lay-oriented INTRA, will be reviewed.
Chapter 5 is the first of two methodological chapters. In this first chapter, the relevant aspects of the SF account of English grammar and the SF perspective on lexis will be introduced.

As the second of the two methodological chapters, chapter 6 will be devoted to an examination of the concept of translation strategy and an operationalization of SF grammatical and lexical categories for the analysis of derivationally related ST and TT micro-segments. Further concepts are adopted from the British translation scholar A. Chesterman as necessary supplements to the SFG-based analytical framework.

Chapter 7 is mainly concerned with the presentation of the corpus compiled for the investigation. The legal requirements behind the texts are summarized, and the two text types are characterized in SF terms. In addition, the sampling strategy behind the compilation is accounted for.

Chapter 8 is initiated by an account of the approach adopted to the pairing of ST and TT material in coupled segments, followed by an account of the general principles adopted for the empirical analyses. The results of these analyses will be presented in the rest of the chapter, and discussed at the end.

Chapter 9 specifies the research contributions achieved by the thesis and presents the answers to the research questions.
Chapter 2. Systemic-Functional Linguistics

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, this thesis is functionalist in orientation, both in its view of translation and of language as such, and since not only the analytical framework of this thesis is derived from Systemic-Functional theory (the SF description of English grammar), but the very phenomena of intralingual translation and register are conceptualized from the SF perspective on language as such, it has been deemed necessary to set out the basic tenets of SF linguistic theory at this early stage. In this way, moreover, SF terminology can be introduced and consistently employed from the outset. It must be noted, however, that SFL is not a unified ‘school of thought’, although it is probably safe to claim that all adherents of the theory are heavily indebted to its ‘founder’, M. A. K. Halliday. This thesis is primarily based on what I shall term the Hallidayan branch of the theory, which, apart from Halliday himself, is represented by his colleagues R. Hasan and C. M. I. M. Matthiessen as the main proponents.

The name of the theory (SFL) reflects its two cornerstones: it is a semiotic theory in which language is fundamentally viewed as a meaning potential (e.g. Halliday 1985/2003), i.e. as a repository of meanings from which language users choose when communicating. This is the systemic part of the theory, which refers to the assumption that language is at all levels organized as interrelated sets of options (systems) from which selections must be made when speakers/writers construct their linguistic utterances. Moreover, SFL is a socio-semiotic theory (Halliday 1978) emphasizing social context as the key to explaining the way language is organized. This is the functionalist component of the theory, pithily captured in Halliday’s own dictum that ‘[t]he internal organization of language can best be explained in the light of the social functions which language has evolved to serve. Language is as it is because of what it has to do.’ (1973/2003: 309). The individual sections in this chapter, therefore, will be concerned with the main principles in the functional and systemic organization of language, and specific sections will be devoted to the place of grammar and vocabulary in the overall linguistic ‘architecture’, as well as to the nature of grammar and lexis each and the relation between the two. Moreover, an account will be given of the SFL view of the relation between language and context, and the key concept of register (context-dependent variation in language) will be examined. In the last sections of the chapter, alternative interpretations of the language-context relation will be considered, one of which represents an alternative branch of SFL, namely the genre theory of J. R. Martin and D. Rose, and another with no connection to systemic linguistics, which is the genre theory of John Swales. Finally, another theory of register with no connection to SFL either, viz. that of D. Biber, will also be briefly reviewed.

2.1. Functional diversification

As a linguistic ‘school of thought’, SFL is, as already mentioned, sociologically oriented, with an emphasis on function in social context as the key principle behind the way language is organized. The functionalist perspective, however, is in no way an SFL invention, being traceable to earlier 20th-century developments in linguistic theory. As what appear to be sources of inspiration, Halliday and Hasan (1989: 15-17) mention, among others, ‘classic’ language function typologies like those of Karl Bühler and Roman Jakobson, both of whose models are well-known: Bühler’s consists of the expressive, the representational
and the conative function, all three of which recur in Jakobson’s model. The latter includes another three, which are the metalingual, the phatic and the poetic function (ibid.: 15-16; Jakobson 1960: 355-357). These three, however, do not appear to be of any importance to the SFL framework and will not be investigated further.

With regard to the three shared functions in Bühler’s and Jakobson’s models, the distinctions reflect those of the person system (1st, 2nd and 3rd person) of European languages (Halliday and Hasan 1989: 16). The expressive function is thus oriented towards the speaker (1st person), the conative function towards the addressee (2nd person) and the representational function towards 3rd person, i.e. ‘everything else’ (ibid.). All three functions are to some extent recognizable in the conceptual framework of SFL, where, however, they are no longer interpreted extrinsically, i.e. merely as different types of possible functions which language may be made to serve in relation to extra-linguistic context. Indeed, generalizations like those of Bühler’s and Jakobson’s about extrinsic language functions are dismissed by Halliday as being of no use in language description (and hence to linguistics), because they are ‘directed towards sociological and psychological enquiries’ (1970/2002: 173), and not towards the internal structure of language. In contradistinction to this ‘extrinsism’, SFL insists that function be seen as something embedded in the very structures (the grammar and vocabulary) of language itself (Halliday and Hasan 1989: 17; Halliday 1973/2003: 298; 1970/2002: 174; 2003: 18). This is the light in which the grammatical and lexical categories to be detailed in chapter 5 should be understood: Systemic-Functional Grammar is a minute description of the very link between the extrinsic functionality of language and its internal organization, and it is this charting of the integration of function and linguistic structure which, in the view of the present author, is one of the greatest achievements of Hallidayan linguistics.

An important corollary of interpreting function as something encoded in linguistic structure is the equation of function with meaning (cf. Teich 2003: 38). In Halliday's model of language, meaning is divided into three general, but distinct types, termed metafunctions, believed to be fundamental to all human languages (Halliday 1970/2002: 173): the ideational8, the interpersonal and the textual metafunction, respectively (e.g. 1973/2003: 312 ff.; 1979/2002: 198-200). Each of these pervades linguistic structure, being operative in grammar and lexis alike (see section 2.4 on the so-called grammar-lexis cline) and operative at all the different levels (ranks) at which wordings are organized, i.e. at the levels of clause, phrase/group and word (see section 2.5 on ‘the rank scale’).

In this tripartite typology, the ideational metafunction is more or less parallel to Jakobson’s and Bühler’s representational function, being concerned with referring to or mirroring ‘reality’ in its broadest sense (Halliday 1973/2003: 314; 1970/2002: 174-175, 177). Yet, the reflective aspect of this type of meaning should not be overemphasized, or at least needs to be qualified, since there is a distinctly creative aspect to the function (Halliday 1990/2003: 145): ‘capturing’ the world of experience in language means interpreting it by imposing the categories of language on it (Halliday 1995/2005: 252; 2003: 16). This appears to be the reason why, in characterizing this metafunction, Halliday’s favourite term is the verb construe, as in the title of what must be considered the SFL main work on idea-

---

8 As will appear from the accounts of SFG in chapter 5, the ideational metafunction in fact covers two subtypes, viz. the experiential and the logical metafunction, respectively.
tional semantics: Construing Experience through Meaning (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999). As this title suggests, the ideational metafunction construes the world of phenomena, with an emphasis on the ‘constructional’ aspect of this interpretive activity, i.e. the creation of structure in the flux of experience. Language in this mode is thus held to embody ‘a theory of human experience’ (Halliday 1990/2003: 145) which shapes our conception of reality (Halliday 1970/2002: 175). In several places, Halliday (1979/2002: 202; 1995/2003: 418; 2004: 175) illustrates this mechanism by means of the following (quite humorous) example: an experience like that of seeing a flock of small winged creatures floating through the air above our heads is something we would typically construe linguistically as There are birds flying, and not as it’s winging (as a parallel to it’s raining), the point being that language in this mode structures experience as configurations of actions/processes and entities (called participants) playing some part in these processes, as in the above case, where birds are construed as the ones ‘doing’ the process of flying. It’s winging, on the other hand, is a process without a ‘doer’, which is at odds with the way language in this mode usually orders experience for us.

Whereas the ideational metafunction is concerned with establishing some kind of correspondence between language and the world of experience, the interpersonal metafunction is the interactional mode of language (Halliday 1970/2002: 175), representing speaker- and addressee-oriented meanings (Halliday 1973/2003: 316; 1979/2002: 199). Thus, the interpersonal metafunction encompasses Bühler’s and Jakobson’s expressive and conative language functions in one: it includes speaker assessment as well as meanings oriented towards regulating the behaviour of the addressee and his/her role in the communicative situation. Categories like modality and mood, therefore, belong to the interpersonal part of the grammar (see section 5.2), in the same way as attitudinally loaded content words are lexical manifestations of this metafunction (see section 5.7).

Unlike the two other types of semantics, the textual metafunction has no counterpart in Jakobson’s and Bühler’s typologies, which is perhaps not surprising, considering that textual semantics is mainly text-internal, interfacing only to a lesser extent with text-external reality. A primary concern of the textual metafunction is the formation of text, i.e. the linking together of what would otherwise be disjointed ‘chunks’ of meaning into a cohesive flow (Halliday 1970/2002: 175). One area of grammar which SFG locates in the textual metafunction, therefore, is cohesion (ibid.), exactly because the function of grammatical categories like reference and lexical repetition (cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976: ch. 2 & 6) is to establish links between an utterance and preceding or ensuing text (so-called co-text).

What appears to differentiate SFL from other functional interpretations of language is the emphasis on the simultaneity of the three metafunctions in discourse (Halliday 1973/2003: 317; see also Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: 58-60). Rejecting the view that any sentence can have only one function, or must at least have a predominant one, Halliday and Hasan (1989: 23) voice the fundamental SF tenet that all three metafunctions are simultaneously operative in any single sentence. The wording of any utterance, therefore, is shaped by all three strands of meaning, each of which takes shape in a particular type of structure. The

---

9 It should be conceded that the claim that textual meaning is mainly text-internal is less true of spoken than written text, spoken text being typically situation-dependent, with high frequencies of exophoric reference, i.e. reference to text-external elements e.g. in the material setting in which the communicative event is situated (cf. Halliday and Hasan 1976: 34-36).
principle is best illustrated through (a non-exhaustive) analysis of a concrete example, an extract from what purports to be an interview with the CEO of a major Danish pharmaceutical company.\textsuperscript{10}

- How will healthcare reforms in various markets impact Novo Nordisk in the near term?
- Healthcare reforms are taking place all over the world with the aim of making provision of health services more affordable (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5)

Ideationally, both sentences refer to processes in ‘external reality’: in the first sentence a process of ‘doing’ (impact) and in the second a process of ‘happening’ (taking place). Both sentences, however, refer to the same entity (healthcare reforms) as the vehicle of, or the phenomenon responsible for the process. Interpersonally, the two sentences are in contrast, yet complement each other: in the first sentence, the finite verb will precedes the Subject healthcare reforms, which yields an interrogative structure. In contrast, the following sentence is declarative, with the Subject Healthcare reforms preceding the finite verb are. In terms of interpersonal semantics, therefore, the two sentences relate to each other as question (meaning ‘I want information from you’) and reply (‘I am giving you information’).

As for textual semantics, the second of the two sentences is brought to connect with the first in two ways: first, the words healthcare reforms are repeated, creating lexical cohesion. Moreover, apart from functioning as Subject in the interpersonal structure, the clause-initial position of healthcare reforms in the second sentence marks its textual function as the topic (in technical terms: the Theme) of the message. Hence, the textual meaning of that sentence may be glossed as ‘the point of departure for my message is healthcare reforms (whose relevance derives from your question)’.

A final point to be made about the concept of metafunction is that while the three lines of meaning are simultaneously present in any sentence, they are independent of each other and combine more or less freely (Halliday 1979/2002: 200). This is underscored by the fact that the same configuration of process and ‘doer’ may for example combine with either a declarative or an interrogative structure with no change in ideational semantics: Healthcare reforms are taking place! and Are health care reforms taking place? only differ in speech function (statement vs. question) and not in the type of action and ‘doer’ referred to. In the same way, a different topic (Theme) might have been chosen for the second sentence of the above example: *All over the world, healthcare reforms are taking place …*, which leaves the ideational structure intact, but changes the textual meaning, which is now ‘I am going to talk about a global phenomenon’.

2.2. Stratification

In SF theory, as we have seen, function is viewed as something language-internal, and identified with the meanings created through linguistic structures, i.e. by means of wordings. In the SFL model of language, meanings and wordings, however, are distinguished as two different levels or strata: the stratum of wordings is what is technically referred to as

\textsuperscript{10} The extract is taken from an annual report, which explains the contrived nature of the dialogue. The interview is in all likelihood fictitious. Most examples serving to illustrate points of grammar are taken from this text, which is published by the Danish pharmaceutical company Novo Nordisk. Novo Nordisk, it may be noted, is the manufacturer of Victoza®, whose SPC and PIL have been selected as one out of the eight pairs of texts which form the empirical material of this thesis.
lexicogrammar in SFL (e.g. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 131) as distinct from the stratum of semantics. Together, the two strata form the so-called ‘content plane’ of language (Halliday 1995/2005: 248) with a stratum of expression below, which refers to phonology and graphology, i.e. expression by means of either the sounds of speech or the signs of a writing system (ibid.: 252). In the same way as this ‘lower stratum’, that of spoken or written expression, interfaces with the human body’ (ibid.: 252), so the stratum of semantics is connected with language-external reality, i.e. ‘human experience and human social processes’ (ibid.), in the form of context, which is the ‘topmost’ level (to be defined in more detail later) in this stratified model of language. Thus, presented ‘vertically’ from ‘above’, the four strata in the SFL model are context – semantics – lexicogrammar – phonology/graphology (ibid.: 249).

In defining the relation between these four strata, the key concept is realization. It is another fundamental SFL tenet that a higher stratum finds expression in lower strata, which is what is meant by the term realization.11 In other words, context (human experience and social processes) finds expression in meanings which are expressed in wordings which in their turn are expressed in either speech or writing (Halliday 1992/2003b: 210). Or, we might reverse the picture by saying that communicants use either speech or writing to express wordings which carry meanings by means of which they construe their experience of reality and enact their social roles. These two different perspectives on realization – one a ‘top-down’ perspective and the other a ‘bottom-up’ one – illustrate the fact that realization is ‘bidirectional’ (Hasan 1996b: 110; cf. Hasan 2009: 170). This means that in the ‘top-down’ perspective, realization is activation, in that certain types of semantics activate certain types of lexicogrammar. When a speaker has a certain set of meanings to communicate, s/he activates certain types of wordings to express them. Conversely, as we have already seen, realization is construal (ibid.), since ‘wordings construct meanings’ (Halliday 1992/2003b: 210), and meanings construct contexts.12

2.3. Systems: meaning as choice

As previously mentioned, SFL fundamentally conceives of language as a meaning potential, which is the conception that informs the systemic aspect of the theory, since potential implies choice. When we speak, as Halliday points out, ‘[…] we choose: whether to make a statement or ask a question, whether to generalize or particularize, whether to repeat or add something new, whether or not to include our own judgment, and so on (1970/2002: 174). Using language, in other words, involves constant choosing among a potential of different meanings, and making one particular choice entails ignoring other possible ones. This is why SFL stresses the paradigmatic organization of language, i.e. the organization of the meaning potential as sets of options (Halliday 1985/2003: 193; 2003: 8), or systems, which is the technical term used in systemic theory to refer to such sets. Specification of systems is precisely what major SF representations of English grammar such as Matthiessen-
In the following, an example will be given to illustrate the systemic organization of a particular ‘area’ of the grammar as meaning potential, namely the different types of mood, which constitutes a set of alternatives well known from traditional grammar (located in the interpersonal metafunction in SFG, as previously noted). Following SF notational conventions, systems are represented along the lines of the graph below:

In accordance with SF conventions, the names of systems are capitalized. The above network thus consists of three interlocking systems: MOOD TYPE, INDICATIVE TYPE and INTERROGATIVE TYPE, each of which constitutes a choice point where a selection must be made between a minimum of two terms (sometimes also referred to as features). The system of MOOD TYPE, for example, entails an obligatory choice between the two terms [indicative] and [interrogative] (in accordance with e.g. Hasan (1996a) and Teich (1999), features in systems will be indicated by means of square brackets). Immediately to the left of each system name, moreover, the so-called entry condition (see e.g. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 89) of the system is specified, i.e. the particular grammatical environment in which the set of options applies. In other words, whenever a free clause (a ‘main clause’) is used in discourse, the speaker must select from a set of two alternatives: [indicative] and [imperative]. Moreover, a term in one system often functions as the entry condition of another, more specific system (Halliday 1994/2003: 434), as in the case of the term [indicative], which, apart from being one of the two features in the system of MOOD TYPE, is also the entry condition of a further set of options, viz. [declarative] and [interrogative]. This means that when a speaker selects an [indicative] instead of an [imperative] clause, s/he is automatically confronted with a further set of alternatives, which is that between a [declarative] and an [interrogative] clause. The latter ([interrogative]) in its turn is the entry condition of the most delicate system in the network, viz. that between the two types of [interrogative] clause (a yes/no question or a wh-question).

The vertical dimension of models like the one above (fig. 2.3) thus represents the paradigmatic axis of language: the meaning potential of a particular ‘area’ of the grammar as interrelated sets of mutually exclusive options. The paradigmatic axis, however, is related to the syntagmatic axis of language, i.e. to linguistic structure, via the choices made in systems: selection of a feature in a system has a particular type of syntagmatic configuration.

---

13 Henceforth, Halliday (2004) will be abbreviated as IFG3 and Matthiessen (1995) as LC.
14 The SFL graphical notation will be used throughout this dissertation when systems and system networks are introduced. The graphs have been created by means of the WagSoft System Network Editor, a small programme freely available at http://www.wagsoft.com/Grapher/index.html.
as its output in wording (Halliday 1994/2003: 433). Selection of the term [declarative] in the system of INTERROGATIVE TYPE, for example, is realized in a clausal structure where the Subject is followed by the Finite (the finite verb). A specification like this is a so-called realization statement\(^\text{15}\) (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 172; Halliday 1994/2003: 434), which in the graphical models of system networks is represented in the form of a box with structural items italicized, e.g. \text{Subject} \& \text{Finite}, below the name of the systemic feature in question (in this case [declarative]). Halliday (1994/2003: 434-435) specifies seven types of realization statement and Hasan (1996a: 74) six, but Matthiessen’s 5-item typology (LC: 23-24) is deemed sufficient for the purposes of this thesis:

1) \textit{Insertion} of a grammatical function (symbol: ‘+’). ‘+Subject’, as in the above graph, means that a Subject must be present in the structure.
2) \textit{Conflation} of functions (symbol: ‘/’). ‘Subject/Theme’, e.g., means that the Subject and the Theme of a clause must be realized by the same element in the structure.
3) \textit{Expansion} of a function (symbol: ‘( )’). ‘+Mood (+Subject, +Finite)’, as in the above graph, is a specification of the constituents of the element termed \textit{Mood}. This element, in other words, consists of the Subject and the Finite.
4) \textit{Sequencing} of functions (symbol: ‘\(^\wedge\)’). ‘Subject\(^\wedge\)Finite’, as in the above graph, means that the Finite must come after the Subject.
5) \textit{Preselection} (symbol: ‘:') Preselection refers to restrictions on the realization of a function, e.g. in terms of word or group class. ‘Actor: nominal group’ (IFG3: 183), for example, means that the ideational clause function \textit{Actor} can only be realized by a nominal group.

In relation to the paradigmatic organization of language, as this may be modelled in system networks, two further points are to be noted: the interlocking of systems in networks, with a term in one system functioning as the entry condition of a further set of options, means that systems represent increasing degrees of specificity, or delicacy (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 212; Halliday 2003: 9), which is the preferred SFL expression. In other words, a system ‘to the left’ in a network is superordinate to a connected system ‘to the right’, which means that more delicate systems represent subtypes of less delicate ones (IFG3: 22). [Interrogative] clauses, e.g., are subtypes of the superordinate category [indicative], as the above example showed. This logic is related to the second point to be noted, namely that when increasingly specific choices are made by proceeding through a network from left to right, selections made in superordinate systems are inherent in ones made in more delicate ones (Halliday 1994/2003: 435). The principle is best illustrated by means of a short, freely invented example like \textit{Who is there?}, i.e. a \textit{wh}-question, whose structure realizes the feature [wh-] in the system of INTERROGATIVE TYPE, which in its turn is dependent on the selection of the feature [interrogative] in INDICATIVE TYPE etc. The wording \textit{Who is there?}, in other words, embodies all the features [free clause], [indicative], [interrogative] and [wh-], which means that all realizational consequences of choices in superor-

\(^{15}\) It needs to be pointed out that apart from referring to the relationship between strata, as previously noted, the term realization in SFL is also used – somewhat annoyingly – to refer to the type of relationship under consideration in this section, viz. \textit{the \textit{inter-axial relation between the paradigmatic axis and the syntagmatic axis of a given rank}} (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 172). This type of relationship, in other words, is \textit{intra-stratal} (ibid.: 171).
dinate systems reverberate in selections made at more delicate points in the network (Hasan 1996a: 76): in the present case, the word order resulting from the selection of an interrogative clause (Finite^Subject) is inherent in a wh-question.

2.4. The organization of the lexicogrammatical stratum

2.4.1. Cline of delicacy (the grammar-lexis cline)

As previously noted, the term used in SFL to refer to the stratum of wording in language is lexicogrammar. The fact that lexis and grammar are thus brought together in a single technical term mirrors the particular SFL understanding of the relation between these two ‘parts’ of language: they are not to be regarded as two separate ‘levels’ of language, with grammar accorded the status of ‘mere’ syntactic rules for stringing together the ‘real’ units of meaning, viz. the lexical items (cf. Hasan 2005: 42). On the contrary, grammar and lexis alike are form (cf. Hasan 1996a: 74), and the two constitute one undivided stratum, i.e. a unified repository of wordings functioning as a resource for the expression of meaning (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 131). The difference between grammatically and lexically expressed semantics is mainly one of delicacy: grammatical items (function words) and grammatical structures encode meanings of a rather general nature, whereas the meanings expressed by lexical items (content words) are more specific in kind (IFG3: 43; cf. LC: 107). Grammar and lexis are thus conceived of as different, but connected ‘zones’ on the same stratum, organized along a ‘cline of delicacy’ (LC: 109). Moreover, whereas the grammatical zone consists of small, clearly defined classes of structures and of items such as pronouns and determiners (LC: 107), lexis consists of ‘open sets’ (ibid.: 108), i.e. items in classes with no clear delimitation.

What appears to support the ‘cline thesis’ (grammar and lexis as a unified repository of wordings) is that certain ambiguous classes can be identified as occupying a ‘middle ground’ between the two zones. To these belong classes such as prepositions and certain types of conjunctions and adjuncts (Halliday 1992/2005: 79; IFG3: 45). Words like under, between, however and meanwhile, for example, are items that are neither clearly grammatical nor clearly lexical in status. A less convincing SFL notion, however, is the one captured in Halliday’s own programmatic formulation as ‘the grammarian’s dream’, which is ‘to turn the whole of linguistic form into grammar, hoping to show that lexis can be defined as “most delicate grammar”’ (1961/2002: 54). The statement reflects the view that the system networks originating at the grammatical end of the cline are extendable into progressively delicate distinctions whose endpoint is features realized in lexical items (cf. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 131; cf. IFG3: 43). The principle may be illustrated by means of an example taken from the IFG3 account of the grammar-lexis cline:

![Fig. 2.4.1a. The [verbal]-clause system network in part. Source: IFG3: 44, 302 (adapted by author)](image)
The above system network will not be examined here, but is only meant to illustrate the SFL claim that lexical distinctions originate in grammatical ones. The entry condition of the system ([verbal]) refers to a particular type of clause identified as one out of six different kinds in the part of ideational grammar which organizes the clause as a grammatical unit. Briefly stated, clause types in this section of the grammar are distinguished according to the way in which processes or ‘actions’ (expressed in verbs) combine with different types of semantic roles. In the present case, the distinguishing feature of [verbal] clauses is the presence of the semantic role termed Sayer in SFG, as shown in the realization statement accompanying the entry condition to the network ([verbal]): the process (or ‘action’) of saying in all cases presupposes somebody performing the saying. What the above system network sets out are progressively delicate types of clauses, with each type being centred around a subset of so-called process types (types of verbs). The process of ‘saying’ as [activity], i.e. one of the two terms in the system of ORDER OF SAYING, is ‘verbal behaviour’ realized by items such as speak and talk (IFG3: 255), whereas the other general type refers to processes of conveying meaning ([semiosis]), such as announce and argue (instances of [indicating] in the system of MOOD TYPE), and tell, order, ask and urge (all examples of [imperating], also in the system of MOOD TYPE) (ibid.). In order to distinguish these processes of [imperating] from each other, the network needs to be extended in delicacy as in the graph below, with the term [imperating] serving as the entry condition of three simultaneous systems (simultaneous means that selection must be made from all three systems at the same time):

![Diagram](image)

Fig. 2.4.1b. Extension of the term [imperating] in delicacy towards lexis.
Source: IFG3: 44 (adapted by author)

The lexical verbs mentioned above as examples of ‘imperating’ processes are four out of a larger set shown by Halliday (IFG3: 44) to realize combinations of features from these ‘endpoints’ of the system network. The combination of the feature [neutral] in all three systems, for example, yields tell, whereas the combination of neutrality in AUTHORITY and LOADING with the feature [toned up] in FORCE yields order. In the same way, neutrality in both AUTHORITY and LOADING in combination with the feature [toned down] in FORCE has ask as its output, whereas neutrality in FORCE and LOADING combined with [personal] in authority results in urge.

To repeat, the above analysis is intended as nothing but an illustration of the SFL claim
that lexis should be seen as an extension of grammatical distinctions. An analysis like the one above is – in my view – convincing enough, but, unfortunately, only one out of very few studies of its kind, with Hasan (1996a) and Tucker (1998) as notable exceptions. ‘To build the dictionary [i.e. the vocabulary] out of the grammar’, as Halliday (1992/2005: 78) puts it in a parallel account of the grammar-lexis connection, is indeed a formidable task: ‘It would take at least 100 volumes of the present size [i.e. the 650+-page size of IFG3] to extend the description of the grammar up to [the point of lexis] for any substantial portion of the vocabulary of English’ (IFG3: 46), which is undoubtedly true, but one might counter that just a few volumes devoted to that type of investigation would help substantiate a claim which appears to be greatly in need of empirical validation.16

2.4.2. Rank scale

In earlier sections, lexicogrammar was also referred to as ‘linguistic structure’, which, as described in the section on stratification, serves as the ‘material’ by means of which meanings are expressed. It has also been described how this ‘material’ is organized along a cline a delicacy, but referring to lexicogrammar as ‘linguistic structure’ reflects yet another type of organization, namely that of composition, i.e. structures as composites of smaller elements according to a ‘Chinese-box’ principle. In SFL, this organization of the lexicogrammar is referred to as rank, with each rank consisting of units belonging to the rank immediately below, which in turn consists of yet smaller units etc. From above, the rank scale is clause – group/phrase17 – word – morpheme. Strictly speaking, the organizing principle is that of constituency, with elements from one rank serving as constituents in the rank immediately above (LC: 75-76; IFG3: 20). Thus, a word (which consists of morphemes) is a constituent in a group or phrase, and a group/phrase in its turn serves as a constituent in a clause. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clause</th>
<th>Our products are our greatest contribution to society. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group/phrase</td>
<td>Our products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word</td>
<td>Our, products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morpheme</td>
<td>Our, product+s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should be made clear, however, that ‘units do not serve directly as constituents of other units; there is always a functional interface’ (LC: 21), which means that a unit at a lower rank always serves as a functional element in the rank above. In the above example, Our products is a nominal group which functions as Subject at clause rank, and are is a verbal group which serves the clausal function known as the Finite. In the same way, the function of Our in Our products is that of Deictic and products that of Thing in the structure of the nominal group (see section 5.5.1).

Finally, with regard to the relation between the rank scale and the grammar-lexis cline, it

---

16 This critical perspective on the SFL ‘orthodoxy’ concerning the interrelation between grammar and lexis will be taken up in section 5.7.

17 In SFG, the term phrase is used about prepositional phrases only and is kept distinct from the term group: the two types of unit belong to the same rank, both of them functioning as constituents in clauses, but the difference between the two is that a phrase consists of a preposition + a nominal group (IFG3: 360). For a more detailed account of the nature of the prepositional phrase, see section 5.5.2.
should be noted that the rank scale is a grammatical hierarchy of units, and therefore the ordering principle behind grammatical structures. In this hierarchy, lexical items are typically co-extensive with the grammatical unit of the word, but may in fact extend across larger units as well. This is evidenced by metaphorical expressions such as *a rainy day* (a group) and *every cloud has a silver lining* (a clause) (LC: 110), each of which constitutes a lexical unit in which the individual word does not contribute an independent semantic element, but where the expression as a whole construes one unified lexical meaning.

### 2.5. Cline of instantiation

In SFL as a linguistic ‘school of thought’, the heritage from Ferdinand de Saussure as one of the founders of modern linguistics is in several ways discernible, one of which is the famous distinction between *langue* and *parole*,¹⁸ i.e. language as system and language as individual ‘acts of speech’ (Matthews 2005: 200, 266). However, in several places Halliday (1995/2005: 247; 1992/2005: 82) rejects the dichotomous thinking inherent in the *langue-parole* pair, emphasizing instead that language as system/potential on the one hand and language as instance (specific ‘acts of speech’, i.e. language as text) on the other should be viewed as the two opposite poles on a cline, viz. a cline of instantiation (cf. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 121-124). In this understanding, individual texts instantiate, i.e. are instances of the linguistic system, and it is only by virtue of the instantiation that it is possible for the individual text to achieve semiotic success: only if a hearer/reader can recognize which parts of the linguistic system are manifested in the text under consideration will s/he be able to make sense of it (IFG3: 26).

As an illustrative parallel, Halliday (1992/2005: 82; IFG3: 26-27; 1991/1999: 9; 1992/2003a: 382) points to the analogy in the relation between climate and weather, which is simply a difference in the time frame of observation: weather is the specific manifestation of certain meteorological conditions observable at a given point in time, whereas climate is the meteorological disposition, i.e. the span of ‘possible weather’ inferable from what the weather has been like over long stretches of time.

However, the above account may not actually have dispelled the dichotomy of the Saussurian *language-parole* pair: the claim that individual texts instantiate the linguistic system still bears the mark of dichotomous thinking, and may not reflect the cline perspective sufficiently clearly. It only makes sense to posit a cline if there is an intermediate zone between the two poles, which is exactly what there is, according to the SFL model of language: in between the two poles on the continuum it is indeed possible to identify a region of ‘sub-potentials’, which, from the vantage point of the instantial pole, correspond to groups of texts with shared characteristics, i.e. text types (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 219; IFG3: 27). Sub-potentials or text types have come to be known as registers in SFL. Register, as conceived of in SFL, is inextricably linked with the notion of situational context, i.e. with context as the crucial factor determining what sub-potential of the overall linguistic system comes to be instantiated in the individual text. Indeed, Halliday himself defines register as follows:

---

¹⁸ Apart from this single example, no further account of the origins of Hallidayan linguistics is deemed relevant to the concerns of this thesis. For such an account, see e.g. Halliday (1994/2003; 1985/2003).
A register can be defined as the configuration of semantic resources that the member of a culture typically associates with a situation type. It is the meaning potential that is accessible in a given social context. Both the situation and the register associated with it can be described to varying degrees of specificity; but the existence of registers is a fact of everyday experience – speakers have no difficulty in recognizing the semantic options and combinations of options that are ‘at risk’ [i.e. available] under particular environmental conditions. (Halliday 1978: 111)

A register is thus a variety or ‘compartment’ of language which ‘correlates with a situation type’ (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 219), and in accordance with the above definition, what varies between one register and another is the type of meanings made, as Halliday goes on to stress:

Since these options [i.e. the semantic options associated with a situation type] are realized in the form of grammar and vocabulary, the register is recognizable as a particular selection of words and structures. But it is defined in terms of meanings; it is not an aggregate of conventional forms of expression superimposed on some underlying social content by ‘social factors’ of one kind or another. (Halliday 1978: 111)

What Halliday appears to be distancing himself from in this quotation is the equation of register simply with a formality scale or 'levels of style' (such as Joos’ (1959/1968: 188) well-known five-item typology of 'styles', viz. intimate, casual, consultative, formal and frozen), i.e. different lexicogrammatical variants used to express basically the 'same' message more or less formally. In the SF conception, registerial variation equals semantic variation, or, to quote Halliday himself, '[... i]n principle registers are saying different things' (Halliday and Hasan 1989: 43). In other words, register in this understanding is not just a matter of how things are expressed, but just as much a question of what (for a definition of the situational determinants of the 'hows' and 'whats' of registers, see section 2.9 on context of situation).

2.6. Models of registerial variation in the linguistic system

Above, registers were conceptualized as text types or sub-divisions of the language system in its entirety – zones or phases midway between the two poles on the cline of instantiation at the semantic and lexicogrammatical strata. Whereas this notion is clear enough, it is less clear how best to incorporate the fact of registerial variation in a model of the linguistic system as a whole. Given that it is at least theoretically possible to model the entire potential of a language – its entire semantic and corresponding lexicogrammatical ‘space’ – as one giant system network, how can the model be constructed so as to reflect the semantic and lexicogrammatical ‘compartmentalization’ of the system which is registerial variation? In Matthiessen (1993), three possibilities are outlined, one being a solution whereby the entire system is represented as a ‘probabilistic system with register skewings’ (ibid.: 244), i.e. with register-specific probability values attached to all features in the whole of the linguistic system. In this model, in other words, every feature in the system as a whole would be assigned a range of different, register-specific numerical values, each indicating the probability with which the feature in question occurs in a given register.19 Matthiessen illustrates the consequences of this solution for a particular grammatical system, that of PRI-

---
MARY TENSE, vis-à-vis three different registers (or register families), viz. narrative, expository\textsuperscript{20}, and forecasting ones. The system of PRIMARY TENSE is:

![Diagram of PRIMARY TENSE system]

Fig. 2.6a. The system of PRIMARY TENSE. Source: IFG3: 135

Probability values for the three options in each of the three registers yield the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Narrative</th>
<th>Expository</th>
<th>Forecasting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[past]</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[present]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[future]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.6. Probability values for three register families. Source: Matthiessen (1993: 245)

The chart shows – perhaps as might be expected – that narrative text types are exclusively oriented towards the past, expository ones exclusively towards the present and forecasting ones predominantly to the future, but to a lesser degree also to the past and present.

The second possible model of register variation is that of a ‘partitioned multi-register system with ‘common core’ (Matthiessen 1993: 246). This second model would consist, not in a unified system, as presupposed in the probabilistic model, but in an assembly of register-specific system networks, constructed in such a way as to specify which areas of the networks are shared across registers (the ‘common core’) and which areas are register-specific (ibid.). This second model is rooted in the notion that a register is ‘a complete system [... which] shares parts with other registers – the common core’ (ibid.: 248), and in the observation that the linguistic system as a whole (i.e. at the potential pole of the instantiation cline) is an abstraction from the total aggregation of register-specific system networks (ibid.). Such register-specific systems may in fact be illustrated through extrapolation from the table of probability values above, which may also be interpreted as the numerical reflection of not one, but three divergent systems of PRIMARY TENSE: in narrative text types, there is a system with only one term, which is [past], and, in expository registers, also a one-term system ([present]), whereas only forecasting registers feature a system with all three options ([past]/[present]/[future]) represented (ibid.: 246). A similar observation can be made with regard to the text types that form the empirical basis of this thesis, i.e. the Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC) and the Patient Information Leaflet (PIL). An examination of selections in the generalized system of MOOD TYPE ([indicative] / [imperative]) in each of the two text types reveals two incompatible register-specific systems, in that the SPC system of MOOD TYPE turns out to have one option only, namely [indicative], which means that [imperative] clauses are completely absent from these texts. PILs, on the other hand, feature both clause types. Nonetheless, at one step further in delicacy, the system of INDICATIVE TYPE is identical in the two text types, since this system turns out to

\textsuperscript{20} An example of an expository register would be science text books.
consist of one term only ([declarative]), with both registers excluding the [interrogative] clause type. Graphically, then, the two interlocking systems of MOOD TYPE and INDICATIVE TYPE must be represented as follows for PIL and SPC each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free clause</th>
<th>MOOD TYPE</th>
<th>indicative</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TYPE</th>
<th>declarative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fig. 2.6b. MOOD TYPE and INDICATIVE TYPE in the register of PILs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Free clause</th>
<th>MOOD TYPE</th>
<th>indicative</th>
<th>INDICATIVE TYPE</th>
<th>declarative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Fig. 2.6c. MOOD TYPE and INDICATIVE TYPE in the register of SPCs**

A third model of register variation is one consisting of completely disparate register-systems with no shared features at all, i.e. with no common core (Matthiessen 1993: 249). However, as Matthiessen points out (ibid.), this is hardly a viable model, since it is based on the assumption that there is no commonality of meaning and wording across registers, which is unlikely. Indeed, the empirical investigation of this thesis is premised on a semantic, and hence lexicogrammatical, relatedness between two registers (the SPC and the PIL). It may however be argued that the common core posited by the second of the three models may well be limited and certainly not co-extensive with all options in even some of the most basic grammatical systems (as these may be described at the potential pole on the cline of instantiation): as Matthiessen’s own example (the system of PRIMARY TENSE) showed, and as evidenced by the above comparison of MOOD TYPE and INDICATIVE TYPE in SPCs and PILs, it is possible to find registers which feature far from all terms in given, basic systems. Nevertheless, certain features such as [declarative] in INDICATIVE TYPE can probably be assumed to figure in virtually all registers of a language like English.

No attempt will be made here to decide between these different possible ways of modelling registerial variation, since this thesis is not concerned with mapping the systemic landscape of two particular registers. The reason why the issue is taken up here is that the discussion points to a potential problem for an investigation – like the present one – of lexicogrammatical shifts between related texts from two different registers: since the second and the third of the above models entail at least the possibility that the commonality between registers is minimal, then how, it may be asked, will it be possible to describe intralingual translation shifts between two derivationally related texts from different registers? How may shifts be described if there is no guarantee of a tertium comparationis? If, for example, one clause in the SPC text is [declarative] and the derived PIL clause [imperative], then how may this change be described as a shift between two options in the system of MOOD TYPE, considering, as already noted, that this system is not identical across the two registers? The only solution to this problem will be a move ‘to the left’ on the cline of instantiation and to describe lexicogrammatical shifts in terms of the options identifiable at the potential pole on the cline, i.e. within the linguistic system as a whole. The two-term
system of MOOD TYPE ([indicative]/[imperative]), within which the shift from [indicative] to [imperative] may be identified, is thus an abstraction ‘located’ at the systemic pole. In terms of Matthiessen’s three models of register variation, in other words, the descriptions of registerial shifts in this thesis are only compatible with the first of the models, i.e. registers specified as probabilistic values assigned to individual features in the system as a whole.

2.7. Instantiation–stratification matrix

In the account of Hallidayan linguistics given so far, the sociological orientation of the theory ought to be apparent, and it is a stance whose importance to SFL as a theoretical framework cannot be overemphasized. In Halliday’s view, as we have already seen, semiosis is inseparable from the human experience and social processes which serve as the context surrounding language events:

> [M]eanings are created by the social system and are exchanged by the members in the form of text. The meanings so created are not, of course, isolates; they are integrated systems of meaning potential. It is in this sense that we can say that the meanings are the social system: the social system is itself interpretable as a semiotic system. (Halliday 1978: 141)

The semiotic underpinnings of the social system and, conversely, the social underpinnings of language as a semiotic system are brought out more clearly if the cline of instantiation is intersected with the hierarchy of stratification. Thus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATIFICATION</th>
<th>System</th>
<th>sub-system</th>
<th>instance type</th>
<th>instance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>context</td>
<td>culture</td>
<td>institution</td>
<td>situation type</td>
<td>situations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semantics</td>
<td>semantic system</td>
<td>register</td>
<td>text type</td>
<td>[text as] meanings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lexicogrammar</td>
<td>grammatical syst-</td>
<td>Register</td>
<td>text type</td>
<td>[text as] wordings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2.7. Instantiation-stratification matrix. *Source: Halliday (1995/2005: 254)*

As the top left-hand corner of the matrix reflects, culture in this model represents the systemic pole on the cline of instantiation at the level of context, which means that generalized social context equals the ‘possible semiotic situations that collectively constitute a culture’ (Halliday 1995/2005: 256), with semiotic situation referring to any event in which meanings are exchanged by means of language. Culture, in other words, represents the totality of human experience (‘knowledge’ in the broadest sense) and social processes which may somehow function as the context of semiosis. In contrast, the instantial pole of the cline at this level (top right-hand box) is represented by specific situations in which language plays some part. One level below (in the left-hand box) is found the semantic...
correlate of culture: the entire ‘space’ of meanings in which culture finds expression through language, with the instantial pole (the right-hand box) represented by the clusters of meanings constituting individual texts. Finally, next below (left-hand box) is found the entire assembly of interlocking lexicogrammatical systems (the grammatical system, for short) which make it possible for meanings to be construed as wordings. At the opposite pole, clusters of selections made in specific lexical and grammatical systems are what make up texts as instances of wordings.\(^\text{21}\)

The above account, which is a relatively free rendering of Halliday's own gloss (1995/2005: 255-256), has only given heed to the poles on the cline of instantiation, of course. In the intermediate region at the level of context are found institutions, which, if viewed from the instantial pole, corresponds to families of situation types (cf. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 126). This means that in a systemic-functional perspective, institutions are ‘sub-regions’ of culture, consisting of groups of semiotic situation types sharing some of the same characteristics in terms of the types of activity and roles taken up by participants (ibid.: 125). An institution, in the words of Matthiessen, Teruya et al. (ibid.), is a ‘system of behaviour’ encoded in ‘a system of meaning’. The legal system of a culture would appear to serve as good example, encompassing a relatively circumscribed range of semiotic situation types, each being defined by a particular type of semiotic activity and a concomitant set of communicant roles. Situation types that form part of the legal system - more specifically the part of it concerned with administering criminal law - are e.g. police interrogation, preliminary charges, indictment, counsel’s opening statement, cross-examination, judgment, appeal, etc. A parallel example, and one closer to the concerns of this thesis, would be the institution of ‘medical care’ (for want of a better label), i.e. all the situation types in which the field of human experience known as ‘medicine’ is instrumentalized in the treatment of people in the role of patients. Within this institution, well-known situation types are the doctor-patient consultation (an oral event) and the doctor’s prescription (a written situation). Related situation types are the ones whose textual realizations serve as the empirical data of this thesis: the Summary of Product Characteristics and the Patient Information Leaflet. Both of these, moreover, may serve to illustrate different ‘zones’ or locations on the instantiation cline: each refers to a (written) situation type associated with a register or text type at the stratum of semantics and lexicogrammar. The register of PILs, that is to say, encompasses all the potential meanings from which the individual PIL instantiates a specific selection. Therefore, since each individual PIL is concerned with one specific medicinal product and is named accordingly (Actraphane, DuoCover, Gilenya etc.), it also follows that PILs at the instantial pole exhibit a certain degree of semantic (and hence lexicogrammatical) overlap. As will appear from the empirical analyses, this semantic homogeneity in PILs is in fact relatively high.

2.8. Context of situation

In accordance with the hierarchy of stratification (see above), context is realized by semantics in the same way as semantics is realized by lexicogrammar etc., which means that any

\(^{21}\) The stratum of phonology/graphology is ignored in Halliday’s matrix, but might easily be incorporated, with the sound system (the inventory of phonemes and intonation patterns of a language) representing the systemic pole of the cline and the articulations made by speakers in a specific language event being located at the instantial pole.
instance of language in use is embedded in context, and vice-versa. In other words, not only are the meanings that are exchanged in a language event determined by contextual parameters, the situation is also created by those meanings (cf. Halliday 1991/1999: 15; Hasan 1999b: 223). The principle is best illustrated through an example (my own) of how language may change a situation: in a situation type like a service encounter in a grocer’s store, typical utterances would be e.g. I’ll have a packet of cigarettes, please, and There you are. That’ll be two pounds fifty, please, with one participant in the role of vendor and the other in that of customer. If, however, on receiving the payment, the grocer goes on to say something like So, John, will we be seeing you at the match on Sunday?, the utterance creates a completely different situation: the service encounter is over, and a more personal relationship is enacted instead, with the grocer and John no longer in the roles of vendor and customer, but rather in that of ‘local acquaintances’ engaged in friendly small-talk.

In giving a closer definition of context of situation, it should initially be emphasized that the concept refers to those elements in the situation, and those only, which are relevant for the exchange of meanings. In the words of Hasan (1995: 219), ‘relevant context is that part of the extralinguistic situation which is illuminated by language-in-use, by the language component of the speech event, the other name for which is text.’ In the Hallidayan tradition, the concept of situational context is modelled as a tripartite construct consisting of the three parameters Field, Tenor and Mode:

1. The Field of Discourse refers to what is happening, to the nature of the social action that is taking place: what it is that the participants are engaged in, in which the language figures as some essential component?
2. The Tenor of Discourse refers to who is taking part, to the nature of the participants, their statuses and roles: what kinds of role relationship obtain among the participants, including permanent and temporary relationships of one kind or another, both the types of speech role that they are taking on in the dialogue and the whole cluster of significant relationships in which they are involved?
3. The Mode of Discourse refers to what part language is playing, what it is that the participants are expecting the language to do for them in that situation: the symbolic organisation of the text, the status that it has, and its function in the context, including the channel (is it spoken or written or some combination of the two?) and also the rhetorical mode, what is being achieved by the text in terms of such categories as persuasive, expository, didactic, and the like (Halliday and Hasan 1989: 12)

It might however be argued (see e.g. de Beaugrande 1993: 13) that the above definitions are somewhat lacking in clarity, which is why each of the three parameters will be investigated in more detail, and the definitions to some extent modified, in the following.

2.8.1. Field

In an earlier work on register (and other language varieties), Halliday (1978: 143-144) makes a useful distinction between first-order and second-order Field, the former consisting in the social activity in which the communicants are taking part, be it a non-linguistic activity accompanied by verbal communication, or an exclusively semiotic process such as story-telling or a political debate (my examples). Second-order field, on the other hand, is what is commonly known as subject-matter. An illuminating example of Halliday’s (ibid.: 144) clarifies the relationship between the two dimensions: in a game of football, where the major part of the social activity is language-external action, with language only accom-
panying the activity (in the form of shouts and commands between the players) subject-matter is absent. In a *discussion* about football, on the other hand, the social activity is exclusively semiotic, and the game features as subject-matter. In other words, ‘social activity’ (1st-order field) is also a matter of the degree to which the activity consists predominantly in non-linguistic doing or predominantly or even exclusively in semiosis, and subject-matter (2nd-order field) is a dimension that is confined to predominantly semiotic activities. In Halliday’s own words:

> At the latter end of the continuum [i.e. where semiosis constitutes the major part or even the whole of the activity] the concept of ‘subject-matter’ intervenes. What we understand as subject-matter can be interpreted as one element in the structure of those contexts where the social action is inherently of a symbolic, verbal nature. (1978: 143-144)

Pictured as a system, Field can be represented as below, where SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS stands for a type of social activity in which language plays some role. The term [social: doing] refers to the types of activity that are predominantly language-external:

![Field modelled as a system network. Source: Matthiessen, Teruya et al. (2010: 96) (adapted by author)](image)

It should be mentioned that in Matthiessen, Teruya et al. (2010: 96), all the types of social processes that are purely semiotic ([expounding], [reporting] etc.) are included under 2nd-order Field, which appears to be a deviation from Halliday’s (1978) account. However, Matthiessen defines 2nd-order contextual phenomena in general as those which ‘can only be brought into existence through language’ (LC: 34), which is why it makes sense to regard the activities that belong to TYPE OF SEMIOTIC PROCESS as 2nd-order phenomena, since these are indeed identical with the language *use*, having no existence outside the linguistic event. 1st-order phenomena of context, on the other hand, are those social processes and roles which exist ‘independently of language’ (ibid.).

In the system network above, subject-matter is represented by IDEATIONAL DOMAIN. This is also recognizable as semantic domain in Leckie-Tarry’s account of contextual variables (1995: 36), and Halliday’s concept of ‘social activity’ is recognizable as what she terms...
By coupling Arena with activities, Leckie-Tarry draws attention to the importance of the setting as part of Field, viewing this variable in terms of a cline of institutionalization, with settings such as courtrooms and doctors' consultation rooms as examples of highly institutionalized arenas (my examples). The other end of the cline would presumably be represented by settings like canteens, playgrounds and private homes. In connection with semantic domain\textsuperscript{22}, Leckie-Tarry (1995: 37) introduces another continuum, viz. a cline of specialization, pointing out that ideational domains can be differentiated according to their degree of technicality. Text types like scientific articles or financial reports would belong to the highly specialized pole and a register like everyday small-talk to the opposite pole. A corresponding cline is introduced by Martin (1992: 543), whose distinction is common sense/uncommon sense as opposite poles, the latter of the two (uncommon sense) being represented by highly technical discourse.

It should also be mentioned that Leckie-Tarry introduces an aspect labelled participants, defined as the ‘inherent features of the participants, that is, their physical and mental attributes and the knowledge they bring to bear on the setting and events’ (1995: 36). Relating to who the participants are, this aspect, however, is more naturally subsumed under Tenor, as in Halliday and Hasan’s (1989: 12) definition.

\subsection*{2.8.2. Tenor}

With regard to the second of the three parameters of context, that of Tenor, the central concept in Halliday and Hasan’s above definition (1989: 12) is the social relation between the interactants in the communicative situation (cf. Hasan 1999b: 232). As in connection with Field, a distinction is to be made between 1st- and 2nd-order Tenor, with the latter referring to the communicative roles that are constituted exclusively in language. These are the roles of ‘provider of information’ (realized directly in language through the speech function of statements) and ‘seeker of information’ (realized through the speech function of questions). 1st-order roles, on the other hand, are the language-external ones that derive from the social system (LC: 35), i.e. roles such as vendor-customer, teacher-student, parent-child, doctor-patient, friend-friend, etc.. Eggins (1994: 100) generalizes the influence of the (language-external) role-relationship on the communicative event as a question of formality, which is specifiable by means of three different variables: a) power (ranging from equality to inequality between the interactants) b) contact (ranging from frequent to occasional) and c) affective involvement (extending from high to low). This means that in situations where a) the relationship between the interactants is unequal, b) where the contact between them is rare, or they may even be strangers to each other, and c) where there is no emotional involvement between them, the formality of the situation tends to be high. Conversely, an equal relationship, frequent contact and a high degree of emotional involvement (as in the case of spouses and friends) usually correlate with a low degree of formality.

Like Eggins, Leckie-Tarry similarly stresses the power dimension in Tenor, pointing out (1995: 41) that the degree of institutionalization that defines the Arena (one of the aspects of Field) tends to be a decisive factor in the role relationship between the participants in

\textsuperscript{22} I prefer the term ideational domain (taken from Frimann 2004: 29), because Field resonates with the ideational metafunction at the stratum of semantics (see below).
terms of power distribution. An example (my own) would be the communication in a courtroom between the judge and the defendant or between the prosecuting attorney and a witness, in both of which cases the unequal role relationship is a function of the institutionalized arena. In some settings it would also make sense to view a skewed power relationship as a result of an unequal knowledge distribution. This is what seems to define communication between experts and non-experts, such as doctor-patient consultations, in which case the inequality is not only a function of the institutionalized setting, but also of the knowledge asymmetry.

Finally, Leckie-Tarry (1995: 40) includes a dimension of Tenor that does not recur in other accounts, viz. focus, which is defined as a continuum between interpersonal and ideational focus, the former representing a preoccupation with (the relationship between) the communicants, and the latter a preoccupation with the ideational aspect, i.e. the ideational domain, of the communication.

2.8.3. Mode
The most opaque part of Halliday and Hasan’s (1989: 12) definition of context is the one concerning Mode, defined as ‘the symbolic form that language takes and the role it plays’ in a communicative situation. Greater clarity is found in Hasan (1999), to whom Mode is centrally concerned with ‘the nature of contact’ (ibid.: 232) or ‘the way in which speakers and their speaking come in contact with the addressee’s intelligence’ (ibid.: 282). This means that Mode is wholly a 2nd-order phenomenon, arising only by virtue of the language use (Matthiessens, Teruya et al. 2010: 144). The conception of Mode as the nature of the contact between the communicants is to some degree reflected in Leckie-Tarry’s (1995: 44) account, where the parameter is subcategorized in four different dimensions: a) channel, i.e. speech or writing; b) degree of planning; c) possibility of feedback between sender and addressee; and d) degree of contextualization. Parallel dimensions are found in Eggins’ account (1994: 90-92) with minor deviations, which, however, are not deemed sufficiently significant to warrant closer examination. In actual communicative events, the four dimensions typically – but not necessarily – correlate, which means that a text produced in a) the graphic channel (such as a letter or a technical user manual) usually represents b) planned discourse; c) it is monologic, i.e. the reader typically does not have the possibility of giving the writer feedback, or, if s/he has, then only delayed feedback; and d) because the reader is typically absent during the composition process, graphic-channel texts are usually required to be self-contextualizing, i.e. the context against which the text is to be understood must be created by the text itself in order for it to be comprehensible without the co-presence of sender and addressee (cf. Halliday and Hasan (1989: 59), where inspiration for the example has been found). Oral, or phonic communication, on the other hand, tends to be spontaneous and unplanned, immediate feedback is usually possible, i.e. the communication typically takes the form of dialogue, and the context against which the discourse is to be understood is typically to be found outside the text, in the social doing

23 Channel is in fact not Leckie-Tarry’s label, which is medium. Hasan (Halliday and Hasan 1989), however, introduces a distinction between channel and medium which will be adopted here and elaborated on below. For the sake of avoiding confusion, Leckie-Tarry’s label has been replaced by Hasan’s equivalent from the start. In Hasan’s technical terms, speech is referred to as the phonic channel and writing as the graphic channel (ibid.).
surrounding the linguistic event. The dimension of contextualization, therefore, may also be expressed as a distinction, or rather a continuum, between ‘language in action’ vs. ‘language as reflection’, or language in an ‘ancillary’ versus a ‘constitutive role’ (Leckie-Tarry 1995: 45), depending on the degree to which the discourse plays a merely accompanying role in the social activity, or constitutes the whole or the major part of the event, as in a semiotic situation like story-telling.

Another possibility, however, is to exclude the dimension of contextualization from Mode, which is what Hasan advocates (1999b: 276-281), interpreting it instead as an aspect of Field. The distinction she makes is still that between [ancillary] and [constitutive], which appears to parallel the contrast between [semiotic] and [social: doing] in the system of SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS in Matthiessen, Teruya et al.’s Field system network (see fig. 2.8.1 above), since in the latter system, as we have seen, the term [semiotic] represents types of process with language in an inherently constitutive role, whereas the term [social: doing] consists in types of activity where language plays a merely ancillary part. This interpretation will be adopted here, and the dimension of contextualization accordingly dispensed with as a feature of Mode.

Another aspect of Mode in Halliday and Hasan’s (1989: 12) definition which is not covered by Leckie-Tarry’s account is rhetorical mode. This is because Leckie-Tarry (like J. R. Martin – see below) assigns this element to a stratum above register, viz. genre. In the quotation from Halliday and Hasan above (1989: 12), rhetorical mode is viewed as an aspect of Mode, and refers to the pragmatic aspect of the discourse: whether the function that language is being made to serve in the situation is ‘persuasive, expository, didactic, and the like’ (ibid.). However, Hasan (1999b: 281-282) objects to this interpretation, pointing out that rhetorical mode, being concerned with language function, should rather be viewed as an aspect of Field. She cogently argues that the notion of social activity (be it verbal, non-verbal or a combination) is inseparable from the notion of goal: social activity is invariably goal-oriented,²⁴ which is why the functionality of language in a social situation belongs with Field (cf. Hasan 1995: 253-254). If the social activity in a given situation is ‘teaching’, for example, the didactic function of the discourse is inherent in the activity, or if the activity is labelled ‘expounding’ (e.g. on a scientific subject, as in a textbook on physics), the language function is inherently expository (both are freely invented examples).

Apart from excluding certain variables from Mode that are better subsumed under Field, Hasan introduces a distinction not mentioned by Leckie-Tarry, viz. one between channel and medium, the options in the former, as we have seen, being phonic vs. graphic and those in the latter being spoken vs. written (Halliday and Hasan 1989: 58). In Hasan’s own definition, ‘[m]edium refers to the patterning the wordings [sic] themselves: for example, is there a greater degree of grammatical complexity or lexical density’ (ibid.), which leads one to conclude that the rather ambiguous label medium as well the equally equivocal spoken and written (cf. Halliday 1987/2002: 335) should be taken to refer to the lexicogrammatical character of the type of language typically associated with phonic-channel vs. graphic-channel texts. This interpretation may find support in Hasan’s own emphasis, first, that ‘medium and channel are distinct phenomena, although they are not unrelated’ (Halli-

²⁴ Strikingly, within translation theory, Vermeer represents exactly the same view as Hasan’s: ‘All acting is goal-oriented - in other words: all acting has a purpose.’ (Vermeer 1996: 12).
day and Hasan 1989: 58), and her observation that certain types of graphic-channel texts tend to assume a conversational character: '[...] if I write a letter to friend [...] I shall write as if I were talking' (ibid.: 59). Conversely, one might add, probably any university student is familiar with the effort of listening to the reading-aloud of a heavily written-style lecture manuscript which would have been more easily comprehended if read and not heard. Hasan's medium, therefore, appears to have the status of a purely connotative phenomenon that is synonymous with this 'as-if-ness' (as if expressed orally / as if expressed in writing), which is why less ambiguous, though not satisfactorily technical labels for the values on this cline would be 'conversational' vs. 'bookish'. Hasan's identification of medium (in the above sense) as a distinct phenomenon thus appears perfectly valid, but what is dubious is the equation of it with a contextual variable. The other Mode variables, such as degree of planning and the possibility of feedback are truly contextual parameters, in the sense that they represent extra-textual circumstances surrounding the text production which are bound to leave their mark on the lexicogrammatical selections in the text. Hasan's medium, on the other hand, rather appears to represent an intra-textual phenomenon which is not obviously relatable to any extra-textual circumstances. One possibility would be to view this intra-textual character as one of the lexicogrammatical correlates of the total configuration of Mode variables. Yet, two texts exhibiting exactly the same values on the other parameters (e.g. channel: graphic, possibility of feedback: none because monologic, and degree of planning: maximum) may still yield texts as different as a children's book and a scientific article on quantum mechanics (while assuming that the different degrees of 'bookishness' that such two texts are almost certain to exhibit are not explainable in terms of Field and Tenor differences). As will be shown in chapter 7, this is also of relevance to the two text types under investigation in this thesis: the PILs can be shown to be less written ('bookish') in character than their source, the SPCs, although all other Mode values are the same for the two text types (both represent graphic-channel, monologic, planned discourse - see sections 7.1 and 7.2). For this reason, and for want of a better solution, Hasan's medium, together with her labels for the two opposed values on this cline, i.e. spoken vs. written, will be adopted here as a separate sub-dimension of Mode, though with the caveat that its status as a contextual variable cannot be satisfactorily argued.25

This concludes the account of contextual variables. It should be emphasized that the account cannot make claims to exhaustiveness, and has made no attempt to reflect all debate within SFL on the precise definition of the variables. Nor should it be denied that the conceptualization of context in SFL is in need of much more rigidity (cf. Hasan 2009: 179-180). One contribution which goes a long way towards addressing this deficiency, at least in respect of Field, is that of Hasan (1999b), who models (what corresponds to) SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS (Matthiessen, Teruya et al.'s term) as a system network taken to a degree of delicacy that is not far from that found in the SF descriptions of the grammatical stratum. Conceivably, the same thing would be possible for Tenor and Mode.

2.9. The context-metafunction hook-up hypothesis
In the preceding sections, the realizational relation between context and language was

---

25 As for the typical characteristics of written-style vs. spoken-style language, see section 5.6 on the phenomenon known as grammatical metaphor.
stressed several times. What has so far been ignored, however, is the more specific way in which each of the contextual parameters finds expression in semantics. A clue is found in the following quotation from Eggins and Martin:

> Read from the perspective of context, realization refers to the way in which different types of field, mode and tenor condition different types of ideational, interpersonal and textual meaning; read from the perspective of language, realization refers to the way in which different ideational, interpersonal and textual choices construct different types of field, tenor and mode. (Eggins and Martin 1997: 241)

Implicit in Eggins’ and Martin’s dictum is the narrower interpretation of the context-language relationship that SFL has made possible, viz. the so-called context-metafunction hypothesis (CMH) (Hasan 1995: 222), which posits a set of specific ties between the three contextual parameters (Field, Tenor and Mode) and the three metafunctions of language: In terms of semantics, Field is seen to be closely associated with (predominantly) ideational meanings, Tenor with interpersonal meanings, and Mode with textual meanings (Halliday 1978: 123; Hasan 2009: 172; Halliday 1979/2002: 201). To give just a few examples of the implications for lexicogrammar, the CMH hypothesis suggests that Field is especially associated with ideational features like transitivity (see section 5.1), Tenor with interpersonal phenomena like person, mood and modality (see sections 5.2 and 5.5.1), and Mode with textual features like theme (see section 5.3) and cohesion (cf. Halliday 1978: 117; Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 106).

It should be mentioned that the CMH hypothesis is not uncontroversial and, according to Thompson (1999), is best taken as a prediction of tendencies:

> [A]ccepting the essential validity of the three-parameter view of context of situation does not necessarily entail the hook-up hypothesis in its stronger forms. […] Halliday in particular […] has consistently stressed that the correlations between contextual parameters and metafunctions are a matter of tendency and statistical probability, not of determination. This implies that certain features of a text might well be linked to a contextual parameter other than, or in addition to, the one predicted by the hook-up hypothesis. (Thompson 1999: 104-106)

The debate about the validity of the CMH hypothesis, however, is one that is deemed irrelevant to the concerns of this thesis, and will therefore not be pursued any further.

2.10. Models of variation in situation type: cline or system network?

Having summarized the Hallidayan perspective on the context-language relationship above, the next question to be considered is whether the entire scope of register variation may be modelled from the vantage point of the contextual stratum (instead of the language-internal models of registerial variation examined previously). If such an endeavour is undertaken, it would appear that priority must be given to one of the three contextual parameters over the two others, which is in effect what Leckie-Tarry does, taking her point of departure in mode. Her perspective (1995: 63-64) is rooted in the observation that the individual contextual values (degree of institutionalization, technicality, formality etc.) of a given language event tend to correlate across the parameters, which is a conception that resonates with Hasan’s view that ‘[…] parameters are permeable: It is difficult to ignore for long the fact that choices in one parameter attract or repel those in others’ (1995: 233). Thus, pointing to the overriding importance of channel for register, Leckie-Tarry (1995: 63-64) posits a kind of supercline ranging from oral to literate registers. The corre-
lation between this super-cline and the *focus* dimension of Tenor can be seen as especially strong: at the oral pole of the super-cline, the focus tends to be interpersonal, whereas the literate end of the cline tends to involve ideational focus. The correlation with the degree of specialization, too, appears to be strong: literate registers tend to represent specialized discourse more than oral ones. Leckie-Tarry’s hypothesis appears to be generally valid, but one drawback which detracts from the analytical applicability of the model is the very cline perspective, which allows no more specific categorization of a given register than e.g. ‘markedly literate’ or ‘relatively oral’.

An alternative view, and one with considerably more explanatory power, is that of Matthiessen (2011), whose point of departure is the typology of socio-semiotic processes (belonging to Field) previously introduced at the primary level of delicacy (see fig. 2.8.1 above):

![Fig. 2.10. Registers typologized according to socio-semiotic process.](source: Matthiessen (2011: 5) (adapted by author)
The system network\textsuperscript{26} indicates the possibility of identifying families of registers (such as [expounding] ones), as well as extending the categorization in delicacy. This is in accordance with the previously quoted dictum of Halliday’s (1978: 111) that registers ‘\textit{can be described to varying degrees of specificity}’ (cf. Matthiessen 1993: 230, 236). The illustration thus shows how one category – [expounding] registers – can be further specified: The first sublevel of the taxonomy is [explaining] and [categorizing], the former of which can be sub-classified as [consequential], [sequential], [causal], [theoretical] and [factorial].\textsuperscript{27} Using the network to categorize a concrete example, the specific register of an excerpt like the following should be identified as [expounding: categorizing: descriptive]. The excerpt is taken from a so-called EPAR Summary for the Public, published by the European Medicines Agency, responsible for the approval of medicinal products for marketing. 

\textit{Actraphane} is the name of a replacement insulin given to diabetes patients:

\begin{quote}
Actraphane is a replacement insulin which is identical to the insulin made by the pancreas. The active ingredient of Actraphane, insulin human (rDNA), is produced by a method known as ‘recombinant technology’. The insulin is made by a yeast that has received a gene (DNA), which makes it able to produce insulin. (European Medicines Agency 2006a)
\end{quote}

It should be noted that registers, as specified according to this model, may correspond to conventional genre labels such as ‘scientific report’, (which would belong to some subcategory in the family of [expounding] registers), ‘news article’ (the category of [reporting]), and ‘user’s manual’ (the [enabling] category). Matthiessen (1993: 233), however, warns that a linguistic theory of register should not rely on the conventional labels rising out of a ‘folk taxonomy’ of genres, pointing out that such labels tend to be based on a few overt characteristics (such as channel), and tend to disregard more subtle linguistic features. Matthiessen’s argument appears to be supported by the fact that a given text may represent more than one specific type of socio-semiotic process, something which is not reflected in conventional genre labels. Thus, while the text type quoted above is far from representing any folk label, but is in fact a mandatory genre deriving from EU legislation, this text type combines the feature [expounding], as we have seen, with [reporting], as in the following brief extract, which details the process and the results of tests conducted on the medicinal product:

\begin{quote}
Actraphane has been studied in a total of 294 patients […]. The study compared Actraphane 30 to a similar mix, but made up using an insulin analogue (insulin aspart). The study measured after 12 weeks the level of a substance (glycosylated haemoglobin, HbA1c), which gives an indication of how well the blood glucose is controlled. (European Medicines Agency 2006a)
\end{quote}

Matthiessen’s register typology (based on the system of \textit{SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS}) is to some degree recognizable in a third model of text type variation, which is the genre model of J. R. Martin and D. Rose. Although in Martin and Rose’s (2008) model (see next section), genre is a distinct level of context ‘above’ the stratum of Field, Tenor and Mode, their genre classification is reminiscent of certain options in the system of \textit{SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS}. They investigate four genre families that largely belong in the educational system.

\textsuperscript{26} The system network, it should be noted, is based on a topological model in Matthiessen (2011). The system network is my invention.

\textsuperscript{27} As appears from the figure, the model on which the network is based is not complete. Only the [expounding] category has been extended to more than one level of delicacy.
and in industry: *stories*, sub-classified into more specific types such as anecdotes, observations and narratives (ibid.: ch. 2), *histories*, such as biographical recounts, historical recounts and historical explanations (ibid.: ch. 3), *reports* and *explanations*, primarily within scientific domains (ibid.: ch. 4), and *procedures and procedural recounts*, mostly within domains relating to machinery and industrial production (ibid.: ch. 5). In this classification, narratives and historical recounts appear to parallel the term [recreating: narrating] in the system of SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS, in the same way as scientific explanations correspond to [expounding: explaining], and certain procedural genres (such as technical user manuals) to [enabling: instructing].

### 2.11. Martin and Rose’s genre model

Despite the points of correspondence between Matthiessen’s register typology and the (partial) genre typology proposed by Martin and Rose (2008), the latter represents a model of the relation between language and context which is derived from, but which also to some extent departs from the Hallidayan model. One difference is purely terminological: Martin (1999: 29) acknowledges the conception of context as a conjunction of Field, Tenor and Mode, but he uses the term *register* to refer to what is traditionally termed *context of situation*. Another point of deviation is his introduction of the concept of *genre*, which he models as a stratum above register (= context of situation) (ibid.: 30) as the determining principle behind contextual configurations (ibid.: 32, cf. Martin and Rose 2008: 16). It is Martin’s claim that the range of possible situation types (configurations of Field, Tenor and Mode values) is limited by culture, which means that only certain situation types are allowed to occur in a given society, to the exclusion of certain others (Martin 1999: 32). To take just a few examples, only certain types of ideational domain and only certain (high) levels of specialization and abstraction are considered appropriate for registers like university lectures, and, similarly, low degrees of formality in Tenor are not easily tolerated in the highly institutionalized dialogue of courtroom proceedings (my example). Accordingly, in Martin and Rose’s model ‘genres are defined as a recurrent configuration of meanings and [...] these recurrent configurations of meaning enact the social practices of a given culture’ (Martin and Rose 2008: 6). Genres, in other words, constitute the compartmentalized meaning potential ratified by culture, which appears to be in accordance with the Hallidayan view of communicative situations as instantiations of a cultural potential (see above).

However, social process in particular is assigned supreme significance in the genre model, as reflected in the following definition: ‘For us a genre is a staged, goal-oriented, social process. Social because we participate in genres with other people; goal-oriented because we use genres to get things done; staged because it usually takes a few stages to reach our goals’ (Martin and Rose 2007: 8; see also Martin and Rose (2008: 6) for a very similar definition). This definition, it may be noted, parallels Hasan’s (1999b) understanding of social process as a concept that is inseparable from purposefulness, but it deviates from the Hallidayan model by isolating social process as the determining factor behind selections at the ‘lower’ stratum of context, i.e. in IDEATIONAL DOMAIN (the remaining aspect of Field) and in Tenor and Mode. What is not clear, however, is how and why social

---

28 This example stems from Martin himself, who is quoted in Leckie-Tarry (1995: 35).
process can be regarded as the factor which exerts this constraining influence on the other parameters of context. Elevating social process to this supreme status, therefore, does not appear sufficiently warranted, which is also one of the crucial points in Hasan’s criticism (1999b: 244) of Martin’s genre model. This does not make the investigation in Martin and Rose (2008) mentioned above a less valuable contribution to our understanding of a certain range of registers (in the Hallidayan sense) linked with social institutions such as education and industry, but it fails to answer how these registers are determined by social process in the last resort.

2.12. Swales’ genre theory
An alternative theory of genre (from outside SFL) which should also be briefly considered is that of John Swales (1990), for whom the concept is intimately linked with the notion of discourse communities, or sociorhetorical groups, which Swales distinguishes from sociolinguistic groups, or speech communities (ibid.: 24). Whereas speech communities are defined by socio-economic class membership, sociorhetorical groups are defined by a shared set of public goals which are often, but not necessarily, of a professional character (ibid.). It thus seems that prototypical discourse communities are highly literate circles organized according to academic discipline, such as law, medicine etc. or by membership of a bureaucracy. As for the characteristics of a sociorhetorical group, Swales lists the following (ibid.: 24-27): apart from the set of shared public goals, it is defined by certain channels of communication, a set of discourse genres, specific terminology and a certain minimum number of members ‘with a suitable degree of relevant content and discoursal expertise’ (ibid.: 27).

As already mentioned, the concept of genre is to be understood in relation to discourse communities and is defined as follows:

A genre comprises a class of communicative events, the members of which share some set of communicative purposes. These purposes are recognized by the expert members of the parent discourse community, and thereby constitute the rationale for the genre. This rationale shapes the schematic structure of the discourse and influences and constrains choice of content and style. (Swales 1990: 58)

Judging from this definition, Swales’ genre concept is compatible with especially Martin’s genre model, and seems to be compatible with the SFL notion of language variation according to function (register theory). However, my main objection to Swales’ theoretical construct is its lack of a conceptual framework that allows more subtle distinctions in terms of important values like degree of technicality and formality. Although, as mentioned above, I reject Martin’s two-layer contextual construct (genre realized through configurations of Field, Tenor and Mode values), at least the SFL conception of register forms part of Martin’s theory, which allows precise distinctions in terms of register values to be made. Also, whereas the link between genre and linguistic realization is indeed part of Swales’ concept (‘genre… constrains choice of content and style’, as quoted above), he is silent when it comes to a closer definition of the link between genre and language characteristics. This is not to deny that much of Swales’ book is in fact devoted to an exploration of the linguistic characteristics of a selection of academic genres, but he fails to provide any systematic interpretation of the realizational link between genre and language.
In the following, moreover, a number of specific objections to Swales’ construct will be raised, of which the first concerns the notion of communicative event, which is defined as ‘comprising not only the discourse itself and its participants, but also the role of that discourse and the environment of its production and reception, including its historical and cultural associations’ (Swales 1990: 46). This very broad definition is reminiscent of the SFL conception of the language-context relation, with certain Tenor and Mode dimensions being recognizable, but Swales fails to make a clear conceptual distinction between context and linguistic realization.

The second objection concerns the concept of discourse community, which seems to apply to specialists first and foremost. This is what seems to be reflected in Swales’ reference to ‘established’ and ‘non-established’ members of a discourse community (1990: 54), whereby a kind of inferior status appears to be assigned to non-experts. Genres are, according to Swales, primarily to be seen as the communicative tools in use among specialist peers: ‘Established members of discourse communities employ genres to realize communicatively the goals of their communities’ (ibid.: 52). This means that only with difficulty does Swales’ genre concept encompass different levels of technicality in discourse, and only with difficulty does it seem to accommodate genres that represent communication based on an asymmetric distribution of knowledge between the participants, as in the case of expert-lay communication.

The third objection is (also) linked with my preference for the SFL register model, which has the advantage of being designed to encompass all types of naturally occurring language. Swales’ genre model, on the other hand, is far from this holistic perspective, excluding most oral events from the concept of genre, especially casual conversation, which ‘will not be considered communicative events’ (1990: 58). Swales does, however, seem to recognize institutionalized types of oral events such as classroom discourse as instances of genre (ibid.), but the objection may be raised that a clear-cut distinction cannot always be made between institutionalized and non-institutionalized discourse, since institutionalization is best viewed as a matter of degree, as was Leckie-Tarry’s point. It is a fair guess that classroom discourse, for example, typically occupies an intermediate region between the two poles on the cline of institutionalization (at least in a fairly liberal country like Denmark).

For these reasons, Swales’ genre theory will not be considered of any relevance to this thesis.

2.13. Biber's register theory
A final theory needs to be considered for its possible relevance to a conceptualization of functional variation in language, viz. the theories of register variation represented by the work of Biber (1993; 1995) and Biber, Conrad et al. (1998). In these studies, a number of general parameters are formulated along which differences between registers may be captured, being thus akin to the SF theory of the context-language interrelation. In Biber (1995: 141-168), seven such parameters or dimensions applicable to English registers are identified, all seven with the status of clines. These are the following:
1) involved vs. informational production (i.e. the degree to which the discourse is 'interac-
tional' vs. informational in focus)
2) narrative vs. non-narrative discourse
3) situation-dependent vs. elaborated reference (i.e. the degree to which the discourse makes sense only in relation to its immediate context of production, or conversely, is independent of this context)
4) overt expression of argumentation
5) abstract vs. non-abstract style
6) on-line informational elaboration marking stance\textsuperscript{29}
7) tentative interpretation: academic hedging.

For each of the seven parameters, Biber has identified two sets of 'opposed' grammatical features, which means that an overweight in a given register of features from one of the sets equals a location near one pole of the cline, whereas an overweight of the other set leads to the opposite. To take an example, the dimension of 'abstract vs. non-abstract style' is mainly related to the presence or absence of passives. This means that a marked presence of passives equals 'abstract style' whereas the relative absence of this grammatical feature is to be equated with a 'non-abstract style'. The point is that the profile of any given register can be expressed in terms of its location on each of these seven parameters, which is what Biber (1995: 141-168) has undertaken with a certain, broad variety of English registers from fiction, LSP and other instances of naturally occurring language.

There are, however, a number of problems with Biber's framework. To begin with a rather specific deficiency, the seven dimensions do not really integrate a cline of specialization, which is a key difference between the two text types under investigation in this thesis. In the dimension concerning informational vs. interpersonal focus, one of the indicators is lexical type-token ratio (Biber 1995: 142), but whether this is a reliable indicator of specialization is far from certain. In other words, the seven-dimension framework is simply not comprehensive enough, which is a possibility that Biber acknowledges (ibid.: 139). Furthermore, as pointed out by Teich (2003: 26), the ontological status of the seven dimensions as such is far from clear: '[...]' what is the level of abstraction? Is it semantics, is it discourse, or is it pragmatics?' (ibid.). Biber only defines them as 'the underlying dimensions of variation in language' (Biber 1995: 18), and they are associated with 'situational, social and cognitive functions' (Biber 1993: 333), which appears to make the pragmatic interpretation the more likely, but whether all dimensions are consistently to be conceived of as context-related parameters is not sufficiently clear.

Another incisive criticism of Teich's, and one that is particularly damaging to the relevance of Biber's framework to the present investigation, is the observation that no paradigmatic background is provided for the various grammatical features associated with each of the seven dimensions. In Teich's own words, 'what cannot be said with Biber's analysis is what the other options in the same systemic context are that might have been chosen but were not' (2003: 26). Thus, what is lacking in Biber's framework is a formulation of, or at least reference to the totality of the language system, which bars the possibility of relating divergent features in different registers to differences in systemic options (ibid.). For these reasons, Biber's register theory will be ignored in this thesis.

\textsuperscript{29}This dimension, and possibly also the next one, is far from self-explanatory and would require a somewhat lengthy explanation to be sufficiently clear. Since Biber's framework will not be adopted here, such a clarification has been deemed irrelevant.
2.13. Summary
The present chapter has presented one part of the theoretical framework on which the thesis is founded, viz. the linguistic theory known as SFL, whose key assumptions and distinctive features have been accounted for. Among the central tenets is the conception of language as a stratified phenomenon whose individual components are context, semantics, lexicogrammar and phonology. In this stratified model, grammar and lexis are not treated as separate compartments of language, but viewed as one unified stratum (lexicogrammar) whose internal organization bears the stamp of the three general types of meaning (meta-functions) it is structured to encode or realize. In a later chapter (chapter 5), a selective account - adapted to the specific purposes of the thesis - will be given of the paradigmatic and syntagmatic organization of the lexicogrammatical stratum. The 'stratification postulate', however, is an assumption that will play some role already in the next two chapters (concerned with translation theory), especially in chapter 4, where certain sub-types of translation will be distinguished (partly) according to which stratum or strata are affected by the translation process.

The other cornerstone of SF theory which is central to this thesis is its contextualist emphasis, i.e. the tenet that the selection of meanings in a given communicative event is a reflex of situational context. Modelled as a configuration of the three parameters Field, Tenor and Mode, situational context has been theorized as the determinant behind registerial variation in language, i.e. variation in what sub-division of the overall linguistic system comes to be instantiated in a given act of communication. Thus, the specific type of translation with which the present investigation is concerned, i.e. intralingual rewriting between registers, consists in the derivation of one communicative situation type from another, and hence a shift between different, yet partially overlapping sub-potentials of the linguistic system.
Chapter 3. Expanding the concept of translation to include intralingual rewriting

As mentioned in the introductory chapter, this thesis takes its departure in the tripartite typology of Roman Jakobson's (1959/2012), which recognizes INTRA as translation on a par with the two other types, i.e. interlingual and intersemiotic translation, and, following Göpferich (2004; 2007), Schmid (2008; 2012) and Zethsen (2007; 2009), the stance adopted here is the one that the object field of TS should be expanded to incorporate these two modes of translation as well. However, not only has Jakobson's typology encountered various kinds of criticism, alternative approaches to the definition of translation have been proposed which do not square with the typology, usually to the detriment of the translational status of INTRA. The purpose of this chapter, therefore, will be to review these criticisms as well other arguments and definitional approaches that would either completely exclude INTRA from the concept of translation, and hence from the object field of TS, or concede it a marginal status only. These are what might be termed the institutional argument, the prototype approach to conceptualizing translation, the equivalence criterion and the interlinguality criterion, respectively. After reviewing these arguments/approaches, it will be shown how INTRA can be incorporated in the concept of translation on the basis of especially G. Toury's broad and non-equivalence-oriented definition, to which, however, certain modifications will be proposed.

3.1. The 'institutional' argument against INTRA

A very incisive criticism of Jakobson is voiced by Hermans (1995), who does not dispute Jakobson's typology as such, but points out that the validity of the typology depends on which of two incompatible perspectives is adopted: an academic or an institutional one. From an academic perspective, Jakobson's typology may well be acceptable, but if translation is viewed as an institution, the matter becomes very different. The 'institutional' status of translation is defined by Hermans as follows: there is such a thing as

a social entity called 'translation' and a form of behaviour called 'translating' with which, give or take a few nuances, we reckon we are all familiar in our own language and culture. The meaning of 'translation' is codified in dictionaries, there are professional activities called translation, we have organizations representing translators, institutes for translator training, etc. It is this 'public face' of translation that I have in mind when I speak of translation as 'institution'.

(Hermans 1995: 5)

Another aspect of this institutional status is the range of stakeholders involved in translation, such as clients, patrons, translators, agencies, editors and readers, all of whose expectations converge in the norms that regulate the practice of translation (Hermans 1995: 9). One central expectation pertains to equivalence: what consumers of translation expect is a relation of sameness between what they read and the ST (ibid.: 14). It is important to stress that from the perspective of translation as institution, i.e. from the perspective of the trans-
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30 One might add authorization as an important aspect. In Denmark, university graduates with a master's degree in languages and LSP translation can obtain certification as state-authorized translators from the Danish Business Authority. The certification gives translators the right to undertake notarized translations (mostly in the field of law). The function of notarization is to provide other institutions, such as courts of law, with the assurance of 'indisputable equivalence'.
lation consumer', the scholarly debate about the (im)possibility of equivalence in translation (see below) is irrelevant, because equivalence is what external stakeholders expect. This explains the type of real-life situation often encountered by translators and translation agencies when clients who are proficient in both the SL and the TL involved in the assignment (which is the typical case when Danish clients commission translations between English and Danish) receive a less-than-literal translation. What the translator or the agency can do at the most in such a situation is to try to convince the client that a pragmatic type of equivalence, and not a literal one, is what the purpose of the TT (its so-called skopos) has dictated (A. Schjoldager, p.c.). The point is not that the client's notions can be dismissed as naive and misconceived, and that s/he ought to take some time out to read up on translation theory. The point is that the expectations of stakeholders are constitutive of translation as an institution, i.e. as a 'social practice' (Pym 1995: 158 et passim) with a specific place and function in society. Pym recognizes the institutional expectations, noting that '[...] the translator is an equivalence producer, a professional communicator working for people who pay to believe that, on whatever level is pertinent, A is equivalent to B' (1995: 167), noting also that the expectation of equivalence is '[...] a socially operative belief that enables translations - and translators - to work' (ibid.) - i.e. enables translation to work as a social practice.

From the point of view of TS, on the other hand, for which translation is not a practice but a research domain, the concept may be invested with a different content. Thus, as Herman's point (1995: 17), in the popular notion translation is only one thing, and that is interlingual, but still there may be good reasons to extend the academic concept of translation to other modes of semiotic derivation, as Jakobson does. This is the stance that will be adopted here, and why this chapter is devoted to arguing for the inclusion of INTRA in the object field of TS. However, as Hermans (1995) points out, the wording of Jakobson's definition reveals an attempt to span both perspectives, the academic and the institutional one. Following Derrida's famous deconstructionist criticism of Jakobson, Hermans points to the inequality of status assigned to each of the three types (INTRA, TRP and intersemiotic): Derrida\(^{31}\) (1985) lays bare the difference in definitional approach in Jakobson's essay, noting that INTRA and intersemiotic translation as concepts are each translated intralingually, i.e. reworded in a 'definitional interpretation' (Derrida 1985: 173): Jakobson's own phrasing (1959/2012: 127) was 'intralingual translation or rewording' and 'intersemiotic translation or transmutation' [my emphases]. In the case of interlingual translation, on the other hand, instead of rewording the label, the central word translation is simply repeated ('interlingual translation, or translation proper' (ibid.), thus revealing that in spite of the extension of the concept, Jakobson still concedes TRP supreme status:\(^{32}\) it acquires the meaning of 'translation in the ordinary sense', whereas the other two types are demoted to 'translation in the figurative sense' (Derrida 1985: 174). Derrida's uncovering of this ambivalence in Jakobson's definitions is what prompts Hermans' criticism of Jakobson for trying to have it both ways, in a manner of speaking, by offering a typology which reveals the institutional bias towards TRP ('interlingual translation is what really counts as translation') while at

\(^{31}\) In the following, Derrida's own criticism of Jakobson will be examined.

\(^{32}\) Apart from this, Derrida (1985: 173) also points to the difficulty of upholding a water-tight distinction between INTRA and TRP. This point will be taken up later.
the same adopting an academic perspective which extends the perimeters of the concept to other modes (Hermans 1995: 17-18; cf. Pym 2010: 108 for a similar interpretation of Jakobson). No such 'differential treatment' of the three translation types will be adopted in this thesis: it should be emphasized that while full validity must be granted to Hermans' attribution of institutional status to translation as a social practice and to his recognition that this institution necessarily comes with a rather circumscribed notion of what translation is, the perspective adopted here is necessarily the academic one, with no difference in status assigned to the three Jakobsonian types.

3.2. The prototype approach to the concept of translation
A type of definition which does include INTRA in the concept of translation, but concedes it only marginal status is Halverson's so-called prototype approach (1999; 2000), which is an interesting contribution to the definitional issue, but in my view nevertheless an untenable one. The nature of the approach is the following: Halverson's point of departure is the observation that previous concepts of 'translation' have proven futile in the delimitation of the object field of TS, i.e. have been unable to provide the grounds for a demarcation of 'translation' from 'non-translation' (Halverson 1999: 2-3), which allegedly pertains to completely relativistic approaches ('translation can be virtually anything') as well as to notions of a 'completely objective delineation, one "true" delineation' (ibid.: 3). The solution she proposes is to view translation as a prototype concept, i.e. a concept characterized by 'membership gradience' (ibid.: 6), which means that individual sub-types of translation are assigned varying degrees of centrality/peripherality as members of the category.

3.2.1. Philosophical foundations of the prototype approach
Philosophically, the notion of graded category membership relies on Wittgenstein's concept of 'family resemblances' from Philosophische Untersuchungen, §§66-67 (Halverson 1999: 5). This concept is rooted in the observation that attempts to define any category in terms of a limited set of clearly identifiable features common to all specimens are futile. Wittgenstein (1958/1994: 66 (§66)) mentions the concept of games as a case in point: an examination of a range of different types of games reveals that it is in fact impossible to identify any particular feature(s) which all the activities we call 'games' share. Be it features such as 'competition', 'amusement', 'luck' or 'skill', none is common to all members. Only a complicated network of partially overlapping similarities can be observed (ibid.), and it is for such similarities that Wittgenstein proposes the term 'family resemblances' (§67), in the same way as some members of a family (of human blood relations) may share the same colour of hair, others the same eye colour, yet others the same temperament etc. (ibid.), without any single characteristic being common to all, and with some members sharing more points of resemblance than others. The concept of 'family resemblances' thus provides Halverson (1999) with the theoretical grounds for positing translation as a prototype category.

Furthermore, Halverson contrasts prototype concepts with the classical (Aristotelian) approach to categorization. In this approach, categories are believed to match reality as it is independently of the observer, and 'the link [between a category and a type of object] is provided by the listing of necessary and sufficient conditions, which match directly with the
essential features of the object in question' (Halverson 1999: 5). As a counterargument to the Aristotelian essentialism, Halverson cites modern cognitive research indicating that the content of a given category is in no way conditioned by any inherent properties of objects, but by the cognitive structure of language users: 'The evidence put forward seems to point towards one conclusion: categorization is not based on objective qualities inherent in real-world objects, but is dependent on and determined by properties of the human cognizer' (ibid.: 6), which explains why the content ascribed to a given category may vary from one language user to another. Allegedly, it is possible to chart a shared cognitive structure behind a given concept of a language community, but any variation identifiable between the notions of individual users is a manifestation of prototype effects, i.e. different patternings in the way individual 'cognizers' attribute varying degrees of centrality/ peripherality to a range of potential members of the category (ibid.).

3.2.2. Halverson's investigation into the cognitive structure behind the translation concept
The wish to chart the cognitive structure behind the concept of translation is what formed the impetus behind an inquiry reported in Halverson (2000). The specifics of the inquiry need to be described in some detail: it involved asking a number of undergraduate students to decide to which degree on a seven-point scale they would assign translational status to seven specimens of different types of semiotic conversion, with the lowest value on the scale signifying unqualified exclusion of a specimen, and the highest value full inclusion in the category of translation (Halverson 2000: 5-7). According to Halverson (ibid.: 5), the seven specimens were selected so as to be consistent with Jakobson's typology (1959/2012), encompassing examples of all three types (interlingual, intralingual and intersemiotic). Halverson's results will not be rendered in exhaustive detail here, but a few notable tendencies deserve to be mentioned. One is the - hardly surprising - status accorded to interlingual translation, which Halverson's informants categorized as unambiguously translational in nature. INTRA, on the other hand, was viewed by the informants as being within the bounds of the concept, but only peripherally. What is also striking is the importance of linguality for translational status: types of translation involving language (in either ST or TT or both) appeared to increase the likelihood of a type of transfer being accorded translational status, whereas the absence of linguality had the opposite effect (2000: 8-11).

Any detailed criticism of Halverson's questionnaire is deemed irrelevant for present purposes, yet one point does deserve critical comment on its own terms, namely the text pair selected to represent the INTRA category, where the (Norwegian) ST was 'Han er makelig anlagt' and the TT 'Han liker å ta ting med ro'. My criticism relates to the fact that most adult Norwegians would be likely to understand ST and TT alike, which means that they are faced with a specimen of text for which they do not need any translation. Had they been exposed to a real challenge to comprehension, such as a piece of highly technical ST language rewritten in a more easily accessible TT register, Halverson's results might well

33 It should be pointed out that the seven specimens were in fact selected to represent an amended version of Jakobson's typology. These amendments will ignored here for being irrelevant to present purposes. For the exact specimens in Halverson's questionnaire, see Appendix 1.
34 ST glossed by Halverson in English as 'He is rather laid-back by nature' and TT as 'He likes to take things easy' (2000: 15).
have been different. Nothing more than speculation is possible, of course, but an intralingual TT that really served to neutralize a comprehension obstacle might have earned a higher degree of centrality on the cline, thus reflecting a cognitive structure behind the common usage of the word translation that might be closer to the academic definition that I shall propose (see below). 35

3.2.3. A critique of the prototype approach
Apart from the above criticism of Halverson's inquiry on its own terms, several more fundamental points of criticism may be raised against the 'prototype' solution to the problem of defining translation. First, in referring to Wittgenstein's concept of 'family resemblances' as part of the philosophical grounds for the prototype approach to categorization, consideration ought to be given to the context in which Wittgenstein's argument belongs: his argument is aimed at showing how concepts make sense in ordinary or everyday language, without language users agreeing on essentialist definitions of the categories they use. In the situations of everyday life with which ordinary language is tied up (Wittgenstein's so-called language games), we understand each other because we agree on how to use the words. Therefore, even in the absence of essentialist definitions, apparently imprecise concepts (such as game) are completely meaningful in everyday language use (Floor 1982: 185-187; cf. Wittgenstein 1958/1994: 68 (§ 70)). Thus, Wittgenstein's argument is concerned with the functioning of ordinary language (the well-functioning of it in spite of apparent odds against it), and his aim is not to dispute the possibility of agreeing on more precise conceptual definitions, like those sought in e.g. law and science (Floor 1982: 187). Indeed, Wittgenstein's argument about family resemblances is hardly relevant to a debate about conceptual definitions within a given scientific discipline. Needless to say, when it comes to scientific inquiry, a minimum requirement is to bring our conceptual tools in order, unequivocal definitions being simply a sine qua non in scientific pursuit (cf. Robinson 2011: 69-70). 36 Therefore, following Robinson, I shall argue that what is needed is a so-called stipulative definition instead (see below), and one that will specify criteria for membership - a definition which might not be in complete agreement with 'common usage', but which may serve as the basis of a scientific taxonomy of translational phenomena.

What Halverson's inquiry (2000) represents is in effect an attempt to investigate the extent to which a layman's understanding of translation overlaps with a possible scientific taxonomy of the concept (Jakobson's first and foremost). In contrast, Halliday and Matthiessen (1999) stress the divergence between scientific taxonomies and so-called folk ones belonging to the 'same' field of experience (ideational domain, in SF terms), pointing out

35 A similar objection might in fact be raised against several of the other categories of Halverson's questionnaire. Thus, in the intersemiotic category (non-language → language), the ST is a picture of the Norwegian traffic sign that signifies 'yield', which is rendered in language as 'vikeplikt' [English: yield] in the TT. In this case, too, the informants must be assumed to be completely familiar with the meaning of the ST.

36 This obviously does not mean that the work of matching concepts with real-life specimens will not be a laborious task full of borderline cases which defy easy categorization, but these are matters of interpretation which lie at the heart of 'doing science' (cf. the deliberations on the concept of interpretive hypotheses in section 1.6.1). Witness the very term borderline personality disorder in psychiatry, apparently created to capture the ambiguous type of disorder which is on the borderline (?) between the two categories of neurosis and psychosis (see Cullberg 1989: 237-262).
that the scientific approach differs from the folk one not only in the delicacy of categorization, but also in terms of classificatory criteria:37

The move from folk taxonomies towards scientific ones involves both an increase in steps of delicacy and a change in the criteria used for classification. [...The change is one] from overt criteria accessible to the naked eye to covert criteria available only through the application of scientific techniques.38 (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 85-86)

A folk taxonomy of translation, therefore, might look something like the graph below, with the primary distinction ([written]/[non-written]) being based on the overt feature of presence/absence of written material:

![Graph of a possible 'folk taxonomy' of translation](image)

This is intended as nothing but a putative model, only constructed to show the possible makeup of a folk taxonomy.39 When it comes to a scientific taxonomy, on the other hand, we are on safer ground, because one such is in fact formulated by Gottlieb (2008a) (to be examined in detail in the next chapter), in whose model the influence of Jakobson is clearly recognizable. Using SF notation, a graphic model of Gottlieb's taxonomy takes the following shape:

37 For a similar view, see White (1998: 288-290).
38 Another hallmark of scientific taxonomies that could be pointed to (not mentioned by Halliday and Matthiessen (1999), but one that must be regarded as consistent with the quoted dictum) is an extendability in delicacy, i.e. the possibility of introducing more subtle conceptual distinctions if new scientific discoveries bring along the grounds for such. Yet another hallmark would appear to be the possibility of modifying taxonomies if alternative criteria are proposed. As an example, see McHugh (2005), who recommends the adoption of a new set of criteria in the classification of mental disorders, viz. the classification which forms the basis of *the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (the diagnostic tool used by the American Psychiatric Association).
39 It should be mentioned that my reason for positing the term [intralingual between distant varieties] in the 'folk' taxonomy is the assumption that if people are faced with two parallel specimens of language, one of which they are unable to understand, and one which is comprehensible and purports to be 'saying the same' as the inaccessible version, they are likely to regard the comprehensible version as a translation, even if the inaccessible piece of text is in fact a (distant) variety of their own language. Thus, if for example Danes are faced with a specimen of Old Norse on a runic tablet in a museum exhibition, they would likely recognize a modern-Danish rendering (which the museum would be sure to provide) as *translation*.
Fig. 3.2.3b. A scientific taxonomy of translation, deduced from Gottlieb (2008)

It should be emphasized that the above graph represents only a fragment of Gottlieb’s taxonomy, with only those translation types that are simultaneously [intrasemiotic], [isosemiotic], [conventionalized] and [verbal] extended to the end points of delicacy. What should be noted, however, is that one hallmark of scientific classification is manifest in the model, being reflected in the system names (SEMIOTIC IDENTITY/NON-IDENTITY, SEMIOTIC COMPOSITION etc.). These names are in fact identical with the criteria behind the conceptual distinctions: covert, but clearly articulated criteria (see Gottlieb 2008a), in this case derived from a number of semiotic characteristics. Like any conceptual apparatus in science, Gottlieb’s taxonomy should indeed be subjected to critical scrutiny, but any attempt to do this from the perspective of a ‘folk model’ based on unarticulated and unargued criteria makes no sense.

Another problematic notion of Halverson’s (1999) is her grounds for rejecting criterial definitions of translation (definitions based on necessary and sufficient conditions). As previously noted, she associates criterial definitions with Aristotelian essentialism, i.e. the conception that such definitions reflect certain inherent properties of the objects that belong to the category. Robinson specifies the Aristotelian notion as follows: ‘Definition was defined by Aristotle as the essence of a thing [...]. On this interpretation, if ‘x is yz’ is a significant and true definition of x, then x is a thing and yz is the essence of that thing’ (2011: 154). Robinson, however, dismisses such essentialism, pointing out that ‘[e]ssence [...] is just the human choice of what to mean by a name, misinterpreted as being a metaphysical reality’ (ibid.: 155). In contrast, Robinson maintains that so-called nominal definitions (definitions of the names we give to things) may be valid even without the assumption of any metaphysical reality inherent in the class of phenomena that a given term is chosen to denote. Such definitions are valid simply as a matter of convention, because we may actively decide, especially in science, what content to stipulate for a given term. Definition by stipulation is in fact what Robinson recommends for scientific disciplines: ‘[w]e must be released from the lexical definitions which merely describe common usage in all its unscientific nature, and allowed to stipulate simpler, more precise, and more unequivocal words and ideas, if we are to have science’ (2011: 73). Therefore, a stipulative, criterial
definition of translation is what I shall try to provide later.

Before leaving Halverson altogether, it might also be noted that in spite of her prototype approach, a criterial definition does in fact seem to be lurking behind the scenes of the inquiry referred to above. This is because in all the seven semiotic ST-TT pairs which formed the basis of Halverson's inquiry (see Appendix 1), the three well-known criteria of translational status formulated by G. Toury ('postulates' as he calls them (Toury 1995: 33-35)) are in fact recognizable, viz. the source text postulate, the transfer postulate and the relationship postulate. In each of the seven ST-TT pairs, a source text is specified, and in all cases the similarity of the semiotic content of ST and TT is sufficiently clear for a relationship of transfer or derivation to be recognizable. All text pairs thus appear to have been selected on the basis of at least the three Touryan criteria. The presence of such criteria in an experiment is in no way surprising, of course, given Karl Popper's point that observation (scientific or otherwise) never takes place in a void, but is always informed by theory (Popper 1935/2002: 88). In fact, the unearthing of such assumptions behind Halverson's inquiry appears to suggest that criteria in definition are not so easily dispensed with after all, even when one tries to avoid them.

Moreover, the question is if Halverson's prototype concept really fulfils the purpose of protecting against the dangers of relativism ('translation can be virtually anything'), as was one of the intentions behind the approach, as previously noted. The results of Halverson's 'prototype inquiry' do go quite some way towards filling the concept of translation with content - a concept otherwise threatened with emptiness by relativism. Yet, the inquiry obviously cannot make claims to being anything more than a charting of a cognitive structure in a specific culture at a specific point in time (cf. Tymoczko 2007: 40 (note 13)). The cultural relativity of such an investigation therefore appears unavoidable.

3.3. The criteriality of equivalence

Although I cannot accept Halverson's 'prototype' approach as a scholarly solution to the definitional problem, she is right in pointing to the inadequacy of previous criterial approaches in providing answers to the problem of demarcation (the delineation of 'translation' from 'non-translation'). One such approach, to be explored in the following, consists in the elevation of equivalence to criterial status.

3.3.1. Obstacles to equivalence in actual translational practice

A detailed scrutiny of traditional, equivalence-oriented conceptions of translation (ones which equate translational status with equivalence) is undertaken by Koller (1995), who demonstrates the limitations of such approaches. More specifically, these are approaches which view translation as a purely transcoding, linguistic (i.e. lexicogrammatical) activity, or, in Koller's rendition, conceptions according to which translation can be understood as the result of a text-processing activity, by means of which a source-language text is transposed into a target-language text. Between the resultant text in L2

\[40\] In Toury (1995), 'text' is only to be understood in the literal sense, whereas here the broadest possible sense, i.e. 'text' as any kind of semiotic entity, must be allowed for.

\[41\] Toury's famous three postulates will be considered in more detail later.
Though favourable to linguistic approaches himself, Koller demonstrates the untenability of this position by pointing to what he terms the 'double linkage' of translations: on the one hand, the link of the TT with the ST whose content the translation is supposed to represent, and on the other hand the link with the TL audience (ibid.: 197). This, of course, is identical with the dual, and often irreconcilable set of obligations incumbent on the translator: the practice of translation as a perennial matter of divided loyalties between fidelity to the ST and consideration for the TL readership (cf. Tymoczko 1999: 55). Koller points out what is well-known to any practicing translator, viz. that equivalence in the form of faithfulness to the source text is in many cases inadequate if a TT is to succeed in providing its readers with proper access to the content of the ST: 'If translations are to be understandable, or rather, if they are to convey certain values of the source-language text to the target-language reader, this cannot but entail the application of text-revision methods' (Koller 1995: 205). In other words, a well-functioning TT is often the product of translational procedures that depart from strict adherence to ST wordings, by modifying and sometimes expanding the semantic content of the original. Neither is this anything new to practitioners of translation, of course, and it is part of the central lessons to be learned from standard textbooks of translation practice such as Schjoldager (2008) and Baker (2011). The point, however, is that such 'text-revisional elements', as Koller calls them (1995: 208), are not 'equivalence-guided text reproduction' (ibid.: 204), but free text production, i.e. 'free' elements only indirectly related to the ST, which means that theories of translation which hypostasize equivalence as a demarcation criterion are bound to exclude significant elements of texts that we normally regard as translations (cf. Schmid 2008: 31; cf. Toury 1986: 1120).

The view of equivalence as something unattainable is also implicit in Tymoczko's (1999) much more realistic view of translation. Like Koller, she stresses the dual orientation of any translation (towards the ST and the TL readership at the same time (ibid.: 56)), but she goes one step further by pointing to a specific trait of all translation which she metaphorizes as 'metonymic'. This is a reference to the type of rhetorical device (metonymy) whereby e.g. a part of something is made to stand for the whole, and this is what captures the realities of translating: translations can never be anything but partial, i.e. can only 'stand for' part of the original content, since translating always - and no matter what type of texts are involved - entails selecting some aspects of the ST to represent in the TT and ignoring others (ibid.: 55; see also Tymoczko 2007: 36-37). No doubt this phenomenon is especially marked in the type of translation Tymoczko is concerned with, viz. translation of ancient Irish literature into English. In cases like these, where the distance between the horizon of

---

42 What Koller may be hinting at, or what this definition is at least reminiscent of, is one of the foremost classics of the linguistic approach to translation, namely J. C. Catford, to whom translation is 'the replacement of textual material in one language (SL) with equivalent material in another language (TL)' (1965: 20).

43 For a similar view, see Mossop (1998: 258).

44 It should be noted that since it is specifically the pars-pro-toto type of metonymy that Tymoczko has in mind, a better metaphor might be 'synechdochic', which has this more specific denotation (cf. the entries metonymy and synechdoche in Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2013)).
the ST and that of the TL audience is marked, *'the amount of literary information to be conveyed to the receiving audience is excessive'* (Tymoczko 1999: 48), which means that the translator is faced with the choice between a translation which gives priority to some ST aspects while omitting others, and an attempt at representing all aspects of the ST content, which would necessitate an extensive body of scholarly commentary (ibid.: 48). Even such a commentary, however, would never be exhaustive (ibid.: 49). Although Tymoczko's specific concerns are far removed from the concerns of the present thesis, the insight she provides into this special type of literary translation is interesting because of the striking similarity with the type of lay-oriented INTRA under consideration here: as TTs, PILs certainly stand in a 'metonymic' (or 'synecdochic') relationship to their STs, being only partial representations of the SPCs (because they are not legally required to be more) in terms of textual quantity as well as semantic specificity, the PILs being generally less specific in meaning. Moreover, a full rendering of the SPCs in a layman's register would indeed require a very extensive commentary, while at the same time the possibility of a complete representation would be questionable.

Another interesting point of Tymoczko's which deserves mentioning is her observation that when it comes to familiar dichotomies such as Toury's *adequacy vs. acceptability* (e.g. 1995: 57), Venuti's *foreignization vs. domestication* (1995) or Schjoldager's *ST-oriented vs. TT-oriented macrostrategy* (2008: ch. 5),45 *'there is no single polarity that describes the orientation of a translation, no single positioning along a linear continuum'* (Tymoczko 1999: 56): parts of a translation may closely adhere to the ST while others may be much more oriented towards making the TT 'digestible' to the TL readership (ibid.: 55). Once again, the similarity with the INTRA of SPCs into PILs is striking: although, as previously indicated, the general orientation of the PILs (the macrostrategy, in Schjoldager's terms) is strongly towards 'acceptability' (here in the form of stylistic appropriacy), the PILs do in fact exhibit some degree of ST fidelity, as manifested in a long series of instances where ST items have been directly inserted in the TTs (see section 8.1.4).

### 3.3.2. The culture-bound nature of meaning and the implications for translational equivalence

Although, as acknowledged above, a translation may undeniably be more or less oriented towards rendering ST content faithfully and conversely less or more oriented towards TL accessibility, there is a deeper sense in which translational equivalence is in the final instance impossible, and in which translation is always in the last resort oriented towards the target audience, even in spite of an intended ST orientation. An illustration may be found in the Nigerian writer Chinua Achebe's renowned novel *Things Fall Apart* from 1958 about traditional African culture and the advent of colonialism. The novel is full of references to traditional West African beliefs, one example of which is the supernatural phenomenon called *ogbanje* in the Igbo language, translated by Achebe himself as *'those wicked children who, when they died, entered their mother's womb to be born again'* (Achebe 1958: 54). Admittedly, the conglomeration of all the individual semantic elements of the translation, such as 'wicked', 'children', 'die' etc., may well come close to representing the content of the Igbo concept (though when we read on in Achebe's description, we

45 Of these examples, only Toury and Venuti are mentioned by Tymoczko (1999: 55, 60 (note 26)).
find that elements such as 'curse', 'torment' and 'evil cycle' help complete the picture). Yet, the point is that however much we try to break down the exact semantic composition of a foreign concept, these elements, when they are rendered in TL words, will carry TL and not SL meanings, as pointed out by Catford (1965: ch. 5) half a century ago (and cf. Malinowski 1935: 14). In realizing this, translators may try even harder to make absolutely sure that TT readers (in this case modern Westerners) 'get the full meaning' of a concept like *ogbanje* by placing it within the world view in which it belongs, e.g. by adding a further explanation like 'this is part of traditional African beliefs in the supernatural' (as I did above). Nonetheless, there is still no escaping the fact that concepts like 'beliefs' and 'the supernatural' are thoroughly English, since, to the Igbo of Achebe's novel, a distinction like the one between 'natural' and 'supernatural' makes no sense. In Saussurian terms, replacing the *signifiants* of a source text with those from another language does not mean that the original *signifié* come along as fellow travellers on the journey across the linguistic di-vide, arriving at their destination to embody themselves in the *signifiants* of the TT. In the words of Derrida, 'the signified is inseparable from the signifier' (1972/1981: 18), which means that nothing in fact moves (cf. Chesterman 1997: 8), from whom the travelling metaphor has been borrowed. Cf. also Stecconi (2007: 21)). What happens in translation is that one text sparks another text into being, since, being that *signifiants* have been selected, they signify TL *signifié*, embedded as these are in the TL cultural framework (cf. Snell-Hornby 1998/1995: 42; cf. Reiss and Vermeer 1984/2013: 93). Obviously, ST *signifié* are (in most cases, at least) what prompt TL *signifiants* to be chosen, but once chosen, the TL *signifiants* signify TL meanings which do not per se 'refer back to' ST meanings; only by social agreement, such as through the legal institution of notariza-

46According to Snell-Hornby (1998/1995: 40-41) this view is traceable to the German philosopher Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767-1835) and was taken up in the 20th century by the American ethnolinguists E. Sapir and B. L. Whorf. In 20th century philosophy, however, the foremost exponent of the idea appears to be J. Derrida, who has also been the one to draw the most radical conclusion from it in respect of translation, as shown above. 

The culture-bound nature of meaning is nothing new, of course, and the inherent prob-

problems of translation have long been recognized as a fundamental obstacle e.g. in ethnogra-
phy and cultural anthropology (cf. Hermans 1996: 16; cf. Malinowski 1935: 11-22; cf. Rubel and Rosman 2003). Within TS, Snell-Hornby (1998/1995: 41) has pointed out the corollary of the non-essentialist position, viz. that translation becomes logically impossible, at least if semantic identity is stipulated as criterial to translation. However unpleasant the non-essentialist position is to translation as an institution (in Hermans' sense, as previously outlined), I nevertheless believe it is inescapable for Translation Studies as a scholarly discipline. What the position hardly precludes, however, is the ability of translation to facilitate communication and at least a satisfactory degree of understanding. In spite of the culture-bound nature of meaning, it would appear that translation still affords the possibility of adequate semantic approximation which may be sufficient for communication to succeed (cf. Kaiser-Cooke 2004: 195). In this way, the issue of ST- versus TT-orientation becomes an issue of approximation degree. To return to the example from Achebe's novel, although a concept like 'the supernatural' is sure to be very different in its Igbo and its English meaning, it is a fair guess that the overlap between English concepts like 'child', 'wicked' etc. (those at stake in Achebe's translation of ogbanje) and related Igbo ones is extensive enough for an adequetely similar content to be conveyed (cf. Malinowski 1935: 17) (see below for a further consideration of the concept of similarity in translation).

It must be conceded that most modern translation scholars in fact appear to acknowledge the impossibility of equivalence in the sense of 'complete semantic identity' (cf. Chesterman 1998: 27). In the words of the influential translation theorist Juliane House,

[v]iews of equivalence as simply based on formal, syntactic, and lexical similarities have been criticised for a long time - not least because it has long been recognised that any two linguistic items in two different languages are multiply ambiguous. Further, purely formal definitions of equivalence have long been revealed as deficient in that they cannot explain appropriate use in communicative performance. This is why functional, pragmatic equivalence has been a concept accepted in contrastive linguistics for a long time, and it is this type of equivalence which is most relevant for translation. (House 2001: 135-136)

Yet, because 'equivalence' implies 'invariance' or 'sameness' at some level or other (cf. Pym 2010: 7-8), no matter how the concept is modified, there is still no guarantee that equivalence even in this expanded sense (as pragmatic/functional) is possible. The assumption that two different texts (a source text and a target text) can have the 'same' function for two different audiences is in fact what Chesterman (1997: 35) denounces as the homogeneous readership fallacy, cogently pointing out that

[s]ince any language-user interprets any utterance partly in terms of his or her own previous experience of the language and of life, no two readers ever come to a given text with exactly the same set of cognitive assumptions; if this is true even within the same language, how much more true must it be for readers of a different language and/or culture altogether. (Chesterman 1997: 35)

Accordingly, a better solution is in my view to dispense with the concept of equivalence altogether.
3.3.3. Similarity, not equivalence

Even if the concept of equivalence is dispensed with, however, the importance of some kind of ST-TT correspondence is undeniable if a given semiotic entity is to count as a translation of another, anterior entity. This applies to any kind of semiotic derivation, and the argument is commonsensical: for a derivational relationship to obtain between two texts (in the broadest sense), some kind of similarity must logically exist (cf. Stecconi 2004: 479). Similarity, and not equivalence, is in fact what several translation scholars like Tymoczko (2007), Chesterman (1996; 2007c; 2007b), Yallop (2001) and Stecconi (2007: 21) emphasize as relevant in translation. Thus, in the words of Tymoczko (2007: 32), ‘[...] equivalence in translation theory and practice can only by a useful concept when it is understood as a form of similarity’. When it comes to any closer designation of the nature of similarity in translation, Tymoczko (2007) is rather vague, however, whereas Chesterman (1996; 1998: 12-16; 2007b: 61-62) provides an incisive analysis of the concept of similarity as such, showing that the concept is not a uniform one, but that a distinction has to be made between two types: convergent and divergent similarity. Of these two types, convergent similarity is bi-directional, which means that two entities can be deemed to be similar from the perspective of either: A in this case is similar to B as much as B is similar to A. In Chesterman's notation: A ↔ B (1996: 161). In the case of divergent similarity, the resemblance is uni-directional: it means that if one entity is derived from another, the product of the derivation can be recognized as being similar to the original, but the converse is not necessarily true, i.e. the original may not be judged to be similar to the derived product. In fact, an entity may function as an original from which many secondary entities may be derived, all of which bear some resemblance to A, but which are nevertheless different from each other. In Chesterman's notation: A → A', A", A‴ (ibid.). An example would be a school class of twenty students given the task of retelling (in writing) a story read to them by their teacher: the result would almost certainly be twenty (slightly) different versions, all of them, however, bearing some resemblance to the original story. The relevance of this analysis to TS is obvious: similarity in translation is divergent, ‘asymmetric’ (Pym 2010: 26)47 or ‘irreversible’ (Toury 1986: 1117), and one ST may give rise to a number of different types of TTs, all of which are similar to the original in some way. This observation is of course especially relevant to INTRA - all sub-types of INTRA, perhaps, but lay-oriented INTRA especially: the derivational relationship between SPCs and PILs means that a PIL is recognizable derived from its SPC source, but any kind of 'back translation', i.e. an attempt to reconstruct the SPC from the PIL, would be virtually impossible.

Moreover, in accordance with skopos theory (see below), Chesterman suggests that what matters in translation is relevant similarity, and that what counts as such in a given translation assignment is dependent on the prospective role of the TT in the communicative situation in which it is to function (2007c: 68).48 In Chesterman’s own words,

---

47 Pym (2010: ch. 3) subsumes Chesterman's stance under a paradigm which he (Pym) terms 'directional equivalence', but, given the connotations of equivalence (a relation of 'sameness', as previously noted), I regard this characterization as unfortunate: a relation of 'sameness' can hardly be said to obtain between two entities if the 'sameness' applies in only one direction, as would be the case with divergent similarity, where the 'sameness' between A and B is recognizable from the perspective of A only, but not necessarily from the perspective of B (or vice versa).

48 See also Yallop (2001: 242) for exactly the same view.
[a] translator submitting a translation to a client claims, in effect, that the translation is similar to
the source text in a way that is relevant to the client's point of view. Without a point of view,
there is no way to assess the relevance of the similarity; indeed there is no way to perceive any
similarity in the first place. There is always a point of view, even though it may not be explicitly
stated or acknowledged.  

In line with this strong claim, we may say that like any type of translation, PILs as INTRA
TTs represent a similarity with their STs (the SPCs) that is determined by their function
vis-à-vis the intended readership - their skopos, in other words. This central concept in
modern, functionalist translation theory, however, needs further definition, which is why a
brief introduction to skopos theory will be given in the following.

3.4. Excursus: Skopos theory

Basically, skopos theory is a prescriptive framework (cf. Gentzler 2001: 72) that aims to
lay down some general principles that may guide translators in how to approach the task of
translating. These principles centrally consist in depriving the source text of the preroga-
tive of determining the type of translation strategy to be adopted by the translator. Instead,
the founder of the theory, Hans J. Vermeer, asserts what he calls the 'skopos rule', viz. that
it is the communicative purpose of the target text (the skopos) that should govern the pro-
cess of translating:

Each text is produced for a given purpose and should serve this purpose. The Skopos rule thus
reads as follows: translate/interpret/speak/write in a way that enables your text/translation to
function in the situation in which it is used and with the people who want to use it and precisely in
the way they want it to function. (quoted from Nord 1997: 29)

To phrase this in SFL terms, it is the prospective situation type (the particular configura-
tion of Field, Tenor and Mode) of the target text which is to decide its semantic/lexico-
grammatical make-up. In other words, the 'skopos rule' requires translators to image a
situation type ahead of the existence of the actual target text and to produce a textual reali-
zation accordingly.

Although, as indicated above, skopos theory is a predominantly prescriptive framework, it
should be emphasized that the prescriptive principle is founded on the observation that any
act of translating is de facto governed by a skopos, whether explicitated or not (Vermeer
1989/2000: 228). What the theory recommends, therefore, is for the skopos to be made
explicit in connection with any act of translating. In practical terms, this means that any
translation assignment should be accompanied by a translation brief from the commission-
er of the assignment in which the skopos of the translation is specified (Nord 1997: 30; cf.
Vermeer 1989/2000: 228-229). The brief, however, should not be conceived of as a one-
way dictate: Nord (1997: 30) as well as Vermeer (1989/2000: 229-230) emphasize that the
details of the brief (or 'commission', as Vermeer calls it) need to be negotiated between the
translator and the client.

49 In several of his writings (e.g. 1997; 2008b), Chesterman shows a clear indebtedness to Karl Popper's phi-
losophy of science, which is why in this emphasis on the perspectivism of perception/assessment we may
hear the echo of Popper's previously cited assertion that observation is always theory-laden, i.e. governed by
some point of view.

50 The identification of skopos with the situation type of the TT finds support in Vermeer (2008: 7)

55
It may need to be emphasized that the proponents of the theory do not exclude the possibility that a high degree of semantic approximation between ST and TT may be called for in a given translation. The point is that this is just one possible skopos and that a number of alternative ones may be equally legitimate (cf. Vermeer 1989/2000: 228). Moreover, the plurality of possible skopoi opens up the possibility of a functional divergence between ST and TT (cf. Vermeer 1989/2000: 228). Nord, in fact, introduces a highly valuable typology of translation functions, whose primary distinction is the well-known one between documentary and instrumental translations. The former category, however, is of little relevance to present purposes: it is represented by translations that are metatextual in nature, by serving to document, as closely as possible, the semantic content, and in some cases even the precise lexicogrammatical realization of the ST (Nord 1997: 48), e.g. for research purposes or to serve as evidence in court. With regard to instrumental translations, the distinction that is relevant to present purposes is the one between equifunctionality and heterofunctionality. The former category comprises translations ‘[...] where the function of the target text is the same as that of the source text’ (ibid.: 50). If, on the other hand,

there is a difference between source and target text functions we would have a heterofunctional translation. [...] It is used if the function or functions of the original cannot be preserved as a whole or in the same hierarchy as in the original for reasons of cultural and/or temporal distance. (Nord 1997: 50-51)

Nord’s typology is valuable because it allows heterofunctional TTs to be included in the concept of translation, and it thus forms a contrast to House’s (2006) distinction between translations and versions. This dichotomy is of course reminiscent of Nord’s concepts of equi- vs. heterofunctionality, in that versions are characterized by House as adaptations, i.e. TTs whose skopos differs from the communicative purpose of the ST (ibid.: 353-54). In contrast, translations in House’s conceptualization are those characterized by functional invariance between ST and TT (ibid.: 345). What makes House’s dichotomy problematic is the difficulty of delimiting the two from each other: the two phenomena are better conceived of as two zones on a cline, one shading into the other, as observed e.g. by Yallop (2001: 239), by Mossop (1998: 261) and by Koller (1995: 210), who, as we have seen, concedes that adaptational elements (text-revisional elements, in Koller’s terms (ibid.)) are part and parcel of almost any type of translation. Thus, House’s wish for a ‘means of distinguishing between translation and other types of multilingual textual operations’ (2006: 354) is hardly fulfillable (cf. Mossop 1998: 234). The same objection might of course be raised against Nord’s conceptual pair, since equi- vs. heterofunctionality must similarly be regarded as forming a cline. Considering Chesterman’s previously mentioned denunciation of the illusion of equifunctionality, it might in fact be theoretically wiser to replace the conceptual pair with a cline of heterofunctionality only, with one pole on such a cline representing approximated equifunctionality. However, since Nord’s preoccupations are primarily practice-oriented (educating translators/translator trainees to make informed choices when translating), it may well be didactically expedient to uphold the distinction. Nowhere

51 A third category is homologous translations, which primarily pertains to literature. It is therefore left out of consideration here.

52 Having previously questioned the notion of equifunctionality in the form of ‘functional/pragmatic equivalence’, I choose not to take issue with the concept here.
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does Nord express any intention that the concepts may serve as tools of descriptive delimitation.

What is particularly relevant in the tenets of skopos theory for the purposes of this thesis is of course the recognition of heterofunctionality as a possibility in translation. Leaving aside the debate about whether equifunctionality is even possible, all types of INTRA are certainly heterofunctional, because in all cases, be it diachronic/dialectal/interregisterial/diamesic etc. (see section 4.3), some change in function - in SF terms to be conceived of as a change in contextual configuration (cf. Thoma 2006: 231-232) - is involved. Moreover, skopos theory affords the proper perspective on the concept of relevant ST-TT similarity (cf. above), since, as previously noted, what is to be considered a relevant type of similarity must be seen through the prism of a given skopos. In the case of the lay-oriented INTRA of SPCs into PILs, the similarity that obtains between STs and TTs can therefore be defined as the one judged by medical professionals to be relevant to the patient in accordance with the pertinent legal framework.

3.5. The criteriality of interlinguality

Apart from the 'equivalence' argument critiqued above, the extension of the concept of translation to include INTRA runs counter to a conception that would confine translation to text operations involving two different languages. Newmark, for example, adamantly excludes INTRA from translational status because '[...] the qualitative difference between 'interlingual' and 'intralingual' translation is so great that it makes a nonsense of the concept of translation' (1991: 69). Likewise, Mossop (1998: 252) is at pains to exclude INTRA from translation, and Schubert (2005: 126) asserts that '[t]o translate means to render a text into a different language. Translation is by definition interlingual.' Even in Toury's - otherwise very broad - definition of translation, interlinguality is in fact close to being criterial: 'Regarding a text as a translation entails the obvious assumption that there is another text, in another culture/language which has both chronological and logical priority over it [my emphasis] (1995: 33-34). Even here, however, the qualification of language as 'culture/language' may be taken to indicate a recognition that interlinguality may be too restrictive a criterion.

In a cogently argued refutation of notions such as those cited above, Schmid (2008) points out that the fuzziness of languages as separate entities makes interlinguality a far from solid basis on which to build a demarcation criterion of translation. He thus points out that the boundaries between languages in many cases reflect socio-political conventions, and not any linguistic characteristics. Thus, although Serbian and Croatian are to all intents and purposes one and the same language, or two dialects at the most, political realities in Ex-Yugoslavia have given rise to a demand in the two populations that the two dialects should be treated as two separate languages (Schmid 2008: 60; cf. Wardaugh 1986: 33). Such politically determined conventions impose an artificial barrier that defies the criterion of mutual intelligibility as the means of distinguishing dialects from languages (two linguistic systems are to be regarded as dialects if they are mutually intelligible, and as lan-

---

53 Nevertheless, Schubert (2005) recognizes the strong affinity between (technical) translation and technical writing as such, noting that the production of technical documentation (the task of technical writers) is based on the derivation of information from prior texts - source texts, in other words!
guages if they are not (Matthews 2005: 96-97)). In the same vein, Schmid (2008), Matthews (2005: 97) and War-daugh (1986: 28) all mention the example of Danish and Norwegian, which are by convention recognized as two different languages, but whose speakers are in fact able to understand each other, at least with a little effort. A converse example mentioned by War-daugh (ibid.) is that of Chinese dialects, such as Mandarin and Cantonese, which are in fact mutually unintelligible, but nevertheless regarded as dialects only. Yet another adducible phenomenon which blurs the division between languages and dialects is the fact that two dialects on each side of a national border, recognized by convention as belonging to different languages, may well have more characteristics in common than two geographically distant dialects within the 'same' language. Thus, Germans living close to the Netherlands may find that their dialect has more in common with Dutch than with southern variants of German (Wardaugh 1986: 28).

Altogether, the fact that languages shade into dialects and vice-versa is a convincing argument against any attempt to uphold interlinguality as a demarcation criterion for the concept of translation, and it provides strong grounds for including especially dialectal INTRA in the concept of translation (for a closer consideration of one example of such, see section 4.3). Whether the language-dialect continuum provides grounds for extending the concept of translation to include INTRA between functional dialects, i.e. registers, is a different matter. For this purpose, an emphasis on translation as a cross-cultural transfer (or rather replacement) operation and not simple transcoding between linguistic systems may be a better avenue, to be explored in the next section.

3.6. Translation as cross-cultural semiosis

Previously, Mossop (1998) was presented as an exponent of the 'institutional' view of translation, i.e. translation as interlingual only. Mossop, however, does acknowledge that there may be reasons to extend the concept of linguality beyond entities that coincide with languages in the ordinary sense of the word:

[I]nterlinguality means that two different languages are involved, a lingua being some person's native language. A standard language is a lingua, but so is a geographical, temporal or a social-class dialect. If two linguas are sufficiently different that speakers find a need for linguistic assistance, then the assistant's activity is interlingual, and [...] translational. (Mossop 1998: 252)

It thus appears that Mossop recognizes varieties (but not registerial subsets, as we shall see) of linguistic systems as linguae, as long as translation confines itself to transcoding, i.e. to replacing selections in one lexicogrammatical system with those from another. Accordingly, Mossop denies translational status to lay-oriented INTRA because this type of rewriting goes beyond mere changes at the stratum of wording. A register is not a lingua, but a 'sub-lingua', (i.e. a subset of the linguistic system), and lay-oriented INTRA, such as science popularization,

[...] has mainly to do with ideas, not vocabulary or grammar per se. [...] Science popularizers fall into a class of mediators [...] who are not in the first instance dealing with linguistic problems. The need for Translating [sic], on the contrary, arises from the fact that some people do not know the lexico-syntax used by other text producers (Mossop 1998: 252)
Schmid (2008: 38) is quite right in criticizing Mossop for reducing translation to a matter of transcoding. Only replace the unknown lexicogrammar with a known one, Mossop's logic appears to be, and access will be granted to the meaning of those foreign, unintelligible wordings. The untenability of this position has already been demonstrated, semantic transformation having been shown to be inherent in TRP. In other words, when INTRA is excluded from translational status on grounds of semantic variance between ST and TT, it must be emphasized that the same mechanism logically applies to TRP as well. I therefore fully accept Schmid's view of translation (TRP in the first instance) as 'cross-cultural transformation' (2008: 41): as the earlier analysis of the culture-bound nature of meaning showed, translation is inevitably a matter of cultural substitution, with equal emphasis to be given to cultural as well as to substitution, which means that it is impossible for translation to be anything but intercultural.

Schmid, however, extends the 'cross-culturalness' of translation to INTRA as well, pointing out that cultural borderlines are not restricted to those running between cultures encoded in the semantics of a 'national' language. Like SFL, Schmid (2008: 44) conceives of culture as a conceptual system, thus echoing the SF notion that culture is a system of meaning (cf. Halliday 1978: 99, 123; cf. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 126). Schmid, however, points out that the system of meaning constituted by a given 'national' language is far from a uniform entity - that even within a language, there are competing conceptual systems, i.e. conflicting semantic construals of the world of experience: 'There are a lot of smaller cultures within a "language community" that conceptualize aspects of the world differently and thus have to recur to processes of translation in order to guarantee successful communication among each other' (Schmid 2008: 48). What Schmid has in mind by referring to 'smaller cultures' are communities characterized by adherence to a shared conceptual system that structures the members' interpretation of and communication about the particular ideational domain which is relevant to their activities (ibid.: 45). Given this definition, a good example of a 'sub-culture' in this sense is thus a scientific community (cf. Aikenhead 2001: 24-25).

A logical consequence of Schmid's conception (as outlined above) is that the individual member of a society comes to represent a multiplicity of cultures: 'since each person takes part in a variety of [...] domains of interaction and experience, a number of concept systems rooted in all kinds of different settings converge in a person's cultural make-up' (Schmid 2008: 47). Once again, Schmid's notions are entirely in agreement with the SF analysis of the interrelation between language and culture, and it is concordant not only with the SF notion of registerial variation within a linguistic system, but also with the idea that individual speakers have access to a certain range of registers, depending on the range of communicative situation types which their social status allows them to participate in (Martin and Rose 2008: 19). As for Schmid's notion of conceptual divergence between (sub-)cultures, this is most clearly exemplified in the incompatibility shown by Halliday

54 I should emphasize that I use semantics here, as throughout this thesis, in the SF sense, i.e. as a reference to the stratum of meaning in language, as opposed to the stratum of wording (cf. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 189-191).
55 It should be made clear that nowhere does Schmid acknowledge any inspiration from SFL. The correspondences noted here are my observations.
56 For a similar view, see Aikenhead (2001: 24).
and Matthiessen (1999) to exist between 'folk' and 'scientific taxonomies (cf. section 3.2.3). As was previously shown, the two types of taxonomy in one and the same ideational domain do not overlap, or if they do, the match is partial at the most. Moreover, scientific taxonomies, as we have seen, are typically much more fine-grained than folk ones and their distinctions are based on different criteria. The content of scientific concepts and folk ones, therefore, is not the same, though of course they may be related.

As previously indicated, Schmid locates the need for translation in the divergence between semantic systems, which he regards as the principal type of communication barrier that necessitates translation: 'The need for translation arises when people do not share a critical mass of mutual accessibility in their conceptualizations and consequently cannot refer to a common conceptual framework in which to make sense of each other's utterances' (Schmid 2008: 51). In Schmid's understanding, therefore, translation 'comprises the reconfiguration of concepts from the perspective of another concept system' (Schmid 2008: 54), which echoes my own previous analysis (see section 3.3.2) of translation as the semiotic act of capturing one set of concepts in terms of an alternative set. As a corrective to Schmid's generalization, it may be necessary to point to the truth in Mossop's observation (1998: 252) that the need for translation may in the first instance arise from the foreignness of the lexicogrammar of a source text, but Schmid is quite right in extending communication barriers requiring translation to those which derive from incompatible conceptual systems, whether or not the lexicogrammar of the two systems are those of the 'same' ('national') language.

Before leaving the issue of conceptual conversion in translation, it will be necessary to briefly return to the issue of equivalence. This is because, somewhat surprisingly, the emphasis on transformation between conceptual systems as the key feature in translation leads Schmid into a critique of Jakobson's (1959/2012) definition of INTRA. Schmid (2008: 66) credits Jakobson for being instrumental in putting INTRA on the map of TS, but criticizes him for adhering to an equivalence-based view of translation, as allegedly evidenced in the latter's 'focus on the word level and his assumption of an objective meaning that remains stable between transformations between semiotic systems' (ibid.). Admittedly, Jakobson's own paraphrase of intralingual translation as 'rewording' (Jakobson 1959/2012: 127) may give reason to suspect him of a belief in 'transcendental signifieds' (Derrida's (1972/1981: 20) previously mentioned term) that are supposedly transferrable between different signifiers, and the same belief may appear to be reflected in the following claim: 'The intralingual translation of a word uses either another, more or less synonymous, word or resorts to a circumlocution' (Jakobson 1959/2012: 127). Yet, Jakobson goes on to qualify his statement by pointing out that '[...] synonymy as a rule is not complete equivalence' (ibid.). Moreover, whether intended by Jakobson or not, his assertion that '[...] the meaning of any linguistic sign is its interpretation into some further, alternative sign [...] ' (ibid.) has post-structuralist implications, bringing to mind the Derridean notion of différance (Derrida 1972/1981: 26-28), i.e. meaning as something eternally 'deferred' from one sign to another (cf. Eagleton 1983: 128) - meaning, therefore, as something inherently unstable. Implicit in
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57 For a similar view, see Göpferich (2007: 33; 2004: 18-19), who, like Schmid, expands the concept of culture beyond its ethnological sense to include 'microcultures', such as a scientific and a lay community between whose conceptual systems translation may be necessary.
Jakobson's conception of translation is therefore the creation of meaning (Pym 2010: 108), which is why it appears ill-advised to attribute an equivalence-oriented view of translation to Jakobson, as Schmid does. Pym (ibid.: 150), in contrast, points out the affinity between Jakobson and the deconstructionist paradigm, according to which translation equals conceptual transformation.

3.7. A criterial definition of translation derived from G. Toury, A. Chesterman and U. Stecconi

Given the previously asserted necessity of establishing a criterial definition of translation, and given the above rejection of equivalence and interlinguality alike as valid definitional elements, it remains to be investigated what criteria can be stipulated. Following Chesterman (1997: 62) and Zethsen (2007), I take the view that Toury's three criteria, or 'postulates', as he terms them, are those which (subject to certain modifications - see below) remain valid. The three criteria are 1) the Source Text Postulate 2) the Transfer Postulate and 3) the Relationship postulate (Toury 1995: 33), each being defined as follows:

(1) The Source Text Postulate
Regarding a text as a translation entails the obvious assumption that there is another text, in another culture/language, which has both chronological and logical priority over it: not only has such an assumed text assumedly preceded the one taken to be its translation in time, but it is also assumed58 to have served as a departure point and basis for the latter. [...] (Toury 1995: 33-34)

(2) The Transfer Postulate
The Source-Text Postulate also entails the assumption that the process whereby the assumed translation came into being involved the transference of certain features from the assumed source text which the two texts now share. [...] (Toury 1995: 34)

(3) The Relationship Postulate
Finally, adopting the assumption that a text is a translation also implies that there are accountable relationships which tie it to its original, an obvious function of that which the two texts allegedly share and which is taken to have been transferred across the cultural-semiotic (and linguistic) border. [...] (Toury 1995: 34-35)

The second and the third of these postulates cannot be accepted outright, however, and the objection concerns Toury's insistence on transfer (or 'transference', as he terms it). As previously shown, the idea of something - entities of meaning - moving from ST to TT is untenable, because translation is not a matter of 'moving' content, but a matter of producing a new text on the basis of an anterior one. I therefore propose the following modification of

58 It needs to be pointed out that Toury's tripartite definition should be understood in the context of his notion of 'assumed translations', which is the concept he proposes to delineate the object field of Translation Studies. TS should preoccupy itself with 'all utterances which are presented or regarded as such [i.e. as translations] within the target culture, on no matter what grounds' (1995: 32), which reflects the strongly relativist conception that 'there is no pretense that the nature of translation is given, or fixed in any way' (ibid.). In other words, translation is defined by the assumptions of any given target culture. The three postulates quoted here, however, in effect represent Toury's own intervention, so to speak, in this culturally relative process of 'assuming'. The postulates must be read as Toury's own specification of the grounds for 'assuming', i.e. for regarding a given text as a translation. He thus ends up contradicting his own pretense at relativism by providing what is actually a definition (cf. Pym 2010: 85). However, Toury's self-contradiction is of no concern to the purposes of this thesis, and, with a few modifications, the three postulates will be regarded as a valid, criterial definition - applicable independently of culturally relative assumptions about translation.
the two postulates: instead of transfer, *derivation* should be posited as a criterion,\(^59\) and, following Chesterman and Zethsen, *relationship* should be specified as one consisting in *relevant similarity* (cf. Chesterman 1997: 62; cf. Zethsen 2007: 292-293), brought about through the application of derivational strategies. As previously argued (in accordance with Chesterman 2007c; cf. Zethsen 2007: 292-293), what counts as *relevant similarity* in a given ST-TT pair is skopos-dependent. Moreover, the criterion of *relationship* must be further expanded to encompass two additional aspects pointed out by Stecconi\(^60\) (2004: 479-482; 2007: 23-24), viz. *mediation* and *semiotic difference*, both of which are to be conceived of as *sine qua non* to translation (2004: 483). Thus, translational status logically entails mediation, i.e. a mediating function on the part of the TT in relation to ST semiotic content. In Stecconi’s own words, ‘*there is no translation if the target sign does not speak on behalf of the source sign*’ (ibid.: 482). Moreover, Stecconi points to ST-TT semiotic *difference* as an inherent feature of translation, holding that translation logically consists in the transcending of a semiotic barrier, or a *‘fold between semiotic systems’* (ibid.: 480). As will be argued in the next chapter (not on the basis of Stecconi), such a *‘fold’* may be language-internal, interlingual or intersemiotic (see also below).

What remains to be considered is whether INTRA in its different forms is compatible with these modified Touryan criteria, to which the answer must be in the affirmative, except in one respect to be examined below. To take the empirical material of this thesis as a case in point, SPCs and PILs relate to each other as STs and TTs, in that PILs are derived from SPCs, and, in spite of representing only a partial, and far from semantically equivalent rendering of ST content, are tied to SPCs by exactly the type of similarity which is required by the skopos, which is that of making relevant SPC information accessible to TT readers through transformation into a lay register.\(^61\) However, Toury's criteria does exclude INTRA from translational status in one respect, as Zethsen (2007: 293) points out, since linguality is in fact part of the first of the three postulates. This becomes especially clear in Toury's own gloss, according to which a source text is required to belong to ‘*another culture and language*’ [my emphasis] (1995: 35) as compared with that of the TT. Nevertheless, *contra* Toury, it must be maintained that linguality cannot be elevated to criterial status, as previously argued. Culture, on the other hand, has been shown to be intimately linked with communication barriers necessitating translation, but it has also been argued that since cultural differences derive from divergent conceptual systems, the conception of cultures as co-extensive with 'national' languages only is much too simplistic.

### 3.8. Summary

The purpose of the present chapter has been to argue for the inclusion of INTRA in the concept of translation and hence in the object field of TS. In this connection, the institutional perspective on translation was considered, according to which translation is synonymous with interlingual translation only, and according to which equivalence is the expected relationship between a source text and a target text. While the institutional perspec-
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\(^{59}\) In a gloss of his own definition, Toury (1995: 35) in fact opens up the possibility of shifting the perspective from transfer to derivation, by describing TTs as being *derived by transfer operations* [my emphasis].


\(^{61}\) Zethsen (2007: 293) undertakes a similar examination of how the INTRA of SPCs into PILs meets the Touryan criteria.
tive was acknowledged, it was argued that this perspective may not necessarily accord with an academic definition of translation. This is also the reason why the prototype approach to a definition of the concept was repudiated, and the necessity of a criterial definition maintained instead. In this definition, equivalence as well as interlinguality were rejected as defining characteristics. It was shown that translation, even as traditionally conceived, consists in more than 'simple' interlinguality, i.e. more than a cross-over between different lexicogrammatical systems (such as the lexicogrammar of English and the lexicogrammar of Danish), but is an inherently cross-cultural phenomenon, with cultures to be understood as systems of meaning. Further, cultural boundaries were shown to be co-extensive with communication barriers even within the same 'national' language, arising e.g. from the in-commensurability of a scientific and a 'folk' culture, i.e. from conflicting conceptualizations of reality. However, while it was argued that the concept of translation should be broadened in this way, i.e. to encompass transformation between systems of meaning, the view taken here is that it should not be confined to conceptual conversion. Instead, the concept of translation should be expanded to include semiotic conversion across communication barriers at any or all strata of language (in the case where ST and TT alike consist in verbal language): conceptual (i.e. semantic), lexicogrammatical and phonological/graphological, all of which will examined in the next chapter.
Chapter 4. Locating lay-oriented INTRA in a taxonomy of translation

Whereas the previous chapter was devoted to arguing that full translational status should be granted to INTRA, the present chapter will be concerned with a closer definition of the concept. This will be done through a partial review of a comprehensive, semiotic translation typology proposed by the Danish translation scholar H. Gottlieb (2008a), which appears to be based, in part at least (cf. ibid.: 45), on Jakobson’s three categories (see section 1.1), and which includes a sub-classification of INTRA (apart from classifications of TRP and intersemiotic translation as well). In connection with the discussion of INTRA categories, empirically based literature on certain of the sub-types will be reviewed, the most extensive attention being given to literature concerned with lay-oriented INTRA.

4.1. Intersemiotic categories

Gottlieb’s translation typology in fact comprises an impressive 33 specific types, distinguished according to four different parameters (quoted directly from Gottlieb 2008a: 44-45): 1) semiotic identity or non-identity between ST and TT, distinguishing intrasemiotic types of translation from intersemiotic types 2) possible changes in the semiotic composition of the translation [...] 3) varying degrees of freedom for the translator, distinguishing adaptational (free) from conventionalized (bound) 4) presence or absence of verbal material in ST and TT [...] (the parameters will be explained in more detail below). A possible graphic representation (using SF notation) deducible from Gottlieb’s account is the one below (previously rendered in section 3.2.3). It is to be noted that the representation is only partial, encompassing only the eleven specific types of verbal translation (inter- and intralingual) as the ‘end points’ of the network. It would be perfectly possible to expand the network to include the rest of the 33 ‘end points’, but these have been excluded for lack of relevance to the present investigation (cf. below).

![Fig. 4.1. Graphic representation of H. Gottlieb's semiotic translation taxonomy, deduced from Gottlieb (2008a)](image-url)
The adoption of SF notation to represent (part of) Gottlieb's translational 'map' serves to emphasize that the taxonomy is here interpreted as a conceptual network, subject to the logic that applies to any network of semantic entities (or lexicogrammatical, for that matter): features associated with terms at the more general end of the network inhere in more delicate ones, while at the same time each step in delicacy adds new features (cf. section 2.3). Thus, as argued in the previous chapter, the interpretation of the general concept of translation adopted in this thesis posits five such features: 'anterior presence of a source-text', 'derivation', 'relevant ST-TT similarity', 'mediation' ('speaking-on-behalf-of') and 'semiotic border-crossing' (see section 3.6). Coupling this definition with the above network means that one particular sub-type ('end point' in the network) will include these five characteristics as well as a number of more specific ones. Thus, a particular sub-type like 'synchronic' translation will not only be characterized by the anterior presence of a source text, derivation etc., but will also include the features 'conventionalized', 'verbal' and 'interlingual', where the interlinguality may be interpreted as a specification of the general feature 'semiotic border-crossing'. It is to be conceded that Gottlieb's own interpretation of the concept of translation may not be identical with mine, his definition being: 'any process, or product hereof, in which a text is replaced by another text reflecting, or inspired by the original entity' (2008a: 42), in which elements like source-text dependency, derivation and relationship may or may not be recognizable. However, Gottlieb's translation concept will neither be subjected to any more thorough scrutiny nor criticized. Whatever features the concept of translation is attributed with, the point is that those features will inhere in sub-types.

In the following examination of Gottlieb's taxonomy, point of departure will be taken in the first of the four parameters, i.e. the inter-/intrasemiotic distinction, since it is the one closest to the tripartite Jakobsonian typology. The very terms (inter- and intrasemiotic), however, require some initial comment: what matters is identity or non-identity between the types of sign system involved (Gottlieb 2008a: 45), which means that intrasemiotic translation refers to the conversion of a semiotic 'product' into another one within the same type of sign system, be it verbal language, pictorial representation, gestural movement, musical sounds, smoke signals or whatever. Thus, INTRA and TRP alike belong in the intrasemiotic category, since they both consist in verbal language on both sides of the ST-TT divide (cf. Toury 1986: 1113-1114). Intersemiotic translation, on the other hand, consists in conversion between different types of sign system. In the following, attention will be given to the intersemiotic category first, but only briefly, in view of its limited relevance to the concerns of this thesis. This is also the reason why the highly technical distinctions of the second of the above four parameters (no. 2 concerning changes in semiotic composition), which mainly apply to intersemiotic translation, will be ignored. Instead, intersemiotic examples will be given according to their intersection with the fourth parameter, i.e. the presence or absence of verbal language. Intersemiotic translations may thus be either 'non-verbal' (no verbal language in either ST or TT62), 'verbalizing' (ST is non-verbal, TT is verbal, or introduces a verbal element) or 'deverbalizing' (ST is verbal language, TT non-verbal) (Gottlieb 2008a: 50-53). A fourth category is 'verbal translation' (ST and TT are

62 In this connection, the two terms ST and TT must be expanded to include non-verbal manifestations of semiosis as the 'input' or 'output' of translational action).
both verbal), which, in Gottlieb's typology, has no intersemiotic representation (but see below). One example of non-verbal translation is thus the transformation of a picture into a piece of music (ibid.: 50), and verbalizing translation is e.g. audio description (or so-called sight translation) on a DVD (ibid.), where the non-verbal acts on the screen are verbalized by a commentator in an additional soundtrack for the benefit of the visually impaired. Another example of the verbalizing category is the conversion of a picture into a piece of writing (ibid.: 51), of which an authentic example is the Victorian art critic John Ruskin’s famous verbal rendering of J. M. W. Turner’s painting *The Slave Ship* from 1840:

> But, I think, the noblest sea that Turner has ever painted, and, if so, the noblest certainly ever painted by man, is that of the Slave Ship, the chief Academy picture of the Exhibition of 1840. It is a sunset on the Atlantic after prolonged storm; but the storm is partially lulled, and the torn and streaming rain-clouds are moving in scarlet lines to lose themselves in the hollow of the night. The whole surface of sea included in the picture is divided into two ridges of enormous swell, not high, nor local, but a low, broad heaving of the whole ocean, like the lifting of its bosom by deep-drawn breath after the torture of the storm. Between these two ridges, the fire of the sunset falls along the trough of the sea, dyeing it with an awful but glorious light, the intense and lurid splendor which burns like gold and bathes like blood. … (Ruskin 1873/2009: [383])

It should be clear from the poetic description that this is in effect an instance of intersemiotic conversion between two works of art – one pictorial and one verbal.63

Another example of verbalizing translation is the verbal interpretation of sign language, i.e. the situation where a person who understands sign language translates into words what is conveyed, usually by a deaf person, by means of signing (see Gottlieb 2008a: 53). Although not mentioned by Gottlieb, the opposite ‘movement’ in this type of situation (where a sign language expert interprets between sign language and verbal language) must be taken to represent deverbalizing translation, i.e. the translation of spoken words (or written for that matter) into sign language. A very different example of the deverbalizing category is pictograms, which transform the content of verbal signification into a pictorial representation (ibid.: 52), in effect the reverse of the Turner-Ruskin example from above.

Before leaving the intersemiotic category, the only recognizable type of verbal intersemiotic translation should be mentioned, i.e. the only type with ST and TT alike consisting in verbal language, which, as previously indicated, is a possibility which does not figure in Gottlieb's typology (but cf. Matthiessen (2001: 64-65)). The specific type of translation in question is that between so-called protolanguage (see e.g. Halliday 2003; 1995/2003; 1974/2004; 1978/2004) and language, i.e. the language of small children on the one hand and adult language on the other - the former a ‘primary’ and the latter ‘higher-order semiotic’ in Halliday's own words (2003: 14). According to Halliday, what differentiates protolanguage from adult language is the stratum of lexicogrammar, which is only present in the latter, and absent in the protolinguistic phase of children's development (ca. six months, starting around the age of nine months (Halliday 1974/2004: 94)). Children's language at this stage is characterized by having only a stratum of phonology and a stratum of semantics with no intervening level of wording with its own distinct organization. Each sign in a protolanguage is a unit of sounds directly associated with a meaning (Halliday 2003: 13),

---

63 As an example of (intersemiotic) translation, the whole of John Ruskin’s description (of which only a part is quoted above) is analyzed in detail in Matthiessen (2001).
like: 'e-e-eh', meaning e.g. 'here I am', or "ùh", meaning e.g. 'do that some more', or "dòh", meaning e.g. 'nice to see you, and shall we look at this picture together?' (examples and glosses (or translations!) quoted directly from Halliday (1978/2004: 118). In this type of semiotic, a sign can carry one meaning only, and not three different, simultaneous layers of meaning (ideational, interpersonal and textual) as in adult language, which is organized around lexicogrammar (Halliday 1974/2004: 102). Translating from protolanguage into language, then, means encoding meanings in wordings, which is what happens when the parents of a protolinguistic child translate what he or she means for the benefit of e.g. grandparents or strangers who cannot make sense of the child's utterances ('He wants you to turn the page for him' or 'She's saying 'hello, granddad').

As for the intrasemiotic super-category, most sub-categories are specific types of either INTRA and TRP. Intrasemiotic translation, however, does include a few non-verbal acts of semiosis such as the transposition of a piece of music into a different key or the rearrangement of an older musical work into a new style (Gottlieb 2008a: 53). Paraphrasing in the art of painting (the production of a new painting on the basis of an original) would appear to belong in the same category.

4.2. TRP categories

Before a review of the specific categories in this part of Gottlieb's typology is embarked on, attention must be given to some general problems in the classification. One is the very distinction between INTRA and TRP, which it is only possible to uphold with some difficulty. As previously shown, languages are not clearly delimited entities, with dialects shading into languages and vice-versa. Thus, what is interlingual as opposed to interdialectal translation (the latter categorized as a type of INTRA by Gottlieb) may in some cases be indeterminate. Yet, the existence of intermediate cases is not a sufficient argument against upholding a distinction. What makes better sense is a cline perspective, with INTRA and TRP as two different, but partially overlapping zones on a cline, and this is the view that will be adopted here.

What is also problematic in connection with the typologizing of INTRA and TRP is the distinction between conventionalized and adaptational types. Its application to the intersemiotic super-category has been ignored for being irrelevant to present purposes, but should be considered in relation to INTRA and TRP types. In Gottlieb’s own definition, ‘conventionalized translation – with both intrasemiotic and intersemiotic types represented – uses some degree of formulaic conversion of the source text en route to the target text’ (2008a: 47), which means that ‘the procedures used in conventionalized translation stay transparent to the outside observer, as the direct link between source and target texts is obvious [...]’ (ibid.: 48). In this definition, it seems, conventionalized translation is characterized by (the assumption of) equivalence between ST and TT, whereas adaptational translation entails a higher degree of freedom (cf. ibid.: 45) in the derivation of a target text from a source text:

[It] is found whenever the existence – and reception, to be exact – of one text triggers the production of another based on the first one. The resulting text [...] will be related to the original in a

64 Cf. the conceptualization of lexis and grammar as two different, but not completely distinct zones of a cline in the systemic-functional ‘architecture’ of language.
way which is much more detached and less predictable than what is found in conventionalized translation. (Gottlieb 2008a: 48)

As examples of adaptational types of intrasemiotic (verbal) translation, Gottlieb points to the remake of an older film into a modernized version (intralingual) or the production of a new film on the basis of an original in a different language (interlingual, in other words). One authentic example of this was the Danish thriller *Nattevagten* from 1994, which was later adapted for the American audience, in English and with an American cast, as *Nightwatch* (Pedersen 2010).

In Gottlieb’s typology, all types of INTRA and TRP belong in the conventionalized category, which is surprising, considering that the relationship between ST and TT in adaptational translation is characterized as ‘the inability to reconstruct the original from the translated version, something which – to a certain extent – is possible with conventionalized translation’ (Gottlieb 2008a: 48). The adaptational/conventionalized dichotomy appears to be relevant to INTRA and TRP as well, since in certain sub-categories of INTRA as well as TRP the reconstruction of the ST on the basis of the TT is not a realistic possibility. As previously noted, this especially applies to lay-oriented INTRA, where – to take the data of this thesis as a case in point – an SPC would only to a very limited extent be deducible from a PIL.

What may also be an untenable feature in Gottlieb’s typology is an identical sub-categorization of INTRA and TRP, both of which are divided into the following sub-types: synchronic, diachronic, dialectal, paraphrasing, transliteration and diamesic. It should be pointed out, however, that in the INTRA typology the synchronic category is identical with the one termed paraphrasing by Gottlieb. Only in the TRP typology are the two categories distinct. I find all categories convincing in connection with INTRA (see next section), but in the following it will be argued that several of them are problematic when applied to TRP.

**TRP: Synchronic translation.** This category encompasses translation as well as interpreting (Gottlieb 2008a: 53), and, though not specified by Gottlieb, a necessary - but not sufficient - membership condition must be contemporaneity between ST and TT. In practical terms, then, this category would include all the cases where a recent text in one language (‘recent’ as viewed from the time of translation) is translated into a different TL. In interpreting, obviously, recentness is a matter of seconds only. Synchronic TRP would appear to be the most comprehensive intrasemiotic category – and possibly the most comprehensive translational category altogether – encompassing naturally occurring language (such as LSP texts) as well as literature. Gottlieb (2008a: 53) posits that synchronic TRP is one of the few types that really count as translation in the ‘folk understanding’ of the concept (the other types being diachronic TRP and interlingual transliteration), which is by and large in accordance with the ‘institutional’ view of translation outlined by Hermans (1995). Halverson’s previously mentioned ‘prototype’ study (2000) provides a corrective to Gottlieb’s assumption, in that her inquiry found respondents to grant translational status, albeit more peripheral, to other types of translation as well, but Halverson’s findings do confirm that outside the community of translation scholars, synchronic TRP is viewed as the central category. In Gottlieb’s definition, synchronic TRP ‘recreates the semantic content in another (verbal) language’. Ignoring the issue of equivalence in translation (see
section 3.3), this definition appears to imply that the difference between a source text and its interlingually translated target text is mainly to be found at the stratum of lexico-grammar, with no variation occurring at the semantic stratum. This assumption has already been problematized, but if by recreation of semantic content Gottlieb means that semantic equivalence is what is typically aimed at in synchronic TRP, the dictum is probably true.

**TRP: diachronic.** Though not specified by Gottlieb, it must be assumed that this sub-type is characterized by ST and TT being situated in different historical epochs, with the ST representing an earlier-than-modern version of the SL in question. Translations of Shakespeare is given as an example (Gottlieb 2008a: 55). Although Gottlieb does not mention this, it must be assumed that when older literature is translated interlingually, the TT will automatically represent the TL in its modern variety. 'Non-diachronic' translation of historical works, such as a 2013 translation of Shakespeare into a reconstructed 16th-century version of a foreign TL such as Danish is supposedly unthinkable, because pointless.

**TRP: dialectal.** Whereas there is no reason to question the two previous categories, dialectal interlingual translation is problematic because it is unclear what qualifies as such and what not. Gottlieb's example (2008a: 55) is the Scottish novel *Trainspotting* from 1993, which is written in Scottish dialect but was translated into standard Norwegian, apparently with no dialectal features at all (ibid.: 55). This is presented by Gottlieb as a 'clear-cut example of interlingual dialectal translation' (ibid.), from which it is to be gathered that when one side of the translational divide is in dialect (supposedly always the ST) and the other side in the standard version of the language in question, this is to be regarded as dialectal translation. This TRP sub-type would thus consist in a difference in language variety (standard vs. dialect) across the divide between two language systems such as English and Norwegian. The question to be asked, then, is that, had the Scottish-dialect ST been translated into what would be regarded as a non-standard Norwegian dialect - a dialect carrying the same connotations of peripherality as Scots, and perhaps the same oppositional relation to what is perceived as a dominant culture - should such a translation be classified as 'non-dialectal', i.e. simply as synchronically interlingual? At least, the perspective in a study such as Deprats (1998) appears to be the opposite of Gottlieb's: Deprats examines a French translation of an Anglo-Irish work, in which the special dialectal features of the ST were rendered by means of the Breton dialect of French, and this translational strategy he terms 'dialectal' (1998: 71). However, unlike Gottlieb's use of dialectal interlingual translation as what appears to be a technical term (it is given a specific location in a scholarly taxonomy), in Deprats (1998) the label dialectal is placed in inverted commas, apparently to stress merely the effect of incorporating dialectal features into the TT. In fact, limiting the question of dialect in connection with synchronic TRP to a matter of a stylistic element which may need well-considered strategies in the translational process (see also Ranzato 2010) appears to be the wiser solution, rather than recognizing shifts in dialect across the divide between language systems as a separate interlingual category.

**TRP: Paraphrasing:** Another category of Gottlieb's (2008a: 55) that is fraught with difficulties is paraphrasing as a separate branch of TRP. Gottlieb's example (ibid.) is the foreign-language versioning of Hans Christian Andersen's tales for children, from which it might be inferred that the category is primarily to be identified with relatively free and at the same time simplified renderings of literature in a different TL. The dichotomy between
the present category and that of *synchronic* TRP thus appears (to some degree, at least) to parallel Nord’s (1997) distinction between *equi-* and *heterofunctional* translations, and the same problem of delimitation previously shown to afflict Nord’s concepts therefore applies to Gottlieb’s as well. As proposed in connection with the category of *dialectal TRP*, a wiser solution is in my view to dispense with this category altogether, and to limit cases of stylistic adaptation to a matter of special skopos requirements within the broad category of *synchronic TRP*.

**TRP: Transliteration:** Yet another superfluous TRP sub-category is *transliteration*, which refers to the shift in alphabet or writing system, such as that between the Latin alphabet and Chinese characters, which occurs e.g. when a European language is translated into Chinese or vice-versa (Gottlieb 2008a: 55-56). It must be objected that the shift in writing system in these cases is a realizational *concomitant* of the cross-over between language systems, and that no actual *transliteration* is in fact involved, precisely because the translation is not *confined* to the stratum of graphology, but extends to lexicogrammar (and semantics) as well (Chinese wordings and meanings are replaced by e.g. English ones). It is thus not a matter of keeping the Chinese words intact while attempting to express them in e.g. the Cyrillic alphabet, or expressing Greek words in Latin characters (e.g. μεταφράσει → *metaphrasè*), which is what transliteration really consists in. As such, this type of conversion is an INTRA category, to be examined below.

**TRP: Diamesic:** The final sub-type of TRP recognized by Gottlieb is the one where apart from a change in language system, a shift in channel takes place, from oral to written. Gottlieb (2008a: 56) mentions the example of subtitling (see also Gottlieb 2008b), while at the same time countering the misconception that this type of translation may be viewed as intersemiotic, rightly stressing the fact that the semiotic type in this case is verbal language in ST and TT alike. Since diamesic TRP is a clearly delimitable concept, and since the shift in channel is not an automatic concomitant of the change in language system, the category may safely be retained as a distinct one.

### 4.3. INTRA categories

It should be clear from the above critique that the specification of TRP sub-categories is complicated by the very fact of the systemic cross-over, which tends to ‘blur’ distinctions beyond the interlingual shift itself. In Gottlieb’s INTRA typology, on the other hand, the absence of the interlingual dimension as a complicating factor makes for much more clearly identifiable sub-categories. These are the following:

**Diachronic INTRA** (Gottlieb 2008a: 56), i.e. translation between diachronic varieties of the same language. As a case in point, this type of INTRA was called for by the literary editor of the Danish weekly newspaper *Weekendavisen* in connection with the bi-centennial anniversary (in 2013) of the Danish author-philosopher Søren Kierkegaard, in whose philosophically demanding works the language is an extra challenge, e.g. because of orthographic and lexical deviations from modern Danish (Libak 2013). Judging from an example given by Libak (ibid.) of what a modern-Danish version of an extract from one of Kierkegaard’s works would look like,65 the changes involved pertain to graphology (ortho-

---

65 Owing to the huge challenges to be expected from an attempt to provide an English translation of the Danish ST and TT each, i.e. a documentary English translation serving to reflect the intralingual Danish changes
graphic changes) as well as lexicogrammar, with inevitable changes in meaning also.

Interestingly, Libak (2013) refers to the modern-Danish versioning she calls for as translations (Danish: oversættelse) with no inverted commas. Indeed, she refers to intralingual translations of Kierkegaard on a par with interlingual ones, echoing the exact point which is Gottlieb’s also (2008a: 55), namely that interlingual translations typically make such historically distant works more accessible to foreign readers than the originals are to Danes.

**Dialectal translation** (Gottlieb 2008a: 57). Unlike the category of dialectal shifts in TRP, which was problematized above, intralingual differences in dialect between a source and a target text must be considered much less ambiguous, and, like diachronic INTRA, a clearly identifiable category of translation between two varieties of the same language, in this case synchronic variation on a geographical dimension primarily. A specific example of dialectal INTRA mentioned by Gottlieb is the subtitling of *people speaking with a heavy ‘local’ accent* (ibid.), supposedly with the purpose of ensuring comprehension on the part of listeners unacquainted with the dialect.

A more dubious example of dialectal INTRA given by Gottlieb, however, (2008a: 57) is the subtitling of less-than-proficient speakers such as immigrants. Since this type of language is hardly identifiable as a dialectal variety (which would imply that a large group of speakers share a distinct set of lexicogrammatical and phonological characteristics which differentiates the dialect from the ‘standard’ version), it may rather be a case of an *idiolect* translated into the standard variety.

Outside subtitling, the most prominent example of dialectal INTRA is probably the versioning of J. K. Rowling’s *Harry Potter* novels for the American readership, mentioned by Denton (2007: 250) as a case of INTRA in the field of literature. Denton strongly advocates INTRA in English literature, arguing that dialectal versioning is in some cases a necessity if readers from other parts of the Anglophone world are to be allowed a satisfactory understanding of works that are strongly embedded in the culture of its country of origin.

One specific work examined by Denton (2007) is the British author Sue Townsend’s novel *The Secret Diary of Adrian Mole aged ¾ from 1982*, whose many ‘Britishisms’ (lexical items specific to British English) and culture-bound references are found to present insurmountable obstacles to American readers, and which therefore, in Denton’s view, needs intralingual rewriting. What is interesting for the purposes of this thesis is Denton’s demonstration that even within what counts as one language (in this case English), dialects may be so far apart as to represent - at least in certain respects - two incompatible cultures, i.e. two mutually unintelligible systems of meaning, which may require translation for successful communication to be possible.

As opposed to Denton’s (2007) advocacy of dialectal versioning, Pillière (2010) disfavours INTRA in fiction, pointing out that dialectal or sociolectal features in a literary character’s language may serve as an important element in the portrayal of that person, and that

---

66 The criticism is not intended to question the reality of this type of subtitling. Only a few days before writing the present chapter, I myself happened to watch a TV-programme on a local Danish channel (TV-Midvest 2013) featuring an interview with an immigrant who had arrived in Denmark only a few years ago, and whose Danish was not yet fluent enough to be completely comprehensible at all times. Accordingly, the answers she gave in the interview were subtitled in standard Danish.
the modification of such features may therefore be detrimental to the literary quality of the work in question. This debate, however, about the merits of INTRA in literature is one that will be left to literary scholars and TS scholars specializing in literature. What is relevant to the purposes of this thesis in Pilliére's study is her demonstration that the modification of dialectal elements results in concomitant semantic changes - what she denounces as 'semantic impoverishment' (2010: 5), supposedly because the connotations of the dialectal/sociolectal expressions disappear when these are replaced by, typically, expressions from a variety which is perceived by readers as standard. In Pillière's own words, the language becomes 'bland and uniform' (ibid.). Contra Halliday and Hasan's dictum that '... in principle, dialects are saying the same in different ways' (1989: 41), i.e. that differences between dialects are confined to the lexicogrammatical and phonological strata, Pillière's study appears to show that translation between dialects is not without consequences at the semantic stratum as well.

Before leaving the category of dialectal INTRA, consideration ought to be given to the question whether translation between social dialects (sociolects) should be recognized as an independent category of INTRA. At least, Matthiessen (2001: 70-71) mentions a specific, and authentic, example which is clearly a case of rewriting between sociolects, viz. a case of Black English Vernacular in the US rewritten in Standard American English. Although Gottlieb (2008a) does not differentiate between sociolectal and dialectal translation in his typology, the possibility should be considered, since sociolects may be viewed as a distinct type of variation within a language, as opposed to variation between geographical dialects (cf. Matthews 2005: 344). Thus, variation between regional dialects is purely a matter of geography, whereas the 'non-standard' status of a given sociolect is a function of the marginalized social position of its speakers (cf. Wardaugh 1986: 46). What makes sociolectal INTRA redundant as a distinct category, however, is a lack of real-life instantiation: other than Matthiessen's example, no other authentic examples can be readily found, which might be due to the fact that 'sub-standard' sociolects are rarely likely to present any real comprehension problems to speakers of the 'standard' variety. Without this need, INTRA subtitles67 of this kind are unlikely to be initiated.

Transliteration. An example of intralingual transliteration is Arabic words rendered in Western lettering (Gottlieb 2008a: 57), as can be seen e.g. on road signs in some parts of the Middle East (my example). This is the only type of INTRA where the change is wholly confined to the stratum of expression (graphology), with no concomitant changes either at the lexicogrammatical or semantic stratum. Since most other types of intrasemiotic (verbal) translation - INTRA as well as TRP - involve lexicogrammatical as well as semantic changes (cf. previous discussions), transliteration, together with diamesic translation (see below), would appear to be the 'odd one out' and might at first glance not be considered worthy of 'truly' translational status. Nevertheless, because it shares the overriding purpose of overcoming a communication barrier, in this case one posed by graphology, while at the same time meeting the (modified) Touryan criteria (presence of ST, derivation, relation of relevant similarity, mediation and semiotic difference) the view taken here is that intralin-

67 Since dialects (social and regional) are mainly confined to the spoken mode, a need for sociolectal INTRA would probably appear mainly in a context where subtitles would be the solution to the problem (TV-programs etc.).
gual transliteration must be accepted as a form of translation completely in line with all other intrasemiotic types.

**Diamesic INTRA.** As previously noted, *diamesic translation* refers to a change in channel, i.e. between speech and writing, which is the case e.g. in intralingual subtitles for hearing-impaired TV-viewers (Gottlieb 2008a: 57). The locus of change in this type of INTRA is primarily the stratum of phonology/graphology, but as Gottlieb points out (ibid.), intralingual subtitles may well represent a condensed version of the spoken ST, which means that lexicogrammatical and semantic changes may be involved as well. Like intralingual transliteration, diamesic rewriting equally deserves translational status, its function being that of allowing a certain group of recipients to gain access to a semiotic output from which they would otherwise be barred.

**Paraphrase.** The final category in Gottlieb's typology must in fact be deemed to be one of two subordinate categories, with the superordinate category missing. Gottlieb's category appears to be identical with the specific type of INTRA under consideration in this thesis, i.e. the rewriting from an expert-oriented to a lay-oriented register: *'This type of translation is commonly seen in situations where public authorities wish to communicate more effectively with clients or voters by making syntactically complex and expert-sounding texts easier to read for the non-expert'* (2008a: 57). A more appropriate designation of this type, however, and the one adopted in this thesis is *lay-oriented interregisterial INTRA*, or simply *lay-oriented INTRA* for short. Two points are to be noted: 1) the term *interregisterial* has been chosen to reflect the fact that a shift in register is involved, and 2) the term *interregisterial INTRA* is thus a superordinate term, of which *lay-oriented INTRA* is one sub-type.

The other type, which would most appropriately be termed *expert-oriented interregisterial INTRA*, or simply *expert-oriented INTRA* for short, represents the opposite 'movement' or shift between registers, i.e. from a layman's to an expert register. This is the type of rewriting involved when an expert translates the statements of a layman into technical terms, of which the most frequent manifestation is likely to be found in doctors' consultation rooms, where, after listening to the patient's own description of his/her symptoms and discussing with him/her the appropriate course of action to be taken, the physician conveys it all into the patient's medical journal, using the proper medical terms. Other examples would be lawyers drafting legal documents, such as wills, on the basis of clients' directions, or civil servants translating the wishes of politicians in government into legislation.

In spite of representing two opposite 'directions' of registerial transformation, a common denominator between the two sub-types of interregisterial INTRA is found in the *strata* affected by the rewriting: representing conversion between 'compartments' of meaning in the overall linguistic system (cf. section 2.5), registerial transformation takes place at the stratum of semantics and hence also in lexicogrammar. The stratum of graphology/phonology, on the other, is unlikely to be affected, with possible exceptions to be found in cases where an alternative spelling is adopted for a specialist term which 'migrates' to non-expert registers (cf. Jensen 2013: 199).

This concludes the review of Gottlieb's (2008a) translation taxonomy. A graphic representation of the modified version argued for above is the one below (graphed from the system of LINGUALITY TYPE, which is the only system in which changes have been proposed. For the full taxonomy, with the modifications included, see Appendix 2):
4.4. A review of empirically based literature on lay-oriented INTRA

Although in the previous chapter it was argued that full translational status should be granted to INTRA, it must be conceded that, as already noted in section 1.1, INTRA is at present a marginal phenomenon within Translation Studies, which is reflected in an extreme sparseness of literature on the subject. In fact, apart from the mainly theoretical contributions of Zethsen (2007; 2009) and Schmid (2008; 2012), all of which argue for the incorporation of INTRA into the object field of TS, empirical research on INTRA is extremely limited. Thus, bibliographical searches indicate that literature on diachronic INTRA is non-existent, and with regard to dialectal INTRA, apart from the two studies on translation between English dialects reviewed in the previous chapter (Denton (2007) and Pillière (2010)), only a single study (Smith 1990) of dialectal poetry translated into standard English exists. A few studies on diamesic INTRA (descriptions of intralingual subtitling primarily, e.g. Pedersen 2010; Remael, De Houwer et al. 2008; Wurm 2007) can be found, and even more on transliteration (e.g. Chuansheng and Yunnan 2003; Wen-chao Li 2007), but the specific focus of the present study, lay-oriented INTRA, has received virtually no attention. Only a single study of the very type of lay-oriented INTRA under investigation here, i.e. the INTRA of SPCs into PILs, together with one other study of a parallel type of INTRA in the field of medicine, have recently appeared, to be reviewed at the end of this section.

4.4.1. Science popularization as lay-oriented INTRA

Whereas virtually no research has been carried out into lay-oriented INTRA within TS, a particular manifestation of this type of rewriting, viz. science popularization, has in fact been the object of linguistic research. Theoretically, science popularization may be viewed as translation, since it a recreation of semiotic content, viz. recreation of specialized knowledge in a register intended for non-specialists (Camus 2009: 466). Popularization thus comprises

---

68 It should be noted, however, that Zethsen (2009) does contain an empirically based attempt at providing a general characterization of INTRA.
69 For two exceptions, see below.
a vast class of various types of communicative events or genres that involve the transformation of specialized knowledge into ‘everyday’ or ‘lay’ knowledge, as well as a recontextualization of scientific discourse, for instance, in the realm of the public discourses of the mass media or other institutions. This means that popularization discourse needs to be formulated in such a way that non-specialized readers are able to construct lay versions of specialized knowledge and integrate these with their existing knowledge. (Casamiglia and van Dijk 2004: 370)

It should be noted that the emphasis on semiotic recreation leads Camus to denounce the conception that popularization is 'mere translation between registers' (2009: 467), which, in her view, is a simplistic notion implying that popularization is nothing but transcoding (ibid.). Such a view of translation, however - translation as a mere transcoding activity - has previously been criticized here, and an opposing view argued, viz. that translation invariably involves transformation between conceptual systems. Thus, the conception of popularization as conceptual recreation is fully compatible with the view of translation taken in this thesis.

However, the emphasis on semantic transformation means that research into popularization strategies appears to confine itself to the investigation of isolated conceptualizations. Thus, Camus (2009) investigates the metaphorization of one concept mainly - which is cancer - in newspaper articles, charting martial metaphors ('cancer is war') as well as mechanistic conceptualizations ('human cells and the human body are machines') and animalistic ones ('cancer cells are animals'). Yet other metaphors, she shows (ibid.), represent cancer as an impurity ('cancer is dirt') or as a riddle or puzzle to be solved. A similar study is that of Rovira (2008) into metaphorizations of DNA, revealing how, since its discovery, this molecule has been conceptualized through images such as information, text, language, a book, a file, a database, a template, a spiral, a rack and a rung ladder. Likewise, Becker (2001: ch. 9.6) examines 19th and 18th century metaphorizations of the cardiovascular system in popularizations of medical knowledge, showing how the heart was modelled as a container and a machine and the vascular system as a tree, as traffic roads and as vessels.

Knudsen (2003), however, shows that metaphorization is not something unique to popularization - that scientific discourse as well as popularization genres, in fact, make use of metaphors, and that the same type of metaphors may be employed for what she terms 'theory-construcive' purposes (ibid.: 1259) and for purposes of popularization: in the process of theorizing a new discovery, scientists may resort to non-scientific metaphors, and once the process is complete and scientific terms have been established, the initial metaphors may be recycled when the new scientific insight is explained to a lay public. Examining representations of the human genome in press articles, Casamiglia and van Dijk (2004) likewise point to metaphorization as a fundamental element of popularization discourse, along with other explanatory moves such as definition, description, paraphrase, reformulation and exemplification. Casamiglia and van Dijk, however, fail to provide descriptions that enable them to discriminate sufficiently clearly between these various categories. One further category, labelled denomination (ibid.: 374-76), thus remains completely opaque.

Outside written communication, Güllich (2003) explores strategies of popularization in the oral transfer of knowledge from experts to non-experts. Focusing on what she collectively refers to as techniques of illustration, she proposes a typology which, apart from metapho-
rization, comprises exemplification, 'scenarios' and concretization. As was the case with Casamiglia and van Dijk's concepts, the boundaries between Gülich's categories are extremely fuzzy, and no criteria for distinguishing between them are specified. Thus, 'scenarios' appear to refer to the sketching of real-life situations in which the scientific concept being illustrated plays a role - situations recognizable to the non-expert from his/her own life experience (Gülich 2003: 244). Concretization, on the other hand, refers to 'rewording abstract information in a non-abstract manner' (ibid.), but what constitutes abstract vs. non-abstract information is not defined.

Another study of knowledge transfer in oral communication between experts and lay persons is Ciapuscio (2003). Ciapuscio, however, is concerned with the intermediate type of communication intervening between the scientific article and the newspaper article aimed at the lay public, viz. the oral interview between the scientist and the science journalist - 'the production of science popularization texts as process' (ibid.: 210). Ciapuscio's particular interest is formulation procedures employed by scientists in the attempt to make scientific concepts accessible to science journalists. More specifically, she distinguishes between formulation and reformulation procedures (ibid.: 211), the former being those used to introduce new knowledge, and the latter being 'those by which speakers double back on their own or their interlocutor's speech to change or modify their words [...] (ibid.). She indicates sub-types of reformulation such as paraphrasing, repetition and correction (ibid.: 213), and introduces a further sub-division of paraphrasing into expansion, variation and reduction, the difference being that expansion means using more words to explain a concept and reduction means fewer words, whereas variation simply changes the word order (ibid.: 214). What complicates the categorization, however, is Ciapuscio's acknowledgement (2003: 229) that illustration procedures of the types defined by Gülich (2003) may also enter into and overlap with reformulation strategies. Thus, how to identify all these different types of rewriting and keep them apart from each other remains essentially unclear.

4.4.2. Empirical investigations of lay-oriented INTRA within TS

Altogether, two limitations are conspicuous in the studies of science popularization reviewed above: they are all narrowly focused on the rewriting/reformulation of individual concepts, i.e. at the stratum of semantics. Besides, the categorization of rewriting strategies in these studies tends to be vague. Only two extant studies, both belonging within Translation Studies and both concerned with the rewriting of medical texts from an expert to a lay audience, conduct a more detailed investigation into the lexicogrammatical implications of intralingual translation. Thus, in a study of INTRA of research articles into summaries for a lay readership, Muñoz-Miquel (2012) identifies a certain number of the types of changes also charted in this thesis. Apart from changes in typography and layout she notes changes in 'sentence length and structure', in 'verbs and voice', 'noun phrases', 'tenor' and 'modality' (ibid.: 197-200). Changes in voice from active to passive are noted as a general tendency, as is a preference for changes in rank from group-level to clausal constructions. Likewise, a tendency to change modalized clauses into non-modalized ones is noted. Certain parts of the investigation, however, are characterized by a lack of analytical rigour: sentence structure is noted be 'simplified considerably [...] in terms of both the length and the morpho-
syntactical and lexical structure’ (ibid.: 197), but no more exact indication, in grammatical terms, of the specific types of clause-rank changes involved is given, a merely commonsensical description being supplied instead, viz. ‘the ideas conveyed are reworded in more accessible language’ (ibid.: 198). Similarly, it is not clear what is referred to by ‘tenor’: being clearly not used in the SFL sense to refer to a contextual parameter, the term might be taken to refer to (what in SFG terms is) (SUBJECT) PERSON (see section 5.5.1). This appears to be supported by the tendency cited by Muños-Miquel from the literature on reformulation, where a tendency to address the reader directly is registered (ibid.: 190).

Yet, the example adduced by Muños-Miquel from her own empirical material is ‘Patients were enrolled [...]’ (ST) rendered as ‘Researchers followed patients [...]’ in the TT (ibid.: 199). Allegedly, this exemplifies ‘a more personalized communication’, by ‘giving more visibility to the authors of the study’ (ibid.), but neither do the two clauses exhibit any change in SUBJECT PERSON (1st, 2nd or 3rd person subject), both having a 3rd-person Subject, and nor is it clear how the shift in Subject from patients to researchers represents a higher degree of personalization. Muños-Miquel correctly notes the change in voice from passive to active between the two clauses, and this is possibly what the enhanced ‘personalization’ - whatever is precisely meant by the term - really derives from. Muños-Miquel's examination of lexical changes (ibid.: 200-202), on the other hand, is more persuasive, showing how medical terms may be transferred unchanged from ST to TT, but either preceded or followed by an explanation or a lay synonym, or may be omitted and replaced by a lay term or a paraphrase. Besides these changes at the ‘micro-textual level’ (ibid.: 197), i.e. at the stratum of lexicogrammar, Muñoz-Miquel also identifies changes at the ‘macro-textual level’ (ibid.: 192), describing changes of title, in textual macro-structure, in length and in content: apart from the TTs being 90% shorter than the STs, which obviously implies a heavy reduction of ST content, considerable additions of information in TTs not derived from the STs are also prevalent (ibid.: 193-95).

With regard to the specific type of lay-oriented INTRA which is the concern of the present thesis, i.e. the rewriting of SPCs into PILs, the only extant study is Piorno (2012). On the basis of a rather limited analysis of translation strategies occurring in the rewriting, Piorno's study identifies three main categories: a) strategies aimed at enhancing readability b) strategies intended to guide the actions to be taken by patients and c) strategies aimed at making the communication more personal. The second of these three categories refers to shifts that change the mainly informative/expository register of the SPCs into the more instructional register of the PILs (for a categorization of the two text types in SF terms, see sections 7.3 and 7.4). In SF terms, in other words, these categories appear to relate to changes within each contextual parameter: readability appears to be related mainly to a decrease in technicality (Field) and possibly to a lessening of the written character of the texts (Mode), the enhancement of personalization is related to a decrease in formality (Tenor), and the shift concerned with controlling the patient's actions is linked with a change in the social activity constituted by the texts (SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS), i.e. also in Field. Either as part of the category of strategies intended to enhance readability or as part of the 'personalization' strategy (it is not clear which), Piorno (2012: 180-181) identifies the same types of 'de-terminologizing' procedures taking place in the rewriting as those examined by Muños-Miquel (2012) (see above).
As already noted, the studies represented by Muños-Miquel and Piorno are the only ones that are directly related to the present investigation in terms of specific field of interest and in methodology. However, methodologically the studies are not rigorous enough to be of value to the present study, but inspiration may be found in the attempts of both studies to arrive at generalizations of translation strategies characteristic of lay-oriented INTRA.

Finally, it should be noted that there is a wealth of empirical literature investigating various aspects of PILs in their own right, such as investigations into the readability of PILs (see e.g. Hirsch, Clerehan et al. 2008; Clerehan and Buchbinder 2006; Askehave and Zethsen 2003; 2010), the discursive construction of risk and trust in PILs (Fage-Butler 2011; 2012), and problems connected with the interlingual translation of PILs from the English ST into other EU languages (Jensen 2013; Jensen and Zethsen 2012). Such studies are ignored here, however, being not concerned with the derivational aspect of (English) PILs, i.e. PILs as products of INTRA, and therefore deemed irrelevant to the present investigation.

4.5. Summary

In the first part of the present chapter, the relevant parts of the comprehensive, semiotic translation taxonomy proposed by H. Gottlieb (2008a) was reviewed and modified. By expanding Jakobson's classic tri-partite translation typology (the theoretical point of departure for this thesis) 'in delicacy', the taxonomy made it possible to distinguish different sub-types of TRP as well as INTRA from each other. The sub-divisions of INTRA were thus distinguished partly according to the type of language variety involved in the transformation and partly according to the linguistic strata affected: diachronic INTRA was seen to involve rewriting between temporal varieties of the same language, with repercussions at the stratum of graphology as well as lexicogrammar and semantics; dialectal INTRA was characterized as the transformation between regional and/or social varieties, affecting the lexicogrammatical stratum first and foremost, but with possible consequences for the semantic stratum as well, and interregisterial INTRA was defined as the rewriting between registers (functional varieties), entailing changes in both semantics and lexicogrammar. As for diamesic INTRA and transliteration, it is to be acknowledged that no change between language varieties can really be said to involved, the linguistic shifts being largely confined to the stratum of phonology/graphology, but in the case of diamesic INTRA concomitant changes in wordings and meanings were recognized as a possibility.

What the review and modification of Gottlieb's translation typology also made possible was identification of the exact taxonomic 'address' of the particular sub-type of INTRA under investigation. As reflected in the long and heavily premodified term itself, viz. lay-oriented interregisterial intralingual translation, the phenomenon was shown to be a subtype of sub-types, constituting one of two types (lay-oriented vs. expert-oriented) of interregisterial intralingual translation, which in its turn was identified as one of the five sub-types of INTRA, etc.

In the second half of the chapter, a review of the extant empirically based literature on lay-oriented interregisterial INTRA was conducted, revealing a marked research gap in this area of TS. The literature has turned out to be extremely sparse and mostly takes the shape of investigations into the conceptual transformation taking place in science popularization.
A mere two studies have been found to concern themselves with micro-level (i.e. lexicogrammatical) strategies in lay-oriented INTRA, both of which investigations, however, were found somewhat lacking in methodology, and hence not sufficiently convincing in their conclusions.
Chapter 5. Analytical framework, part 1: SFG

This chapter will introduce the SF perspective on certain core areas of grammar (sections 5.1 - 5.5), as well as the SF interpretation of the organization of lexis and the relation between lexis and grammar (5.7). Moreover, the chapter will include a section on phenomena which represent tension between the semantic and the lexicogrammatical stratum (so-called grammatical metaphor - section 5.6). Before the individual grammatical/lexical descriptions are embarked on, however, a caveat is necessary: because SFG is an extremely intricate framework, the below account will be a highly selective one in which only those areas deemed relevant to the ensuing translation analysis will be covered. Furthermore, because of the intricacy of SFG, some degree of simplification in the accounts is unavoidable. This also applies to most of the graphical representations of the system networks selected for comment. Most graphs are simplified or adapted versions of the originals.

5.1. The experiential grammar of the clause

In Chapter 2, what might be termed the metafunctional hypothesis was introduced, i.e. the (apparently) unique SF tenet that language is organized to express three different strands of meaning - the so-called metafunctions. At clause rank the strands are simultaneous, which means that any clause is structured to encode these three lines of meaning (the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual) at the same time. In the following section, the grammar of the clause will be examined from the perspective of the ideational, or more specifically the experiential mode of the ideational metafunction (the other branch of the ideational metafunction, the so-called logical mode and its clause-rank manifestation will be examined in section 5.4).

As previously mentioned (see section 2.1), the ideational metafunction is concerned with structuring the world of experiential phenomena for us. At clause rank, this manifests itself in a structure that encodes a semantic figure consisting of an action or process involving participants and concomitant circumstances (cf. Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 52-58). An example will serve to make the definition less abstract:

At Novo Nordisk, we have experienced double-digit sales growth rates in recent years.
(Novo Nordisk 2010a: 4)

According to the perspective just outlined, the core element in a figure is the process\textsuperscript{70} represented, which is have experienced. Two participants are identified as being involved in this process, namely one who 'does' the experiencing (we) and another which represents the object of the experiencing (double-digit sales growth rates). Apart from this, two sets of circumstances specify the where and the when of the process: At Novo Nordisk (place) and in recent years (time). A certain set of different types of figure may be distinguished from

\textsuperscript{70}As a matter of terminology, it might be objected that process is not a very suitable term for the 'action' that constitutes the core element of a figure. Presumably, the term has been chosen as a sufficiently general label that may encompass all the disparate types of figure. Admittedly, a term like action would be even less adequate, being only really appropriate as a reference to figures of doing. Especially in connection with figures of being (see below), on the other hand, process seems equally ill-chosen. The term, however, is the established SFG term, and no attempt will be made to suggest an alternative.
each other, whose reflex in the grammar is the system of PROCESS TYPE: this is the core of the experiential perspective on the clause, being a system of clause types based on semantic categories of verbs grouped according to the types of participant roles they configure with. As a whole, the comprehensive system network branching off from the terms in PROCESS TYPE is termed TRANSITIVITY (reproduced with the first steps in delicacy in Appendix 7). The system of PROCESS TYPE in itself is the following:

![Fig. 5.1. The system of PROCESS TYPE. Source: IFG3: 173 (adapted by author)](image)

In the realization statements, the system graph above indicates the obligatory participant role or roles that a particular process type is associated with. Thus, a [mental] clause is, as a minimum, a configuration of a mental Process and a Senser, as in the example given above (… we have experienced …), in which we can now be identified as fulfilling the participant role of Senser.

In the following sections, the grammar of each of these experiential clause types will be examined, but it should be noted that different degrees of detail will be pursued in the account of each type: in no case is an exhaustive account deemed necessary, but especially [material] and [relational] clauses – because they are by far the most frequent ones - will be examined in some detail. The other clause types, on the other hand, will be more summarily dealt with.

5.1.1. [Material] clauses

Semantically, a [material] clause represents a figure of doing or happening, or in Halliday’s own words, 'a quantum of change in the flow of events [that] tak[es] place through some input of energy' (IFG3: 179). As appears from the system graph below, a [material]

---

71 The SF concept of figure thus appears to be in some degree parallel to Predicate-Argument configurations (cf. Hasan 1989/2009: 196; cf. Murphy and Koskela 2010: 19-20) and the concept of participant appears to correspond to that of semantic role or theta-role (cf. Teich 1999: 23) in other accounts of the relation between clause grammar and semantics (see e.g. Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 226-235).

72 This section is a summary of the account of [material] clause grammar in IFG3: 179-97. Specific references will only be given in connection with quotes.
clause invariably presupposes an Actor, viz. the entity which is instrumental in bringing the Process to unfold, as in:

*We (Actor) launched (Process) a new product [...]*. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2), where the process of launching is brought about by *We*.

![Fig. 5.1.1a. The system network of [material] clauses. *Source: IFG3: 183 (adapted by author)*](image)

As the above graph shows, the first step in delicacy reveals two simultaneous systems in the network, i.e. two systems from which a selection must be made at the same time when a [material] clause is chosen: TYPE OF DOING and IMPACT. The latter will be presented first, being concerned with the presence or absence of the type of participant which, apart from the obligatory Actor, is probably the one most intimately associated with [material] clauses, viz. the Goal. If a Goal is present, the clause is [transitive], which means that the figure includes a participant that is affected by the Process. In this way, the Goal is the participant role that appears to correspond most closely to the Direct Object of traditional grammars. As reflected in the verb patterns of most standard dictionaries, the same verb may function as Process in a [transitive] as well as an [intransitive] clause. Examples:

[Transitive]: *We (Actor) increased (Process) sales (Goal) by 11% [...].* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)

[Intransitive]: *Dividends to shareholders paid during 2009 (Actor) increased (Process) by 25% compared to the prior year.* (ibid.)

The system simultaneous with IMPACT, that of TYPE OF DOING, represents the basic distinction between [creative] and [transformative] clauses, with the former type construing the creation or the coming into being of a participant, which may be the Actor or the Goal, depending on how the clause selects for IMPACT. Typical verbs serving as Process in these clauses are e.g. *create, build, paint, cook* (IFG3: 187), and clausal examples are:

---

73 In the online edition of Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary, for example, the verb *increase* is accompanied by the grammatical information '[INTRANSITIVE, TRANSITIVE]' (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2013: [entry: increase]).

74 IFG3 and LC feature the same, rather elaborate list of verbs that function as Process in the different [material]-clause sub-types. This list is reproduced in Appendix 4.
a) Our people around the world (Actor) build (Process) the business (Goal) [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5);
b) Healthcare reforms (Actor) are taking place (Process) all over the world [...] (ibid.),

where in a) the Goal and in b) the Actor is the entity construed as coming into being (by being built and by taking place, respectively). Both examples illustrate that [creative] clauses need not involve physical acts of creation or arising. Both clauses are figurative in meaning, and this possibility is in fact open to material clauses as such. If a [creative] clause is selected, the system of CLINENCY, is enterable, which means that the possibility of including yet another participant, viz. a Client, opens up:

We (Actor) create (Process) value (Goal) for healthcare patients and payers (Client). (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 6)

As this example reflects, the Client is the participant for whose sake or on behalf of whom the process of creation (or arising) is undertaken.

The other term in the system of TYPE OF DOING is [transformative], which branches into three clause types, distinguished according to TYPE OF OUTCOME, whose terms are [elaborating], [extending] and [enhancing], respectively. Of these, [elaborating] clauses fundamentally entail a change to one of the participants, and prototypical verbs are ones referring to physical processes like burn, cut, destroy, fry, expand (IFG3: 187). [Elaborating] processes may therefore be further differentiated according to the more specific type of change involved (be it related to state, make-up, shape, size, amount etc.), which, however, is a step in delicacy which will not be pursued here. Instead, one example will be given:

At the same time we (Actor) have reduced (Process) CO2 emissions (Goal) [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 4),

which represents the Goal CO2 emissions as being changed in volume as a result of the process (consisting in reduction). Matthiessen characterizes the outcome of an [elaborating] clause as an ‘intensive result’ (LC: 246), which refers to the possibility of formulating the outcome in terms of a [relational] clause of the [intensive] sub-type (see section 5.1.4), or, in traditional grammatical terms, a clause consisting of subject – copula – predicate, in which the predicate is derived from a participial form of the Process in the [material: transformative: elaborating] clause. The outcome of the above example may thus be phrased as *CO2 emissions are now reduced (with reduced in an adjectival and not a verbal function).

With regard to [extending] clauses (the second term in the system of TYPE OF DOING), the outcome relates to a) possession and b) accompaniment, with examples of verbs in the former category being give, donate, buy, acquire, sell, bequeath, receive (IFG3: 187). An example is:

In 2009, we (Actor) repurchased (Process) shares worth 6.5 billion Danish kroner (Goal) [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 48),

which encodes a change of ownership pertaining to the Goal shares worth 6.5 billion Danish kroner. Verbs of clauses construing a change in accompaniment are e.g. join, meet, collect, separate, scatter (IFG3: 188), a clausal example being:
Johnny Henriksen (Actor) joined (Process) Novo Nordisk (Goal) in January 1986 [...].
(Novo Nordisk 2010a: 43)

What does not appear from the general system network of [material] clauses above (figure 5.1.1a), is that a system of RECIPIENCY (presence/absence of a Recipient) is open to [transformational: extending] clauses that are at the same [transitive].

![Diagram of extending and transitive RECIPIENCY](image)

**Fig. 5.1.1b. The system of RECIPIENCY. Source: IFG3: 183 (adapted by author)**

The Recipient is a benefactive role that typically represents the one to whom goods are transferred in a change of possession. Thus:

This programme (Actor) gives (Process) the selected financial institutions (Recipient) the mandate to purchase shares independently of Novo Nordisk A/S (Goal). (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 48)

In this clause, the mandate to purchase shares […] is the 'goods' transferred by this programme to the selected financial institutions. As this example shows, the 'transfer of goods' may well be figurative.

As for [transformational: enhancing] clauses, the change expressed relates to motion or locative change, with the Process being realized by verbs such as walk, run, leave, enter, fall, rise (IFG3: 189). An example (once again figurative) of a locative change is:

By the end of 2009, emissions from production (Actor) had fallen (Process) below the level of the 2004 baseline year (Place) (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2),

in which a 'movement' between two 'places' is construed, i.e. from the level of the 2004 baseline year and below that. What is labelled Place in the above analysis is a realization of one of the terms in the system of LOCATIVE OUTCOME (presence/absence of location), which is enterable on the selection of a [transformational: enhancing] clause:

![Diagram of enhancing LOCATIVE OUTCOME](image)

**Fig. 5.1.1c. The system of LOCATIVE OUTCOME. Source: IFG3: 183 (adapted by author).**

Place is in fact one type of the so-called circumstantial elements, which will be further explored in section 5.1.7.

---

75 For a graphic representation of the [material]-clause system network which includes the system of RECIPIENCY and the two other systems at the same level of delicacy (to be accounted for in the following), see Appendix 3.
At the same level of delicacy as RECIPIENCY and LOCATIVE OUTCOME, a further system is SCOPING, which is open to [intransitive] clauses that are either [transformative: enhancing] or [elaborating]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>intransitive and enhancing SCOPING</th>
<th>+scope</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+Scope;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scope: nom.gp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no scope</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5.1.1d. The system of SCOPING. Source: IFG3: 183 (adapted by author)

The system represents the choice between inserting or leaving out a Scope, and the fact that the term [intransitive] (in the system of IMPACT) is one of the entry conditions seems to reflect that this participant role should be conceived of especially in contradistinction to the role of Goal. Whereas the Goal represents the entity which a process impacts on (as in the ball (Actor) hit (Process) the window (Goal)), the Scope rather indicates the terrain (literally or figuratively) in which a process takes place. Thus, in examples like he (Actor) crossed (Process) the room (Scope) and they (Actor) played (Process) a game of tennis (Scope), the room and a game of tennis would in traditional clause grammar be regarded as Direct Object, but the two participants are in fact not ‘objects’ of the processes, in that nothing is ‘done to’ them. Instead, the room is the literal and a game of tennis the figurative domain of the respective processes.

Finally, it should be mentioned that the grammar of [material] clauses includes yet another system at the same level of delicacy as SCOPING, RECIPIENCY and LOCATIVE OUTCOME, viz. one named QUALITATIVE OUTCOME. The system is however irrelevant to my empirical purposes, and is therefore ignored in this account. The system of VOICE, on the other hand (see fig. 5.1.1a), which has not yet been accounted for, is highly relevant to my purposes, but will be regarded as belonging with the textual, and not the experiential metafunction (cf. LC: 590-91). In the present account, the system will therefore be grouped with textual clause systems (see section 5.3.2).

5.1.2. [Mental] clauses
Whereas [material] clauses construe figures of doing and happening in 'external' reality, i.e. outside the minds of participants, the figures encoded by [mental] clauses are ones of sensing, with mental processes at the core. These processes, in other words, are 'internal' to the participant which this clause type invariably configures with, viz. the Senser. Representing the entity performing the sensing, this participant type is one which is subject to so-called value restrictions, i.e. limitations on what type of entity can occupy the role. Since mental clauses express figures of conscious sensing, the role of Senser must be filled by a conscious being, which in practice means a human person (or a higher animal attributed with certain human characteristics, i.e. certain mental capabilities).

---

76 This section is based on the account in IFG3: 197-210. Specific references will only be given in connection with quotes.
The part of the [mental] clause system network which will be accounted for here is the following:77

Fig. 5.1.2. The most basic [mental]-clause systems. Source: IFG3: 209 (adapted by author)

The first system to be accounted for is that of PHENOMENALIZATION, which represents the choice between specifying and not specifying the ‘object’ of the sensing, the Phenomenon. An example of non-specification would be the famous Cartesian dictum *I think; therefore I am*, in which the importance of the mental process (*think*) in itself is stressed, irrespective of any object of thinking. Most [mental] clauses, however, seem to select specification of the Phenomenon, as in:

*At Novo Nordisk, we (Senser) have experienced (Process) double-digit sales growth rates (Phenomenon) in recent years.* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 4)

Unlike the Senser, there are no value restrictions on the Phenomenon: the role may be filled by concrete entities – as in *I saw the car* (Phenomenon) *on the street* – or abstract ones, as in the case of *double-digit sales growth rates* in the above example. The Phenomenon may also be an act, as in:

*As markets are becoming more global we (Senser) are seeing (Process) a convergence of medical and regulatory practices (Phenomenon)* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5),

where the act of converging is nominalized as *convergence* (and thus reified), but may still be interpreted as an act. The Phenomenon can also be constituted by an idea, as in the following example:

*Based on our experience, we (Senser) believe (Process) that transformation to a lowcarbon economy is not only possible […]* (Phenomenon) (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 4),

in which the clause ‘*that transformation […]*’ expresses the idea that is believed. Further types of Phenomenon may be identified and all of them organized into several interlinked systems of PHENOMENALITY, which however constitute steps in delicacy that will not be pursued here.78 Instead, one of the other systems at the primary level of delicacy in the above system network must be examined, which is TYPE OF SENSING. As the graph above reflects, this system is concerned with selection among the more specific types of sensing,

77 The systems at only the first level of delicacy are deemed to suffice for present purposes. For the full network, see IFG3: 209.
78 It must also be acknowledged that the representation of the term [specified] in the system of PHENOMENALIZATION in the graph above is a gross simplification, but deemed necessary to avoid intricate accounts of details that are irrelevant to present purposes.
which are divided into two ‘higher’ types, [cognitive] and [desiderative], and two ‘lower’ types, [perceptive] and [emotive]. [Perceptive] clauses have already been illustrated above (‘[...] we have experienced [...]’ and ‘[...] we are seeing [...]’), and a [cognitive] clause was ‘[...] we believe [...]’). Examples of each of the two remaining types will be given with the participant roles indicated, but without further comment:

[Desiderative] (i.e. expressing ‘wanting’): As a global business we (Senser) had hoped for (Process) an ambitious, binding and long-term global framework (Phenomenon) [...].

(Novo Nordisk 2010a: 36)

[Emotive]: … we (Senser) are greatly encouraged (Process) by the progress (Phenomenon) [...]. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 3)

In the table below (reproduced in part from IFG3), some of the most ordinary verbs functioning as Process in each of the four sub-types of mental clauses are set out:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>‘like’ type</th>
<th>‘please’ type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[perceptive]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>perceive, sense; see, notice; hear; feel; taste; smell</td>
<td>(assail)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[cognitive]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>think, believe, suppose, know; understand; remember</td>
<td>strike, occur to, convince; remind; surprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[desiderative]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want, wish, desire; intend, plan; decide; agree</td>
<td>(tempt)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[emotive]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like, love, hate; fear; enjoy</td>
<td>please, disgust; delight, frighten; amuse, interest, worry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The above distinction between a 'like' type and a 'please' type of verbs reflects the final [mental] clause system to be explored in this account, which is DIRECTION OF SENSING. Thus, most of the verbs in the previous examples belonged to the [like] type, representing the sensing as 'emanating' from the Senser. Only in the last example (‘we are greatly encouraged by the progress’) was the direction the opposite, viz. 'impinging', in that the sensing was represented as 'originating' in the Phenomenon the progress, which was represented as obtruding itself (though in a positive sense) on the consciousness of the Senser we.

Another (freely invented) example – the final one in this section - of an [impinging] clause is this child (Phenomenon) frightens (Process) me (Senser), i.e. an [emotive] clause where the Phenomenon this child is represented as the active party in the figure, inspiring fear in the Senser me.

5.1.3. [Verbal] clauses

If the system of experiential clause types, i.e. that of PROCESS TYPE, is modelled, not as a typology, but topologically, [material], [mental] and [relational] clauses constitute the three most dominant, but clearly separated domains in the semantic 'space' construed by these clause types. In between these most prominent domains, however, are found the three 'lesser' kinds, with [existential] clauses occupying the border zone between [material] and [relational] clauses, [behavioural] ones between [material] and [mental], and [verbal]
clauses between [mental] and [relational] (IFG3: 172).\textsuperscript{79} The point is that whereas the typological perspective (the system model) may create the impression that the 6 clause types are completely separate, the truth is that they ‘shade into’ each other (an expression often used by Halliday (e.g. ibid.)): semantically, [material] clauses shade into [behavioural] ones, which shade into [mental] ones etc., meaning that while it is perfectly possible to find prototypical instances of each type, some cases occupy disputed territory between two categories, being interpretable as either.

Of the three 'lesser' clause types, the [verbal] one is located in the space between [mental] and [relational] clauses, and the system network of [verbal] clauses\textsuperscript{80} is to some extent reminiscent of the one pertaining to [mental] ones:

![Diagram of the [Verbal]-clause system network. Source: IFG3: 302 (adapted by author)](image)

In the system of ORDER OF SAYING in the above network, the second of the two terms, i.e. clauses of [semiosis], will be examined first. The term serves as the entry condition of the system named VERBALIZATION\textsuperscript{81}, which relates to what is ‘said’ (in the broad sense of ‘semioticized’). As the latter of the two terms in the system reflects, one option is [projecting], which involves representing the semiotic content as either a direct quote, as reported speech ([indicating]), or as the content of a command or other kind of directive utterance ([imperating]). Verbs prototypically filling the role of Process in connection with each of these types of projection are set out in the table (reproduced in part from IFG3) below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Examples of verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Semiosis]</td>
<td>[Neutral quoting]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{79} A somewhat similar view is taken by Matthiessen (LC: 204), but he does not seem to recognize existential clauses as a zone between material and relational ones. Halliday’s ‘topology’ is adopted here as the more convincing one.

\textsuperscript{80} The account in this section is based on IFG3: 252-56. Specific references will only be given in connection with quotes.

\textsuperscript{81} This system is not labelled in Halliday’s model, and the name is therefore taken from Matthiessen (LC: 282).
An example of a direct quote is:

“The transformation to a carbon-neutral economy is necessary to secure global sustainable development,” says (Process) Lise Kingo, executive vice president and chief of staffs (Sayer). (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 35)

Instead, reported speech might have been selected, in which case the example could have been phrased *Lise Kingo ... says/explains/announces that the transformation to a carbon-neutral economy ..., where the reporting is expressed in a dependent, finite that-clause. A (freely invented) example of [imperating] is:

Could I (Sayer) ask (Process) you to lend me a hand?

in which the content of the ‘imperating’ takes the form of a non-finite clause (to lend …).

Projected content, in other words, always takes clausal form, unlike the participant role of Verbiage, which is introduced through the selection of the other term ([verbiage]) in the system of VERBALIZATION. This term can only be realized by a nominal group, and it may serve one of two functions:

All shareholders (Sayer) may also ask (Process) questions (Verbiage: name) at the general meetings. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 37)

In this clause, the Verbiage has the character of simply naming the Process, in that the Verbiage questions does not really add new meaning, but merely labels the specific semantic content of the lexical verb serving as Process, in this case asking. Verbiage may, however, represent content, as in:

Employees can report (Process) misconduct (Verbiage: content) to their immediate manager (Receiver) (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 35),

where the Verbiage does in fact represent an addition of meaning to the clause, by specifying what is reported. The introduction of a Receiver (the Board) reflects a selection ([reception]) in the system of RECEPTION, which ought to be virtually self-explanatory: the Receiver is a benefactive role (cf. IFG3: 291), i.e. represents the one ‘for whose sake’ the verbal process is undertaken, and might also be termed Addressee (LC: 281).

Certain types of [verbal] clauses border on [behavioural] ones (see next section), and they are more specifically the two types grouped under the term [activity] in the general system.

---

82 In the IFG3 table, say is not featured in this category, but it obviously belongs here as well as in ‘neutral quoting’.

83 My model deviates slightly from Halliday’s (IFG3: 302), in which the term labelled [verbiage] here is the entry condition of a system comprising two terms, viz. [+Verbiage] and [no Verbiage]. This means that in Halliday’s model, [verbal: semiosis] clauses have the option of being neither projecting nor combining with Verbiage. This, however, appears to me impossible: if a [verbal] clause neither projects nor combines with Verbiage, it must be regarded as a [verbal: activity] clause (see the account of this clause type later in the section).
of ORDER OF SAYING. The Process in these subtypes is typically realized by a verb from the following list (quoted from a more extensive one in IFG3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>Examples of verbs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Activity]</td>
<td>praise, insult, abuse, flatter, blame, criticize</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Targeting]</td>
<td>speak, talk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Talking]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1.3b. Verbs serving as Process in clauses of [activity]. Source: IFG3: 255.

An example of a clause of [talking] is:

\[ E x e c u t i v e s \text{ (Sayer)} \ldots \text{ may speak (Process), without voting rights, at board meetings [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 35),} \]

where indeed the verbal process is construed rather like a type of behaviour and not as an act of semiosis, since aspects like message and addressee do not enter into the semantic figure. In terms of the contextual variable of Field, the socio-semiotic process (or 'pragmatic function') reflected in the clause appears to be a regulation of allowable behaviour on the part of executives at board meetings.

The other type of verbal process belonging to the category of [activity] is [targeting], which invariably configures with a participant role that is unique to this specific type of clause, viz. the Target. Unlike the Receiver, which, as previously mentioned, is a benefactive role, the Target appears to be Goal-like, having the character of an 'object of impact', as in connection with prototypical processes like criticize or insult. The last example in this section, however, encodes 'friendly targeting':

\[ F i n a l l y, \text{ we (Sayer) also want to thank (Process) our shareholders and business partners (Target) [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 4),} \]

with our shareholders and business partners construed as those ‘targeted’ by the thanking.

5.1.4. [Relational] clauses

Being concerned with construing figures of being and having, [relational] clauses\(^84\) constitute the third of the three most prominent experiential types. A relatively complex system network applies to this type of clause, of which, however, only the most basic systems are deemed relevant to the purposes of this thesis:

---

\(^{84}\) This section is based on the account in IFG3: 210-48. Specific references will only be given in connection with quotes.
All (or virtually all) [relational] clauses encode a relation of being or having between two participants, but as the above graph reflects, the specific type of relation may be one of three kinds, while at the same time one of two modes must be selected. In terms of TYPE OF RELATION, [intensive] and [circumstantial] clauses express figures of being, whereas [possessive] clauses construe figures of having. As for MODE OF RELATION, a clause may be either one of attribution, in which case the two participant roles of Carrier and Attribute are involved, or one of identification, which entails a double set of participants, viz. Identifier-Identified and Token-Value. Each of the three [relational] clause types will be examined, but only in connection with the [intensive] sub-type will the distinction between the [attributive] and the [identifying] mode be examined in detail.

5.1.4.1. [Relational: intensive] clauses

In the [attributive] mode, [intensive] clauses are concerned with characterization or 'class-membership' (IFG3: 214), with the Attribute indicating the class to which the Carrier is assigned. Thus:

*I* 2005 Novo Nordisk (Carrier) *was* (Process) *one of many companies listed as paying fees to the Iraqi government* (Attribute) [...]. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 3)

In this clause, the construal of class-membership is immediately apparent, in that the Attribute is realized by a nominal group which indicates the class of companies (= those *listed as paying fees* etc.) to which the Carrier *Novo Nordisk* belongs. Instead of an entity, however, the Attribute may also consist in a quality:

[Intensive] and [attributive]: [*T*he last year (Carrier) *has been* (Process) *very eventful* (Attribute) (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2),

in which the Carrier is assigned to the class of years distinguished by the quality *very eventful*. The relationship established by [attributive] clauses is thus one of instantiation (the Carrier as an *instance* of a type), whereas in the [identifying] mode of [intensive] clauses, class membership is ‘narrow[ed] down [...] to a class of one’, to use Halliday’s own succinct formulation (IFG3: 228). The relationship established in these clauses is thus one of identity between two participants, where one, the Identifier, represents the means of identifying the other participant, the Identified:
(A freely invented example:) That small flat (Identified) was (Process) my home for years (Identifier).

Here, that small flat is identified through its status as my home for years. Another example is:

[Our portfolio of modern insulins (Token/Identified) was (Process) the key driver of our solid business performance in 2009 (Value/Identifier) […] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2),

where the key driver (etc.) represents the distinguishing, i.e. the identifying feature of Our portfolio (etc.). As indicated in the analysis, however, the link between the two participants may also be viewed in different terms, namely as a relation of signification, with one participant occupying the role of signifier and the other that of signified (cf. LC: 306). It is this relation of ‘symbolization’ which is reflected in the IFG3 labels Token and a Value. Thus, in the above example the key driver (etc.) represents the signified content of Our portfolio (etc.). This type of relationship may be even more easily recognizable in a clause like:

The subpoena (Token) indicates (Process) [[that the documents are necessary for the investigation of potential criminal offences …]] (Value). (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 84)

As this example reflects, it is possible for a participant to be realized by a clause. In the present case, the clause ‘that the documents […]’ construes the content of what is signified by The subpoena. Structurally, the Token usually appears before, and the Value after the Process, but the order may also be reversed:

The main contributor to growth in 2009 (Value) was (Process) sales of modern insulins … (Token). (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 8)

In this clause, The main contributor (etc.) encodes the significance of sales (etc.) and not the other way round. As for the mapping between Token and Value on the one hand and Identifier and Identified on the other, both combinations are possible. Usually, it appears, the Token maps onto the Identifier and the Value onto the Identified, but the conflation Token/Identifier and Value/Identified is also possible. However, it should be pointed out that for purposes of simplification, the role set Identifier and Identified will be left out of consideration henceforth. The double set of participant roles is a complicating factor in textual analysis, and the Identifier-Identified set carries less explanatory value than Token and Value.

5.1.4.2. [Relational: circumstantial] clauses
As previously mentioned, [relational] clauses of the [circumstantial] subtype realize figures of being as do [intensive] clauses, and in both types the prototypical verb serving as Process is be. In [circumstantial] clauses, however, the relation established is that between a participant and a so-called element of circumstance (an adverbial element, in traditional grammatical terms). In other words, these clauses relate a participant to ‘adverbial’ features like time, place, manner, cause and degree. Examples are:

85 For the full IFG3 list of verbs functioning as Process in each of the three different relational clause types, see tables 1-3 in Appendix 5.
Ultra-long-acting Degludec (Carrier) is (Process) in phase 3 clinical trials (Attribute) (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 18),

which locates the Carrier spatially by means of the prepositional phrase in phase 3 clinical trials (which, to be exact, denotes a figurative ‘space’), and:


where, likewise, the being is construed in relation to spatial location. An example of a participant representing causal circumstantiality is:

The development (Carrier) is (Process) due to increased absence related to illness (Attribute) (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 93),

where once again the Attribute encodes the circumstantial feature. It should be mentioned that in certain cases the circumstantiality is construed in the Process, and not by a participant, as in a freely invented example like altercations followed the board meeting, which relates the two participants altercations and the board meeting to each other in time (the altercations occur after the meeting). For the sake of avoiding less relevant details, however, this phenomenon will not be pursued here. Likewise, the question of relational mode will be ignored in this type of clause: all three of the above examples should probably be interpreted as being [attributive] in mode, but the distinction between attribution and identification appears to me unconvincing when applied to [circumstantial] clauses (Halliday, too, (IFG3: 243) acknowledges that the distinction is less obvious than in connection with [intensive] clauses).

5.1.4.3. [Relational: possessive] clauses

The final [relational] clause type is the [possessive] one, which, as previously noted, is concerned with figures of having. Have is indeed the prototypical verb in this clause type, as in:

We believe that we (Carrier) have (Process) an obligation and an opportunity to develop new and better therapies (Attribute) […] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 3),

where a possessive relation is established between we and an obligation and an opportunity (…). Other important manifestations of possession consist in containment:

The EU Takeover Bids Directive (Carrier) […] contains (Process) certain rules relating to listed companies (Attribute) […] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 85),

or in composition:

The framework for our corporate governance system (Token/Identified) consists of (Process) internal principles as well as external regulation and codes (Value/Identifier) […]. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 37)

The distinction between attribution and identification as the two modes of relation makes better sense in this connection, with the 'containment' clause above (The EU Takeover etc.) as an example of the attributive mode. In this clause, the participant certain rules etc. is thus encoded as a feature or quality of The EU Takeover Bids Directive, whereas in the
‘composition’ clause above (‘The framework [...]’), identity is established between an entity (the Identified) and its component parts (the Identifier). In terms of signification, the components internal principles, external regulation and codes represent the ‘content’ beneath the surface of The framework.

5.1.5. [Behavioural] clauses

The behavioural category is the second of the three ‘minor’ experiential clause types in the system of PROCESS TYPE, and like [existential] clauses (see next section), but unlike the first four types accounted for, the structural configuration is simple and of a single kind only, which means that no system or system network applies to the category. Apart from the Process, the only participant is the Behaver, who is the agent, or rather the (mostly human) vehicle of physiological and psychological processes such as sleep, doze, yawn, sneeze, cough, laugh, cry, dream, stare (IFG3: 251; 253).

Having no distinct characteristics of its own, the behavioural category must be regarded as a theoretically weak one: it does indeed occupy a ‘middle ground’, being defined as ‘partly like the material and partly like the mental’ by Halliday (IFG3: 250). Behavioural clauses are, however, clearly distinguishable from [material: transitive] ones, which always construe the impact of a process, initiated by an agent, on a different participant (the Goal) (cf. section 5.1.1). [Behavioural] clauses, on the other hand, never involve impact, which is why a second participant is never present. [Behavioural] clauses featuring processes realized by verbs such as lie (in the sense of ‘be lying down’), sit and dance, however, are close to overlapping with [material] clauses of the [intransitive] type (IFG3: 251), and in the same way processes represented by verbs like worry and dream might be mistaken for [mental] ones. As previously mentioned, the problem stems from the topological nature of the experiential clause grammar, and no other and more viable distinctions seem possible.

5.1.6. [Existential] clauses

The final clause type to be examined, viz. the [existential] one also encodes figures of being, but is much simpler in configuration, with the following as a typical example:

While there are (Process) problems (Existent) at an industry level, there are (Process) also significant opportunities (Existent). (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5)

The above sentence consists of two clauses, both of which are in fact [existential] in type, and both of which are typical in realization, featuring there as the so-called ‘preliminary subject’ known from traditional grammar in combination with the verb be as Process. Apart from these elements, the role represented by the Existent is virtually self-explanatory, being the participant construed as existing or, in certain cases, coming into being. Some verbs typically serving as Process in [material] clauses, such as occur, happen, arise, emerge, may double as Process in [existential] clauses, but the configuration with the ‘pre-

---

86 In terms of the so-called ergative perspective on the clause, which will be ignored in this account, behavioural clauses are invariably ‘middle’ (see IFG3: 284-301 and LC: 229-35).
87 In certain cases, it must be acknowledged, an extra participant named Behaviour is in fact present, but is Scope-like, and not Goal-like in character, as in he gave a great yawn (example taken from IFG3: 251), where the lexical verb is semantically weak and the Process really construed in the nominalization yawn. The category, however, has no relevance to my analytical purposes and will not be examined further.
88 This section is based on IFG3: 256-59.
liminary subject 'there' appears to be what distinguishes such clauses from [material] ones, as in freely invented (and slightly archaic?) examples like *there arose a spectacle* or *there occurred a clash of interests*, in which a *spectacle* and a *certain resistance* are not construed as Actors but rather as vehicles of processes consisting in coming-into-being. What on the other hand distinguishes [existential] from [relational] clauses is that the former involve one participant only, viz. the Existent, whereas the latter always involve two participants whose relation is what is construed in the clause.

5.1.7. CIRCUMSTANTIATION

In the experiential perspective, the configuration of Process+participants constitutes the core – the so-called Nucleus (LC: 222) - of the clause, and selection among the different types of nuclear configuration (according to the system of PROCESS TYPE, as outlined in the previous sections) is obligatory. However, as previously indicated (see section 5.1), the experiential clause grammar includes the possibility of introducing further, but more peripheral constituents, labelled circumstantial elements in SFG. These elements are all optional ones in the clause, which means that alongside the system of PROCESS TYPE, each type of circumstance is to be modelled as a system with two basic terms: absence/presence. In the model below, one of these systems has been included as an example:

![Fig. 5.1.7. PROCESS TYPE and one circumstantial system.](image)

*Source: LC: 190 (adapted by author)*

As a 'zone' of experiential clause grammar, these circumstantial systems are collectively termed CIRCUMSTANTIATION (LC: 327). Apart from the difference in label, however, the concept of circumstantial element corresponds to what is more traditionally known as adverbial elements (cf. Vestergaard 1985: 71-78) or adjuncts (cf. Huddleston and Pullum 2002: ch. 8). A circumstantial element is realized either by a prepositional phrase or an adverb, and it serves to specify the circumstances under which the process (the doing/happening/saying etc.) unfolds (IFG3: 260-61). The different types of circumstance are thus well-known ones like time, place and manner, but the general categorization may be slightly different from traditional accounts. The SFG categories (IFG3: 262-63) are Extent, Location, Manner, Cause, Contingency, Accompaniment, Role, Matter and Angle, each of which is subdivided into to two, three or four more specific types. Not all of the general
categories are self-explanatory, but the classification of circumstantial elements plays only a very limited part in the empirical investigation in this thesis, which is why a more detailed examination of the categories is deemed irrelevant.\textsuperscript{89}

5.2. The interpersonal grammar of the clause

As outlined in the previous section, the clause in its experiential function serves as representation, by construing figures consisting of processes, participants and attendant circumstances. Interpersonally, on the other hand, the clause serves as a vehicle of action, by constituting a move in the dialogic exchange between the interactant parties (speaker and addressee, irrespective of the channel of the communication, i.e. be it oral or graphic) (IFG3: 106). Semantically, the 'content' of the exchange is either a) information or b) 'goods-and-services', both of which may be either c) given or d) demanded (ibid.: 107; Halliday 1984/2003: 227-228). Thus, in terms of speech function, the combination of ‘demanding’ and 'information' realizes a question, whereas ‘giving’ combined with 'information' constitutes a statement. Coupling ‘demanding’ with ‘good-and-services’, on the other hand, corresponds to the speech function of request or command, whereas ‘giving’ in conjunction with ‘goods-and-services’ amounts to an offer (IFG3: 108; Halliday 1984/2003: 229).

Statements and questions are termed propositions under one, and commands and offers are termed proposals in SFG (IFG3: 110-11). All these semantic entities form the system of speech function, of which, however, the above is only a partial outline (for accounts of speech function taken to much further detail, see Eggins and Slade (1997: ch. 5) and Hassan (1992/2009: 282-286)).

5.2.1. Mood and Residue

Grammatically, the semantic system of speech function, as outlined above, has its reflex in the system of mood type (see also section 2.3), which might be regarded as the ‘core’ of the interpersonal clause grammar:

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{mood_type_diagram.png}
\caption{The system of MOOD TYPE and dependent systems. \textit{Source:} IFG3: 23 (adapted by author)}
\end{figure}

Thus, [imperative] clauses (the first term in the mood type system) carry the speech function of command/request, whereas the distinction in the more delicate system of indicative type (i.e. between [declarative] and [interrogative] clauses) corresponds to the difference between statement and question. The ‘odd one out’ is the speech function of offer.

---

\textsuperscript{89} A detailed chart of general categories as well as specific types of circumstantial elements with examples of realization is however reproduced from IFG3 as Appendix 6. As a 'zone' in the experiential clause grammar, CIRCUMSTANTIATION is pictured along with transitivity (the system network branching off from PROCESS TYPE) in Appendix 7.
which has no separate grammatical reflex, but is typically realized by an interrogative clause containing modality like *would you like a cup of coffee* (offer of ‘goods’) or *shall I hold the seat for you?* (offer of ‘service’). In passing, it must be conceded that the semantic category of ‘offer’ is not uncontroversial, its validity being questioned by Andersen (2011) and Harder (2010: 132), but the discussion will be ignored here since the category plays no role in connection with the empirical analyses later in this thesis.

The above paradigmatic distinctions (in MOOD TYPE etc.), of course, are well-known from traditional grammar. The SFG interpretation of the interpersonal syntagmatic organization of the clause, on the other hand, departs from traditional accounts in important respects, and will be more closely examined in the following. As for interpersonal structure, the clause is divided between the two general constituents termed Mood and Residue, of which the former consists of the two structural functions Subject and Finite, with the latter of these being realized by the finite verb in the verbal group. The Mood is underlined in the following example:

*Overall we have improved our productivity [*…*].* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)

The presence of a Mood element is the distinguishing feature of [indicative] clauses, whereas in [imperative] clauses it is absent. Moreover, it is the order of the Subject and the Finite which determines the [indicative] type: Subject ^ Finite realizes a [declarative] clause, and the reverse order (Finite ^ Subject) an [interrogative] one (cf. section 2.3). These features must be mentioned, but are obviously ‘basic grammar’, representing no insight that is unique to SFG. What appears to be a unique SFG understanding, on the other hand, is the recognition of the Mood element as a functional entity: according to Halliday, it is to be regarded as the interpersonal core of the clause (IFG3: 120), being the element which carries the arguability of a proposition and the negotiability of a proposal. Thus, in the above example, we *have* is the element which exposes the statement to the possibility of questioning, and the one to recur in a potential query about its validity: *Have you really? I don’t think you have!* And if the proposition were to be reasserted, the Mood element would reappear in an imaginable retort like *Yes, we have indeed – just look at the statistics.* Similarly, the Mood is what puts a proposal ‘up for negotiation’, i.e. invites either acceptance or refusal, as in the (freely invented) example from above: *Would you like a cup of coffee?*, with the Mood serving as the element carrying the clause’s interpersonal function of offer, and which would recur in a (somewhat blunt) refusal like *No, I won’t.*

As indicated above, the Mood is the central element in the interpersonal strand of the clause, and the remaining clausal elements more peripheral, which may be reflected in the fact that the SFG term for this remainder is the Residue. It consists, first and foremost, of the two functions Predicator and Complement, of which the former is invariably realized by all the verbs in the verbal group apart from the initial auxiliary. If the verbal group consists of one verb only (the lexical verb), this will have the shared function of Finite in the Mood and Predicator in the Residue. The other element, the Complement, is the function

---

90 The following account (of the Mood element in the interpersonal clause grammar) will be based on IFG3: 111-21.
91 Because of the lesser interpersonal significance of the Residue, a more sketchy account of this element has been deemed appropriate. The account will be based on IFG3: 121-23.
which is the counterpart of the Subject, in the sense that it has the potential to fill this other role. Thus, in the example

*We (Subject) are (Finite) exploring (Predicate) the possibilities of an oral GLP-1 preparation (Complement) […]* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 16),

the Complement would take the place of Subject in a passivization of the clause, and the original Subject would be shifted to the role of Complement:

*The possibilities of an oral GLP-1 preparation (Subject) are (Finite) being explored (Predicate) by us (Complement).*

The role of Complement is typically occupied by a nominal group (i.e. one with a noun as Head\(^{92}\)), but it may also be adjectivally realized, as in:

*Some types of haemophilia (Subject) are (Finite/Predicate) particularly rare (Complement) […].* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 26)

In this case, the element *particularly rare* cannot be shifted to the role of Subject, but serves as Complement nevertheless.

### 5.2.2. The Subject in SFG

To return to the Mood element and its constituents, SFG offers a functional definition of the Subject which is not found in more traditional accounts. Thus, in Huddleston and Pul-lum (2002: 235), the Subject is merely defined ‘[…] as that functional element in the structure of the clause that prototypically expresses: (i) the semantic role of agent, and (ii) the presentational status of topic\(^ {93}\).’ This, however, is not a satisfactory definition of the function as such, but only a specification of a typical conflation pattern. In contrast, the cogency of Halliday’s interpretation consists in the clear assignment of the Subject to a particular metafunction, viz. the interpersonal, and a precise definition of its semantic role. In Halliday’s definition, it is the element responsible for the ‘validity’ of the clause’s function as a proposition or its ‘success’ in the case of a proposal (IFG3: 117). Thus, in the previous example (‘Overall we have increased our productivity […]’), we is indicated as the element which validates the proposition: the statement about (somebody) having increased the productivity is valid with reference to we – but invalid with reference to others. Likewise, in the case of a proposal such as *shall I hold the door for you?*, it is the Subject I which is indicated as the one responsible for making ‘holding the door’ a successful offer, i.e. the one to whom the power of fulfilling the offer is attributed.

### 5.2.3. The Finite

It is now time to consider the Finite in more detail, also because this structural element (realized by the finite verb in the verbal group) is one of the gateways into a relatively extensive area of the interpersonal metafunction, viz. that of modality. As for function, the Finite is deictic, i.e. it relates a proposition or proposal to the context – more particularly

---

92 In the SFG interpretation, nouns and adjectives may equally serve as Head in the nominal group.

93 For the clausal structure of topic vs. comment, which is recognized by SFG as the structural manifestation of the textual metafunction, see section 5.3.1.
the point of view of the speaker/the interlocutors (IFG3: 116). This point of view may be established either temporally, by situating the proposition/proposal in the past, present or future vis-à-vis the moment of speaking (ibid.), or it may be realized modally (ibid.), whereby the speaker’s perspective is expressed in terms of obligation, inclination, probability or usuality, in the shape of modal verbs like should, may, will, must etc. Paradigmatically, the options open to the Finite are organized in the system of MODAL DEIXIS, which is:

![Fig. 5.2.3. MODAL DEIXIS and dependent systems. Source: IFG3: 135 (adapted by author)](image)

This graph also shows the more delicate systems branching off from MODAL DEIXIS. Of these, PRIMARY TENSE will be regarded as self-explanatory, whereas the two systems of modality will be considered in more detail in the following.

In the system of MODALITY TYPE, the labels of the two terms in the system (modalization and modulation) appear to be specific to SFG, but the content of the two concepts is recognizable as epistemic and deontic modality, respectively, as represented in an account like Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 180-212). In Halliday’s interpretation, [modalization] is concerned with degrees of probability and usuality, and [modulation] with degrees of obligation and inclination (IFG3: 147). Thus, [modalization] is confined to propositions, whereas [modulation] – obligation especially – occurs in propositions and proposals alike (ibid.). Examples, with categorization indicated in parentheses, are:

[Probability]: *Disciplinary action may include retraining, dismissal or other appropriate discipline of the individual involved* […] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 35)

[Usuality]: *He would take the same walk every day* (freely invented example).

[Inclination]: *Most people would prefer a tablet to an injection* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 20)

[Obligation]: *Another issue we must address* […] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 6)

---

94 It should be noted that the representation of MODAL DEIXIS and dependent systems is a fragment of the total system network (termed MOOD) which governs the interpersonal grammar of the clause (the major part of the network being reproduced in Appendix 8), and it should further be noted that the representation is a simplification: MODAL DEIXIS and the dependent systems represent a continuation in delicacy of the term [indicative] in the system of MOOD TYPE, as well as a term from a system not previously introduced, viz. FINITENESS. The term [finite] from this latter system is the one represented as the entry condition to the system of MODAL DEIXIS above.
Semantically, the first three examples are propositions, all of them serving to convey information. The last example, on the other hand, is a proposal, constituting a ‘demand’ for a ‘service’ consisting in the addressing of an issue. The example illustrates that the exclusive identification of commands, i.e. ‘demands for goods-and-service’, with the grammatical category of imperatives is too simplistic. A modulated [declarative] clause may also encode a proposal, especially in combination with an interactant person (‘1st’ or ‘2nd person’) as Subject (cf. IFG3: 147-48), as in the present instance (we).

As appears from the system graph in figure 5.2b, a selection must be made not only between different types of modality but also between different degrees, which is what the parallel system of MODAL VALUE is concerned with. Once again, it should be acknowledged that the insight that modality is gradable is not the monopoly of SFG (cf. Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 186-188; 207-188). The formulation of such gradability as a paradigmatic set applying to all four kinds of modality, however, appears to be unique to SFG. Below, the three terms in the system ([high]/[median]/[low]) will be exemplified in their intersection with one type of modulation (obligation) and one type of modalization (probability). The intersection has in fact already been illustrated in respect of [high] obligation, which was the exact type of modulation encoded in the clause ‘Another issue we must address [...]’, where the obligation encoded by must is equivalent to deontic necessity. [Median] obligation, on the other hand, is typically expressed by should, as in

[N]o child should die of diabetes. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 22)

As for [low] obligation, an example is

All shareholders may, no later than 1 February, request that proposals for resolutions be included on the agenda [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 37),

where the [low] obligation encodes a permission, by specifying the allowable behaviour of a third party.

With respect to probability, the example given previously represented the [low] degree, equivalent to possibility: ‘Disciplinary action may include retraining [...]’. Median-value probability in fact corresponds to likelihood, as in

Oh, someone’s coming. That will be John (example partly taken from IFG3: 622),

whereas [high] probability is equivalent to logical necessity:

How can you do something like that? You must be out of your mind (freely invented example).

5.2.4. Modality outside the Finite
All the examples given in the preceding sub-section were instances of verbal modality, but it should be emphasized that modality is not restricted to verbal realization. It may also

---

95 The oversimplification may have been inherent in the summary account given in section 5.2.1 of the way the various speech functions are grammaticalized in the system of MOOD TYPE. Now is the time to introduce more nuance.
enter the clause in the shape of so-called mood Adjuncts, which are typically realized by adverbs such as *usually, certainly, likely, probably, possibly*, etc. (cf. IFG3: 126-28):

*Post-employment benefit plans are usually funded by payments from group companies* [...]. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 72)

Modality is in fact only one of the areas of interpersonal meaning that mood Adjuncts may express. The two other areas are intensity and temporality, respectively, as reflected in the graph below:

![Diagram of mood Adjuncts](image)

**Fig. 5.2.4a. The system of mood Adjuncts (dependent on the term [+mood assessment] in the system of MOOD ASSESSMENT - see below). Source: IFG3: 128 (adapted by author)**

As for realizations of mood Adjuncts of temporality, examples are *soon* (= [relative to now]) and *already* (= [relative to expectation]), and examples of intensity Adjuncts are *entirely* (= [degree: total]), *almost* (= [degree: high]) *scarcely* (= [degree: low]), *even* (= [counterexpectancy: exceeding]) and *only* (= [counterexpectancy: limiting]) (IFG3: 128-29). No more detailed account of mood Adjuncts is deemed necessary, apart from a comment on their structural position: their presence in a clause complicates the previously given definition of the Mood element as consisting of Subject and Finite only, since mood Adjuncts are in fact often – though not always – positioned in the Mood (cf. IFG3: 124-26), as in the following example:

*Novo Nordisk (Subject) only (modal Adjunct) hedges (Finite) invested equity in major foreign affiliates to a very limited extent.* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 75)

It should also be mentioned that mood Adjuncts represent only one kind of Adjunct, other types being so-called circumstantial and conjunctive Adjuncts (IFG3: 125). Of these, circumstantial Adjuncts (as the label implies) map onto circumstantial elements in the experiential clause structure, i.e. elements of Time, Place, Manner etc. (see section 5.1.7), and conjunctive Adjuncts are those with a primarily textual, i.e. ‘connective’ function, examples being *however, moreover, therefore, consequently, on the other hand* (IFG3: 82; 132-33). Altogether, Adjuncts are defined by their peripheral status in the interpersonal clause grammar: ‘An Adjunct is an element that has not got the potential to become Subject; that
is, it cannot be elevated to the interpersonal status of modal responsibility’ (IFG3: 123), and Halliday stresses that the different functional categories of the interpersonal clause grammar must be graded in terms of centrality/peripherality, with the Subject at the core, the Complement in a less central and Adjuncts in the most peripheral role (IFG3: 123-24). The different categories of Adjuncts, moreover, appear to form a cline with regard to interpersonal status, too: mood Adjuncts are ‘truly’ interpersonal in meaning, whereas Halliday acknowledges (IFG3: 132) that conjunctive Adjuncts are on the very fringe of the interpersonal grammar, since they really belong to the textual metafunction. In the same way, circumstantial Adjuncts really belong to the experiential metafunction, but it does not appear from IFG3 whether these are exactly as interpersonally marginal as the textual Adjuncts. One possible interpretation of the SFG treatment of Adjuncts is that the incorporation of all three types (modal, circumstantial and conjunctive) into the interpersonal clause structure is a dictate of the logic behind the three-strand perspective, i.e. the view that all three metafunctions are intertwined in the clause. This logic appears to require all elements in a clause to be assignable to all three metafunctions at the same time, e.g. in the way the functions of Subject, Actor and Theme\footnote{With regard to the textual clause constituent labelled Theme, see section 5.3.} may be conflated in the same element. The question is, however, if this triple assignment of all clausal elements is really necessary, considering that the logic does not apply to group rank, where e.g. not all elements in the VG select from systems from all three metafunctions (cf. IFG3: 349). It therefore appears to me that it might be wiser to leave circumstantial and conjunctive Adjuncts out of the interpersonal perspective altogether and leave them in each of the two respective metafunctions in which they originate. Strikingly, circumstantial and conjunctive Adjuncts are not represented in the general system network (called MOOD) of the interpersonal clause grammar:\footnote{A more detailed graph of the network (incorporating some of the more delicate systems not reproduced in the graph below (Figure 5.2.4b)) is represented in Appendix 8.}
As the above graph reflects, the system of MOOD ASSESSMENT is concerned with the absence/presence of a mood Adjunct, and not just any Adjunct. It should be mentioned, however, that there is a further type of 'truly' interpersonal Adjuncts, viz. so-called comment Adjuncts, which have not been included in the above graph. The reason is that these Adjuncts serve the function of encoding the speaker’s subjective comment on the proposition/proposal, which makes them rare in LSP registers, and virtually absent in the specific medical text types that provide the empirical basis of the present thesis. Suffice it to say that in IFG3 (p. 135) the status of comment Adjuncts in the interpersonal clause grammar is modelled as a system named COMMENT, which is simultaneous with SUBJECT PERSON and MOOD TYPE, thus sharing the entry condition [free]. The terms of the system are [+comment]/[no comment], representing the possibility of either inserting of omitting an Adjunct of this type.

5.2.5. Remaining systems: FREEDOM, FINITENESS, SUBJECT PERSON and POLARITY

With regard to the four systems from the above network (MOOD, fig. 5.2.4b - see also Appendix 8) which remain to be accounted for, a summary treatment is deemed sufficient. Thus, the system of FREEDOM equals the choice between [free] and [bound] clauses, the former term representing independent clauses, i.e. the ‘main’ or ‘superordinate’ clause in a clause complex, and the latter comprising subordinate clauses and so-called embedded ones. Of these, embedded clauses are those which serve as constituents at group level –
typically as Postmodifier in a nominal group, which is why they are often referred to as ‘downranked’ clauses in SFG, i.e. ones which have been transferred from clause to group rank. An example of a clause complex featuring all three types is the following:

(β:) To raise awareness of the need for a successful outcome of the UN Climate Change Conference held in Copenhagen in December 2009, (α:) Novo Nordisk provided seed money and was a driving force behind the World Business Summit on Climate Change [[held in May 2009]]. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 33)

The SFG convention of symbolizing hypotactic clause relations by means of Greek letters is followed here (as throughout this thesis), indicating that the first clause (‘To raise [...]’) is the dependent/subordinate one, symbolized by β, and the second (‘Novo Nordisk provided [...]’) the independent/superordinate one, symbolized by α (for further notes on SFG notation in relation to clause complexing, see section 5.4.1). The clause marked by double square brackets (held in May 2009) is an embedded one serving as Postmodifier in the nominal group whose Head is Summit.

The MOOD system network (fig. 5.2.4b) also reveals that the choice between finiteness and non-finiteness (in the system of Finiteness) is open only to [bound] clauses, whereas finiteness is a so-called selection restriction on [free] clauses, i.e. these can only be [finite].98 An example of a clause complex featuring both types is:

(α:) We will continue our work to develop a next generation climate action strategy, (β:) taking into account signals from the summit process (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 36),

where the α-clause is [finite], owing to the presence of the Mood element we will, and the β-clause is [non-finite], by having only a Predicator (realized by the present participle taking) and no Mood element.

The system network graph (fig. 5.2.4b) also shows that the system of Mood Type is only one of two simultaneous systems open to [free] clauses, the other being that of Subject Person. This system, however, is linked with that of Nominal Person at group rank, and will therefore be detailed in the account of group level systems (see section 5.5.1).

The final system to be examined in this section is the rather simple one of Polarity, which is concerned with the absence or presence of negation (IFG3: 22-23). The term [positive] implies the absence, and the term [negative] the presence of a negation (often realized by not):

Giving products away is not sustainable. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 6)

The label polarity refers to the fact that the two terms in the system represent semantic opposites. Thus, removing the negation not from the above clause would obviously entail a complete reversal in meaning.

A final point to be made in this section concerns the relation of Polarity to another area of interpersonal semantics, more specifically that of modality. In Halliday’s very persuasive interpretation, the two terms in Polarity represent the opposite poles on a cline where

98 [Imperative] clauses form a special case: in spite of having no Mood element (at least in most cases) and only a Predicator, they nevertheless count as finite (IFG3: 183-84).
the intermediate areas are occupied by the three different degrees of modality (IFG3: 147). Thus, where the proposition in the last example (*Giving products away is not sustainable*) is located at the negative pole on the cline, deleting the negation and introducing low probability would constitute the first step up the cline towards ‘positive’ meaning: *giving products away may be sustainable*. The next step would be median probability, as in *giving products away is probably sustainable*, and high probability (*giving products away must be sustainable*) the last step but one before the unqualified, positive statement is reached: *giving products away is sustainable.*

This concludes the account of the interpersonal clause grammar.

5.3. Textual clause grammar

In the two previous sections (5.1 and 5.2), the organization of the grammar (at clause rank) was examined from the perspective of each of the two strands of meaning that interface with text-external context, i.e. experiential and interpersonal semantics. The third strand (the textual metafunction), on the other hand, consists in meaning that is primarily concerned with the internal organization of the text (cf. section 2.1). Textual meaning is linked with the clause’s function as message, and it has its reflex in the clausal systems known as THEME, VOICE and INFORMATION, respectively, of which the former two are grammatical systems (or system networks, to be correct), whereas the latter in fact operates at the stratum of phonology. This is why only THEME and VOICE are deemed relevant to the present thesis, whose empirical data consists of written texts only (for the system of INFORMATION, see IFG3: 87-92 and LC: 605-7).

5.3.1. Thematic clause structure (THEME)

So-called thematic clause structure\(^{100}\) is the grammatical resource for assigning topical status to one element in the clause and the status of ‘comment’ to the rest. Hence, from this perspective, the clause is a configuration of two distinct constituents, viz. the Theme and the Rheme, each with a clearly defined function. The former is – exactly as the label implies – the function which indicates what the clause ‘is about’, whereas the latter represents the ‘content’ of the message. The contrasting functions of the two constituents are also reflected in fixed positions in the clause: the Theme is identified by its clause-initial position, extending from the beginning of the clause up till, and including, the first so-called topical element, which is the first element in the experiential structure. Thus:

*Sales of diabetes care products increased by 12% measured in Danish kroner to DKK 37,502 million and by 11% in local currencies compared to 2008.* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 8)

In this clause, the underlined element is the Theme of the clause, which means that *Sales of diabetes care products* is what the message of the clause is about. For the actual content of the message, we must look to the rest of the clause, the Rheme, which predicates an increase of 12% etc. about these sales. In other words, the textual meaning of the clause may be glossed as: ‘We want to tell you about sales of diabetes care products: you should know

\(^{99}\) *Must* in the sense of ‘logical necessity’ here.

\(^{100}\) This section is based on IFG3: 64-87.
that they increased …’.

In [declarative] clauses, the unmarked choice is for the Theme to conflate with the Subject, whereby the message takes its point of departure in the core element of the modal structure. This was the case in the above example, where sales of diabetes care products served as Theme and Subject alike. Alternatively, Theme and Subject do not conflate, as in the following example:

At the end of 2009, 40% of our modern insulin volume in the US (Subject) was sold in FlexPen®. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 8)

In this case, the clause takes its point of departure in At the end of 2009, which is a circumstantial element (an Adjunct in the interpersonal structure), whereas the Subject is 40% of our modern insulin volume in the US. The textual meaning of this clause is therefore something like: ‘We are going to talk about the state of affairs at the end of 2009: we want you to know that 40% etc.’ Paradigmatically, the system concerned with thematic structure in [declarative] clauses (named THEME SELECTION) may therefore be modelled as follows:

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject and Theme not conflated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
---

Fig. 5.3.1. The system of THEME SELECTION. Sources: IFG3: 80; LC: 540 (adapted by author)

As already indicated, a [marked] Theme entails presenting the message of the clause from a perspective which deviates from the most ‘obvious’ one (Subject as Theme). Typically, a [marked] Theme occurs if the speaker needs to stress a particular focus, e.g. when the focus of the discourse is about to change. This is the case in the following example:

To challenge ourselves to continuously improve, we are introducing new pilot programmes in 2010 to cultivate new ways of thinking and working in several parts of our business. Another issue we (Subject) must address is the fundamental trust society has in healthcare companies. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 6)

Had an [unmarked] Theme been selected in the last clause (such as *We must address the issue of society’s trust in ...), the reader might have been led to believe that the message of the clause was a simply a continuation of the previous clauses, carrying new information, of course, but with the same focus. The [marked] Theme actually chosen, however, serves to prepare the reader for the fact that a change of topic is about to follow.

The important point is that the frequency of [marked] versus [unmarked] Themes is register-dependent, with [marked] Themes being much more frequent in written than spoken text. As Halliday points out (IFG3: 73), the focus of spoken discourse is often interpersonal, which means that the Subject is typically a personal pronoun which serves as

---

101 This is only one of the systems from the THEME network, but the only one which is considered relevant for the purposes of this thesis. Since the vast majority of clauses in my empirical material are [declarative], the present account will focus on thematic structure in this clause type only.
Theme as well. Introducing [marked] Themes in spoken dialogue is unusual and would amount to an increase in formality, as in the second of the following two freely invented examples:

(unmarked Theme): I don’t think you’ve bought the proper kind of dog food.
(marked Theme): As for dog food, I don’t think you’ve bought the proper kind.

In the second of these examples, the [marked] theme selection means that the interactant (i.e. ‘speaker or addressee’) Subject I is displaced from the centre of attention, creating a slightly more formal Tenor through the choice of an experiential rather than an interpersonal focus.

Before leaving the account of thematic clause structure, it should be noted that the discovery of this aspect of clause grammar is not a SFG achievement, and similar structural concepts such as Topic and Comment are mentioned in other accounts of grammatical semantics (see Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 237; Murphy and Koskela 2010: 165). Only in SFG, however, is thematic clause structure recognized as the realization of a separate strand of meaning, viz. the textual metafunction.

5.3.2. Voice

The other important system in the textual clause grammar is that of Voice. It should be noted that the phenomenon that concerns us in this section is the clausal system of Voice, which in SFG is distinguished from, but usually interlinked with, the verbal-group system of Voice. In the latter, the terms are the well-known [active] vs. [passive] (IFG3: 349), whereas in the clausal system the terms are [operative] vs. [receptive]:

---

**Fig. 5.3.2. The clausal system of Voice and the dependent system of Agentivity.**

*Source: IFG3: 183 (adapted by author)*

In the words of Matthiessen (LC: 590), Voice is ‘*a resource for varying the mapping between the Subject and the different participant roles in the clause*,’ as reflected in the realization statements of the above system graph, which represents the system as it applies to the participants of [material: transitive] clauses: in an [operative] clause, the participant role of Actor is conflated with the interpersonal function of Subject, whereas in a [receptive] clause the Subject maps onto the participant role of Goal (and the Process is in the passive). Examples are:

---

102 The representation chosen here is limited to [material] clauses, which may be unfortunate, but almost all cases of shifts between [operative] and [receptive] in my empirical material concern [material] clauses. Besides, a model of Voice that would be applicable to clauses of all process types has to take its point of depa-
[Operative]: We (Theme/Subject/Actor) also initiated (Process, with VG in the active) a phase 1 clinical trial of an oral formulation of GLP-1 (Complement/Goal) in January 2010. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 20)

[Receptive]: This formulation (Theme/Subject/Goal) was designed (Process, with VG in the passive) in partnership with Emisphere Technologies. (ibid.)

As the graph (fig. 5.3.2) shows, on selection of the term [receptive], the system of AGENTIVITY is enterable, which means that these clauses afford the choice between specifying or leaving out the Actor. In the latter of the two above examples ('This formulation was designed [...]'), the Actor was ellipsed, whereas it is included below:

The cash-to-earnings ratio (Theme/Subject/Goal) has been positively impacted (Process: passive) by a relatively low level of investments (Actor) during 2008 and 2009 [...]. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 8)

In the present account, VOICE is treated as a feature of the textual clause grammar, which is a perspective adopted from Matthiessen (LC: 590-93), whereas Halliday (IFG3: 297-98) appears to treat the system as an aspect of the experiential grammar. The reason why Matthiessen’s perspective is followed in this account is that VOICE has clear implications for the presentational status of participants, i.e. whether participants are introduced ‘early’ or ‘late’ in the clause: the conflation of a participant with the interpersonal role of Subject equals ‘early’ introduction (or even thematization if the Theme is [unmarked], as it is in all three examples above), leaving the other participant to map onto the Complement, i.e. as late as after the Predicator.

5.4. Clause complexing: the logical mode of the ideational metafunction

Previous sections dealing with ideational clause grammar were focused on the experiential mode of the metafunction, whereas the present section will give brief consideration to the other ‘branch’ of ideational semantics, which is the logical mode. In section 5.1, the clause was examined from the semantic perspective of the figure, i.e. the clause as the grammatical reflex of the experiential configuration of a process and participants, but what remains to be examined is the potential of figures to enter into so-called sequences (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 50-51). This is what takes us to the other mode of ideational grammar, since the ordering of figures into sequences is the semantic province of the logical metafunction. Whereas the experiential semantics of the clause is configurational, the logical metafunction is concerned with semantic relations between figures (LC: 128). A first example is:

(β:) While there are problems at an industry level, (α:) there are also significant opportunities. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5)

Here, two figures of existence (each realized by an [existential] clause) are linked by means of a clause complex (two clauses in one sentence) to construe a sequence. In this
case, the two clauses are joined in an unequal relation, with the first clause in a subordinate, or dependent, position, and the other in a dominant position (being the ‘main’ clause). At the same time, the initial clause expresses ‘concession’ (realized by while) in relation to the proposition of the other clause. As this analysis shows, the grammatical area in question (named clause complexity in SFG) consists of phenomena like tactic relations and different types of ‘adverbial’ clause function – phenomena, in other words, that are in no way unknown to more traditional grammatical accounts. What is unique about the SFG treatment of the area, however, is the association of it with a particular strand of semantics (the logical metafunction), and – as always – the analysis of its paradigmatic organization, which will be examined in the following: \(^{103}\)

![Diagram: Clause Complexities and Dependent Systems](image)

**Fig. 5.4. Clause Complexity and Dependent Systems. Sources: LC: 126 and IFG3: 373 (adapted by author)**

As the system graph reflects, the term [clause complex] is the entry condition of choices relating to tactic as well as logico-semantic relations, and it opens up the possibility of either stopping or ‘going on’, i.e. adding another clause to the complex. \(^{104}\) The first of the three simultaneous systems, that of Taxis, is the one concerned with the tactic relation, i.e. the degree of interdependency between two clauses in a complex. In [parataxis], the clauses are linked but independent of each other and thus equal in status, being joined together by means of conjunctions like and, but and or. \(^{105}\) In a hypotactic relation, on the other hand, one clause is dependent on another clause with dominant status.

### 5.4.1. Excursus on notational conventions

The SFG notational convention, it should be noted, is to indicate paratactically related clauses by numerals (1, 2 etc.), and [hypotaxis] by Greek lettering (α, β, etc.), as previously...

---

\(^{103}\) The following account is based on IFG3: 373-93.

\(^{104}\) This system is, as the name implies, recursive, which means that selection of the term [go on] leads to another instance of complexing. In other words, the selection process starts over with [clause complex] as the entry condition. A proper rendition of the system network should have featured a curved arrow emerging from the term [go on] and pointing back to the term [clause complex] (cf. LC: 126; 139), but this is unfortunately beyond the technical capabilities of the program Sysneteditor4.0 used to produce the system graphs in this thesis.

\(^{105}\) No example is considered necessary. Altogether, the exemplification in this section will be kept to a minimum, because, as noted, most phenomena have a parallel in traditional grammatical accounts.
noted, with the letter $\alpha$ indicating dominant status, and $\beta$ dependent status (and $\gamma$ indicating dependence in relation to a $\beta$-clause etc.). However, in case of intricate complexing, more than one symbol at a time is often necessary to indicate the exact status of a clause within a clause complex, as in the following example:

\[(\beta\alpha: \text{As the global economic environment and the reimbursement environment for medicines developed (} \beta\beta: \text{) as we anticipated, with continuing challenges, (} \alpha: \text{) we are pleased to be able to report very positive results for 2009. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)}\]

In this complex, the structure as a whole is simply $\beta^\alpha$, with the $\beta$-part of the complex (As the global ... continuing challenges) being in itself constituted by an $\alpha^\beta$-complex. That is why the very first of the three clauses is marked as $\beta\alpha$: the $\beta$ indicates that the clause belongs to the dependent part of the 'overall' hypotactic complex, whereas the $\alpha$ indicates that within the $\beta$-part it is the dominant clause. The $\beta\beta$-clause, on the other hand, is 'doubly' dependent in status, belonging to the subordinate part of the 'overall' complex, and being the dependent part of the nested complex as well. Greek letters and numerals may also combine. That would be the case if the wording in the above example had been the following:

*\((\beta1: \text{As the global economic environment recovered}, (\beta2:) \text{and as the reimbursement environment for medicines developed in accordance with our forecasts, (} \alpha: \text{) we are pleased to be able to report ...}\)*

In this case the $\beta1$- and the $\beta2$-clause both belong to the dependent part of the 'overall' complex, but within the nested complex they are paratactically linked, which explains the numbering (1 and 2).

5.4.2. Types of interdependency between clauses in a clause complex

In the system network presented in the preceding section (CLAUSE COMPLEXITY and dependent systems, fig. 5.4), the system of LOGICO-SEMANTIC RELATION is concerned with the type of interdependency between two clauses, the options being [projection] and [expansion]. The former represents the type of link that obtains between either a [verbal] or [mental] clause on the one hand and the clause representing the content of the saying or cognition (or an alternative subtype of mental process). An example is:

\((\alpha: \text{We believe (} \beta: \text{) that access to health is a fundamental human right (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 6)},\)

where the $\alpha$-clause projects the $\beta$-clause as the one representing the content of the process of believing. The content-clause, in other words, is an [idea] clause in this case, whereas clauses of [locution] are the type projected by verbal processes.

The other term in the system of LOGICO-SEMANTIC RELATION is [expansion], which is extended in delicacy below:
Of the three sub-types of [expansion], only the [extending] and [enhancing] ones will be examined here, being the only ones of relevance to my empirical investigation. An example of an [extending] clause is:

(1:) To remain competitive we must constantly innovate, improving treatment outcomes,
(2:) and in this area the last year has been very eventful.

In terms of TYPE OF EXTENSION (the system consequent on the term [extending]), the 2-clause in the complex is [additive]. Had the connector been or, the clause would have been [alternative]. With regard to [enhancing] clauses, an example is:

(β:) When we eat, (α:) the pancreas automatically produces the right amount of insulin […]. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 18)

In terms of TYPE OF ENHANCEMENT (the system branching off from the term [enhancing]), the β-clause is [temporal], qualifying the proposition of the α-clause in terms of a time aspect. In the following example (also hypotactic), the β-clause is [causal]:

(β:) However, because insulin is a protein, (α:) it is rapidly destroyed or degraded in the gastrointestinal tract. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 20)

In function, [enhancing] clauses are analogous to circumstantial elements (realized clause-internally by prepositional phrases), which is why, in more traditional grammatical accounts, their function is considered ‘adverbial’ on a par with prepositional phrases (see e.g. Vestergaard 1985: 220-224). Thus, in a sentence like the following:

Despite progress, children with type 1 diabetes in developing countries continue to have high mortality rates […] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 22),

the initial prepositional phrase Despite progress is analogous to a β-clause like *(β:) Although progress is being made, (α:) children … . Conversely, it is sometimes possible to compress a β-clause into a prepositional phrase, as in the instance below:

---

106 The third option in the system of TYPE OF EXTENSION, viz. [varying], is of no relevance to the present investigation and will not be detailed further.
Since it was founded by Novo Nordisk in 2001, it has supported 219 projects in 90 countries. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 22)

Here, the β-clause may be rephrased as Since its foundation by Novo Nordisk in 2001, it has … .

A final point to be made about clause complexing is that certain types of hypotactic clause complexes have two sequencing options open to them: [progressive] (α^β) and [regressive] (β^α). The two options may thus be modelled as a system which might be labelled CLAUSE SEQUENCING.107 [Regressive] sequencing is the type found in the example immediately above ('Since it was founded [...]'), where the dependent clause precedes the dominant one. In this way, the β-clause comes to function as a [marked] Theme in the clause complex as a whole (cf. IFG3: 393), indicating a certain type of perspective (in the above case a temporal limitation) to be adopted vis-à-vis the proposition of the α-clause.

5.5. The grammar of groups and phrases

Whereas the previous sections were all preoccupied with the grammar of the clause (and clause complexes), it is now time to take a step down the rank scale, i.e. to group/phrase rank. In the SF analysis, a typology of groups is: the nominal group (NG), the verbal group (VG), the adverbial group, the conjunction group and the preposition group (IFG3: 309-59). Moreover, a nominal group may combine with a preposition to form a prepositional phrase (PP) (see section 5.5.2). In accordance with the principle of limiting the account to those areas of SF grammar that are relevant to the present investigation, however, the following examination will confine itself to NGs and PPs, these being the only types of entities at group/phrase rank where shifts108 occur between STs and TTs. In a very limited number of cases, VGs are also affected, but much too infrequently to warrant the extensive account needed to do justice to this complex group type. VGs, along with adverbial and conjunction groups, will therefore be ignored in the present account.

5.5.1. The nominal group

The previous sections examined the clause as a grammatical unit structured to express three simultaneous lines of meaning, each realized by a distinct type of structure coexisting with the two others, whereby one and the same constituent was seen to encode up to three different clause-rank functions at the same time, e.g. Actor/Subject/Theme. Below clause-rank, however, the three-strand principle does not apply to the same extent, which means that the NG is not viewed as a multi-structural configuration, but as an experiential structure primarily, with one particular role assigned to each element in it (cf. IFG3: 311-12). Nevertheless, the other metafunctions, especially the interpersonal one, do manifest themselves in certain of the elements, as will appear from the below.

107 The labels (progressive and regressive) derive from IFG3 (p. 393), where the two options, however, are not represented in any system. The systemic modelling, therefore, is taken from LC (p. 154), though in a simplified version. The system is not named in LC, however, and the name CLAUSE SEQUENCING is my creation. The same, it should be noted, applies to TYPE OF ENHANCEMENT, which is also a label of my invention. For a complete graph of the interrelation of all the systems accounted for in this section (i.e. all systems relating to clause complexing), see Appendix 9.
108 For the concept of shifts, see section 6.1.
The structure of the NG is the following (schematic representation adopted from IFG3: 312):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deictic</th>
<th>Numerative</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>Thing</th>
<th>Qualifier</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Those</td>
<td>two</td>
<td>old</td>
<td>country</td>
<td>houses</td>
<td>with thatched roofs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of experiential structure, the individual elements of the NG are ordered along a cline according to the degree of permanency which each element expresses (LC: 654).\textsuperscript{109} Thus, the Deictic (e.g. this, your, John’s) is the most ‘ephemeral’, situation-bound element, serving to relate the NG to the here and now of the speech event, whereas, at the opposite pole, the Thing encodes the most stable characteristic, assigning the NG to a class of things, such as dog, house, place etc. (in those cases where the Thing is realized by a common noun) (LC: 654). Being the NG’s sine qua non, the Thing is the core of the structure, and will therefore be accounted for first.

5.5.1.1. The Thing

The Thing is subject to the following basic sets of options:

![Fig. 5.5.1.1a. Nominal group systems. Source: LC: 650 (adapted by author)](image)

Most basically, a selection must be made between the two categories of NOMINAL PERSON: [interactant] and [non-interactant], of which the former comprises the two parties involved in the speech event, i.e. speaker (I) and addressee (you), inclusively referred to as we. The [interactant] persons are thus equivalent to the first and the second person, respectively, of traditional grammatical accounts, whereas the term [non-interactant] corresponds to third person (LC: 689). Interactant persons can only be realized by personal pronouns (I, you, we), whereas selection of the feature [non-interactant] opens up the system of NOMINALITY, which consists of the two options [pronominal] (realized by pronouns, i.e. he, she, it, they etc.) and [nominal]. The latter feature, in its turn, gives rise to the system of INDIVIDUATION, whose two terms are [class] (realized by common nouns) and [named individual] (realized by proper names, i.e. Peter, Mary etc.). Only through selection of a common

\textsuperscript{109} The account of NG grammar will to a greater extent than previously be based on LC and IFG3 alike. This is among other things because the LC account provides a more thorough account of the paradigmatic organization of the NG than does IFG3, which is primarily concerned with the syntagmatic perspective.
noun as Thing do the systems of QUALIFICATION, CLASSIFICATION, EPITHESIS, NUMERATION, ORDINATION and DETERMINATION become enterable. These are the systems governing the structural functions preceding and following the Thing, which means that only common nouns allow the introduction of the other structural functions (Classifier, Epithet, etc.).

As previously indicated, selecting a common noun to occupy the role of Thing means assigning the NG to an experiential class, as in:

*There are major (Epithet) healthcare (Classifier) reforms (Thing) sweeping the globe (Qualifier) […]* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 4),

where the word *reforms* indicates the 'type of thing' that the underlined NG belongs to.

THING TYPE is in fact the system which governs this particular structural function:

![Diagram of Thing Type System](image)

*Fig. 5.5.1.1b. The system of THING TYPE. Source: LC: 672*

As appears from the above graph, the primary distinction in the system of THING TYPE is between [conscious] and [non-conscious] 'things', the former being constituted by [humans] and [higher animals] and the latter by [simple] and [complex] 'things' respectively. Unfortunately, the criteria behind these divisions are far from apparent in Matthiessen’s account (LC: 671-85), from which the system is taken, and the system is only presented as ‘tentative’ (LC: 671-72). On the one hand, it appears that the distinctions derive from the different types of participant role which a nominal group can be made to serve at clause rank:

[A] participant is construed relative to some basic type of thing; and this is represented in the Thing of the experiential structure of the nominal group. If the group is nominal rather than pronominal, the Thing is realized by a noun and the resources of THING TYPE become available – the distinctions among things construed by (sets of) nouns in English. (LC: 671)

---

110 It must be conceded that modification of proper names does occur, as in an example like *the dear old Mary*, but in practice modification is the prerogative of common nouns.

111 Strangely, the system of THING TYPE is not featured in the NG system network (figure 5.5.1.1a) adopted from LC: 650. Judging from the account of the system (LC: 671-85), it ought to be simultaneous with those of QUALIFICATION, CLASSIFICATION, EPITHESIS, NUMERATION, ORDINATION and DETERMINATION, and thus share their entry condition [class]. This mystery has had to be left unsolved.
It appears that the primary distinction between [conscious] and [non-conscious] 'things' reflects selection restrictions like those applying to the role of Senser in [mental] clauses: only [conscious] 'things', i.e. humans and higher animals, can serve as Senser, which non-conscious entities obviously cannot (LC: 673). On the other hand, the systemic divisions also seem to be based on so-called grammatical reactancies, i.e. the structural implications of selecting a certain type of noun: 'The system is based partly on the modification potential of different types of thing. For instance, only projections (theory, case, hypothesis, proposal, etc.) can be qualified by projection clauses' (LC: 671). Judging from the examples given by Matthiessen (LC: 673 ff.), of which a few will be reproduced below, such reactancies appear to be the decisive criteria behind the more delicate distinctions between e.g. different types of [non-conscious: simple] 'things'. Thus, as an example of a subcategory of [objects] (one of the subtypes of [non-conscious: simple] 'things') Matthiessen mentions two-pronged implements, such as scissors, pliers, tweezers (LC: 675), which are all plural nouns that can be made countable by means of a pair of. Halliday (IFG3: 326), in his even more limited treatment of THING TYPE, in fact mentions countability, i.e. the countable/uncountable opposition, as one of the important organizing principles of THING TYPE, but the exact relation of this distinction to the divisions in the system as modelled by Matthiessen remains unclear. As already mentioned, Matthiessen’s typology is indeed only tentative, and is certainly too sketchy to be sufficiently convincing as a non-arbitrary set of divisions, which is why it will not be pursued any further in this account. Leading into classifications towards the lexical pole on the grammar-lexis cline, a more thorough investigation of the system of THING TYPE is probably beyond the scope of accounts like LC and IFG3, which are primarily concerned with systems located in the grammatical zone of the cline. To adherents of SFG, nonetheless, the lack of a better reasoned and more thorough account is regrettable.

5.5.1.2. Classifier, Epithet and Numerative

The next function in the NG, to the left of the Thing, is the Classifier, which serves to specify a sub-class of the Thing, as in the above example, where the word healthcare indicates what particular sub-type of reform is referred to. The Classifier may be occupied by a common noun or an adjective, but with the important restriction that only non-gradable adjectives have access to this function (IFG3: 320), i.e. words like bodily fluids, pharmaceutical companies, medicinal products, chemical waste (all freely invented examples). The system that applies to the function of Classifier is CLASSIFICATION (LC: 665-67), but regrettably no specification of how the system is organized as sets of options is given in either IFG3 or LC.

One step further to the left, the Epithet is concerned, not with class or sub-class, but with quality, which is why this function is invariably occupied by an adjective (IFG3: 318-19),

---

112 This is also the reason why no more space will be devoted to explicating the term [non-conscious: complex] 'things' and its subdivisions [projections] and [expansions] and the more delicate terms, which are, admittedly, far from self-explanatory.

113 As in these examples, it appears likely that adjectives serving as Classifier are typically ones derived from nouns, which would explain their classifying potential, but this is an aspect that is not considered in either LC nor IFG3, and will therefore not be explored any further here.
as in *this new generation of insulins* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 3), and often graded, as in the example below, where *positive* is modified by *very*:

> [We are pleased to be able to report very positive (Epithet) results (Thing) for 2009 (Qualifier). (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)]

According to IFG3 (pp. 318-19), Epithets fall into two categories: experiential and interpersonal ones, which shows that the Epithet is one of the functions that provide scope for the interpersonal metafunction to make its presence felt in the NG. Interpersonal, or attitudinal, Epithets are those expressing the subjective opinion of the speaker, as was the case with *very positive* in the above example, whereas experiential ones refer to an objective quality of the Thing, as in the previous example *this new generation of insulins*. The boundary between these two categories is necessarily a fuzzy one, but Halliday (IFG3: 319) provides the useful rule of thumb that experiential Epithets can be used for the purpose of definition, which interpersonal ones cannot. Thus, *new* can actually be used to identify the *generation of insulins* in question (‘which generation of insulins are you talking about – the old or the new one?’), whereas *very positive* cannot be used for this purpose: a question like ‘which results are you talking about – the very positive ones or the less positive ones?’ would be invalid as a request for identification.

Paradigmatically, the Epithet is governed by the system of **EPITHESIS**, whose organization, like that of **CLASSIFICATION**, is unfortunately not specified in any system network in either IFG3 or LC. The next function in the NG structure, on the other hand, that of Numerative, selects from either of two systems which are named **QUANTIFICATION** and **ORDINATION**, respectively:114

![System Diagram](image)

**Fig. 5.5.1.2. NUMERATION, QUANTIFICATION and ORDINATION. Deduced from IFG3: 317**

In the system of **QUANTIFICATION**, [definite] Numeratives are realized by cardinal numerals (*one, two, three* etc.), and [indefinite] ones by expressions like *few, many, much* etc. In the other system, [ordinal: definite] Numeratives are represented by ordinal numerals (*first, second, third* etc.), and [ordinal: indefinite] ones by expressions like *preceding* and *subsequent*.

5.5.1.3. The Deictic

Whereas the Thing, Classifier and Epithet are all realized by lexical items, and the Numerative mostly by numerals, the next NG constituent to the left, that of Deictic, selects among items that are primarily grammatical. With regard to function, the Deictic, as previ-

---

114 This system graph is nowhere represented in either IFG3 or LC, but has been modelled in accordance with a schematic representation in IFG3.
ously indicated, serves to situate the NG in relation to the 'here-and-now' of the speech event, and it does this by indicating the identifiability of the referent (the entity or entities referred to), i.e. '[...] whether the referent is identifiable or not [...]’ (LC: 695) - whether it is retrievable from either the context surrounding the speech event or from surrounding (typically preceding) text. Thus, in a freely invented example like Have you also noticed that thin old man over there at the entrance? I have seen him several times. His face is a mystery to me, the Deictic that in the first clause indicates that that thin old man is identifiable to the speaker and addressee, and the ensuing Qualifier over there at the entrance indicates how to identify the person, viz. from the external context of the speech event. Likewise, His in His face indicates that the face referred to is identifiable, in this case because it belongs to the old man previously mentioned in the text. *A* in *a mystery*, on the other hand, signifies that the mystery referred to has not been introduced before and is not recoverable from any context. The contrast between identifiability and non-identifiability in fact equals the distinction between [specific] and [non-specific] reference, which is the most basic set of options in the system network (called determination) from which the Deictic selects: the two nominal groups *that thin old man* and *his face* (with the Deictics underlined) are both [specific] in reference, whereas *a mystery* is [non-specific]. As a whole, the system network may be represented as follows:

![System Network Diagram](image)

Fig. 5.5.1.3. The system network of determination. Sources: IFG3: 313; LC: 696 (adapted by author)

As appears from the above system graph, if the feature [specific] is selected in the primary system of Deixis, the next step in delicacy consists of two simultaneous systems: Type of Deixis and Mood of Deixis. The various combinations of features from these two systems yield realizations like those in the following, non-exhaustive list (reproduced in part from IFG3):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Deixis</th>
<th>Mood of Deixis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determinative</td>
<td>(‘I’m telling you’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative</td>
<td>(‘You tell me!’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrative</td>
<td>the, this, that, those, these</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal (Possession)</td>
<td>my, your, our, his, her, its, their, John’s, my father’s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Which</td>
<td>whose, which person’s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5.1.3. Type of Deixis and Mood of Deixis: Realizations. Source: IFG3: 314.

As the above system graph indicates, further distinctions within some of these categories must be made, however. Thus, if the feature [demonstrative] in Type of Deixis is selected
in combination with [determinative] in MOOD OF DEIXIS, a further choice must be made between [non-selective] and [selective], the former of which is realized by the definite article the. The definite article is [determinative] but [non-selective], presumably because it signifies specificity without implying selection from among a set of contrasting possibilities. In Halliday’s own words, using it amounts to saying that the referent ‘is identifiable; but this will not tell you how to identify it – the information is somewhere around, where you can recover it’ (IFG3: 314). [Determinative: selective] Deictics, on the other hand, are realized by what are traditionally termed demonstrative pronouns (this, that, those, these). This combines the semantic features [non-plural] and [near], and that the features [non-plural] and [far], whereas [plural] and [near] in combination equals these and [plural] and [far] those (cf. ibid.). The selectiveness of such Deictics appears to consist in implied contrast: this train means ‘this one near me – and not any other (such as that one over there)’. Finally, possessive Deictics are distinguished according to the categories of PERSON, i.e. [interactant] ones (my, your, our) vs. [non-interactant] ones (his, her, its, their). Apart from possessive pronouns, the [non-interactant] category includes downranked NGs (cf. IFG3: 314), as in a freely invented example like that cute little cat’s soft fur, where fur is Thing, soft is Epithet and that cute little cat’s Deictic. This means that instead of functioning as a constituent at clause rank, which is the ‘home’ environment of NGs, that cute little cat has been downranked, i.e. ‘taken down’ one or more ranks, to serve as a constituent (in this case as Deictic) in another NG. The same would apply to an interrogative Deictic like which person’s in the freely invented example which person’s (Deictic) cat (Thing) is this?

Having traversed the DETERMINATION network to the endpoints of delicacy from the term [specific] in the system of DEIXIS as our starting point, it is now time to return and briefly consider the other feature in that system, i.e. the term [non-specific]. As the label implies, [non-specific] Deictics indicate that the NG refers to a non-specific instance of the type of thing in question, as in the previously mentioned a mystery, which means ‘an instance, but no specific one, of the class of phenomena called mystery’. [Non-specific] Deictics thus indicate a selection, either [partial] or [total], of the class of thing referred to. [Total] selection is either [positive], as in all children, or [negative], as in no children. [Partial] selection, on the other hand, is either [determinate] or [indeterminate]: some children never learn to read properly, for example, refers to a non-specified, but determinate selection of the class children, whereas a child in a child that does not learn to read stands no chance in today’s society represents an indeterminate selection.

5.5.1.4. The Qualifier

115 It should be pointed out that whereas the part of the system network in the above graph that branches out from the term [specific] is wholly based on IFG3 (p. 313), the systems dependent on the feature [non-specific] follow the model in LC (p. 696). Matthiessen’s model contains only two terms ([total] vs. [partial]) in the first system (not named) of [non-specific] Deictics, whereas Halliday’s model contains a third term named [unrestricted] (IFG3: 313) which is not sufficiently clearly distinguished from the other two terms. However, since this part DETERMINATION is only of marginal relevance to my investigation, a more detailed discussion of the merits of the LC model over against the IFG3 one on this point is deemed irrelevant.

116 This account of [non-specific] determination (based on LC: 700-702) is admittedly rather sketchy, but a more thorough examination of the various possible realizations of the different terms in this part of the network would take the account to an inordinate degree of detail in what is a very specific area of the grammar. A full chart of realizations (of [specific] as well as [non-specific] Deictics) is given in Appendix 10.
The last structural function to be examined is the Qualifier, which takes us to the opposite end of the NG. As previously noted, the Qualifier is positioned after the Thing, and it serves to characterize and delimit the Thing further. It is always occupied by downranked material, either a prepositional phrase or a clause (IFG3: 323-24):

*To create long-term (Classifier) change (Thing) [in healthcare systems] (Qualifier), we need to have a substantial impact on healthcare infrastructure and capacity.* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 6)

Here, the PP in *healthcare systems* is an embedded/downranked one, serving as Qualifier/Postmodifier in the underlined NG. Notationally, embedded NGs and PPs are marked with single square brackets ([ ]), in the same way as embedded clauses are indicated by double square ones ([[]]). Embedded clauses may be either [finite] or [non-finite], the following example belonging to the latter category:

*As a world leader in diabetes care, we have the potential and responsibility (Thing) [[to make a difference for people with diabetes]] (Qualifier) […].* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 20)

Embedded clauses functioning as Qualifier, it should be noted, are equivalent to defining relative clauses (IFG3: 324), which is most clear in the case of finite clauses initiated by a relative pronoun:

*Our accomplishments during the year also include measures (Thing) [[that will provide a foundation for better long-term performance]].* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 7)

It is worth mentioning that from the perspective of SFG, embeddedness versus non-embeddedness is in fact what distinguishes defining from non-defining/parenthetic relative clauses:

(α:) *The phase 1 clinical trial, (β:) <<which involves around 50 people >>, was initiated in 2009.* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 16)

Providing only parenthetical information, the clause ‘which involves […]’ is not part of the NG *The phase 1 clinical trial*, but a free clause which stands in a hypotactic relation (and is therefore marked by the Greek letter β) to the superordinate clause (marked by α). Instead of the double square brackets, SFG convention dictates the use of double arrowheads with these so-called hypotactic, elaborating clauses (IFG3: 399).

This completes the account of the functional components of the NG in experiential terms, but it needs to be mentioned that apart from the structure examined above (consisting of Deictic, Numerative etc.), Halliday (IFG3: 329-31) also describes NG structure in more general terms, viz. as one consisting of Premodifier, Head and Postmodifier, in other words the traditional structural concepts known from other accounts (see e.g. Vestergaard 1985), with the Postmodifier mapping onto the Qualifier, the Head onto the Thing, and the Postmodifier onto the elements preceding the Thing.¹¹⁷ The three alternative labels will therefore be adopted along with the experiential categories, especially because the two categories of modifier provide a useful means of referring to structural *location* (relative to the

---

¹¹⁷ There are exceptions to this parallel mapping (see IFG3: 331-35), but this is a level of detail that will be ignored in the present account. Similarly, it should be mentioned that the Head+modifiers structure is a manifestation of the logical metafunction (IFG3: 331), but this perspective will not be pursued here.
Head/Thing) in the NG. As will appear from the empirical analyses in chapter 8, a relatively frequent type of change between a nominal group in the INTRA ST and the corresponding one in the TT is a shift in structural location, whereby e.g. premodifying material in the ST is transferred to postmodifying position in the TT. In Matthiessen’s account of group structure in general (LC: 645), it is in fact acknowledged that the structural position (pre- or post-Head) allocated to modifying material is a matter of choice:

![Diagram of MODIFICATION system]

Fig. 5.5.1.4a. The system of MODIFICATION. Source: LC: 645 (adapted by author)

For purposes of greater analytical applicability, I propose a slightly simplified system that ignores the distinction between the terms [epitheted] and [classified] in Matthiessen’s model:

![Diagram of TYPE OF MODIFICATION system]

Fig. 5.5.1.4b. The system of TYPE OF MODIFICATION, as proposed by author

The name TYPE OF MODIFICATION has been chosen as the most suitable label for the system, which is not named in LC.

This concludes the account of the SF perspective on the NG.

5.5.2. The prepositional phrase

From a systemic-functional perspective, the relation between NGs and prepositional phrases (PPs) is one of constituency: the PP is a two-constituent structure consisting of a preposition and a nominal group (IFG3: 360), which is why, as previously noted (see section 2.5), a distinction is maintained between groups and phrases. Another apparently unique SFG perspective is the interpretation of the PP as a structure with a strong resemblance to clauses. It is in fact conceived of as a kind of mini-clause, with the preposition in a role similar to the Predicator/Process and the NG in a function corresponding to that of Complement/Scope. The reason is that a PP like across the lake is very close in meaning to the [non-finite] clause crossing the lake (example taken from IFG3: 360), where crossing serves as Predicator/Process and the lake as Complement/Scope. Similarly, a PP like around the house is very similar to surrounding the house. Another example that may be given in support of Halliday’s interpretation is:

---

118 The following account is based on IFG3: 360-61.
119 Scope appears to be the function that applies to most cases, but there are exceptions where other experiential functions are more obvious equivalents.
With headquarters in Denmark, Novo Nordisk employs more than 29,300 employees in 76 countries [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 1),

where the initial PP With ... may be substituted by the [non-finite] clause *having headquarters in Denmark. Conversely, in:

Managing our business using the Triple Bottom Line business principle helps ensure that [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 10),

the underlined [non-finite] clause is equivalent to with or by means of the ... principle. What also appears to support Halliday's interpretation is the fact that certain non-finite verbal forms have assumed outright prepositional status (IFG3: 360), such as:

... to maintain blood glucose levels over time, insulin may be introduced following lifestyle changes and initiation of metformin or GLP-1 therapy (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 19),

following being a preposition that is denotationally equivalent to after. Similar cases are concerning and regarding (LC: 627), which are both more or less interchangeable with about.

Halliday (IFG3: 360) does, however, point to one important difference between [non-finite] clauses and PPs: in a [non-finite] clause, a Subject is implied, which is never the case in PPs. What may also contradict the SFG interpretation (of the PP as a mini-clause) is the number of PPs with no apparent equivalent in any imaginable [non-finite] clause. Thus, it does not seem possible to express a PP like in Denmark from the first of the three previous examples in any other way. Therefore, it must be conceded that there are points of similarity between (some) PPs and [non-finite] clauses, but Halliday’s insistence that the PP is a kind of compressed clause does not appear universally valid.

5.6. Grammatical metaphor

In the account of all the areas of grammar covered so far, the relation between the semantic and the (lexico)grammatical stratum has consisted in so-called congruent realizations. In other words, the presupposition was that a particular type of semantics is naturally associated with a certain type of realization in grammar. Thus, in the ideational grammar the different types of clause (grammatical stratum) were all examined from the perspective of the type of figure (semantic stratum) they encoded, and clause complexes were associated with sequences of figures. Similarly (though not previously explicitated), groups and phrases were presupposed to encode so-called elements of figures (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 58-59), i.e. participants, processes and circumstances. A schematic representation of congruent realizations (adopted from Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 237) is:

- sequence of figures $\downarrow$ (: is realized by) clause complex
- figure (a configuration of a process, participants and circumstances) $\downarrow$ clause
- element in a figure $\downarrow$ group or phrase
- process $\downarrow$ verb
Apart from the elaborate descriptions in works like LC and IFG3 of the meanings that the grammar is naturally structured to make, however, much work has been carried out within SFL to chart the possibilities of incongruent realization of semantics in grammar (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: ch. 6; Halliday 1989/1993: 79-82; 1998/2004a; 1998/2004b; 1997/2004; Halliday and Matthiessen 2004: ch. 10; Taverniers 2006; Ravelli 2003). This is the phenomenon termed grammatical metaphor, which occurs whenever the realizational patterns like those outlined above are upset and tension between the two strata results. In its traditional use, the term metaphor is of course synonymous with lexical metaphor, but in that use, too, the phenomenon consists in tension or incongruity between the stratum of meaning and the stratum of wording, the lexical item having been detached from its 'true' or original meaning and linked up with a new one. An expression like hot feelings is a banal example, where hot no longer refers to a high level of temperature, but to emotional intensity instead. Yet, despite the semantic shift, the word hot has not left its original meaning completely behind, which is of course the usual reason for employing a metaphor. The original meaning ('high temperature') contributes a connotational aspect ('it is like heat') which would be absent in a non-metaphorical expression. In this way, lexical metaphor represents an expansion of the meaning potential available to a speaker, and the same is the case with grammatical metaphor, as will be shown below.

In the ideational part of the semantics, incongruent realization first and foremost consists in so-called rankshift (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 259), occurring e.g. when a sequence of figures is realized, not by means of clause complex, but in a clause, and when figure is expressed, not by a clause, but shifted to realization in a phrase or a nominal group. Halliday and Matthiessen (ibid.: 250 ff.) identify three types of grammatical metaphor within the ideational metafunction:

1. Figure → element
2. Sequence → figure
3. Figure with process → figure with process as thing

One manifestation of the third of these three types may briefly be mentioned, which is [material] clauses featuring a Scope as the real (but nominalized) Process, such as make a mistake, have a shower, do a dance. The second type, on other hand, is completely irrelevant to present purposes, and will therefore be ignored, whereas the first of three types is the predominant one in my empirical material, and therefore the one to be focused on in this account. A simple example is:

Finally, we also want to thank our shareholders and business partners for their support. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 4)

Here, the underlined NG may be regarded as a figure whose clausal realization would be *they (Actor) supported (Process) [us]. Thus, what is a participant (they) in the clausal version has been downranked to the function of Deictic and the Process (support) to Thing. Moreover, the example illustrates how the downranking of elements is almost inevitably

---

120 It should be mentioned that grammatical metaphor occurs within the interpersonal metafunction as well (see IFG3: 613-16). This phenomenon, however, is of very limited relevance to the present investigation, and will therefore be ignored at present, but briefly introduced at a later stage (see section 8.2.3.9).
accompanied by transcategorization (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 261), i.e. a change of word class: they has been converted into a possessive pronoun (their), and the verb support has become a noun. Another example is the underlined NG in the following quotation:

At an industry level, a lack of innovation also means that [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5),

which may be de-metaphorized\(^\text{\footnote{This term (de-metaphorization) is the one that will be adopted from Halliday and Matthiessen (1999: 284) to refer to the process of converting a metaphorical expression into its congruent version.}}\) as *when somebody (Carrier) lacks (Process) innovation (Attribute). Once again, what serves as Process in the clausal version has been nominalized as lack, which enables it to occupy the role of Thing in the NG, whereas no change of word class has been necessary to rankshift innovation to serve as (part of the) Qualifier. A final example involves two metaphorical realizations:

*The current economic downturn has impacted societies’ and individuals’ ability to pay for healthcare, including life-saving medicines* (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5),

in which the former of the two underlined NGs may be ‘clause-ified’ as *the economy is currently turning (or more idiomatically: slowing) down, and the latter as *societies and individuals are unable to pay for healthcare. Apart from the rankshifts and transcategorizations involved, the three examples variously illustrate a number of points:

- A metaphorical realization is typically less explicit than the congruent version because the downranking is typically accompanied by omission of information (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 270). Thus, in both of the first two examples a participant has been ellipsed in the downranked version: the Goal in the first example (their support) and the Carrier in the second (a lack of innovation).
- Like lexical metaphor, grammatical metaphor represents a ‘junction’ of two semantic features (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 243), because the original feature is retained while a new one is added. When a figure is shifted from clause to group rank, the semantic feature ‘process’ (or in some cases ‘quality’, as in ability in the above example) is retained while at the same time the feature ‘thing’ is contributed by the nominal group. Grammatical metaphor is therefore, in a manner of speaking, ‘having it both ways’ (ibid.: 271), which is why this possibility of fusing semantic features amounts to an extension of the meaning potential available to the language user (ibid.: 241). In other words, incongruent realization allows access to semantic resources from which congruent realization is barred. Thus, when a figure is downranked, access is opened up to the grammatical potential of the nominal group, such as DETERMINATION, CLASSIFICATION and QUALIFICATION (ibid.: 265), as well as the possibility (available to a nominal entity) of serving as a participant in another figure (ibid.: 271). In the third of the above examples, both participants were in fact nominally construed figures, with *The current economic downturn serving as Actor and societies’ and individuals’ ability to pay for health care as Goal. One particular type of advantage that may be pointed to is textual, as borne out by the following example:

*The gross margin increased to 79.6\% compared to 77.8\% in 2008. This improvement primarily reflects improved production efficiency [...]*. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 9)
Cohesion is established between these two sentences by means of the nominalization *this improvement*, which crystallizes the previous sentence into a nominal group. As a kind of grammatical proxy for the previous sentence, this NG is given the textual role of Theme, whereby it is made to serve as the point of departure for further comment (cf. Thompson 1999: 117; IFG3: 657; LC: 667).

- Apart from being (typically) less explicit than congruent realization, grammatical metaphor also results in more abstract discourse (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 264), creating abstractions out of concrete processes: medical terms like *irregular heartbeat*, *bone fracture* and *atrioventricular conduction delay* and legal terms like *freehold*, *liquidation* and *grievous bodily harm* are all metaphorical expressions which convert processes of hearts beating, bones breaking, victims being assaulted etc. into abstract entities. Abstractions allow easier generalization (Martin and Rose 2007: 112), which is why grammatical metaphor is especially prevalent in elitist discourse like scientific, administrative and legal text types (ibid.: 110; Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 272): the legal term *grievous bodily harm*, e.g., enables legislators to abstract from individual instances of assault into a general phenomenon whose defining characteristics and legal consequences may be laid down in criminal law.

- Apart from increasing the level of abstraction in discourse, grammatical metaphor also makes a text more 'compact', as illustrated in the last but two examples above ('*The current economic downturn has impacted societies' and individuals' ability to pay for healthcare, including life-saving medicines*'): the realization in nominal groups allowed two figures to be 'packed' into one clause instead of two, which would have been the congruent version. It is a main point in Halliday (1989: 95; 1987/2002) that grammatical metaphor is particularly prevalent in written texts, but less typical of the spoken mode (cf. Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 238), which explains why written-style language is characterized by greater 'compactness', or what is termed *lexical density* (Halliday 1989: 63). This expression refers to the fact that by 'packing' semantic figures into fewer clauses, grammatical metaphor results in a higher concentration of content words, i.e. lexical items, per sentence (clause complex), whereas congruent realization has the opposite effect. This is best illustrated by 'unpacking', i.e. de-metaphorizing the example from above:

*The current economic downturn has impacted societies' and individuals' ability to pay for healthcare →*

*(1:) The economy is currently slowing down, (2α:) and this means (2β:) that societies and individuals are unable to pay for healthcare.*

In the original version, 9 out of a total of 14 words are lexical (= the underlined items), whereas in the rewritten version with 3 clauses the ratio is 9/18. This explains why the original, 'packed' version appears denser in content. Moreover, the two examples illustrate the two different types of complexity involved: the first example is simple in terms of clause complexity (the sentence consists of only one clause), but is complex at group rank, with two relatively complex NGs (*The current economic downturn* and *society's and individuals' ability to pay for healthcare*). The second example, on the other hand, exhibits greater clause complexity (the sentence as a whole consists of three instead of only one clause as in the first example), whereas its NGs (*The economy, this, societies and individu-
als, unable to pay for healthcare\textsuperscript{122}) are simpler.

- As a final point, it is to be noted that grammatical metaphor leads to a general increase in discursive inaccessibility: ideationally, metaphorization has already been shown to result in a higher degree of abstraction, and textually the consequence was seen to be higher lexical density. An interpersonal dimension may be added, which may once again be illustrated by the example 'The economic downturn [...] and the rewritten version above. Consisting of three [finite] clauses, the latter version contains three Mood elements, viz. The economy is, this means and societies and individuals are, whereas the original version contains only one (The current economic downturn has). As previously noted (see section 5.2), the Mood element is the modal core of the clause, being the element which carries the interpersonal negotiability of the proposition/proposal. The Mood element, in other words, is where the speaker most manifestly intrudes him/herself into the clause, by signifying (in the case of statements, as in the above examples) 'I am making this claim – for you to accept or contradict'. By eliminating Mood elements from discourse, grammatical metaphor therefore creates a more impersonal Tenor, while at the same time making propositions non-arguable (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 241-242). Thus, in 'The current economic downturn [...] the proposition the economy is currently slowing down is implied, but, with the Mood element eliminated, the proposition assumes the appearance of an 'unquestionable fact' (Thompson 1999: 117).

5.7. Lexis in SFG
Whereas all (or most of) the previous sections have been concerned with the semantics construed in the grammatical zone of the grammar-lexis cline, it is now time to turn our attention to lexis. What appears to be unique to the SFG treatment of lexis is the recognition that the different aspects of lexical semantics are metafunctionally related to meanings construed in the grammatical part of the lexicogrammar. Thus, the experiential metafunction manifests itself in lexis as DENOTATION (to be accounted for in section 5.7.1), the interpersonal metafunction as CONNOTATION (section 5.7.2), and the textual as LEXICAL COHESION\textsuperscript{123} (section 5.7.3) (LC: 110-11; 114).

5.7.1. The experiential metafunction in lexis: DENOTATION
Whereas the above-mentioned metafunctional perspective on lexis appears to be a unique SF feature, the recognition of (especially) DENOTATION and CONNOTATION as different types of meaning is of course in no way the prerogative of Hallidayan linguistics, and the SF interpretation of each of these two types is in perfect agreement with definitions found in other representations of lexical semantics. Murphy and Koskela (2010: 56), for example, define denotation as ‘the relation between an expression and the things (or properties or actions or concepts) that it refers to. Broadly speaking, a word’s denotative meaning is its ‘literal’ meaning [...]’, which is in close correspondence with the SFG categorization of DENOTATION as experiential meaning. Similarly, Murphy and Koskela (ibid.: 44) contrast denotation and connotation, linking the latter with non-denotational aspects like speaker

\textsuperscript{122} In SFG, ‘adjectival phrases’ like unable ... are regarded as a sub-type of NG (IFG3: 331).

\textsuperscript{123} In the lexical zone, the identification of the textual metafunction with LEXICAL COHESION only is a simplification (cf. LC: 111), but LEXICAL COHESION will be the only aspect to be accounted for here (see section 5.7.3), other aspects of textual semantics being deemed irrelevant to present purposes.
attitude and social meaning (degree of formality), as does SFG (see section 5.7.2.).

Another traditional insight that recurs in SFG is the recognition that the semantic ‘space’ covered by denotation is taxonomically organized in hierarchies of class-member relations (hyponymy) and part-whole relations (meronymy) (see Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 82-92 et passim). Hyponymous relations, of course, are ones of inclusion (Cruse 1986: 88), such as the relation between e.g. the items plant, tree and beech. As Tucker (1998: 93) points out, a subordinate item takes over the semantic features of the superordinate item: the semantic feature 'tree' is inherent in the hyponym beech, in the same way as the feature 'plant' is inherent in tree. What appears to be a unique SFG insight, on the other hand, is the recognition that a hyponymous relation, i.e. the relation between a hyponym and a superordinate item, is one of elaboration (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 89), being construible by means of a [relational] clause of the [intensive] subcategory. In other words, hyponymy is an ‘is-a’ relation: the relation between tree and beech must be expressed as a beech is a tree, with beech as Carrier and tree in the role of Attribute, whereby beech is assigned membership of the class construed by tree. In contrast, meronymy consists in extension (ibid.: 89), i.e. a ‘has-a’ relation, as expressed in a [relational] clause like a tree has branches, which brings out the part-whole relation between branches and tree as one of possession (cf. ibid.: 145).

What also appears to be a unique SFG conception is the contention that the progressive semantic delicacy of hyponymically related lexical items (such as plant, tree, beech) constitutes a move along the grammar-lexis cline. In other words, the 'move' from superordinate items to ones of increasingly specific lexical meaning consists in a traversal of interrelated systems from 'left to right'. This is a point that was previously made in the introduction to fundamental SFL tenets (section 2.4 on the grammar-lexis cline), and exemplified in respect of verbs, whereas here the contention will be examined in relation to nouns. Thus, the item plant is the entry condition of a system whose terms are hyponymous items such as tree, bush, flower etc.. Selection of a term like tree, then, opens up a further system of more delicate items such as beech, oak, birch etc.\(^{124}\) In the SF conception, as also noted in section 2.4, such taxonomic relations represent a continuation of distinctions originating at the grammatical pole of the cline:

In general, then, we can say that the move in delicacy in the ideation base\(^{125}\) from 'most general' to 'most delicate' is construed lexicogrammatically as the move from 'grammar' to 'lexis' […]

This is of fundamental significance in the construal of semantic categories. The early part of the scale of delicacy is construed in the grammatical ‘zone’. This zone provides the resources for construing more delicate categories: those categories are realized lexically but construed according to the systemic parameters of the grammar. (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 87)

In respect of nouns, the above perspective appears to be in agreement with a grammatical system such as THING TYPE, whose general distinctions, according to Halliday (IFG3: 327), are hyperonymically related to lexical items (cf. Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 86). Thus, the most basic distinction in THING TYPE is the one between [conscious] and [non-conscious] 'thing', as previously mentioned (see section 5.5.1.1), and a subtype of [non-

\(^{124}\) Obviously, this example represents no attempt to render a truly botanic taxonomy. Presumably, a scientific taxonomy of plants would include intermediate stages between tree and beech, such as foliferous tree.

\(^{125}\) As previously noted, ideation base refers to the repository of experiential (and logical) meaning construable in a language.
conscious] 'thing' is [objects], which, following systemic logic, may be further subdivided into more specific terms. Presumably, a subtype of [object] is [plant], which takes us into previously mentioned hyponymic relations like plant – tree – beech. This representation may or may not be valid: it is simply intended as an attempt to follow the SF perspective on the relation between grammar and lexis – a perspective, however, which cannot be accepted unreservedly. What is at issue here is not the taxonomic organization of lexis: in that respect, the SF perspective is completely in agreement with widely regarded representations of lexical semantics like those of Cruse (1986) and Lyons (1977). What is nowhere argued with sufficient cogency in the SF literature on lexis (apart from Halliday and Matthiessen: 1999, see also Halliday 2004; Matthiessen 1991; Tucker 1998), however, is the contention that grammatical and lexical meanings are interrelated via system networks originating at the grammatical pole and extending in delicacy all the way towards the lexical pole. In some cases, such an interrelation may be identifiable, as in the above example where an attempt was made to traverse the systems originating in THING TYPE along the cline 'down to' items of very specific meaning such as beech, but no strong case is made in SFL that a pattern like this will accommodate any lexical item.

5.7.1.1. Technicality in lexis

Whereas the above-mentioned hypothesis concerning the interrelation between grammar and lexis must be considered tenuous, a more cogently argued point – and one particularly germane to the present investigation – is the observation that in a number of regions of experiential semantics in the lexical zone, scientific taxonomies are at odds with so-called 'folk' or lay ones. Both types represent interpretations of the way reality is structured, but according to Halliday and Matthiessen (1999: 85) and Martin (1993: 205), scientific taxonomies typically differ from 'folk' ones in organization, as illustrated by the two contrasting classifications of infectious diseases below:

![Fig. 5.7.1.1a. Commonsense taxonomy of diseases. Source: Martin (1993: 206).](image-url)
The two models obviously represent very different categorizations, being based on very different criteria, since, in the move from a ‘folk’ to a scientific taxonomy, ‘the criteria for categorization [...] change, from overt criteria that are accessible to the naked eye to covert criteria available only through the application of scientific techniques’ (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 86), as previously quoted (section 3.2.3). Thus, in a comment on the above two models, Martin (1993: 206) points out that the criteria behind the ‘folk’, or ‘commonsense’, model are symptoms and effects, i.e. readily observable phenomena, whereas the medical classification is based on causes, i.e. phenomena that are only discoverable by means of scientific tools.

Yet, it must be maintained that the distinction between 'commonsense' classifications on the one hand and scientific, or 'uncommonsense', taxonomies on the other is far from clear-cut, but is rather to be viewed as a cline, as also acknowledged by Halliday and Matthiessen (1999: 565). In fact, the cline appears to be reflected in the two conflicting models of disease above: they are clearly based on very different distinctions, but certain features in the 'folk' model, such as AIDS, hepatitis b and polio, have clearly been incorporated from the scientific model, being concepts that derive solely from the discoveries of modern medical science. Therefore, the contention that 'commonsense' classifications deviate from scientific models is probably valid, but what should not be ignored is the degree of overlap between the two types. It would appear that due to factors like modern science-based education systems and the free flow of information in modern (post-)industrial societies, a good deal of scientific knowledge does in fact 'filter down' to the lay public (cf. Pearson 1998: 27). Thus, out of the five different types of pathogenic microorganisms featured in figure 5.7.1.1b above (viruses, bacteria, fungi, protozoa and prions), the first two or three are concepts that are in all likelihood known to most adult lay persons in the Western world, whereas the last two are more likely to be part of specialist knowledge only (this is obviously a purely intuitive assessment). What seems to be the case is that 'folk' or lay world views incorporate fragments of scientific taxonomies, resulting in classifications that have points of contact with scientific models, but which are, as Halliday and Matthiessen
point out (1999: 85), typically much less fine-grained. Moreover, apart from the deviation in semantic organization, a difference in form should also be noted, with scientific taxonomies typically preferring labels that are foreign to those of ‘folk’ models. As reflected in the above models of infectious diseases, it turns out that the scientific model has e.g. Epstein barr instead of glandular fever and herpes simplex instead of cold sores. Such differences, as will be appear from the analytical chapters of this thesis, are highly relevant to the present investigation (for a further consideration of the possibility of shifts in the technicality of lexical items between STs and TTs in translation, see section 6.5.6).

5.7.2. The interpersonal metafunction in lexis: CONNOTATION

Leaving the denotational aspect of lexical semantics, we now turn to the interpersonal metafunction, i.e. to CONNOTATION, which, however, is an area that will be dealt with somewhat more summarily than DENOTATION. In Yallop’s (2004: 28) definition, the interpersonal aspect of lexical semantics is somewhat vaguely identified with ‘emotive meaning’, whereas Matthiessen (LC: 111) is more specific: he points out three different aspects to CONNOTATION, viz. politeness, affect (or attitudinal loading) and formality, all of which are manifest in a freely invented example like Why don’t you just sod off, you dirty, old bastard?, where all three underlined lexical items are markedly informal in character while at the same time connoting a relatively strong degree of impoliteness and negative affect. As this example shows, the three parameters may be intertwined, but it appears that they may also be independently variable. In an example like That man/guy is my friend/mate (inspired by Tucker (1998: 112)), the alternatives in each of the two sets differ on a scale of formality, whereas no difference in politeness and affect is evident. No more mention of politeness and attitudinal loading is in fact relevant to the empirical purposes of this thesis, since no variation on these two parameters is detectable within and between the LSP corpora compiled for the present investigation. Altogether, it appears safe to generalize that signs of affect are rare in LSP texts. Formality, on the other hand, is a different matter, being a dimension on which differences in lexical choice between the specialized and the lay-oriented corpus are in fact observable. One model of formality that should be mentioned is the scale proposed by M. Joos (1959/1968; cf. Tucker 1998: 112), whose five degrees are frozen, formal, consultative, casual and intimate. The model, however, cannot be deemed sufficiently operable for analytical purposes, as evidenced by Tucker (1998: 112), who distinguishes the difference in formality between friend and mate by identifying the former with all the three topmost degrees on Joos’ scale and the latter with the two bottommost. In other words, an analytical strategy that aims to define the formality of an item in absolute terms (by assigning it to a specific and fixed degree on a scale like Joos’) appears far from viable. A safer approach, therefore – and the one adopted for present purposes – must confine itself to making distinctions in relative terms. As will appear from the analytical chapters, when two items are deemed to deviate, the formality of one will be distinguished from another simply as being higher or lower (for a further consideration of the possibility of shifts in formality between STs and TTs in translation, see section 6.5.2).

5.7.3. The textual metafunction in lexis: LEXICAL COHESION

As touched on at the beginning of section 5.7, the manifestation of the textual metafunc-
tion in lexis is the province of LEXICAL COHESION (LC: 114), which is concerned with the cohesive meaning created by e.g. repetition and synonymy across clause boundaries. Judging from the account in IFG3 (pp. 570-78), LEXICAL COHESION forms a system in which the following types must be held to constitute the terms:

- [repetition], i.e. cohesion established through repetition of a lexeme, e.g. *engine - engine*;
- [synonymy], i.e. cohesion established by the selection of a synonym of a preceding item, such as *engine - motor*;
- [hyponymy], i.e. cohesion achieved by means of a hyponym or a hyperonym, such as *rose - flower*;
- [meronymy], i.e. part-whole relations between two items, such as *rose - stem*, used cohesively.

It should be clear that apart from [repetition], the above types are based on the paradigmatic (experiential) organization of lexis (cf. IFG3: 570). A final term in the system of LEXICAL COHESION is:

- [collocation], i.e. cohesion established through the exploitation of a syntagmatic association between two items, e.g. *pan - fry* (example taken from IFG: 577). In other words, when there is a frequent syntagmatic co-occurrence between two items like *pan* and *fry*, e.g. at clause rank, *(fry the fish in a pan and never cook it in the oven)*, a cohesive effect will be achieved if the two items are selected in two different, but not-too-distant clauses, such as *Be sure to fry the fish in butter only. Put the fish in the pan ... .*

In the extract below (from an EU report on a medicinal product named *Actraphane*), the three types of lexical cohesion that are based on paradigmatic relations are exemplified:

### What is Actraphane used for?

Actraphane is used in patients with diabetes. The medicine can only be obtained with a prescription. [...]

### How does Actraphane work?

Diabetes is a disease in which the body does not produce enough insulin to control the blood sugar. Actraphane is a replacement insulin which is identical to the insulin made by the pancreas. (European Medicines Agency 2006a: 1)

In this extract, [repetition] is manifested in the reiteration of *Actraphane* and of *insulin*. [Hyponymy] is seen in the relation between *Actraphane* and *medicine* (*Actraphane* is a type of *medicine*) and between *insulin* and *replacement insulin*, at least in so far as the latter can be understood as a technical term which denotes a subtype of *insulin*. Finally, [meronymy] obtains in the relation between *body* and *pancreas*, the latter item being a part of the former. [Synonymy] and [collocation], however, are not exemplified in the extract.

Any more detailed account of this specific area is deemed irrelevant since the STs and TTs of my corpora have turned out to be rarely comparable in terms of textual meaning, and the rather brief introduction given above therefore concludes the account of the SFG perspective on lexis.

---

126 According to Halliday and Matthiessen (1999: 197; cf. Rose 1998: 258), the structure of the NG provides the resource for sub-classification of lexis. In other words, if one NG consists of the experiential constituent *Thing only* (such as *insulin*) and another consists of *Classifier + Thing* (such as *replacement insulin*), the latter will denote a subtype of the former.
5.8. Conclusion: a matrix of the lexicogrammatical resources of English

What follows from the above accounts is that the lexicogrammatical potential of a language (in our case English) may be modelled along the lines of a matrix with metafunction on the horizontal axis intersected with rank on the vertical:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rank</th>
<th>ideological</th>
<th>experiential</th>
<th>interpersonal</th>
<th>textual</th>
<th>(cohesive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>clause</td>
<td>[class]</td>
<td>logical</td>
<td>TRANSITIVITY</td>
<td>MOOD</td>
<td>THEME</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PROCESS TYPE</td>
<td></td>
<td>VOICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and dependent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SYSTEMS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CIRCUMSTANTI-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>group/</td>
<td>[preposi-</td>
<td>TAXIS</td>
<td>ASPECT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrase</td>
<td>tional]</td>
<td>&amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[verbal]</td>
<td>LOGICO-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SEMANTIC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RELATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[nominal]</td>
<td>MODIFICATION</td>
<td>THING TYPE</td>
<td>NOMINAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CLASSIFICATION</td>
<td>PERSON</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[adver-</td>
<td></td>
<td>QUALIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bial]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>word</td>
<td>DERIVA-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>morpheme</td>
<td>simplex-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complexes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


A few comments on the model are required: thus, although certain of the spaces have been left blank, all of them should rightly be filled out with one or several names of systems/system networks. In the above version, however, only those systems/system networks are represented which have actually been accounted for in the previous sections. One exception is group-rank (i.e. VG) ASPECT, which has in fact not previously been accounted for, but will be taken up later (see section 8.2.6.10). Another exception is DERIVATION (word rank, logical metafunction), which, unfortunately, is nowhere explicitly defined anywhere in the SFG literature, but must be taken to refer to the lexicogrammatical resources for word formation by means of pre- and suffixing (cf. LC: 101), such as fragile → fragility. Exploitation of these resources, in other words, in some cases entails transcategorization (changes in word class), as in the above example, where the adjective fragile becomes a noun when the suffix -ity is added. What is nowhere explained in the SFG literature either is why DERIVATION is located in the logical metafunction, but the most obvious expla-
nation is that word formation through pre- or suffixing (or both, of course) creates a tactic relationship between morphemes. If this interpretation is sound, a noun like *fragility* is to be interpreted as a hypotactic nexus or junction between a dominant morpheme, *viz.* *fragil-* (α), and a dependent one, the suffix *-ity* (β).

Another feature in the model that requires comment is COHESIVE RELATIONS: in the above, only one type of cohesive relation was examined, *viz.* LEXICAL COHESION, but four other types are in fact recognized in SFG, *viz.* conjunction, reference, substitution and ellipsis (IFG3: ch. 9). However, cohesion is a phenomenon that must be presumed to be well-known from more traditional grammatical accounts (see e.g. Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 1453-1463) on reference (anaphora, ellipsis and substitution)), which is why the area of cohesion has been ignored in the grammatical sections above. Besides, shifts in cohesive relations have turned out to play only a very minor role in my empirical material.

Finally, a comment is required on the various NG systems in the model. These (THING TYPE, CLASSIFICATION, EPITHESES, QUALIFICATION, PERSON and DETERMINATION) have previously been presented as being interrelated in a system network, which is indeed possible (see section 5.5.1.1, fig. 5.5.1.1a), but the function-rank matrix makes clear that they are in fact located in different metafunctions. The system network which was modelled to incorporate these different systems (fig. 5.5.1.1a) is thus best interpreted as a multi-metafunctional one, unlike most other networks, which are confined to one metafunction only.
Chapter 6. Analytical framework, part 2: translation strategies (shift types)

In the previous chapter, all the grammatical and lexical categories examined - and all the examples analysed - ought to have made clear that SFG provides a framework well suited to the analysis of the lexicogrammatical make-up of texts. However, all examples given were ones of texts (textual fragments) analysed in isolation, i.e. with no reference to or comparison with other texts. The matter becomes more complex when it comes to translation analysis, i.e. the comparative analysis of two related textual fragments at a time. This is where the translation-theoretical concept of strategy comes in - a concept concerned with the type of 'movement' from ST to TT segment, or the generation of TT wordings in relation to or on the basis of ST ones. In this chapter, therefore, the SF conception of lexicogrammatical organization (as outlined in the previous chapter and in chapter 2) will be operationalized for the analysis of translational strategies. Such a framework, however, is found insufficient to account for all changes occurring in translation - TRP as well as INTRA - and will therefore be supplemented by more traditional concepts from Translation Studies. First, however, the very concept of translation strategy needs to be critically scrutinized.

6.1. The concept of translation strategy

Strategy is a central concept in this thesis, but one, unfortunately, which is fraught with ambiguity and therefore in need of clarification (cf. Gambier 2010). Thus, Chesterman (2005: 17-18) lists a number of terms that appear to be used more or less synonymously by translation scholars. Besides strategy, these are operation, procedure, technique, change, solution-type, shift, method. Apart from this terminological confusion, Chesterman (ibid.: 19-22) also points to a four-fold semantic ambiguity that surrounds the concept:

1. Process vs. result: Chesterman (2005: 20) points out that the names given to many individual strategies (like omission, addition, explicitation) are nominalizations of verbs, which may explain why strategies are sometimes conceived of as processes and sometimes as the results of those processes (cf. Molina and Albir 2002: 506).
2. Cognitive vs. linguistic (Chesterman 2005: 20-21): A parallel ambiguity resides in the question of environment, i.e. whether strategies should be regarded as cognitive phenomena, to be located in the mind of the translator, or as linguistic phenomena to be located in the textual material.
3. Problem-solving vs. routine (Chesterman 2005: 21-22): A third ambiguity relates to the question of when or to what extent strategies are applied. According to one perspective, strategies are linked with problem-solving and should be viewed as tools that are applied only when the translator encounters problems and cannot proceed in a routine manner. The opposite perspective is not explicitly stated, but judging from the specifics of Chesterman's own typology of strategies (1997: ch. 4) his implicit stance appears to be that strategies are integral to translation as such, which means that any translation fragment, whatever its size, is based on strategies, even if it is the product of routine and non-conscious procedures on the part of the translator.
4. Global vs. local (Chesterman 2005: 22): A distinction must also be made with regard to the level at which strategies operate: Global strategies pertain to the overall plan or design.
of the translation, whereas local strategies are those which operate ‘inside’ the text, having to do with the manipulation of individual words, phrases and clauses (cf. Molina and Albir 2002: 506). The global/local dichotomy is thus identical to Schjoldager’s (2008) distinction between macro- and microstrategies, a parallel acknowledged by Schjoldager herself (ibid.: 67-68).

5. Finally, it should be mentioned that elsewhere (in his main work on translation theory, Memes of translation), Chesterman (1997: 92) points to a necessary distinction between comprehension and production strategies, the former constituting the translator's analysis of the source text and the latter being the linguistic operations which result in a target text. In answer to the terminological and conceptual confusion, Chesterman proposes a convincing solution which will be adopted here: the term method, he suggests (2005: 26), should be reserved 'to denote a general way of translating, not a local solution'. In other words, it should be identified with linguistic operations in the global sense (cf. Molina and Albir (2002: 507) for the exact same proposal). The term strategy, on the other hand, is to be invested with purely cognitive content to refer to the 'plan', 'decisions' / 'choice' (Chesterman 2005: 26) behind linguistic operations. For textual manipulation at micro-level he proposes the term technique. Finally, the 'classic' term shift is to be restricted to a resultative sense, to denote the differences 'observable [...] between target and source' (ibid.).

Chesterman’s terminological solutions are useful, especially because they accommodate the separation between the cognitive and the linguistic/textual aspect and between process and result, and because they facilitate the precise identification of the object of analysis in this thesis, which is shifts in the above sense, i.e. the observable differences in lexicogrammatical selection in derivationally related ST-TT units (cf. Bakker, Koster et al. 2009): source and target texts are the only empirical data dealt with in this thesis, which means that only linguistic results are analysable, and furthermore that the investigation of translators’ cognitive processes is precluded. As also pointed out in the introductory chapter, it should be made quite clear that translator cognition is in no way the concern of this thesis. In other words, whether or not the SPC-into-PIL translator has consciously opted for changes in PROCESS TYPE, MOOD TYPE, MODAL DEIXIS etc. (see below) will not be an issue (and in most cases it is a fair guess that the translator is unlikely to be aware of the specificities of a number of SFG categories).

6.2. Degree of granularity in typologies of shifts
Chesterman’s useful quadripartite set of concepts (methods, strategies, techniques and shifts) has important implications for the degree of granularity necessary in the sub-classification of each of these four categories. This is a consequence of the difference in application with which each of the four categories is to be associated: as Chesterman points out (2005: 26), catalogues of techniques, methods and strategies can be made to serve didactic purposes, which shifts cannot. Thus, contra Bakker, Koster et al. (2009: 270), to whom shifts may (also) be prescriptive in status, I side with Chesterman when he points out that 'we do not teach shifts' (2005: 26), meaning that in translation classes we teach possibilities, and not results: techniques (and methods and strategies) are what can be taught to translator trainees in the guidance of derivational text generation, i.e. to make students

127 For a more detailed definition of translation unit, see section 8.1.3.
aware of the options open to them before and in the middle of the translation process. Examples of such didactic catalogues are found in textbooks of translation like Newmark (1988) and Schjoldager (2008), and they include the 'classic' typology of Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000), which must also be deemed prescriptive in purpose. For such typologies, a limited number of relatively broad categories is probably the most expedient choice (cf. Chesterman's (2005: 25) recommendation of 'portable' concepts for such catalogues). This, presumably, is why Newmark's (1988: ch. 8) typology of techniques consists of no more than 18 items, Schjoldager's (2008: ch. 6) twelve and Vinay and Darbelnet's (1958/2000) merely seven.

For analytical purposes, i.e. for the analysis of shifts, on the other hand, what is needed is a 'toolbox' of sufficiently fine-grained categories that will allow types of shifts to be distinguished from each other with as little ambiguity as possible. This is why the present investigation will rely on the conceptual framework of SFG, which enables such distinctions to be made with the necessary degree of delicacy. However, as will appear from below, the SFG-based framework will be supplemented by certain concepts from Chesterman's 30-item typology (1997: ch. 4). It is to be noted, however, that both purposes (the didactic and the analytic) are discernible in Chesterman' catalogue, which makes it somewhat opaque in intent:

[... N]o claims are being made here about the formal or theoretical status of these strategies or their grouping. In this context, if the strategies provide useful conceptual tools for talking about translation, for focusing on particular things that translators seem to do, and for improving translation skills, then that is justification enough. (Chesterman 1997: 93)

The use of the term strategies reflects the development in Chesterman's terminology. It thus appears that the strategies of the above quotation are to be conceived of as techniques (in the (2005) sense) in the first instance (for improving translation skills'). Yet, especially the phrase 'for focusing on particular things that translators seem to do' may be taken to imply an analytical, or at least a descriptive, teleology as well. This conflation of purposes need not be problematic: in the (2005) article, Chesterman in fact points out that although techniques and shifts must be conceptually differentiated from each other, there will be an overlap of some terms (ibid.: 26). Accordingly, those concepts from the (1997: ch. 4) typology which can be deemed operationalizable as analytical concepts will be adopted to fill gaps in the SFG-based framework to be presented below.

6.3. SFG as a (primary) analytical framework for shift analysis

Before a classification and closer examination of shift types from the perspective of an SFG framework is embarked on, the nature of translational shifts as such needs to be further conceptualized. Chesterman's definition of what he terms changes is an illuminating starting point:

At its simplest, such a taxonomy [of strategies] might consist of a single strategy only: Change something. [...] “Change something” could be informally glossed as follows: if you are not satis-

---

128 A prominent example of a framework designed for shift analysis is that of van Leuven-Zwart (1989; 1990), which, however, is intended especially for the analysis of literary translation, and therefore ignored here.
fied with the target version that comes immediately to mind – because it seems ungrammatical, or semantically odd, or pragmatically weak, or whatever – then change something in it. […] This grand overall strategy also suggests that one way to look at strategies in more detail is in fact as kinds of changes. Of course, the source text is “changed” anyway in an obvious sense when it is translated into another language; but change as a strategy begins to apply beyond the scope of this obvious change from one language to another. (Chesterman 1997: 92)

In other words, Chesterman appears to equate 'the version that comes immediately to mind' with literal translation (in TRP), which he may possibly be taken to view as a kind of default translation mode. In accordance with this definition, shifts in TRP can centrally be defined as the results of all the types of changes that depart from the 'shadow text' (Matthiessen 2001: 83) that would have been the result of a literal translation. The definition is easily applied to INTRA as well: since, according to Chesterman, changes only begin to operate beyond the switch from one language to another in TRP, shifts in INTRA may likewise be regarded as the results of changes occurring between ST and TT, only without the intervening switch in languages. Considering the sense of 'movement' and 'direction' associated with the concept of shift, further conceptualization is possible through recourse to metaphors derived from geography and transport. Thus, the lexicogrammatical resources of language could be conceived of as a 'space' or 'terrain' within which the 'route' between a source-text 'point of departure' and a target-text 'destination' may be identified, with the 'co-ordinates' (of 'departure' and 'arrival') specifiable in terms of the dimensions which organize lexicogrammar, i.e. a) grammar-lexis cline, b) metafunction, c) rank scale and d) axis. This means that

- a) shifts may either take place either in the grammatical zone or in the lexical zone, or it may occur along the cline, thus constituting a shift in delicacy (cf. Matthiessen 2001: 106). As will appear from below, shifts in delicacy are relevant primarily in the lexical zone of the cline.
- b) shifts may either be intra-metafunctional (ST and TT item belong to the same metafunction) or inter-metafunctional, i.e. involve a shift from one metafunction to another (cf. Matthiessen 2001: 101-104).
- c) shifts may occur along the paradigmatic axis (intra-systemic shifts - cf. Matthiessen (2001: 106)) or along the syntagmatic axis.
- d) shifts may be confined to the same rank (intra-rank shifts) or constitute a movement between ranks (inter-rank shifts - cf. Matthiessen (2001: 105-106)).

The four dimensions can be seen to combine in various ways to provide the 'co-ordinates' of shifts: in the case where e.g. a source-text [imperative] clause in the system of MOOD TYPE (such as don't smoke) is replaced by a modulated [indicative: declarative] clause in the TT (you shouldn't smoke), the change is located a) in the grammatical zone of the grammar-lexis cline, b) is intra-metafunctional, with the ST and TT items both belonging to the interpersonal metafunction, c) is intra-systemic, involving a change between two terms in the system of MOOD TYPE, and d) is an intra-rank shift, both features (the ST [imperative] and the TT [indicative: declarative]) being clausal phenomena. To take a different example, viz. the replacement of a source-text grammatical metaphor (such as Watson and Crick's discovery of DNA) with a de-metaphorized, i.e. a clausal wording in the TT (such as when Watson and Crick discovered DNA), the shift is likewise located a) within the
grammatical zone, d) it involves a shift between ranks (ST group → TT clause rank), and b) may be argued to be intra- as well as inter-metafunctional: ‘unpacking’ an ideational metaphor as a clause not only entails upranking group elements to constituents in experiential clause structure, but also involves the introduction of interpersonal as well as textual structure. Axis, however, would not appear to be a relevant dimension in this connection, since the shift is certainly not intra-systemic, and since viewing it in terms of a change along the syntagmatic axis hardly makes sense, the change in rank being sufficient explanation.

Considering the multiplicity of ways in which the four dimensions of lexicogrammatical ‘geography’ (grammar-lexis cline, metafunction, rank scale and axis) may combine in shifts, as indicated above, formulating an SFG-based typology of shifts necessitates giving priority to one of the four dimensions over the others. To be able to provide such a classification (or at least an outline of one such), therefore, point of departure will be taken in the grammar-lexis dimension, since (in lay-oriented INTRA at least) shifts are generally identifiable as belonging either within the grammatical or the lexical zone. In this respect, the classification follows the general approach of Chesterman (1997: ch. 4), whose typology is divided into three main categories, viz. a ‘syntactic’, a ‘semantic’ (i.e. lexical) and a ‘pragmatic’ one. However, only insofar as this division between a ‘syntactic’ and ‘semantic’ category can be seen to correspond to the SFG distinction between a grammatical and a lexical zone of lexicogrammar do the classifications overlap. Chesterman’s terms (syntactic and semantic) may connote a view of grammar in which syntax is mere structure and devoid of meaning (though it is not clear whether Chesterman shares this view). It is important to emphasize that shifts in all three categories entail changes in meaning, albeit of different kinds and to very different degrees. A particularly valuable feature of Chesterman’s typology, on the other hand, is the recognition of a third category beyond grammatical and lexical shifts (the ‘pragmatic’ category). A deficiency of an SFG-based framework is that it offers no categories to explain changes that cannot be contained within grammatical and lexical categories, which is a lacuna that especially Chesterman’s third category remedies. In the following, shift types within each of these main categories will exemplified, with the other dimensions of lexicogrammatical organization serving as tentative parameters of subclassification in the grammatical and lexical categories.

To emphasize that the analytical model proposed here is intended as a framework applicable to both of the two Jakobsonian translation categories involving language in ST and TT alike, i.e. both INTRA and TRP, the examples selected in the following sections are all taken from TRP (mostly English-into-Danish translations or vice-versa and a minor number of German-into-English examples). However, two features of interlingual translation complicate the application of the model to the analysis of TRP:

- TRP involves two language systems, and hence, for the model to be applicable, the two languages must be systemically comparable. This, however, appears largely to be the case with regard to English and Danish, which must be deemed close in terms of language typology. Therefore, although the ‘map’ of grammatical resources (the so-called function-rank matrix - see section 5.8) in which point of departure will be taken for a survey of possible grammatical shifts is the one formulated specifically for English, it will be assumed that it may safely be applied to Danish as well. No such matrix has been
formulated for Danish, but, judging from the two SF descriptions of Danish in existence (Andersen and Smedegaard 2005; Frimann 2004), there is a strong case to be made that the English matrix can be applied to Danish also and taken as a common frame of reference (in the category of grammar) for the investigation of translational shifts between the two languages.

- Differences in parallel texts in two different languages (such as a translation pair) may be located anywhere on the cline of instantiation (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2008: 161): they may belong to the systemic (i.e. potential) pole, be sub-systemic (register-dependent) or purely instantiation, i.e. incidental by being confined to a specific text pair. In the following, the intention has been to select examples that are, as far as possible, confined to the instantiation pole of the cline and hence to be regarded as optional ones, unlike obligatory changes, which result from systemic differences between the two languages (for this distinction (optional/obligatory), see Chesterman 2005: 23). Resulting from systemic differences, obligatory shifts are *necessitated* by the switch in language and therefore manifest themselves as automatic shifts in the translation process (ibid.; cf. Matthiessen 2001: 109). The systemic differences behind such shifts, as Chesterman points out (2005: 23), is the research territory of contrastive linguistics and not Translation Studies. Only shifts resulting from a choice between several, equally legitimate options can be the domain of Translation Studies (ibid.), which is why only such shifts (i.e. optional ones) will be exemplified below.

### 6.4. Shift types within the grammatical zone of the grammar-lexis cline

The purpose in this section, it should be made clear, will not be to establish a finite typology of grammatical shifts: even within a framework based on SFG, the number of grammatical shift types may not be infinite, but potentially much too numerous to allow specification of every single type. To take a case in point: one type is intra-systemic shifts (see below), i.e. changes between terms within a grammatical system such as PROCESS TYPE, where for example a source-text [material] clause may be changed into a TT [relational] one. However, since the system of PROCESS TYPE comprises six terms, the number of possible shift types within this system alone adds up to a total of 30. Whether all shift types within this specific system are really conceivable in real-life translation, i.e. instantially, is impossible to decide. Undoubtedly, some of these are more likely than others, but the SF description allows for the *possibility* of all types. Therefore, instead of a minute account of all specific possibilities, which is simply not feasible, only a broad overview with examples of possible shift types will be given.

As indicated above, a general survey of potential shifts within the grammatical zone must navigate within the ‘map’ of grammatical resources, i.e. the matrix of metafunctions on the horizontal axis intersected with ranks on the vertical, with the major grammatical systems located in each section, as introduced in section 5.8 (see table 5.8). Grammatical shifts in

---

129To mention just one example of a systemic difference (register-independent, and therefore automatized in translation) between English and Danish: within the system of THEME, Danish exhibits one particular structural restriction that is virtually absent in English, namely a constraint on the first element of the Rheme. This element must be taken up by the Finite, and this is what causes inversion of Subject and Finite in certain [declarative] clauses in Danish: if the Theme is marked, i.e. does not conflate with the Subject, the Subject is shifted to post-Finite position, whereas in English the word order in [declarative] clauses is virtually fixed (Subject^Finite). The example is inspired by Teich (2003: 118), who points out a similar difference between German and English, with German exhibiting the same constraints on the structure of the Rheme as Danish.
fact appear to fall into two main categories, viz. a) intra-systemic shifts, which are inherently rank-internal and intra-metafunctional and b) shifts along the rank scale. Shifts along the syntagmatic axis, on the other hand, appear to be confined to the lexical category, and inter-metafunctional shifts, while recognizable, only manifest themselves in combination with certain types of inter-rank shifts, as will be shown below. As Matthiessen (2001: 99) points out, 'in translation metafunction tends to be preserved.'

6.4.1. Intra-systemic shifts
In this section, one or two examples will be given of shifts within systems from each metafunction at clause and group/phrase rank, and at word rank in the form of transcategorization (i.e. changes in word class). Shifts in the word-rank systems of DENOTATION and CONNOTATION, on the other hand, are not possible to illustrate. This is because TRP examples of shift in DENOTATION would be confined to cases where a SL word crosses the linguistic border to enter a foreign-language TT. If, in this process, the word undergoes a change in experiential meaning, this would qualify as a shift in DENOTATION, and if there is a concomitant change in interpersonal meaning, a shift in CONNOTATION would be the case. No TRP examples of such shifts have been found, however. As for ST-TT differences at morpheme rank in TRP, such shifts derive from systemic differences and are accordingly obligatory in translation.

Once again, it should be emphasized that the systems represented in the below examples only represent a fraction of the total possible number, which is in the vicinity of a thousand (Halliday 2003: 25).

1. Clause rank, experiential: shift in PROCESS TYPE. The specific shift in the example is [relational] (ST) → [material] (TT):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: To remain competitive we must constantly innovate, [...] (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)</th>
<th>TT, Da: Hvis vi skal fastholde vores konkurrenceevne, skal vi løbende udvikle nye og bedre produkter. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [literal back translation: If we are to maintain our competitiveness, we must continually develop new and better products.]

Comment: The English non-finite clause is [relational], with To remain as Process and competitive as Attribute. The Danish dependent clause is [material] with the following constituent structure: vi = Actor, skal fastholde = Process and vores konkurrenceevne = Goal.

2. Clause rank, experiential: shift in the [material]-clause system of IMPACT. The specific shift is [transitive] → [intransitive]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: We increased sales by 11% (measured in local currencies) and our reported operating profit</th>
<th>TT, Da: Salget steg med 11% (opgjort i lokale valutaer), og det rapporterede resultat af primær drift steg med 21%. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| [literal back translation: Sales increased by 11%]
by 21%. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)  
*(measured in local currencies, and the reported operating result increased by 21%).*

Comment: The change means that what is Goal (= sales) in the ST becomes Actor (= Salget) in the TT.

3. Clause rank, logical: shift in clause complexing (TAXIS). The specific shift is [hypotaxis] → [parataxis]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En:</th>
<th>TT, Da:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>As the global economic environment and the reimbursement environment for medicines developed as we anticipated, with continuing challenges, (α;) we are pleased to be able to report very positive results for 2009. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)</td>
<td>Den globale økonomi og tilskudsreglerne for medicin udviklede sig som forventet med fortsatte udfordringer, (2:) og på den baggrund er vi særligt tilfredse med at kunne rapportere om et 2009 med meget positive resultater. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 2)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Back translation: The global economy and the reimbursement rules for medicines developed as expected with continuing challenges, (2:) and on that background we are particularly pleased to be able to report (on) a 2009 with very positive results.]

Comment: The ST complex is hypotactic, consisting of a dependent clause followed by a dominant one (β^α), whereas the TT is a complex of two independent clauses (1^2).

4. Clause rank, interpersonal, MOOD TYPE. The shift is [imperative] → [indicative: declarative]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, Da:</th>
<th>TT, Da:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If there is ![... a] gas leakage in the area, do not start engine. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 2)</td>
<td>Motoren må ikke startes, hvis der er naturlig gas eller flaskegas i nærheden. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Back translation: The engine must not be started if there is natural gas or LP gas in the vicinity.]

Comment: The Danish clause is a modulated [declarative], which renders the TT semantically close to a proposal (cf. IFG3: 147-48). In the ST, the proposal is congruently realized by an [imperative] clause.

5. Clause rank, interpersonal, SUBJECT PERSON. The shift is [interactive] → [non-interactive]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, Da:</th>
<th>TT, En:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>På Københavns Bymuseum finder du en mindestue indrettet med genstande, som har tilhørt Søren Kierkegaard. (Wonderful Copenhagen 2011b)</td>
<td>At the Copenhagen City Museum a room has been set up with Kierkegaard memorabilia. (Wonderful Copenhagen 2011a)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At Copenhagen’s City Museum you will find a memorial room furnished with items that belonged to Søren Kierkegaard.

Comment: The ST has a 2nd-person, the TT a 3rd-person Subject.

6. Clause rank, interpersonal metafunction, FINITENESS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: [...] safety information to tell you how to avoid or reduce the risk of injury. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 1)</th>
<th>TT, Da: [...] sikkerhedsoplysninger, der forklarer dig, hvordan du undgår skader eller nedsætter risikoen for skader. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Back translation: [...] safety information which explains to you how you avoid injuries or reduce the risk of injuries.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In this case, admittedly, the shift is motivated by systemic differences between English and Danish: both languages allow non-finite clauses, but only in English is it possible to have a WH-element as Theme in this type of clause (cf. Sørensen 1991: 25). The translational solution has been to convert the [non-finite] structure into a [finite] clause in Danish. In the VG, this is necessarily matched by a corresponding shift from non-finite (*to avoid* and *reduce*) to finite form (*undgår* and *nedsætter*, where the Danish morpheme *-r* marks present tense).

7. Clause rank, textual, THEME:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: With headquarters in Denmark, Novo Nordisk employs more than 29,300 employees in 76 countries and markets its products in 179 countries. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 1)</th>
<th>TT, Da: Novo Nordisk har hovedkvarter i Danmark, beskæftiger over 29.300 medarbejdere i 76 lande og sælger sine produkter i 179 lande. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Back translation: Novo Nordisk has headquarters in Denmark, employs more than 29,300 employees in 76 countries and sells its products in 179 countries.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The Theme is [marked] in English (Theme and Subject are not identical), whereas it is [unmarked] in Danish (Theme and Subject conflated, Theme underlined).

8. Clause rank and group rank (VG), VOICE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: At Novo Nordisk, decisions about our operations are driven by The Triple Bottom Line. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 1)</th>
<th>TT, Da: I Novo Nordisk træffer vi alle forretningsmæssige beslutninger ud fra princippet om den tredobbelt bundlinje. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Back translation: At Novo Nordisk we make all]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: The English clause is [receptive] (with a VG in the [active] voice\textsuperscript{130}), the Danish clause [operative] (and hence with a VG in the [passive]). This, of course, entails a shift in the mapping between Subject and the constituents in the experiential structure of the clause: in the English clause, the Subject maps onto the Goal (decisions), whereas in the Danish clause the Subject (vi) is identical with the Actor.

9. 'Above the clause': shifts in cohesive relations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From a technical manual:]</th>
<th>TT, Da: Hvis du spilder brændstof, så vent med at starte motoren, indtil brændstoffet er fordampet. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST, En: If fuel spills, wait until it evaporates before starting engine. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 2)</td>
<td>[Back translation: If you spill fuel, then wait with starting the engine until the fuel has evaporated.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Where the ST uses anaphoric reference (by means of the pronoun it), the TT achieves cohesion lexically by means of repetition (brændstof – brændstoffet). (The shift seems to be motivated by disambiguation: the translator may have feared that direct translation of the ST pronoun it might entail ambiguity of reference in the TT.)

10. Group rank, NG, logical metafunction, TYPE OF MODIFICATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From a technical manual:]</th>
<th>TT, Da: Gennemvædning af luftfilteret med olie. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 15)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST, En: Oil saturation of air filter. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 3)</td>
<td>[Back translation: Saturation of the air filter with oil.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: What is Premodifier/Classifier in the English NG is Qualifier/Postmodifier in the Danish one. In this case, the change may in fact be due to systemic differences between the two languages, since English allows a wider range of word classes to function as Premodifier in the NG than Danish (cf. Sørensen 1991: 50). However, it might be possible to mirror the English NG structure by choosing a Danish compound: oliegennemvædning.

11. Group rank, NG, DEIXIS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From a technical manual:]</th>
<th>TT, Da: Tag minuskablet af batteriet, hvis motoren er udstyret med elstarter. (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 14)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST, En: Disconnect battery at negative terminal (only engines with electric start). (Briggs &amp; Stratton Corporation 2000: 2)</td>
<td>[Back translation: Take the negative cable off the battery if the engine is equipped with an electric</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: The absence of a Deictic means that the underlined English NG is [non-specific]. The Danish NG is [specific], on the other hand, owing to the presence of the definite article (the suffix -en in Danish). Apart from that, a shift in NUMBER has taken place, the English NG being [plural], the Danish [singular].

12. Word rank, transcategorization\(^{131}\):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: <em>We continue to be the global leader</em> (Novo Nordisk Scandinavia AB 2009a: 8)</th>
<th>ST, Da: <em>Vi er fortsat globalt førende</em> (Novo Nordisk Scandinavia AB 2009b: 8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Back translation: <em>We continue to be globally leading</em>]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: There is a difference in word class between the two underlined items. Thus, where the ST uses a nominal derivation of the English morpheme *lead-*., the TT uses an adjectival derivation of the corresponding Danish morpheme *før*.-.

### 6.4.2. Shifts along the rank scale

The other main category of shifts in the grammatical zone is relocation of a unit from one rank to another. Examples are:

1. Shift in rank, from group constituent to clause constituent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From an annual report:]</th>
<th>TT, Da: <em>Lårets løb har vi også gennemført en række tiltag, der skaber grundlag for bedre resultater på lang sigt.</em> (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST, En:</strong> <em>Our accomplishments during the year also include measures that will provide a foundation for better long-term performance.</em> (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 7)</td>
<td>[Back translation: <em>During the year, we have also accomplished a number of measures which create the foundation for better results in the long run.</em>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: *During the year* is Postmodifier (Qualifier in the experiential structure) in the English NG *Our accomplishments during the year*. In the Danish version, *I årets løb* has been shifted 'upwards' to clause rank, where it functions as Adjunct/Circumstantial.

2. Shift in rank, from clause constituent to ranking clause:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From an annual report:]</th>
<th>TT, Da: <em>(α):</em> *Det har krævet solid dokumentation og slagkraftige argumenter for, hvorfor denne behandling bør blive et standardtilbud, <em>(β):</em> <em>for vi</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ST, En:</strong> <em>Achieving market access and reimbursement for a new medicine in a new treatment class</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{131}\) *Transcategorization* is the term that will be adopted in the analyses to refer to changes in word class between STs and TTs. Such changes relate to the system of DERIVATION (see section 5.8), but will not be referred to as *shifts in DERIVATION*. The reason is that in far from all cases would it appear warranted to refer to the use of derivational resources (e.g. suffixes) as a *shift* in DERIVATION - if e.g. the transcategorization of a ST adjective (such as *fragile*) into a TT noun (*fragility*) is effected by the use of a derivational resource (here: the suffix *-ity*) on one side of the ST-TT divide only.
required strong evidence and compelling arguments for why this therapy should become a standard treatment. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 2)

kunne komme ind på markedet og opnå tilskudsberettigelse. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 2)

[Back translation: It has required solid documentation and compelling arguments for why this treatment should become a standard offer before we could get access to the market and achieve reimbursement entitlement.]

Comment: The underlined clause is an embedded clause (functioning as Carrier) in what is a simplex in the English ST. In the Danish version, it takes the part of a ranking (i.e. non-embedded) clause in a clause complex.

3. Finally, an example should be given of the type of shift whereby a nominal group is transformed into a clause:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: [...] a testament to our belief in this future treatment paradigm. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 3)</th>
<th>TT, Da: ... det synlige bevis på, at vi tror på denne behandlingsform. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Back translation: [...] the visible proof that we believe in this treatment form.]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: the ideational metaphor our belief in English has been turned into a clause in Danish (at vi tror på), which exemplifies the shift type for which the label de-metaphorization will adopted (cf. section 5.6), i.e. the 'unpacking' of an ideational metaphor into a more congruent, clausal version. The shift obviously entails other changes, such as transcategorization: the ST noun belief has been converted into the TT verb tror (present tense of the verb tro) and the ST possessive pronoun our has become the TT nominative-case vi. As previously indicated, apart from involving a shift 'upwards' along the rank scale, de-metaphorization may be argued to constitute an inter-metafunctional shift as well, in that the constituent structure of a nominal group is confined to the experiential and logical metafunctions (cf. section 5.5.1), whereas transformation into clausal structure involves the introduction of thematic as well as interpersonal structure. Thus, in the Danish clause fragment at vi tror (English: that we believe) the experiential structure is vi = Senser and tror = Process, the interpersonal structure is vi = Subject and tror = Finite+Predicator, and the thematic structure at vi = Theme and tror = Rheme.

6.5. Shift types within the lexical zone of the grammar-lexis cline

In the lexical zone of the cline, shifts between ranks would appear to be of rather limited relevance (but see section 6.5.3 on syntagmatic shifts), whereas the other dimensions of lexicogrammatical organization, i.e. metafunction and axis, turn out to be of much greater significance. In the following, a finite typology will be posited, with shift types in this zone sub-divided according to metafunction. Several types can be found to correspond to Chesterman's categories, which will be reinterpreted in a systemic-functional framework. The inventory is the following:
Experiential metafunction:
- Shifts between denotationally equivalent items (paradigmatic shift type). Label adopted: •synonymy\textsuperscript{132} (section 6.5.1).
- Shifts between denotational opposites (paradigmatic shift type). Labels adopted: •Antonymy and •converses (section 6.5.2).
- Syntagmatic shifts. Labels adopted: •expansion and •compression (section 6.5.3).
- Shifts along the cline of delicacy. Labels adopted: •hyponymy and •hyperonymy (section 6.5.4).
- Shifts expressible as part-whole relations (paradigmatic shift type). Labels adopted: •meronymy and •holonymy (section 6.5.5).
- Shifts in technicality (paradigmatic shift type). Labels adopted: •increase- and •decrease-in-technicality (section 6.5.6).
- Shifts in lexical metaphoricity. Labels adopted: •lexical metaphorization and •lexical de-metaphorization (section 6.5.7).

Interpersonal metafunction:
- Shifts in formality (paradigmatic shift type). Labels adopted: •increase- and •decrease-in-formality (section 6.5.8).

Textual metafunction:
- Shifts in LEXICAL COHESION (paradigmatic shift type) (section 6.5.9).

As appears from the above list, several of the categories constitute 'pairs' of shift types, with the individual members of certain categories representing opposite 'directions' (cf. Toury 2004a: 20), such as •expansion vs. •compression. This has its parallel in the grammatical super-category, where any shift type is always mirrored by the possibility of the reverse movement (e.g. [receptive] to [operative] vs. [operative] to [receptive] in the system of VOICE).

6.5.1. Shifts between denotational (near-)equivalents
In TRP, this shift type equals the replacement of a source-text lexical item not by its 'obvious' denotational equivalent, but by a •synonym (Chesterman 1997: 102). An example would be the translation of the English lexeme fabulous into Danish fantastisk or German fantastisch instead of the most literal choice, which would be Danish fabelagtig and German fabelhaft. In INTRA, of course, this would correspond to the replacement of English fabulous with fantastic. As noted by Cruse (1986: 266), no clear definition of •synonymy is possible, however. In Cruse’s definition, •synonymy is correspondence with regard to central semantic traits and difference only in peripheral traits (ibid.). Moreover, •synonymy is a scalar concept, extending from total identity of meaning over near-synonymy to the point where two items cannot be regarded as synonyms. Unfortunately, no criteria exist for determining this ‘cut-off’ point where •synonymy no longer exists (ibid.). For the purposes

\textsuperscript{132} From this point on, labels adopted in this thesis to refer to shift types will be preceded by the symbol ‘•’. Exceptions are all the shift types that are referred to by the very word shift as the first word (where any further symbol must be deemed superfluous). This includes virtually all grammatical shifts, such as shift in VOICE.
of this thesis, two lexical items will be regarded as synonymous if they are interchangeable with no or only insignificant change of denotational meaning. What is ‘insignificant’ will be a matter of analytical judgment.

6.5.2. Shifts between denotational opposites

In Chesterman's typology, shifts between denotational opposites are termed •antonymy (1997: 102) and •converses (ibid.: 103), which are the labels that will be adopted here. According to Murphy and Koskala (2010: 16), •antonymy is 'the paradigmatic lexical relation between two lexemes that are opposite in meaning, such as big/little, female/male, up/down'. Chesterman's example (1997: 102) is inclusive/exclusive. If an antonym is selected in the TT, it can be expected to occur in combination with the opposite polarity (+/− not) of that in the corresponding ST clause. As for •converses, these 'describe the same relation or activity from different perspectives, and follow patterns like: If X is p to Y, then Y is q to X' (Murphy and Koskala 2010). Examples are buy/sell, child/parent and above/below (ibid.).

6.5.3. Syntagmatic shifts

Syntagmatic shifts correspond to what Chesterman (1997: 104) labels •expansion and •compression, the former referring to 'a change in the distribution of the “same” semantic [i.e. lexical] components over more items' (ibid.: 104). •Compression is the opposite, i.e. the concentration of a number of semantic components into fewer lexical items. An interlingual example of •expansion would thus be the translation of German Krankheit or Danish sygdom [back translation of both: disease] into English as medical condition.

It should be noted that Chesterman's definition appears to cover only those instances where the number of lexical items differ between ST and TT. It needs to be made clear that for the purposes of this thesis, •expansion will be used to refer to the replacement of a source-text item with a target-text expression which encodes the same semantic content in a higher number of words and not necessarily a higher number of lexical words (though this will mostly be the case). This needs to be stressed because •expansion, as operationalized for present purposes, may involve the introduction of words that are located further towards the grammatical zone on the grammar-lexis cline. •Compression will be used in the exact opposite sense, i.e. as a reference to the replacement of a source-text unit consisting of several words with a target-text unit consisting of fewer words, but expressing the same experiential content. Thus, although •expansion and •compression are shift types that concern lexis more than grammar, they do not operate exclusively in the lexical zone, which bears witness to the fact that an absolute distinction between grammatical and lexical shift types cannot be maintained. Moreover, it may be noted that the two shift types (•expansion and •compression) include an element of rank shift, i.e. an element of grammatical change: when, as in the above example, the semantic content of one ST word is 'spread out across' two in the TT, this equals conversion of a word-rank item into a group (medical condition forms a nominal group in which medical is Premodifier/Classifier and condition is Head/Thing). Still, •expansion and •compression go beyond mere rank shift, in that they involve the replacement of (what is mostly) lexical items.
6.5.4. Shifts in delicacy
In the lexical zone, shifts in delicacy consist in •hyponymy between ST and TT (the TT item is the subordinate one) and •hyperonymy (the TT item is the superordinate one) (cf. Chesterman 1997: 102-103). An example is:

[From a technical manual:]
ST, En: Use clean, fresh, lead-free, regular gasoline with a minimum of 77 octane. (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 9)

TT, German (!): Reinen, frischen, bleifreien Normalkraftstoff mit einer Mindesoktanzahl von 77 verwenden. (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 9)

[Back translation: Use clean, fresh, lead-free normal fuel with a minimum of 77 octane.]

Comment: At the same level of delicacy, an equivalent German translation of English gasoline would be Benzin. As it is, the •hyperonym -kraftstoff [English: fuel] has been selected. Had the ST item been fuel and the TT item Benzin, the shift would have been the opposite, i.e. •hyponymy.

6.5.5. Part-whole relations
These are shift types where the ST item denotes a part and the TT item the whole of a phenomenon (•holonymy) or vice-versa (•meronymy). An example is:

[From a technical manual:]
ST, En [a headline]: WHEN OPERATING EQUIPMENT (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 2)

TT, German: BEIM BETRIEB DES MOTORS (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 8)

[Back translation:] In connection with operation of the engine.

Comment: The shift between ST and TT is one from whole to part, TT Motor being a •meronym of ST equipment. Had the ST item been engine and the TT item Gerät (equipment), the shift would have been the opposite, i.e. with the TT in a •holonymic relation (cf. Murphy and Koskela 2010: 102) to the ST item.

6.5.6. Shifts in technicality
Before any definition of shifts in technicality can be attempted, the very concept of technical term needs to be defined first: I shall adopt the definition proposed by Meyer and Mackintosh (2000: 113), according to which a technical term is 'a lexical item [...] used in a particular domain of expertise' where it is identified with 'a rigidly fixed obligatory range of meaning' (ibid.: 111). Shifts in technicality, then, are manifested when a technical term is replaced by a non-technical, i.e. general-language, equivalent (•decrease-in-technicality), or vice-versa (•increase-in-technicality). However, the possibility of complete 'equivalence' or 'synonymy' between a technical and a non-technical term must - in many cases, at least - be dismissed as a fiction, since technical terms encode conceptual taxonomies that typically deviate from 'folk' conceptions (cf. section 5.7 on the divergence between scientific and 'folk' taxonomies). Hence, the term •decrease-in-technicality will be applied to cases where a TT item can be deemed to represent not a completely synony-
mous, but nevertheless a close rendering, in non-technical terms, of the denotational content of a source-text technical term. •Increase-in-technicality, obviously, represents the reverse phenomenon, but in these cases the shift entails a potential increase in semantic specificity from ST to TT, and not, as in cases of •decrease-in-technicality, potential semantic loss (cf. Meyer and Mackintosh 2000: 114; 124).

Since shifts in technicality entail 'movement' between two different systems (a scientific/technological taxonomy and a 'folk' one - cf. above), it is debatable whether a paradigmatic shift is involved. Yet, since in the SF conception all lexical distinctions can - in theory, at least - be traced back to indelicate, grammatical ones, a common point of origin for the two systems may be posited at a sufficiently low point of delicacy in the giant system network which constitutes the totality of the lexicogrammatical resources of a language. In other words, although the technical and the non-technical item cannot be identified as realizations of different, but related options within the same system, the shift is still paradigmatic.

6.5.6.1. Difficulties in identifying technical terms and shifts in technicality

Despite the clear definition that can be given of technical termhood as such (see above), it is not always clear, nevertheless, whether a given lexical item should be regarded as a technical term or not. In translation analysis, this is a complicating circumstance when it comes to the identification of a •decrease-/•increase-in-technicality between a source- and a target-text item. In fact, as Matthiessen, Teruya et al. (2010: 5) point out, the technicality of lexis must be conceived of as a cline, by which they appear to mean that the recognizability of a lexical item’s technical status is a matter of degree. Thus, at one extreme, representing cases of marked technicality, are found lexical items whose technical status is obvious because they (virtually) never occur outside the specialized register or registers of the discipline within which the theory [i.e. the scientific theory in question] has been developed (ibid.). In other words, the technicality of such items is easily recognizable by virtue of their 'foreignness' to general-language registers. At the opposite pole, on the other hand, are found items from so-called core vocabulary (typically of Anglo-Saxon origin (Carter 1998: 45)) which may occur across registers, but have been technicalized, i.e. associated with a specialized meaning, within certain disciplines (Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 5). An example would be a legal term like grievous bodily harm, whose individual components (the three words grievous, bodily and harm) are not in themselves technical, but assume technical status when used together in the field of criminal law.

Though not mentioned by Matthiessen, Teruya et al. (2010), the intermediate zone on the cline of technicality would presumably be occupied by items originating in scientific registers, where they still hold a well-defined place in the scientific taxonomy in question, but which are also found outside specialist registers - e.g. medical terms such as AIDS, antibiotics, sclerosis, diabetes (cf. Hoste, Vanopstal et al. 2010: 5), i.e. items also occurring in the registers of non-experts, where they are typically used without precise knowledge of their scientific content (Meyer and Mackintosh 2000: 114). When such items are found in their original type of environment, i.e. in expert registers such as the SPC, however, their multi-registerial prevalence cannot be deemed to detract from their technical status.

What also complicates matters is that, according to White (1998), a distinction may be
drawn between technological and scientific terminology - a separation rooted in denotational as well etymological difference: scientific terms denote classes of naturally occurring phenomena identified and classified by science (my definition), and are typically of Greek or Latin derivation, whereas technological terms are often items from the 'vernacular lexicon' redeployed to denote a specific type of technical product/apparatus (ibid.: 267). An example is the term mouse, which has been transferred from zoology to the domain of computing (ibid.: 268). In this thesis, following Matthiessen, Teruya et al. (2010: 270, note 1), the distinction between the two categories of terms will not be upheld, which means that the label technical term will be used to refer to both technological and scientific terms. Moreover, by far the majority of technical terms in the empirical material under investigation in this thesis are scientific ones.

In SPCs, the identification of technical terms usually presents no problem: owing to their Graeco-Latin origin (cf. Hoste, Vanopstal et al. 2010: 18-19), the technical status of items such as neuralgia, akathisia and gastro-intestinal (ibid.: 5) is easily recognizable, while at the same time etymology is obviously not to be taken as anything more than an indication of technical status. This is because, following Sager (1990: 19; cf. Matthiessen, Teruya et al. 2010: 5) and in accordance with the definition given at the beginning of section 6.5.6, subject-specificity must be emphasized as criterial of technical termhood, which means that only items employed in a recognizably medical sense in these texts will be regarded as technical terms. Hence, when a Greek/Latin item likely to occur in a range of academic/administrative registers, with no domain-specific meaning, is replaced by a less academic item, such a shift will be registered as an interpersonal shift (a •decrease-in-formality - see section 6.5.2 below) only. Examples (freely invented) of such shifts would be the intralingual replacement of an item like accumulate with gather and predilection with liking. In cases of doubt whether a given item is to be regarded as a technical term or not, recourse to 'external authority' will be had: in the analyses of the empirical material, such cases will be checked in Elsevier’s Medical Dictionary in Five Languages (Sliosberg 1975), the rationale being that if a term is registered in this comprehensive dictionary of medical terms, this equals technical status. One case of ‘dubious technicality’ is thus the term administer, which frequently occurs in especially the SPCs. The problem with this item is that it is not restricted to medical registers, as is borne out by such collocations as administer justice and administer a sacrament. However, administer is in fact registered in Elsevier’s Medical Dictionary, and will accordingly be regarded as a technical term.

6.5.6.2. Shift in technicality exemplified

One (interlingual) example of •decrease-in-technicality is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST, En: Actraphane is a replacement insulin which is identical to the insulin made by the pancreas. (European Medicines Agency 2006a: 1)</th>
<th>TT, Da: Actraphane er et erstatningsinsulin, der er identisk med det insulin, der produceres af bugspytkirtlen (European Medicines Agency 2006b: 1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[From an EU report, aimed at the lay public, stating the grounds for the authorizing of a specific medicinal product for marketing:]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Back translation: Actraphane is a replacement insulin which is identical to the insulin which is produced by the pancreas [literally: the abdominal salivary gland]].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: in the field of medicine, English in many cases only has a (Graeco-)Latin term, whereas Danish in a number of cases has a (Graeco-)Latin term as well as a non-technical Danish term (Zethsen 2004: 134), i.e. of Germanic origin. In the present example, the translator has chosen the Danish term bugsprytirklen instead of transferring the Latin term pancreas, which does exist in Danish, but has a decidedly technical status. A similar example from the same text (European Medicines Agency 2006b: 2) is the Danish sukkersyge (literally: sugar illness), which is the non-technical Danish term for diabetes. Danish has both, whereas English only has diabetes.

6.5.6.3. Terminological note
Before leaving the definition of shifts in technicality, a note should be made on the choice of labels for this category of shifts (•decrease-/•increase-in-technicality). An alternative to •decrease-in-technicality would be de-terminologization, which, however, is used as a superordinate term by Montalt-Resurrecció and Shuttleworth, covering 'explanation, definition, exemplification, illustration, analogy, comparison and substitution by a more popular term' (2004: 16). Piorno (2012: 180) similarly uses determinologization as a generic term referring to a broad range of more specific shift types. Meyer and Mackintosh (2000) also use the term, but in a very different sense, viz. about the linguistic developments that take place when technical terms gain general-language currency, i.e. 'move' outside the registers of expert communication. Because these various uses are at odds with the sense needed here (as defined above), the label de-terminologization has been avoided.

6.5.7. Shifts in lexical metaphoricity
In the lexical zone, a change in metaphoricity results from the replacement of a metaphorical ST item with a non-metaphorical TT item or the reverse (Chesterman (1997: 105-107). The term •lexical de-metaphorization has been chosen for the former case and •lexical metaphorization for the latter. Whether this type of shift is also to be categorized as a paradigmatic one is questionable: a metaphorical lexical expression and its non-metaphorical equivalent can hardly be said to form part of a paradigmatically organized lexical set. The shift type still belongs in the lexical category of shifts, since the relation between metaphorical and non-metaphorical equivalents is akin to synonymy, but otherwise this shift type appears to defy categorization in terms of the dimensions used to subclassify the other lexical shift types.

An example of a shift in metaphoricity is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[From an annual report:]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ST, En: [... G]overnments and private payers face budget constraints. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT, Da: [... R]egeringer og private indkøbere overalt i verden spænder livremmen ind. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Back translation: [...G]overnments and private purchasers all over the world tighten the belt.]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The non-metaphorical TT expression has been metaphorized in the TT. The TT expression is in fact a clausal construction, with spænder (English: tigthen) = Process and livremmen (English: belt) = Goal, which in this case replaces a corresponding clausal con-
6.5.8. Lexical shifts within the interpersonal metafunction

Within the interpersonal metafunction, shifts are paradigmatic ones between lexical items that are denotationally (more or less) equivalent, but connotationally variant by being located on different points on a scale of formality (cf. section 5.7). Hence, the labels adopted are •decrease- and •increase-in-formality, respectively. A German-into-English example from Chesterman (1997: 108) is:

| ST, German: Damit können ... Meilen-Guthaben gesammelt ... werden. |
| Back translation: Thereby, mileage-discounts can be collected. |
| TT, English: This means that passengers can clock up "Qualiflyer" mileage. |

Comment: the phrasal English verb clock up is slightly less formal than the German verb sammeln (Chesterman 1997: 108).

Other, intralingual examples of the possible replacement of academic with non-academic items were given above.

It should be noted that the category in Chesterman's typology from which the above example is taken is also termed 'interpersonal change' (1997: 110). This category, however, is broader in scope than my SFG-based category, referring to a change in 'the formality level, the degree of emotiveness and involvement, the level of technical lexis and the like: anything that involves a change in the relationship between text/author and the reader' (ibid.). Apart from being too broad to be analytically operable, the definition is problematic for not distinguishing between technicality and formality. From a systemic-functional perspective, as previously noted (cf. section 5.7), degree of technicality is an experiential (i.e. denotational) aspect of lexis, and formality an interpersonal (i.e. connotational) one, which is why two different categories are needed. Nevertheless, it must be acknowledged that a shift in technicality has interpersonal consequences as well: as Eggins and Slade point out (1997: 148-150), in casual conversation between peers a speaker may introduce technical lexis to assert an asymmetry in knowledge, and hence an unequal power relationship, between himself and the interlocutor(s). Conversely, it is to be inferred that even in more formal registers (i.e. ones marked by interpersonal distance) such as PILs, the choice of a non-technical instead of a technical term entails a lessening of the knowledge asymmetry on which the text type is otherwise based, and accordingly a less formal Tenor. When shifts in technicality are registered in the analyses, therefore, these interpersonal repercussions will be regarded as an automatic concomitant. The reverse, on the other hand, is not necessarily true: the difference between a formal and a less formal item need

---

133 Chesterman's category ('interpersonal change[s]'), it should also be noted, is part of his 'pragmatic' super-category. In this thesis, on the other hand, the shift type will be confined to shifts between lexical items within the interpersonal metafunction.
in no way have consequences relating to technicality.

6.5.9. Shifts within the textual metafunction

For a lexical shift within the textual metafunction to be observable, different systemic terms in LEXICAL COHESION must be selected in ST and TT in respect of a corresponding lexical item. An example is:

| ST, En: During 2009, we also reached out to 416,000 people with diabetes, offering training on how to manage their condition. (Novo Nordisk 2010a: 11) |
| TT, Da: I 2009 nåede vi også ud til 416.000 mennesker med diabetes med undervisning i, hvordan de bedst håndterer deres diabetes. (Novo Nordisk 2010b: 11) |

[Back translation: In 2009 we also reached out to 416.000 people with diabetes, with training on how they best handle their diabetes.]

Comment: the cohesive relation between the two underlined ST items is [hyponymy], diabetes being a hyponym of condition. In the TT, on the other hand, the cohesive relation between the corresponding set of items is achieved by means of [repetition].

Before moving on to the final category of shift types, it may be noted that most of Chesterman’s 'semantic' categories have in fact been reinterpreted and incorporated within the present SFG-based framework (along others which are not recognized by Chesterman). Three categories of Chesterman’s, however, have not been incorporated, viz. abstraction change (1997: 103), emphasis change (ibid.: 104), and other semantic strategies (ibid.: 107). All three are deemed too vaguely defined to be analytically operable. A fourth category, viz. paraphrase, will be adopted, but transferred to the category of pragmatic shift types (for reasons to be given in the next section).

6.6. Beyond lexicogrammar: pragmatic shift types

In Chesterman (1997: 107), the third major category of shift types (the 'pragmatic' category) is defined as having to do with 'the selection of information in the TT, a selection that is governed by the translator’s knowledge of the prospective readership of the translation. [...] Pragmatic strategies tend to involve bigger changes from the ST [...]’ (1997: 107).

Baker defines a similar group of strategies (aimed at what she terms 'pragmatic equivalence' (2011: 230 ff.)) as ones selected to ensure the coherence of a text, by which she refers to a text's ability to make sense to a given readership: ‘The coherence of a text is a result of the interaction between knowledge presented in the text and the reader’s own knowledge and experience of the world [...]’ (ibid.: 232). In an analytical context, however, such definitions are of little use: although regard for the lay readership of the TTs is undoubtedly what is behind many of these 'bigger changes' in lay-oriented INTRA, motivational factors are not operable criteria when it comes to the analytical categorization of a given (instantial) shift. Instead, the sole criterion applied here will be describability/non-describability in terms of lexicogrammatical dimensions. As previously mentioned, all shifts entail changes in meaning (extensive or only slight) between ST and TT, and if such changes are describable in terms of a grammatical or lexical type of shift, they will be cat-
egorized as such. This means that when a common denominator for a TT unit and its related ST unit can be found at the lexicogrammatical stratum (in the shape of one or more grammatical or lexical dimensions), the shift will be classified accordingly. Shift types belonging to the pragmatic category, on the other hand, represent differences in meaning between ST and TT which cannot be explained by recourse to lexicogrammatical categories. This situation occurs when no common grammatical or lexical denominator is identifiable between two units, e.g. because a given TT unit is purely an addition and not the result of derivation, or in some cases the opposite, i.e. when a given ST unit has no counterpart in the TT.

My typology of pragmatic shift types (deemed exhaustive, at least for the description of LSP TRP and INTRA) is the following, with no sub-classification being found necessary:

- •Direct transfer (section 6.6.1)
- •Omission (section 6.6.2)
- •Explicitation (section 6.6.3)
- •Addition (section 6.6.4)
- •Shifts in logogenesis (section 6.6.5)
- •Cultural adaptation (section 6.6.6)
- •Paraphrase (section 6.6.7)
- •Shifts in translator's visibility (section 6.6.8)

6.6.1. •Direct transfer

As a shift type, •direct transfer (henceforth: •DT) is in fact a contradiction in terms, referring (in SF terms) to selectional identity between a source-text unit and a corresponding target-text unit. In other words, •DT applies when no shift has taken place in the derivational process, because a source-text wording has been 'copy-pasted' into the TT without changes, which means that •DT really falls outside all three categories (grammatical, lexical and pragmatic shift types). It is accounted for here, however, as a matter of convenience. As in connection with the other (genuine) sub-categories of pragmatic shifts, one of the traditional designations known from TS literature will be preferred here for being handier in comparison with the more cumbersome labels that may be derived from SF terminology (such as identity of lexicogrammatical selection). The shift type in question is labelled borrowing in Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000: 85), and loan in Chesterman (1997: 94), but, since these terms may connote TRP only (as evidenced in the linguistic term loanword), the term •direct transfer (from Schjoldager 2008: 93) will be adopted here. No example is deemed necessary.

It should be noted that for the analysis of TRP, a further category of 'shiftless derivation' would be needed, viz. what is usually labelled direct or literal translation (e.g. Vinay and Darbelnet 1958/2000: 86), i.e. the very switch in languages which is the sine qua non in TRP, but with no shifts involved. Whereas both literal translation and direct transfer are possible in TRP, the former is of course logically impossible in INTRA, for which reason this shift type (or technique, rather) will be given no more attention here.
6.6.2. •Omission
In SF terms, •omission (adopted from Chesterman 1997: 109) is the result when no lexi-
cogrammatical TT unit has been selected to match a corresponding ST unit. An example is:

| ST, Da: De kendteste af hans værker omfatter symfoni nr. 3, 4 og 5, operaen 'Saul og David' og verket for solister, kor og orkester 'Fynsk forår'. (Wonderful Copenhagen 2011b) | TT, En: The best known of his works include Symphonies Three, Four and Five, the opera Saul and David and the work for soloists, choir and orchestra 'Springtime in Funen'. (Wonderful Copenhagen 2011a) |
| ST: Da: De kendteste af hans værker omfatter symfoni nr. 3, 4 og 5, operaen 'Saul og David' og verket for solister, kor og orkester 'Fynsk forår'. (Wonderful Copenhagen 2011b) | TT: En: The best known of his works include Symphonies Three, Four and Five, the opera 'Saul and David' and the work for soloists, choir and orchestra 'Springtime in Funen'. (Wonderful Copenhagen 2011a) |

Comment: The ST elements solister and orkester have been omitted in the corresponding TT unit the choral piece.

6.6.3. •Explicitation
•Explicitation is the result when a unit of meaning which is only implicit in the ST is made explicit in the TT (Chesterman 1997: 108). In SF terms,

[w]e assume ‘explicitation’ if in a translation (or language-internally in a pair of register-related texts) meanings (not only ideational, but including interpersonal and textual) are realized in the more explicit variant which are not realized in the less explicit variant, but which are in some theoretically motivated sense implicit in the latter. The resulting text is more ‘explicit’ than its counterpart. (Steiner 2008: 242)

An example is:

| ST, En: Do not wear lose-fitting clothing, dangling drawstrings or items that could become caught. (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 2) | TT, Da: Undgå at bære løstsiddende tøj, tøj med snore eller andre genstande, der kan sætte sig fast i de roterende dele. (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 14) |
| ST, En: Do not wear lose-fitting clothing, dangling drawstrings or items that could become caught. (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 2) | TT, Da: Undgå at bære løstsiddende tøj, tøj med snore eller andre genstande, der kan sætte sig fast i de roterende dele. (Briggs & Stratton Corporation 2000: 14) |
| [Back translation: Avoid wearing loose-fitting clothes, clothes with strings or other items which can get stuck in the rotating parts.] |

Comment: The ST in this clause does not explicitly mention that it is the rotating parts of the machine which the various types of clothing/items can become caught in, presumably because this has been mentioned earlier in the text. The TT is more thorough on this point, repeating the information.

6.6.4. •Addition
•Addition is the opposite of •omission, referring to the result of adding elements that cannot be inferred from the ST (Chesterman 1997: 109). Example:
6.6.5. Shifts in logogenesis

This shift type corresponds to Chesterman's coherence change, which has to do with 'the logical arrangement of information in the text, at the ideational level' (1997: 110). This must be taken to relate to changes in the order in which information is presented, especially through rearrangement of textual macrostructure, for which the term shift in logogenesis is preferred here. Logogenesis is an SFL term which refers to 'the unfolding of the act of meaning itself: the instantial construction of meaning in the form of text' (Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 18), i.e. the way meanings are made sequentially to create what we call text. This is why changes in the sequentiality of meanings in text may be referred to as logogenetic shifts. Chesterman's label coherence change is avoided here, since coherence in SFL refers to registerial consistency (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 23), i.e. the consistency of a text with regard to contextual configuration. No harm to registerial consistency need come from making changes to the order in which meanings are made in a text.

For reasons of space, i.e. because the shift type typically affects large segments of text, no example will be given.

6.6.6. •Cultural adaptation

Adopted from Chesterman (1997: 108), this type of shift is more or less similar to adaptation in Vinay and Darbelnet (1958/2000: 90-91) and Schjoldager (2008: 103) and to cultural equivalent in Newmark (1988: 82-83), being one that concerns culture-bound references. An example would be Tour de France translated as e.g. Vuelta España or Giro d'Italia, or a well-known children's song in one language replaced by an equally well-known song in the other language (Schjoldager's example). In INTRA, good examples can be found in the American adaptation of the Harry Potter novels, where a British item like biscuits is replaced by the American cookies, football is replaced by soccer and rounders by baseball (Zethsen 2009: 807).

---

134 Chesterman's term is cultural filtering, but filtering has been avoided here because the semantic feature of 'process' inherent in present participles makes the word more appropriate as a designation of a technique, and not a shift.
6.6.7. •Paraphrase

The result of •paraphrase is, in Chesterman’s own words, a TT version that is ‘loose, free, in some contexts even undertranslated. Semantic components at the lexeme level tend to be disregarded, in favour of the pragmatic sense of some higher unit such as a whole clause’ (1997: 104). In accordance with this definition, paraphrase will be used to refer to instances where a source- and a target-text unit match each other closely in contextual configuration, but where the semantic relatedness between the two units is too distant for the connection to be grammatically and/or lexically specifiable. This is the reason why in the present framework this shift type is included in the pragmatic, and not the lexical category, as it is in Chesterman's typology. An example (from Chesterman (ibid.)) is:

[From an Austrian Airlines flight magazine:]
Wenn Sie sich entschliessen, die Vorteile zu nutzen
[...]

[Back translation: If you decide to exploit the advantages [...]]

If you wish to become a member of the scheme
[...].

Comment: In this example, there is lexicogrammatical relatedness in the first half: ST Wenn Sie sich entschliessen) and TT If you wish are similar in textual and interpersonal structure, and closely related ideationally (both ST entschliessen and wish are [mental] Processes). The whole of the English clause may also be interpreted as a shift in PROCESS TYPE, from [material] to [relational], which explains the change of Process from ST nutzen to TT become, but inside the TT clause the underlined unit must be categorized as •paraphrase, since no lexicogrammatical points of contact with the corresponding ST unit are identifiable, and only a more distant semantic relatedness can be posited. Contextually, on the other hand, the two units are in close correspondence, since in terms of SOCIO-SEMIOTIC PROCESS (see section 2.8.1), i.e. ‘pragmatic function’, they are elements in the same attempt to promote some bonus scheme that the company appears to be offering. The semantic connection between the two units may thus be characterized in cause-and-effect terms, in that by joining the scheme (TT), the addressee will gain access to advantages (ST Vorteile).

6.6.8. Shifts in translator's visibility

This refers to the insertion of translator’s footnotes or other similar additions which draw attention to the translator’s presence (Chesterman 1997: 112). The shift type appears to be similar to Newmark’s notes, additions and glosses (1988: 91-93), in so far as these are clearly marked as stemming solely from the translator’s initiative. In Gambier (2010: 416), such shifts are termed out-of-text solutions.

This concludes the list of pragmatic shift types included in the present framework. This means that several of Chesterman's categories have been excluded, viz. ‘partial translation’ (1997: 111), ‘other pragmatic strategies’ (ibid.: 112) and ‘transediting’ (ibid.: 112), the first two of which are deemed analytically inoperable. Likewise, being concerned with the improvement of poor textual quality, transediting is deemed not only analytically inopera-
ble, because what constitutes badly written text is bound to be highly subjective, and thus a cognitive matter, but also a superfluous category, since the shifts occurring between a source text of poor linguistic quality and its TT are likely to be describable by means of other shift-type concepts from the catalogue, e.g. •paraphrase. A final category of Chesterman's, viz. 'illocutionary change' (ibid.: 110-11), which refers to changes in speech act (in SF terms: the interpersonal system of SPEECH FUNCTION, at the stratum of semantics), is superfluous because analyzable in grammatical terms (primarily as shifts in MOOD TYPE and more delicate systems.

6.7. Summary
In the present chapter, the grammatical and lexical categories of SFG have been operation-alized for the analysis of TRP and INTRA, and a tripartite framework consisting of three super-categories (grammatical, lexical and pragmatic shifts) has been formulated. A minor number of lexical categories and all items in the pragmatic super-category have been adopted from Chesterman (1997) to supplement insufficiencies in the SFG-based frame-work, viz. types of shifts not describable in lexicogrammatical terms.
Chapter 7. Presentation of corpus
The corpus selected for the present investigation consists of a body of two interrelated text types from the field of medicine, viz. the so-called Summary of Product Characteristics and the Patient Information Leaflet, both of which are mandatory text types, subject to detailed regulation in EU law. The individual specimens of both text types originate in the application process which pharmaceutical companies must go through to obtain marketing authorization for a medicinal product from the European Medicines Agency (EMA). As part of the application process, a specimen of both text types must be supplied by the applicant company, one providing the product information needed by healthcare professionals and one aimed at the patient. The communicative purpose and the interrelation between the two text types is centrally defined as follows: 'The SmPC is the basis of information for healthcare professionals on how to use the medicinal product safely and effectively. The Package Leaflet (PL) shall be drawn up in accordance with the SmPC.' (Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2009a: 2). EU law thus mandates a derivational relationship between the SPC and the PIL, which is what provides the grounds for viewing - in translation-theoretical terms - this relationship as one of intralingual translation (cf. Zethsen 2007: 293; cf. Jensen and Zethsen 2012: 33). As a derivational product, the English PIL is an intralingual TT, but subsequently assumes the function of source text when, as the next step in the translation process, it is interlingually translated into the other EU languages (Jensen and Zethsen 2012: 33; cf. European Medicines Agency 2012a). In the following, each of the two text types will be characterized in more detail, by citing central regulatory requirements, including the mandatory generic structure of each. Apart from this, the contextual profile of the text types will be established using SFL terms (Field, Tenor and Mode).

7.1. The Summary of Product Characteristics

7.1.1. Generic structure
The generic structure and the exact types of information to be included in the SPCs are detailed in A Guideline on Summary of Product Characteristics (Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2009a), one of the so-called Regulatory Guidelines issued by the European Commission. As laid down in the Guideline (ibid.: 14-24), the structure of the entire text and the contents of each section are the following:

Sections 1-3 contain 'pharmaceutical data' (Piorno 2012: 173), i.e. the name, the strength and the 'chemical' composition of the drug. Sections 4 and 5 are concerned with clinical details, more specifically the so-called therapeutic indications in section 4.1, i.e. the types of medical condition for which the product is recommended, and posology and administration in section 4.2, i.e. dosage and how to administer the drug. Further subsections are concerned with so-called contraindications (section 4.3), i.e. 'situations where the medicinal

---

135 EMA is the agency responsible for authorizing medicinal products for marketing in the EU (see http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/). The European Medicines Agency's online, free-access database of medicinal product information documents (available at http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/medicines/landing/epar_search.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058001d124&jsenabled=true) has provided the sample frame from which the text corpus of this thesis has been selected.

136 SmPC corresponds to what is abbreviated as SPC in this thesis, and PL to PIL.
product must not be given' (Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2009a: 10) and special warnings and precautions for use (section 4.4.), where any specific risks associated with the product are stated. Section 4.5 (interaction with other medicinal products and other forms of interaction) describes the effect of taking the medicine together with other drugs or other substances, and section 4.6 (fertility, pregnancy and lactation) contains guidance for use of the medicine in pregnant or breastfeeding women, as well as 'women of childbearing potential' (Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2009a: 14). Section 4.7 contains further safety information, describing effects on ability to drive and use machines, and section 4.8 specifies undesirable effects, i.e. side effects. Section 4.9 is concerned with overdose.

Section 5 is concerned with so-called pharmacological properties: pharmacodynamic properties in section 5.1, providing information about how exactly the drug works, and pharmacokinetic properties in section 5.2, detailing how the drug is absorbed, distributed in, and finally eliminated from the body. Section 5.3 (preclinical safety data) provides further safety information.

The heading of section 6 is pharmaceutical particulars, with section 6.1 containing a list of excipients, i.e. ingredients apart from the active substance, and section 6.2 specifying incompatibilities. In the words of the Guideline (Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2009a: 23): 'Information on physical and chemical incompatibilities of the medicinal product with other products with which it is likely to be mixed or co-administered should be stated. This is particularly important for medicinal products to be reconstituted and/or diluted before parenteral administration'\(^{137}\). Section 6.3 contains information on shelf life, section 6.4 on special precautions for storage, and section 6.5 specifies the nature and contents of container, such as 'Aluminium blisters in cardboard cartons containing 14, 28, 30 and 84 film-coated tablets.' (Duocover SPC (Appendix D): 17). Section 6.6. details special precautions for disposal of a used medicinal product or waste materials derived from such medicinal product and other handling of the product.

Finally, sections 7-10 contain administrative details. These sections play no role whatsoever in the intralingual investigation in this thesis, and they will accordingly be listed with little or no explanation:

Section 7: Marketing authorisation holder, i.e. name and address of the pharmaceutical company to which marketing authorization has been granted.

Section 8: Marketing authorisation number(s)

Section 9: Date of first authorisation/renewal of the authorisation

Section 10: Date of revision of the text

Section 11: Dosimetry (if applicable)

Section 12: Instructions for preparation of radiopharmaceuticals (if applicable)

7.1.2. Contextual configuration

With regard to the contextual profile of the SPCs as a text type, it needs to be emphasized that the following SF characterization is 'impressionistic', in the sense that it is not based on any detailed semantic/lexicogrammatical analysis of the texts (the lexicogrammatical

\(^{137}\) Parenteral administration is administration 'by means other than through the digestive tract, esp. by injection' (Farlex inc. 2012: [entry: parenteral]).
analysis performed has been reserved for the investigation of the translation shifts between the SPCs and PILs). Instead, the characterization is based on the above-mentioned extra-textual characteristics and on a simple reading of sample documents. This approach has been deemed adequate for determining the central registerial characteristics of the two text types, these features being more or less immediately apparent. The SFL-specific terms will be italicized.

**Field** (for a definition of each of the parameters, see section 2.8.1):

* Socio-semiotic process:
  - 1. [reporting] the texts provide pharmaceutical information, e.g. about chemical ingredients, side effects registered in clinical trials, etc.
  - 2. [enabling: instructing] (the texts contain instructions e.g. regarding dosage and administration).

* Degree of contextualization:* language as constitutive of linguistic event (the communicative event is purely semiotic), which forces the texts to be completely self-contextualizing.

* Degree of institutionalization:* high (the texts construe a highly regulated, mandatory situation type which is part of a formal application process).

* Ideational domain:* medicines (at the instantial pole of the cline of instantiation, i.e. in the individual text, the subject matter is a specific medicinal product, such as *Avamys/Gilenya/DuoCover* etc.).

* Degree of specialization:* high / 'uncommon sense'.

**Tenor** (for a definition of each of the parameters, see section 2.8.2):

* Language-internal roles:* sender as provider of information, and addressee in the complementary role of receiver.

* Language-external roles:* pharmaceutical expert addressing healthcare professional.

* Power relation:* symmetrical in terms of knowledge distribution, but asymmetrical in so far as the sender is invested with the authority to issue instructions which the addressee is obliged to follow.

* Contact (degree of familiarity):* none (anonymous sender addressing anonymous, non-specific reader).

* Affective involvement:* complete absence of emotional charge.

The *degree of formality* (encompassing the parameters of *power, contact and affective involvement*) may thus be summarized as maximal.

**Mode** (for a definition of each of the parameters, see section 2.8.3):

* Channel:* graphic

* Possibility of feedback:* the texts are monologic, with no possibility of feedback from the addressee.

* Degree of planning:* planned discourse.

* Medium* ('spoken-ness' vs. 'written-ness' of style): highly 'written' in character, because

---

138 *Sociosemiotic process* is the only contextual dimension which, on the basis of SF literature, it has been possible to describe as a system comprised of a finite set of terms (cf. section 2.8.1, especially figure 2.8.1). The square brackets thus indicate that [reporting] and [enabling: instructing], respectively, refer to terms in this system.
lexically dense (cf. section 5.6). This aspect is one which may require further documentation than the merely 'impressionistic' reading of sample documents: whereas it is immediately apparent that the frequency of technical terms is markedly higher in the SPCs than in the PILs, the impression that there is also a difference in lexical density as such may be deceptive. For this reason, a proper, quantitative analysis has been conducted on one sample pair of documents (the Duocover SPC and PIL - see appendix D), using the so-called UAM Corpus Tool designed by the SF linguist Michael O'Donell. According to this analysis, the lexical density of the Duocover SPC, measured as the percentage of lexemes in the whole text, is 63.09. In the PIL, on the other hand, this percentage is only 56.01. Another numerical value which is also indicative of lexical density is the mean number of lexemes per clause (cf. Halliday 1989: 67), which is 10.9 in the SPC but only 7.39 in the PIL (similarly calculated by the UAM Corpus Tool). These values, too, reflect that, in so far as the Duocover is representative, SPCs are indeed lexically denser than the PILs.

7.2. The Patient Information Leaflet

7.2.1. Generic structure

PILs, as previously pointed out, are derivational products, written 'in accordance with the summary of product characteristics' (Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2008: 8). It should be noted, however, that PILs are derivational products mainly, since '[a]s provided by Article 62 of Directive 2001/83/EC as amended, the package leaflet may include: "...other information compatible with the summary of product characteristics which is useful for health education, to the exclusion of any element of a promotional nature."

(Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2008: 8). This reflects the fact that not all information in the PILs can be identified as being derived from the SPCs. A good example is a two-page instruction in the Avamys PIL (see Appendix A) demonstrating, partly by means of illustrations, the exact way to operate the product, which is a nasal spray. This instruction has no source in the SPC.

Moreover, in accordance with the template for SPCs and PILs issued by the EMA (European Medicines Agency 2012b: 24-34), the PILs contain certain fixed, mandatory wordings which are not derived from the SPC either. This, among other things, pertains to the first paragraphs of the documents, which present an index of the individual sections, as well as a recommendation to read the leaflet carefully and to seek medical advice in cases of doubt. In accordance with the template, the generic structure of the rest of the document must be as follows (with prescribed headlines italicized below):

1. **What X is and what it is used for**, specifying the name, the active substance(s) and what medical condition the product is a treatment for.
2. **What you need to know before you <take><use> X**, providing information about situations where the medication should not be taken or where there may be reason to exercise caution.
3. **How to <take><use> X**, giving instructions regarding dosage and method of administration, and, in some cases, what to do in the event of overdose.
4. **Possible side effects**, specifying the variety and likelihood of adverse reactions regis-

---

139 The application is freely downloadable from www.wagsoft.com.
tered in the clinical trials preceding the marketing authorization of the product.

5. *How to store X*, giving instructions about storage and providing information about shelf life.

6. *Contents of the pack and other information*, listing the chemical ingredients of the product and giving a physical description of the product, i.e. its shape, colour etc.

With regard to 'style' and layout, another of the Regulatory Guidelines issued by the European Commission, in this case the *Guideline on the readability of the labelling and package leaflet of medicinal products in the European Union*, emphasizes readability (and legibility) as a central requirement for PILs:

> The package leaflet is intended for the patient/user. If the package leaflet is well designed and clearly worded, this maximises the number of people who can use the information, including older people and adolescents, those with poor literacy skills and those with some degree of sight loss. (Directorate General for Enterprise and Industry 2009b: 7)

The EMA template for SPCs and PILs similarly stresses the lay-oriented skopos of the latter: 'The package leaflet should be written in a language understandable by the patient and should reflect the terminology the patient is likely to be familiar with' (European Medicines Agency 2012b: 24).

### 7.2.2. Contextual configuration

In terms of contextual profile (once again in SFL terms), the PIL as a text type may be characterized as follows:

**Field:**

*Socio-semantic process:*

1. [reporting] (like the SPCs, the PILs provide pharmaceutical information, e.g. about chemical ingredients, side effects registered in clinical trials etc.)
2. [enabling: instructing] (likewise, the PILs contain instructions e.g. regarding dosage and administration).

*Degree of contextualization:* language as constitutive of linguistic event (the communicative event is purely semiotic), which forces the texts to be completely self-contextualizing.

*Degree of institutionalization:* high (highly regulated, mandatory situation type forming part of a formal application process).

*Ideational domain:* medicines (at the instantaenous pole of the instantiation cline: a specific medicinal product, such as *Avamys/Gilenya/DuoCover* etc.).

*Degree of specialization:* low/moderate. It should be noted, however, that exceptions to the relatively low degree of technicality do occur when not infrequently, contrary to the principle of readability, technical terms have been transferred unchanged from the SPC. Examples will be given in the analytical sections.

**Tenor:**

*Language-internal roles:* sender as provider of information, and addressee in the complementary role of receiver.

*Language-external roles:* pharmaceutical expert addressing lay member of the public in the specific role of product consumer.
Power relation: asymmetric in terms of knowledge distribution. In a different respect, however, the balance of power is in the reader's favour, in so far as s/he is addressed in a private capacity, viz. as a patient, whose body and its ailments is ultimately his/her own concern, and who is accordingly free to follow or ignore the sender's instructions as s/he pleases. This makes the sender's role 'advisory' rather than 'regulatory'. The reader of the SPC, on the other hand, is addressed in a professional capacity, making him/her obliged to follow the writer's instructions.

Contact (degree of familiarity): none (anonymous sender addressing anonymous, non-specific reader).

Affective involvement: complete absence of emotional charge. The degree of formality may be characterized as intermediate: in the texts, the reader is often addressed directly (as you\textsuperscript{140}), which makes the PILs more interactional than the SPCs, but nevertheless far from the markedly informal Tenor of casual conversation between intimates.

Mode:

Channel: graphic
Possibility of feedback: the texts are monologic, with no possibility of feedback from the addressee.
Degree of planning: planned discourse.
Medium: less 'written' in character than the SPCs (cf. the statistics on lexical density above). An intuitive estimate is that on a scale extending from the most 'spoken' types of language to the most 'written/bookish' types, the PILs are intermediate.

As appears from the above, the two text types are contextually similar in certain respects and different in others. To summarize: in Field, they are similar in socio-semiotic process, in ideational domain (though it is to be noted that far from all the information from the SPC recurs in the PIL), in degree of institutionalization and with regard to degree of contextualization, but they differ with respect to degree of specialization. In Mode, both text types represent graphic-channel, planned, monologic discourse, but the SPCs are more 'written' in character than the PILs. The central difference, however, is to be located in Tenor: the fact that the SPCs are addressed to experts and the PILs to a lay readership may well be identified as the pivotal point which explains all other registerial differences. The aim of the present investigation (into the translation shifts involved in the derivation of the PILs from the SPCs) is thus to explain, at the level of derivational micro-segments, how this shift in register has come about.

7.3. Sampling procedure

According to Ritchie, Lewis et al. (2003: 78), purposive or criterion-based sampling is recommended for qualitative studies like the present, as opposed to random or probability sampling, which is more appropriate for statistical research (ibid.). From the different sub-

\textsuperscript{140} In the Duocover PIL, 2nd-person reference constitutes 5.5 % of the total number of tokens in the text, i.e. approximately one out of every twenty words is you. The SPC, on the other hand, features no 2nd-person reference at all.
categories of purposive sampling listed by Ritchie, Lewis et al., *maximum variety sampling* (ibid.: 79) was adopted as the specific type best suited to the present study, i.e. a sampling approach aimed at achieving as much diversity in the corpus as possible. The reason is that PILs as a text type exhibit a relatively high degree of homogeneity, with a number of fixed wordings recurring between the individual texts. Therefore, to ensure representation of the widest possible range of intralingual shift types in the corpus, maximum heterogeneity was sought in the sampling. Diversity in three specific parameters (one extra-textual and two intra-textual) was found likely to ensure maximum linguistic variation between the samples: the company responsible for the product (Marketing Authorization Holder), *therapeutic area* (i.e. the medical condition(s) for which the individual product is used as a treatment and/or the purpose of the medicine\(^{141}\)) and *method of administration*. As an additional measure to achieve maximum variety, care was taken to maximize the spread of samples from across the sample frame (the EMA's online database of medicinal product information documents, as mentioned above). In the frame, the texts are listed alphabetically by product name, and it was therefore initially decided to select one text (ten altogether) from the following initial letters: A - D - G - J - M - P - S - V - Y - B. Starting with the letter A and selecting one text from every three letters would thus ensure representation from across the sample frame. However, when the analysis of the first eight text pairs had been completed, the *point of diminishing returns* (Ritchie, Lewis et al. 2003: 83) was reached, i.e. the point where further analysis would in all probability be a waste of time and effort: the patterning of the shift types was clear and analysis of further samples was deemed unlikely to uncover species not previously encountered. Hence, texts representing the letters Y and B were excluded. While the last ‘corner’ of the sample frame was thus excluded from representation, the eight specimens selected must still be deemed to represent a broad cross-section of the frame.

In a different respect, however, heterogeneity was avoided, viz. differences potentially stemming from diachronic variety. Since the present study is a synchronic investigation of intralingual translation within modern English, recentness of publication was also adopted as a selection criterion. To ensure this recentness, a cut-off point three years prior to the time of selection (February 2012) was decided on. The actual genesis of the texts goes some time further back than the time of publication, however: in most cases, the date of first publication on the website (see below) from which the sample texts were collected follows 1-2 months after the date of authorization, i.e. the date when the medicinal product is approved for marketing. This relatively short time lapse applies to all the sampled texts, except *Avamys*, which - strangely - was not published until one and a half years after the date of authorization (the authorization date for this product was 11/01/2008 and the publication date 09/07/2009). Prior to authorization, however, all medicinal products go through a relatively long application process lasting a little under a year, in the course of which the texts are subjected to repeated revision (see European Medicines Agency 2012a). A first proposal for the texts must be submitted together with the application for marketing authorization, but neither the application date nor the date when the texts were actually (first)

\(^{141}\) The purpose of a medicinal product may be other than the treatment of a disease. The product *Scintimun* (one of the products whose SPC+PIL was sampled for the present corpus), for example, is for diagnostic use and not for treatment.
drafted ahead of the submission is in the public domain. A fair guess is that none of the sampled texts - with the possible exception of Avamys - contain wordings that are more than five years older than the time of sampling. Within this time frame (five years), lexicogrammatical developments in the English language are deemed unlikely to materialize in the texts.\textsuperscript{142}

The following eight texts were selected:\textsuperscript{143}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of product</th>
<th>Marketing Authorization Holder</th>
<th>Therapeutic area</th>
<th>Method of administration</th>
<th>First published</th>
<th>Appendix to this thesis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avamys</td>
<td>Glaxo Group Ltd</td>
<td>Rhinitis, Allergic, Perennial and Seasonal</td>
<td>intranasal use</td>
<td>09/07/2009</td>
<td>Appendix A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duocover</td>
<td>Bristol Myers Squibb Pharma EEIG</td>
<td>Acute Coronary Syndrome / Myocardial Infarction</td>
<td>oral use</td>
<td>31/03/2010</td>
<td>&quot; D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilenya</td>
<td>Novartis Europharm Limited</td>
<td>Multiple Sclerosis</td>
<td>oral use</td>
<td>30/03/2011</td>
<td>&quot; G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jevtana</td>
<td>Sanofi-aventis groupe</td>
<td>Prostatic Neoplasms</td>
<td>intravenous infusion</td>
<td>05/04/2011</td>
<td>&quot; J</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mepact</td>
<td>IDM PHARMA SAS</td>
<td>Osteosarcoma</td>
<td>bolus injection</td>
<td>06/05/2009</td>
<td>&quot; M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pumarix</td>
<td>GlaxoSmithKline Biologicals s. a.</td>
<td>Disease outbreaks / Immunization / Influenza, Human</td>
<td>intramuscular injection</td>
<td>05/04/2011</td>
<td>&quot; P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scintimun</td>
<td>CIS bio international</td>
<td>Osteomyelitis / Radionuclide imaging</td>
<td>intravenous injection</td>
<td>15/03/2010</td>
<td>&quot; S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoza</td>
<td>Novo Nordisk A/S</td>
<td>Diabetes Mellitus, Type 2</td>
<td>subcutaneous injection</td>
<td>08/07/2009</td>
<td>&quot; V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As appears from the above, complete heterogeneity was not achieved in respect of method of administration: two products are both tablets for oral use. Given that probably the majority of medicines are designed for this type of administration, it was deemed impossible

\textsuperscript{142} What is also to be noted is that most of the texts contain wordings that are in fact more recent than the date of first publication, since all texts are regularly updated and modified. Which wordings have been changed when and how does not appear from the texts themselves nor from any other information available on the EMA’s website, but the question must be considered of no relevance to the investigation, since the correspondence between SPC and PIL is mandatory for each published version. In other words, if changes are made to parts of the SPC from which the PIL is derived, the latter is modified accordingly.

\textsuperscript{143} The database is available at http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/. The SPC and PIL for the individual product form separate parts of a larger type of document named European Public Assessment Report - Product Information published for each medicinal product authorized for marketing in the EU. Apart from the SPC and PIL, the Report contains a section with further information about the Marketing Authorization Holder and a section specifying the particulars to appear on the outer and inner packaging.
to avoid coincidence in this respect completely.

7.4. Selection of sections for analysis
It should be made clear that not all sections of the PILs (as TTs) and their corresponding ST sections in the SPCs have been analysed. More specifically, sections 5 and 6 in all PILs were excluded, whereas sections 1, 2, 3 and 4 were analysed in complete detail. The reason for the exclusion of sections 5 and 6 was that these parts of the PILs turned out to consist largely of fixed wordings with no source in the SPC (in other words, the PIL wordings are •additions) and of wordings directly copied from the source text (•direct transfer). Both shift types (•addition and •direct transfer) occur throughout sections 1-4, which meant that excluding sections 5 and 6 presented no danger to the representation of these shift types.
Chapter 8. Analyses, results and discussion

The present chapter will report on the findings achieved in the analyses of the SPC-into-PIL INTRA. The report will account for the range of shift types registered, as well as the relative prominence and the nature of the individual species’ manifestation in the corpus. Grammatical shifts will be accounted for in section 8.2, lexical ones in 8.3 and pragmatic ones in 8.4. The report on the manifestation of the individual shift types in the texts will include a preliminary characterization of their translational effect, by which is meant the specific type of contribution a given shift type can be seen to make to the rewriting of the SPCs into PILs, particularly the extent to which the shifts in question contribute to the fulfilment of the lay-oriented TT skopos. In some cases, translational effect will also provide the grounds for distinguishing shift types from each other. This is especially the case in connection with ‘pairs’ of shift types, i.e. two opposite ‘directions’ such as shifts in voice from either [receptive] to [operative] or from [operative] to [receptive]. Although these are shifts within the same grammatical system, they make very different contributions to the rewriting, which is why they must be distinguished from each other (cf. section 8.2.3.1). In cases where no such difference of effect is discernible, different ‘directions’ within the same grammatical system will not be categorized as separate shift types.

At the end of the chapter (section 8.5), the species will be typologized, first according to relative frequency and next according to translational effect. First, however, before any accounts can be embarked on, the principles that have guided the analyses will need to be detailed (section 8.1).

8.1. Principles of analysis

8.1.1. Derivation: the identification of paired segments

In the analysis of SPC-into-PIL INTRA, a first challenge is posed by the task of establishing analytical units, i.e. coupled pairs consisting of a TT segment derived from a corresponding ST segment. In this respect, the INTRA is fundamentally different from the TRPs of the SPCs, which a few examples from the English-into-Danish translations will serve to illustrate. One random example is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English ST (Avamys, p. 4, section 4.5):</th>
<th>Danish TT (Avamys, p. 4, section 4.5):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In a drug interaction study of intranasal fluticasone furoate with the potent CYP3A4 inhibitor ketoconazole there were more subjects with measurable fluticasone furoate concentrations in the ketoconazole group (6 of the 20 subjects) compared to placebo (1 out of 20 subjects).</td>
<td>I en interaktionsundersøgelse, hvor fluticasonefuroat blev givet samtidig med den potente CYP3A4-hæmmer ketoconazol, var koncentrationen af fluticasonefuroat målbar hos flere i gruppen, der fik ketoconazol (hos 6 ud af 20), i sammenligning med placebogruppen (hos 1 ud af 20).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Back translation: In an interaction study where fluticasone furoate was given simultaneously with the potent CYP3A4-inhibitor ketoconazole, the concentration of fluticasone propionate was measurable in more [subjects] in the group who received ketoconazole (in 6 out of 20), in comparison with the placebo group (in 1 out of... ]
The two examples illustrate the homogeneity in the derivational relationship between TRP STs and TTs: in both cases, the semantic correspondence is high, with the TT matching the wording of the ST closely throughout the unit. Alignment of longer stretches of TRP ST and TT text also shows a completely linear relationship, with TT sentences matching those of the ST in exactly the same sequence. In SPC-into-PIL INTRA, on the other hand, there tends to be little corresponding sequentiality between STs and TTs, as the following example bears out, where a TT extract has been aligned with the ST section from which most of the TT segments are derived. The TT segments have been numbered sequentially, and the same numbers inserted in the ST section at the beginning of the corresponding segments. Numbers missing in the ST extract indicate that the TT segment either has no ST base, or is derived from a different ST section. Thus, TT segments 1 and 5 are additions with no ST origin, and no. 4 stems from a different section:

Avamys SPC, pp. 2+3, section 4.2:

**Posology and method of administration**

Avamys nasal spray is for administration by the intranasal route only.

For full therapeutic benefit regular, scheduled usage is recommended. Onset of action has been observed as early as 8 hours after initial administration. However, it may take several days of treatment to achieve maximum benefit, and the patient should be informed that their symptoms will improve with continuous regular use (see section 5.1). The duration of treatment should be restricted to the period that corresponds to allergenic exposure.

Avamys PIL, p. 19, section 3:

1) **When to use Avamys**
   2) • Use once a day
   3) • Use at the same time each day.
   4) This will treat your symptoms throughout the day and night.

5) **How long Avamys takes to work**
   6) Some people will not feel the full effects until several days after first using Avamys.
   7) However, it is usually effective within 8 to 24 hours of use.

The disrupted sequentiality also manifests itself at clause level (clause-internally), as the example below illustrates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G6144</th>
<th>2-4.1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- Patients with high disease activity despite treatment with a beta-interferon. These patients may be defined as those [[who have failed to respond to a full and adequate course (normally at least one year of treatment) of beta-interferon]].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35-1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients who have failed to respond despite treatment with beta-interferon (another MS treatment).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

144 This will be the style of reference to SPC and PIL segments henceforth: The G refers to the initial letter of the text in question, and the figure refers to the numbering of the analytical segments. In the appendix containing all analyses (Appendix 11), all analytical segments have been numbered as A1, A2 etc., D1, D2 etc. for easy reference. G6 thus refers to *Gilenya*, segment no. 6. In the other part of the reference (2-4.1), 2 is the page number and 4.1 the section number in the original text. In the opposite column (showing the corresponding PIL segment), only the page and section number from the original text is given (here 35-1), since the number of the analytical segment is obviously the same as the SPC segment.
Comment: TT patients who have failed to respond and TT despite treatment with beta-interferon are reduplicated ST segments (i.e. results of •DT) that stem from two different ST sentences. In the TT, not only have the two segments been joined in the same (embedded) clause, the segment occurring first in the ST (despite treatment with a beta-interferon) occurs last in the TT.

Apart from the limited corresponding linearity between the INTRA STs and TTs, another marked difference between SPC-into-PIL INTRA and TRP concerns the ST-TT derivational relationship, which is much more heterogeneous in INTRA than is typically the case in TRP. In SPC-into-PIL INTRA, derivation varies from cases where an entire ST segment has been reduplicated without any changes in the TT, to cases with only limited points of ST-TT contact. An example of exact duplication (•DT) is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S27 - 2-4.1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scintimun should not be used for the diagnosis of diabetic foot infection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>25-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scintimun should not be used for the diagnosis of diabetic foot infection.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In a similar example, the match is only a few slight changes (a couple of •omissions and one change in word order) from being complete:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M26 - 4-4.5:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended to separate the administration times of MEPACT and doxorubicin or other lipophilic medicinal products if used in the same chemotherapy regimen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>24-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended to separate the times of administration of MEPACT and doxorubicin or other medicines if used in the same chemotherapy treatment regimen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the other extreme are cases where only a few words from the ST have been transferred and inserted in a TT segment without any other point of contact with the ST:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P48 - 11-6.1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[from a list of excipients] Sodium chloride Potassium chloride</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>32-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pumarix contains less than 1 mmol sodium (23 mg) and less than 1 mmol of potassium (39 mg) per dose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the TT segment, only the words sodium and potassium come from the ST. The rest of the TT wording is •addition, i.e. there is no ST base.

In between these extremes (exact duplication vs. very limited derivation) are cases of partial derivation, as in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S47 - 3-4.2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The radiolabelled solution should be adminis-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>26-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A single injection into a vein in your arm is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tered intravenously as a single dose only. sufficient [[to provide your doctor with the information needed]].

Comment: TT a single injection is derived from ST as a single dose and possibly administered, and TT into a vein has its origin in ST intravenously. TT in your arm as well as the embedded clause, on the other hand, are additions with no ST base. That leaves TT is sufficient to be accounted for, which, however, is not possible because the derivation is uncertain. TT is sufficient may somehow be derived from ST only, but this possibility is far too tenuous for any analysis to be reliable. The consequences of such uncertainty regarding the derivational status of TT items will be further commented on below.

Although statistics on this point have been deemed neither possible nor relevant, probably the majority of TT segments are only partially derived from an ST segment, with most TT segments featuring •additions, as in the above example.

Another relatively common type of INTRA ST-TT relationship is mixed derivation:

| P14 - 3-4.3: | 31-2: |
| … provided that facilities for resuscitation should be immediately available in case of need. | (αα): This is (αβ): as long as medical treatment is available straight away, (β): in case you have an allergic reaction. |
| 3-4.4: | |
| As with all injectable vaccines, appropriate medical treatment and supervision should always be readily available in case of a rare anaphylactic event following the administration of the vaccine. | |

Comment: The TT αβ-clause is derived from the first of the two ST segments (3-4.3), whereas the β-clause is derived from latter of the two (3-4.4 – from the prepositional phrase in case of a rare anaphylactic event). The αα-clause is •addition.

As already indicated, an important – and problematic – consequence of the high degree of variation in the INTRA of SPCs into PILs has been the occasional difficulty of establishing the presence or absence of a derivational relationship with certainty. A few more examples will serve:

| A11 - 3-4.2: | 18-2: |
| Once adequate control of symptoms is achieved, dose reduction to one spray actuation in each nostril once daily (total daily dose, 55 micrograms) is recommended. | Your doctor may adjust your dose of Avamys. |

Comment: The TT may be derived from the segment indicated as ST, but it is not possible...

---

145 SF notation indicating the dependency status of clauses (embedded, hypotactic or paratactic) have in some cases been inserted in the quotes for easier reference and/or for purposes of analysis in the comments. As previously mentioned (see section 5.4.1), Greek letters (bracketed) indicate hypotactic relations, and numbers (also bracketed) indicate paratactic relations. Embedded clauses are marked by double square brackets.
to decide whether the TT proposition regarding possible dose adjustment originates in the ST recommendation to reduce the dose once the medicine has taken effect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G145 - 6-4.4.:</th>
<th>39-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lymphocyte counts progressively return to normal range within 1-2 months of stopping therapy (see section 5.1).</td>
<td>(Preceding TT segment: <em>Gilenya will stay in your body for up to 2 months after you stop taking it.</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your white blood cell count (lymphocyte count) may also remain low during this time and the side effects described in this leaflet may still occur.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The TT reference to lymphocyte counts, to the (one-)two-month time frame and to discontinuation of therapy all indicate a possible derivational relationship. Yet, since the propositions in the two segments (ST and TT) in fact contradict each other (ST *progressively return to normal range* vs. TT *may remain low*), the derivation remains a possibility that is too uncertain for analysis to be undertaken.

In yet other cases, a derivational relationship *can* be established, but not with sufficient exactitude:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D35 - 11-5.1.:</th>
<th>48-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[<em>first possible ST</em>]: … one of whose metabolites is an inhibitor of platelet aggregation.</td>
<td>(α:) This is linked to the way your medicine works (β:) as it prevents the ability of blood clots to form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[<em>second possibility</em>]: … the active metabolite that inhibits platelet aggregation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[<em>third possibility</em>]: … thereby inhibiting platelet aggregation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: It can be established beyond doubt that the three ST segments are the only possible origins of the TT β-clause. It is also certain that the TT β-clause is derived from the ST lexemes *inhibit, platelet and aggregation*, but whether one particular of the three ST segments has been the actual source, and in that case which, or all of them, cannot be decided.

In cases where a source-text segment has had to be identified among several possible ones, context has been a decisive factor in identifying the relevant segment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J53:</th>
<th>28-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[<em>first possible ST segment</em>]:</td>
<td>(α:) This medicine contains 15% v/v ethanol (alcohol), &lt;&lt;(β:) equivalent to 14 ml of beer or 6 ml of wine&gt;&gt;.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2.:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excipients:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each vial of solvent contains 573.3 mg of ethanol 96%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[<em>second possible segment</em>]:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5-4.4.:

**Excipients**

(α:) The solvent contains 573.3 mg ethanol 96% (15% v/v), <<(β:) equivalent to 14 ml of beer or 6 ml of wine>>.

Comment: Because of the relatively similar wording, the first part of each of the two possible ST segments is the possible ST base of the TT α-clause. In the TT β-clause, which is clearly derived from the β-clause from the second of the two possible ST segments, this latter segment must be identified as the most likely ST base. This likelihood is strengthened when one considers the further context of both ST and TT: the sentence following the latter ST segment is *Harmful for those suffering from alcoholism*, which is also the next sentence in the TT: *This medicine may be harmful for those suffering from alcoholism.*

Apart from taking context into account in the identification of ST-TT paired segments, the most obvious solution has been opted for in cases where more than one segment must be considered the possible ST base of a TT segment:

J35 - 4-4.4:
The dose of cabazitaxel should be reduced …

4-4.4.:
Patients with a hypersensitivity reaction must stop treatment with JEVTA NA …

[Alternative ST segment:]

5-4.4.:
Cabazitaxel treatment should be discontinued …

Comment: Even with context taken into account, ST *stop treatment with Jevtana* and *treatment should be discontinued* both offer themselves as the possible ST base of the TT β-clause. However, because the TT wording is closer to ST *stop treatment*, this is the segment that has been identified as the most likely ST base.

It should be emphasized that in spite of the derivational uncertainty occasionally encountered in the analyses, in the vast majority of cases it *has* been possible to either identify the ST base of a TT segment with certainty, or, conversely, to establish the absence of any ST origin. In cases of doubt, however, a policy of caution has been adopted, which means that no analysis has been conducted in such cases, since analysis based on dubious derivation would obviously be unreliable. Unfortunately, no criteria have been found by means of which the derivational question could be settled with absolute certainty, which means that the pairing of ST-TT segments has been a matter of analytical judgment. In Appendix 11, containing the full INTRA analyses, it is indicated specifically which segments have not been analysed due to uncertainty regarding ST origin.

---

146 It should be mentioned that in the last example above, a degree of analysis has in fact been possible, and therefore undertaken.
8.1.2. Units of analysis
Since the objective of the inquiry has been to account for the shifts (and non-shifts, i.e. •DT) occurring in the derivation of TT wordings from related ST ones, the analyses have been conducted with the TT segments as the analytical point of departure, which means that TT items have been related 'back to' ST items, and not the other way around. As a consequence of this principle, the analysis has followed TT structure (i.e. sequence of sentences), with each TT sentence in most cases constituting one analytical segment. Because of the large amount of analysis required by many segments, analytical units larger than one sentence were deemed unmanageable. Headlines have been treated as separate units, including the cases where a clause in a clause complex has the status of headline (marked in bold) in the TT. In the case of bullet point lists in which each point consists of a dependent clause or a nominal group, each point has been treated as a separate analytical unit, as in the following example, where each cell contains one TT segment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duocover 55-2:</th>
<th>Take special care with DuoCover</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If any of the situations mentioned below apply to you, you should tell your doctor before taking DuoCover:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- if you have a risk of bleeding such as:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a medical condition that puts you at risk of internal bleeding (such as a stomach ulcer).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a blood disorder that makes you prone to internal bleeding (bleeding inside any tissues, organs or joints of your body).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a recent serious injury.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- a recent surgery (including dental).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8.1.3. Translation units
It is to be noted that the concept of analytical segment/unit, as defined above, must be kept distinct from a related, but different concept, viz. translation unit (TU). In each analytical segment, multiple TUs are typically present, in that each separately analysed TT item represents a TU. To be quite exact, such a TT item is, according to Ballard (2010: 439), the outcome of a TU, whereas the corresponding ST item is the base of the TU. In the analytical approach adopted here, the outcome of a TU is thus a TT item affected by one or more shifts in comparison with the ST base of the TU. This is in accordance with the following definition of the concept:

[... A] unit of translation is generated by the implementation of a strategy (literal or non literal). It is the change of strategy which marks the boundary of a translation unit for our perception [...]. This view of the unit concerns the identification of linear units that is to say those based on syntax or stylistics, but the act of translation does not apply to syntax alone and one also has to take into account units based on words or phrases too (that is to say lexical elements) which are embedded in larger units. (Ballard 2010: 438)
The corollary of this definition is that TUs may well overlap structurally. Thus, an entire clause may be a TU, but smaller TUs are almost invariably identifiable inside a clause – more often than not down to the size of individual words. Ballard’s above definition also reflects the fact that the size and rank of TUs is interrelated with the particular shift types identifiable in a given analytical segment. Thus, grammatical clause-rank changes (such as shifts in MOOD TYPE, PROCESS TYPE and THEME SELECTION) presuppose the presence of a clause on both ‘sides’ of the TU – the ST base as well the TT outcome - and a grammatical group-rank change (such as a shift in DEIXIS or TYPE OF MODIFICATION) presupposes a comparable NG on both sides. Similarly, a lexical change is only a possibility if related lexical items can be identified across the ST-TT divide, etc. Only in the case of •de-metaphorization (and of course the opposite movement, i.e. •metaphorization) are the two related units on each side of the ST-TT divide lexicogrammatically divergent in nature, •de-metaphorization being the one lexicogrammatical shift type whose TU must be identified at the stratum of semantics, viz. in the shape of a figure (see sections 5.1 and 5.6) which finds grammatical expression at group/phrase rank on one side of the divide and clause rank on the other. Similarly, TUs in the case of •paraphrase and •explicitation can only be located at the semantic stratum, the connection between the ST base and the TT outcome being only describable in terms of a semantic, and not a lexicogrammatical relatedness (cf. sections 6.6 and 8.4).

8.1.4. Analytical limitations
One aspect of the SPC-PIL derivational relationship not previously noted is that only certain parts of the STs have found their way into the TTs, and large parts have not, which is why the TTs are considerably shorter than their ST counterparts. In translation-analytical terms, the ST sections not represented in the TT are •omissions, but it needs to be pointed out that •omissions have not been registered in the analyses, for two reasons. One is, as noted above, that the analyses have been conducted with the TTs as the analytical point of departure, relating TT items ‘back to’ corresponding ST ones. This approach was at odds with the concept of •omission, which is an ST-focused analytical concept, aimed at deciding what parts of the ST have been left out in the rewording. In other words, this entails the opposite analytical perspective, i.e. taking the ST as the point of departure. Another reason is scale: in a number of cases, it would be perfectly possible to identify the omission of small, specific units inside clauses, but since, as already noted, large ST sections are not reflected in the INTRA TTs, the task of identifying •omissions precisely and exhaustively is virtually impossible, and has therefore not been undertaken. Likewise, shifts in logogenesis (for a definition, see section 6.6.5) have been ignored, also for reasons of scale. As was indicated previously, the restructuring of the INTRA TTs (above the level of sentences) in comparison with their ST counterparts is too comprehensive to allow precise and exhaustive analysis.

Another type of shift which has similarly been ignored in the analyses is shifts in CONNOTATION. Such shifts sometimes occur in connection with •DT, especially when technical items from a source-text segment are reduplicated in the TT. An example is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M26 - 4-4.5:</th>
<th>24-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is recommended to separate the administration</td>
<td>It is recommended to separate the times of</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
times of MEPACT and doxorubicin or other lipophilic medicinal products if used in the same chemotherapy regimen.

Comment: This is a good example of what really amounts to the 'translationese' of lay-oriented INTRA, viz. the DT of ST wordings where some kind of rewording would clearly have been preferable. Thus, especially the DT of the highly technical ST item doxorubicin (and possibly also items like administration and regimen) is almost certain to accentuate the knowledge asymmetry between TT sender and addressee, which causes the item(s) to undergo a shift in connotative meaning: in the expert-expert communication of the ST, no asymmetry in knowledge is signalled by specialist terms, which, accordingly, are interpersonally 'unmarked'. A technical term embedded in the environment of a lay-oriented text, on the other hand, is interpersonally 'marked' (cf. Zethsen 2004: 127-128).

However, connotative meaning must be deemed too subjective a matter to allow shifts in this respect to be reliably identified: an item that may appear 'intolerably technical' to one reader may not carry the same negative connotations for another, which is why such shifts have been ignored.

It should also be mentioned that since the investigation is concerned with linguistic shifts occurring as a result of translation, ST-TT differences irrelevant to the derivational relationship have been ignored in the analyses. An example is:

G88 - 12.5.1:
[Previous ST segment: Since this lymphocyte subset typically does not traffic to lymphoid organs it is not affected by fingolimod.]
(1:) Peripheral lymphocyte count increases are evident within days of stopping fingolimod treatment (2:) and typically normal counts are reached within one to two months.

38-2:
[Previous TT segment: The desired effect of Gilenya treatment is to reduce the amount of white blood cells in your blood.]
This will usually go back to normal within 2 months of stopping treatment.

Comment: Carrying anaphoric reference to the amount of white blood cells in the previous sentence, TT this must be regarded as a result of intratextual logic, and not an item derived from the ST. Corresponding anaphoric reference is not present in the ST segment and is not possible either since the preceding ST segment is completely different from the TT segment which contains the referent of TT this (the amount of white blood cells in your blood).

Thus, TT items interpretable as the manifestation of intratextual necessities – especially cohesive items unrelated to the ST – have been excluded from the translation analysis.

8.1.5. Principles of categorization: exhaustiveness and explanatory economy
Whereas translation analysis may appear to be a rather straightforward matter of assigning observable shifts to predefined types, actual analytical performance often involves selection among several alternative explanations (cf. section 1.6.1 on the critical assessment of
interpretable hypotheses as an integral part of analytical procedure). In the analyses, therefore, two criteria have been adopted for choosing between multiple possible interpretations, viz. exhaustiveness as well as sufficiency. On the one hand, this means that as many explanations (identification of shifts) have been sought which were deemed necessary for the analysis to be exhaustive. On the other hand, explanatory economy has been sought by providing only the number of explanations for a given analytical segment which were deemed sufficient. An example will serve to illustrate the principle – and also serve to illustrate the general analytical approach:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST</th>
<th>TT</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| V34 - 5-4.5: … Victoza should not be used during breast-feeding. | 23-2: (α:) Do not use Victoza (β:) if you are breast-feeding. | α-clause:  
- shift in MOOD TYPE (ST modulated [indicative: declarative] → TT [imperative])  
- shift in VOICE (ST [receptive] → TT [operative])  
Victoza + not: •DT  
use: •DT (of the ST lexeme use-)  
β-clause: •de-metaphorization (of the ST ideational metaphor during breast-feeding)  
breast-feeding: •DT  
you: •explicitation (specification of agency, i.e. who it is that may be breast-feeding) |

Comment: Two clause-rank shifts affect the α-clause, viz. in MOOD TYPE (from a modulated [indicative: declarative] in the ST (should … be used) to an [imperative] in the TT) and in VOICE (from [receptive] in the ST to [operative] in the TT. With regard to clause structure, these two explanations are sufficient, since they obviate the need to account for the change in thematic structure (Victoza is Theme in the ST, but rhematic in the TT). This shift in structure is an automatic consequence of the shift in VOICE, and does not need to be accounted for separately. In the same way, the introduction of TT do is an automatic consequence of the choice of the [imperative] mood. These changes, however, pertain to clausal grammar, which still leaves certain group/word-rank items to be accounted for, viz. the three items Victoza, not and use, which are results of •DT. The choice of these three words must be accounted for since their presence in the TT is not automatic and since other items could have been selected instead. An alternative to Victoza, e.g., would be the medicine, and use could have been replaced by a synonym like take. The case of use illustrates that when it comes to lexical words, •DT refers to duplication of the lexeme, and not necessarily the word in its exact ST form (though this is often the case). The morphological change affecting use (from ST used → TT use), however, does not need separate explanation, being an automatic consequence of the shifts in MOOD TYPE and VOICE.

In the β-clause, •de-metaphorization accounts for the introduction of clause structure to

---

147 This column is a rendition of the way the analysis is recorded in the analytical appendix (Appendix 11).
replace what is a prepositional phrase in the ST (during breast-feeding), thus explaining the presence of a conjunction\textsuperscript{148} and a VG. Likewise, the explanation covers the emergence of experiential, interpersonal and thematic structure in the TT clause: these, too, are inherent in the introduction of clause structure. Likewise, the •transcategorization (change in word class) affecting breast-feeding (ST noun (gerund) → TT verb (participle)) is inherent in the conversion of the prepositional phrase into a clause. On the other hand, the •de-metaphorization is deemed insufficient to account for the TT β-clause item you (which serves as Actor/Subject), since the experiential clause grammar (of [material] clauses, such as the one in question) only presupposes, but does not require the insertion of an Actor (cf. IFG3: 179), just as the interpersonal structure does not necessitate a Subject (since the clause might have been [non-finite] instead of [finite]). The presence of TT you therefore needs to be explained, and may be categorized as •explicitation, viz. of agency, i.e. the implicit 'doer' of the breast-feeding. Grammatically, this is realized by the insertion of an Actor.\textsuperscript{149} Similarly, the choice of the TT lexeme breast-feeding needs to be explained (as •DT), since different choices would have been possible, such as the term lactating (the fact that this alternative would be an unlikely choice, because of its technical character, is a different matter).

Other conceivable, but insufficient explanations of the β-clause should also be mentioned: if one had chosen to explain the translation of ST during breast-feeding into TT if you are breast-feeding by for example categorizing if you are simply as •addition (and breast-feeding still as •DT), this would not have been a sufficient explanation, since the mere •addition of an element in no way accounts for the ideational, interpersonal and textual semantics resulting from the introduction of clause structure. Besides, •additions are defined as the introduction of elements that are not inherent in the ST, whereas the clausal meaning (at least the experiential aspect) is not really a new element but can be regarded as implicit in the downranked structure of an ideational metaphor (cf. e.g. Eggins 1994: 62).

As indicated in the above comment, the principle of explanatory economy means that TT phenomena (e.g. certain grammatical items or structures) that are interpretable as being inherent in, or an automatic consequence of, other changes are not recorded separately. In the above example it may also be noted that a shift in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY is observable (ST = [clause simplex] (only one clause) → TT = [clause complex] (two clauses)), but this can be interpreted as an automatic result of the TT •de-metaphorization of the ST prepositional phrase, in that the 'unpacking' automatically introduces an extra clause. The reverse explanation, on the other hand, would be insufficient, since a shift in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY (from [clause simplex] to [clause complex]) does not automatically involve a conversion of a nominal construction into a clause (see section 8.2.2.1 for examples of shifts in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY where no •de-metaphorization is involved). In the same vein, lower-ranking

\textsuperscript{148} It may be objected that during is temporal in meaning, whereas if denotes condition. However, the semantics of during breast-feeding must be interpreted as a combination of conditionality and temporality, i.e. 'if and when [the patient] is breast-feeding ...'. In the TT, the conditional aspect is the one rendered.

\textsuperscript{149} It may be objected that the explanation is not complete, since no reasons are given why the •explicitation is viewed from the perspective of the experiential, and not the interpersonal nor the textual metafunction, respectively. However, since the above example is only meant to illustrate the general principles of analysis, it has been decided to delay the full explanation until the manifestation of •de-metaphorization in the corpus is investigated separately (see section 8.2.5.4).
shifts (changes at group or word level) inherent in higher-ranking ones (i.e. clause-rank changes) are not registered as separate shifts. VOICE is a clear example: as a system that operates at clause and group rank (VG) simultaneously, shifts in VOICE (typically ST [receptive] → TT [operative]) are only recorded at clause rank, because a shift in the VG from [passive] to [active] is inherent in clause-rank VOICE. However, it might be objected that since shifts in clausal and VG VOICE are in fact mutually entailing, identifying one shift as the automatic consequence of another is in this case meaningless, and the policy of only recording the clause-rank shift therefore completely arbitrary. To this, the answer is that the principle of explanatory economy means that the most comprehensive explanation is to be preferred. A shift in clause-rank VOICE explains the change in the VG as well as the automatic shifts in thematic structure, whereas recording the shift in VG VOICE still leaves the changes in clause-level textual structure to be explained.

8.2. Shifts registered within the grammatical zone of the grammar-lexis cline

In the following, the individual types of grammatical shifts instantiated in the corpus will be presented and exemplified, and their prominence characterized. It needs to be emphasized that in all the examples selected for comment, only the specific type of shift under consideration will be analysed. For the recording and categorization of other shifts involved in a given analytical segment, see appendix 11. For good measure and where relevant, the graph of the system (network) affected will be re-represented at the beginning of each section, with the original numbering maintained (indicating the section where the graph was first represented).

8.2.1. Shifts at clause rank, experiential metafunction

Within the experiential metafunction at clause rank, the shifts registered have been found to affect systems at two different levels of delicacy: the general system of experiential clause types, i.e. PROCESS TYPE (to be detailed in section 8.2.1.1), and, within [material] clauses, the more delicate systems of TYPE OF OUTCOME (section 8.2.1.2) and IMPACT (8.2.1.2), respectively. Within [relational] clauses, only the system of TYPE OF RELATION is affected (section 8.2.1.2). Apart from these changes, a few shifts in CIRCUMSTANTIATION (section 8.2.1.3) and in experiential status (section 8.2.1.4) have been registered.

---

150 As previously mentioned (see section 5.3.2), the options in the VG system of VOICE are [active]/[passive] (IFG3: 349).
8.2.1.1. Shifts in PROCESS TYPE

Shifts in PROCESS TYPE are represented relatively consistently across the corpus, with an average of around six instances recorded in each text. No systematic tendency can be observed with regard to the nature of these shifts, however, in that, except for [behavioural] clauses, all clause types (i.e. [material], [mental], [verbal], [relational] and [existential]) are involved, in virtually all combinations and in both ‘directions’, i.e. from e.g. ST [material] to TT [relational] and vice versa. Below, a variety of different combinations will be exemplified:

**A43 - 2-4.2:**
However, it may take several days of treatment [[to achieve maximum benefit]] …

**19-3:**
Some people will not feel the full effects until several days [[after first using Avamys]].

Comment: ST to achieve maximum benefit is a [material] clause, whereas the TT ranking, i.e. non-embedded, clause (which is the one corresponding to the ST embedded clause) is [mental] (owing to TT feel). The change in experiential clause type and the concomitant change in transitivity structure, i.e. in the configuration of experiential clause constituents, means that whereas ST maximum benefit serves as Goal, the corresponding TT item the full effects is Phenomenon.

**G90 - 6-4.4:**
Laboratory tests involving the use of circulating mononuclear cells require larger blood volumes due to reduction in the number of circulating lymphocytes.

**38-2:**
… for certain types of blood test your doctor may need to take more blood than usual.
Comment: ST *require* must be deemed synonymous with *need*, which is a verb that typically serves as Process in [relational] clauses that are simultaneously [possessive] and [attributive] (see Appendix 5). The ST clause is thus [relational] whereas the TT clause is [material] (owing to *take*). The resulting change in experiential structure means that what is Carrier in the ST (*larger blood volumes*) becomes Goal in the TT (*more blood than usual*). 

| G122 - 8-4.7: | 39-2: |
| (α:) On initiation of Gilenya treatment it is recommended (β:) that patients be observed for a period of 6 hours (see section 4.4, Brady-arrhythmia). | However, at initiation of treatment you will have to stay at the doctor’s surgery or clinic for 6 hours ([after taking the first dose of Gilenya]). |

Comment: The ST [mental] β-clause (*be observed*) has been converted to a [material] clause in the TT (the ranking clause, in which the Process is *stay*). This accounts for the difference in the experiential function of ST *patients*, which is Phenomenon, and TT *you*, which serves as Actor. 

| V16 - 3-4.4: | 22-2: |
| (1:) Patients treated with Victoza should be advised of the potential risk of dehydration in relation to gastrointestinal side effects (2:) and take precautions to avoid fluid depletion. | (β:) When initiating treatment with Victoza, (α:) you may in some cases experience loss of fluids/ dehydration, e.g. in case of vomiting, nausea and diarrhea. |

Comment: The ST 1-clause is [verbal] (*be advised*) unlike the derived TT α-clause, which is [mental] (owing to *experience*). The consequent change in experiential structure means that ST *patients* functions as Receiver and the corresponding TT *you* as Senser. 

| M16 - 3-4.4: | 23-2: |
| … consideration should be given to administration of bronchodilators on a prophylactic basis. | (β:) Before using MEPACT, (αα:) you should discuss with your doctor (αβ:) whether you should take medicine for your asthma (αγ:) when using MEPACT. |

Comment: The ST clause is a special case, in that *given* is semantically empty in ST *consideration should be given*, which means that the transitivity structure of the clause must be interpreted not as Process and Goal but rather along the lines of Process + Scope (cf. IFG3: 193). In consequence, the Process of the clause really resides in the nominalization *consideration*, whose verbal content (*consider*) is a mental process (IFG3: 210). Thus, although the clause is [material], it is semantically close to a [mental] one. The corresponding TT-clause (β), on the other hand, is [verbal]. However, no participants are affected by the change, in that TT *you* and *your doctor* have no ST base.
M47 - 2-4.2: Safety and efficacy have been assessed in studies of patients 2 to 30 years of age at initial diagnosis.

Comment: the ST clause is [mental] (assessed), whereas the TT clause must be interpreted as a [relational] one. The reason is that the verb establish in this case (like the verbs prove and confirm means ‘make (something) a fact’ (see Appendix 4). Establish thus serves as Process and Attribute combined in what is a [relational: attributive] clause. The shift in PROCESS TYPE means that what is Phenomenon in the ST (safety and efficacy) becomes Carrier in the TT.

G84 - 6-4.4: Minor dose-dependent reductions in values for forced expiratory volume (FEV1) and diffusion capacity for carbon monoxide (DLCO) were observed with Gilenya treatment ...

Comment: The ST clause is a [mental] one (were observed) that has been converted into a [relational: possessive] one in the TT (has). ST reductions … is thus Phenomenon, whereas the corresponding TT a slight effect … serves as Attribute.

G112 - 7-4.6: … the potential risk to the foetus may persist …

Comment: This is the only shift in PROCESS TYPE in the entire INTRA corpus in which an [existential] clause is involved (the TT clause, which is derived from what is a [material] clause in the ST (may persist)). This change explains why the potential risk to the foetus changes from Carrier in the ST to Existent in the TT (a risk … ).

What is to be noted as a characteristic feature of many of the shifts in PROCESS TYPE is the quite extensive change of meaning that is often involved. A good example is the second but last example above (from G84): there is a relatedness of experiential semantics between ST and TT, but a relatedness that is a good distance from any identity of meaning. In this way, the shifts in PROCESS TYPE are akin to the shifts categorized as •paraphrase (see section 8.4.1), where ST-TT relations are often similarly characterized by only distant relatedness.\(^{151}\) What may thus be emphasized at this early stage of the analyses is that inter-registerial INTRA consists in derivation, and rarely in the generation of semantic equivalence.

\(^{151}\) As previously noted (see section 6.6), the criterion adopted for distinguishing between lexicogrammatical shifts on the one hand and pragmatic shifts (like •paraphrase) on the other is describability/non-describability in lexicogrammatical terms. In other words, the possibility of categorizing shifts in PROCESS TYPE as such (instead of •paraphrase) entails the analytical imperative that they must be.
8.2.1.2. Shifts in more delicate experiential clause-rank systems

Unlike shifts in PROCESS TYPE, shifts in more delicate clause-rank experiential systems are quite rare in the corpus. Thus, in the [material]-clause system of TYPE OF DOING, a mere two instances have been registered:

J47 - 6-4.6.: … cabazitaxel may cause foetal harm in exposed pregnant women.

Comment: In comparison with the ST-clause, which is [creative], the TT 2-clause is [transformational: elaborating].

The other shift in TYPE OF DOING (G71) is exactly the same, i.e. from [creative] to [transformational: elaborating].

In TYPE OF OUTCOME, i.e. one further step in delicacy in the system network of [material] clauses, only 8 shifts altogether have been identified (i.e. approximately a single instance per text pair), all of which represent a change from a [transformational: elaborating] clause into a [transformational: extending] one or vice versa, as in the following two instances:

D87 – 3-4.2.: … and should not double the dose.

Comment: The ST clause is the [transformational: elaborating] one (owing to double), and the TT clause the extending one (take). No other changes in transitivity are involved, which means that dose serves as Goal in both clauses.

V28 - 3-4.2: Victoza is administered once daily at any time.

Comment: You can use Victoza regardless of meals.
independent of meals …

Comment: In this example, the ST clause is the [extending] one (owing to administered), and the TT clause the [elaborating] one (because of use).

An ambiguous case should also be mentioned:

A12 - 3-4.4:
Growth retardation has been reported in children [[receiving some nasal corticosteroids at licensed doses]].

18-2:
[[Taking nasal glucocorticoids (such as Avas- mys)]] may … cause [[children to grow more slowly]].

Comment: The Process taking in the first embedded clause in the TT is clearly derived from ST receiving in the ST embedded clause, but in this case, although both clauses (ST and TT alike) construe the paediatric patient as a consumer of the medicine, the two verbs can hardly be deemed close enough in meaning to count as synonyms: the implicit meaning of ST receiving is the giving or prescription of the medicine by someone else, which is an aspect that is absent from TT taking. The question, then, is whether the two verbs, instead of being synonyms, may be interpreted as serving as Process in two different types of [material: transformative] clause, which would make it possible to view the change from receiving to taking as one affecting the clause a whole, and thereby representing a shift in TYPE OF OUTCOME. The problem, however, is that the ST clause must be interpreted as a [material: transformative] clause of the [extending] subtype, which, as noted in the comment on the previous example, is also how clauses with the Process realized by take are listed in IFG3 (see appendix 4) and LC (pp. 246-48). Nevertheless, TT take in this case cannot be taken to realize possessive meaning, but is rather used in the sense of ‘consume’, making the clause a [transformative] one of the [elaborating] subtype. If this interpretation is sound, the shift must be interpreted as one in TYPE OF OUTCOME, from [extending] in the ST to the [elaborating] type in the TT.

Shifts in IMPACT ([transitive]/[intransitive]) are similarly rare, with only five instances registered, i.e. less than a single instance per text pair. Two of these occurrences will be analysed below:

G133 - 2-4.2:
Patients can switch directly from beta interferon or glatiramer acetate to Gilenya …

39-3:
Your doctor may switch you directly from beta interferon to Gilenya …

Comment: In this segment, the ST clause is [intransitive] and the TT [transitive]. This means that ST patients serves as Actor, but TT you (which is derived from ST patients) as Goal.

V33 - 5-4.6:
(α:) It is not known (β:) if liraglutide is excreted in human milk.

23-2:
(α:) It is not known (β:) if Victoza passes into breast milk.
Comment: The ST β-clause is [transitive], unlike the TT clause, which is [intransitive]. This change explains why ST *liraglutide* serves as Goal, whereas the corresponding TT *Victoza* serves as Actor.

Only one [relational]-clause system is affected by the INTRA, viz. TYPE OF RELATION, whose graphical representation is:

![Fig. 8.2.1.3. The [relational]-clause system of TYPE OF RELATION. Cf. fig. 5.1.4, section 5.1.4](image)

Within this system, only four shifts have been recorded, one of which is from [circumstantial] to [possessive]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D19 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>48-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… in patients who may be at risk of increased bleeding …</td>
<td>if you have a risk of bleeding such as:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST [relational: circumstantial] clause (*be at*) has been replaced by a [relational: possessive] one in the TT (*have*). An automatic consequence of this shift is that ST *at risk of increased bleeding* changes from a circumstantial element into Attribute (*a risk of bleeding*) in the TT.

In the other three instances, the shift is from [intensive] → [possessive], as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M14 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>23-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If symptoms are persistent and worsening, …</td>
<td>If you have long-lasting or worsening symptoms, …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST [relational: intensive] clause has been transformed into a [relational: possessive] one in the TT. This, in combination with the change in SUBJECT PERSON (from ST *symptoms* to TT *you*), means that *symptoms* changes from the status of ST Carrier to TT Attribute.

As was seen to be the case with shifts in the general system of PROCESS TYPE, the changes within the more delicate experiential clause-rank systems likewise result in semantic variation, but, precisely because more delicate systems are involved, perhaps to a less conspicuous degree.

**8.2.1.3. Shifts in CIRCUMSTANTIATION**

Like the shift types analysed in the previous section, shifts in CIRCUMSTANTIATION (i.e. shifts where two corresponding items across the ST-TT divide represent different types of circumstantial element) are similarly rare, with only four instances counted in the whole
corpus. The first (J62) is a change from Role to Manner, the second (P38) a change from spatial to temporal location,\(^{152}\) and the third (P54) a change from Manner to Role. The fourth occurrence is analysed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V42 - 2-4.2.</th>
<th>23-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… the starting dose is 0.6 mg liraglutide daily. After at least one week, …</td>
<td>The starting dose is 0.6 mg once a day, for at least one week.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ST *after at least one week* has been reworded as TT *for at least one week*. The change of preposition means that the PP expresses Time (or, in IFG3 terms (p. 262), Location: time) in the ST, but Duration (or, in IFG3 terms (ibid.), Extent: duration) in the TT.

Shifts in CIRCUMSTANTIATION, too, are responsible for a change in experiential semantics: *After at least one week* and *for at least one week* are related as indications of a time frame, but do not mean the same.

### 8.2.1.4. Shifts in clause-rank, experiential constituent status (nuclearity/peripherality)

A slightly more frequent type of clause-rank shift within the experiential metafunction (12 instances registered) concerns changes in constituent status, whereby an item is either 'demoted' from nuclear status, i.e. from participanthood, to the peripheral status of Circumstance, or 'promoted' from Circumstance to participant. One example of each 'direction' will be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G38 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>36-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Gilenya treatment results in a transient decrease in heart rate …</td>
<td>At the beginning of treatment, Gilenya causes the heart rate [[to slow down]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: What is Actor in the ST (*initiation of Gilenya treatment*) has been 'demoted' to the status of Circumstance (Location: time) in the TT (*At the beginning of treatment*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S47 - 3-4.2:</th>
<th>26-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The radiolabelled solution should be administered intravenously as a single dose only.</td>
<td>A single injection into a vein in your arm is sufficient [[to provide your doctor with the information needed]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ST *as a single dose* is a circumstantial element that has been 'promoted' to the status of participant (Carrier in [relational] clause) in the TT (*A single injection*).

The instances recorded are not evenly spread across the INTRA corpus, with 7 out of the 12 occurrences registered in the Gilenya text pair. Nor is there any systematic pattern to be observed with respect to the ‘direction’ of the change: in four instances, the movement is from status as participant to circumstantial element, whereas in the 6 other instances the

---

\(^{152}\) What might more simply be termed *Time* and *Place* is referred to as *Location: time* and *Location: place* in IFG3: 262 (see also Appendix 6).
direction is the opposite.

In terms of the semantic difference generated between ST and TT, shifts in experiential status may possibly be regarded as the least conspicuous of the experiential clause-rank shift types, but the variation in meaning is an unmistakeable consequence all the same.

8.2.2. Shifts within the logical metafunction

Fig. 5.4. CLAUSE COMPLEXITY and dependent systems. Sources: LC: 126 and IFG3: 373 (adapted by author)

8.2.2.1. Shifts in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY

As independent shifts, i.e. ones that are not the automatic consequence of another type of shift at work in a given clause or clause complex, shifts in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY are not very frequent: 13 instances have been counted across the corpus, i.e. a little less than two occurrences per text pair on average. Nevertheless, shifts in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY are in fact extremely pervasive in the corpus, but are in most cases to be interpreted as an automatic consequence of •de-metaphorization or •paraphrase involving a shift from group/phrase to clause rank, since these types of change almost invariably introduce an extra clause (see sections 8.2.5.4 and 8.4.1 for elaboration of this point). The same type of phenomenon (a shift as an automatic consequence of some other change) is observable in a case like the following:

| V24 - 3-4.4: Patients [[receiving Victoza in combination with a sulphonylurea]] may have an increased risk of hypoglycaemia. |
| 23-2: (αα:) You may get hypoglycaemia (low blood sugar) (αβ:) when using Victoza together with a sulphonylurea (β:) as sulphonylureas increase the risk of hypoglycaemia. |

Comment: What is a downranked clause in the ST (receiving Victoza ...) has acquired the status of a ranking (i.e. non-embedded) one (αβ) in the TT, which automatically leads to a shift in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY: The appearance of an extra ranking clause necessarily results in a complex instead of a simplex.
Accordingly, the subject matter of the present section will only be non-automatic shifts in clause complexity. It should also be noted that in some cases a difference in clause complexity is evident in a translation segment, without providing grounds for any shift to be recorded:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V15 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>22-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients should be informed of the characteristic symptom of acute pancreatitis: persistent, severe abdominal pain.</td>
<td>(β:) If you have symptoms of acute pancreatitis, like persistent, severe abdominal pain, (α:) you should consult your doctor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: There is indeed a difference in clause complexity between ST and TT, but in this case the TT must be interpreted as being only partially derived from the ST segment. This especially applies to the TT α-clause, which is pure addition, having no counterpart in the ST. Thus, it is not the case that a source-text simplex has been expanded into a TT complex, and accordingly no shift in clause complexity can be identified.

Examples of non-automatic shifts are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G56 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>37-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The immune system effects of Gilenya may increase the risk of infections (see section 4.8).</td>
<td>(β:) While you are taking Gilenya (and for up to 2 months after you stop taking it), (α:) you may get infections more easily.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The information in the ST simplex has been 'diluted' to form a complex (α^β) in the TT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G83 - 6-4.4.:</th>
<th>37-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In MS clinical trials, patients treated with fingolimod 0.5 mg had an average increase of approximately 2 mmHg in systolic pressure, and approximately 1 mmHg in diastolic pressure, first detected approximately 2 months after treatment initiation, and persisting with continued treatment. Therefore, blood pressure should be regularly monitored during treatment with Gilenya.</td>
<td>(β:) As Gilenya causes a slight elevation of blood pressure, (α:) your doctor may want to check your blood pressure regularly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In this case, the shift in clause complexity stems from the conversion of two ST simplexes (forming two separate sentences) into a TT hypotactic complex (β^α).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J57 - 5-4.4.:</th>
<th>28-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To be taken into account in high-risk groups such as patients with liver disease, or epilepsy.</td>
<td>(α:) To be taken into account (β:) if you are in a high-risk group such as patients with liver disease, or epilepsy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: The introduction of *if you are* in the TT means that two clauses appear in the TT, as compared with one only in the ST. It should be noted that the addition of a conjunction and a Mood element is what makes the shift in **clause complexity possible**, but the addition does not automatically result in the introduction of an extra clause. The introduction of a Mood element might, for example, simply change a [non-finite] clause into a [finite] one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V14 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>22-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1:) There is limited experience in patients with inflammatory bowel disease and diabetic gastroparesis (2:) and Victoza is therefore not recommended in these patients.</td>
<td>The use of Victoza is not recommended in patients with inflammatory bowel disease and/or diabetic gastroparesis.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: This is one of the only three cases altogether where a source-text clause complex (in this case paratactic) has been ‘compressed’ into a simplex in the TT, which is achieved by replacing ST *in these patients* from the 2-clause with *in patients with inflammatory bowel disease and diabetic gastroparesis* from the 1-clause.

Despite the relatively low number of non-automatic shifts in **clause complexity** recorded, there is still a clear majority of shifts from [simplex] to [complex] (ten instances), which is consistent with the required lay-friendliness of the TTs, since, as noted in section 5.6, grammatical complexity is a predominant feature of the spoken mode.

8.2.2.2. **Shifts in Taxis**

Only two shifts in Taxis have been recorded, one of which is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G45 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>36-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1β:) If therapy is discontinued for more than 2 weeks, (1α:) the effects on heart rate and atrioventricular conduction may recur on re-introduction of Gilenya treatment (2:) and the same precautions as for treatment initiation should apply.</td>
<td>(α:) The same applies (β:) if you are resuming treatment after a break of more than two weeks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Only part of the ST complex has been transferred to the TT, of course, with the TT α-clause being derived from the ST 2-clause, and the TT β-clause from ST 1β. What justifies the categorization of the shift as one in Taxis is that the ST 2-clause enters into a paratactic complex, whereas its counterpart in the TT (the α-clause) is hypotactically linked with its neighbouring clause (the β-clause). The reversal of the sequence of the clauses, on the other hand (the ST 2-clause comes last, whereas the TT α-clause comes first), is a change in structure which it has not been possible to capture in terms of any shift type.
The other shift recorded (M60) is also from [parataxis] to [hypotaxis], but in both cases the question of translational effect is too uncertain to be pronounced on.

8.2.2.3. Shifts between types of complexing at clause and group rank

A related type of shift within the logical metafunction concerns changes between the various types of complexing, i.e. the different ways in which clauses may be joined in clause complexes and groups in group complexes. What has not previously been mentioned is that NGs, like clauses, may form complexes, i.e. entities consisting of several individual NGs, as in *castor oil [...] may cause stomach upset and diarrhoea* (from D74, the third example in this section), where *stomach upset and diarrhoea* constitutes one unified nominal entity serving as one single constituent at clause rank. However, shifts between different types of NG complexing are very rare in the corpus, which is why this particular area was ignored in the grammatical accounts (ch. 5). Moreover, the different types of complexing open to NGs are in close correspondence with those available to clauses (see section 5.4): NG complexing may be either [elaborating], [extending] or [enhancing] (LC: 645-46), thus corresponding to the system of TYPE OF EXPANSION at clause rank (cf. fig. 5.4.2 above).

The term [extending], then, which is the only one relevant here, branches off into two further options in the more delicate system of TYPE OF EXTENSION, viz. [alternative] (realized by *or*) and [additive] (realized by *and*). Graphically:

---

**Fig. 5.4.2. TYPE OF EXPANSION and dependent systems. Sources: LC: 150 and IFG3: 411-12 (adapted by author)**

---

**Fig. 8.2.2.2. NG complexing systems: TYPE OF EXPANSION and TYPE OF EXTENSION. Source: LC: 646 (adapted by author)**
In the following, both clause-rank and group-rank shifts will be examined, since the shift types at both ranks are directly comparable.

A mere three instances of shift within the clause-rank system of TYPE OF ENHANCEMENT have been found, one of which is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G146 - 6-4.4</th>
<th>39-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(β:) If a decision is made [[to stop treatment with Gilenya]] (αα:) a 6 week interval without therapy is needed, …</td>
<td>(β:) After stopping Gilenya (αα:) you may have to wait for 6-8 weeks …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST β-clause, which is [(causal-)conditional], has been transformed into a [temporal] one in the TT, with the effect that the conditionality becomes implicit (in a headline a few lines earlier (If you stop taking Gilenya), the conditionality is explicit.)

In the other two instances, the shift is the exact reverse, i.e. from [temporal] to [conditional]. In TYPE OF EXTENSION ([alternative]/[varying]/[additive]), two occurrences have been identified, one of which is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V37 - 5-4.7</th>
<th>23-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(α:) Patients should be advised (β:) to take precautions [[to avoid hypoglycaemia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the ST, while driving and and using machines, though part of an embedded clause, form a paratactic clause complex, being joined together through [additive] extension (and). In the TT, the corresponding units (the αβ1- and αβ2-clause) likewise form a paratactic complex, but in this case the selected type of extension is alternation (or).

At group rank, the shifts in complexing recorded also pertain to TYPE OF EXTENSION ([alternative]/[additive]):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D74 - 4-4.4</th>
<th>49-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This medicinal product also contains hydrogenated castor oil which may cause stomach upset and diarrhoea.</td>
<td>DuoCover also contains hydrogenated castor oil which may cause stomach upset or diarrhoea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In ST and TT alike, stomach upset and diarrhoea together form a nominal-group complex, and in both cases the expansion type is [extending], but two different terms from the system of TYPE OF EXTENSION have been selected: [additive] (and) in the ST, but [alternative] (or) in the TT.

Four other instances of shift in TYPE OF EXTENSION at group rank have been identified, all of them identical with the example above.

In two instances, the shift in TYPE OF EXTENSION crosses ranks:

---

153 The symbol '‖' is used here to mark a clause boundary within an embedded clause. The usual symbols are avoided because the clauses are not ranking (non-embedded) ones.
Active substances [[which inhibit inflammation || or affect the haematopoietic system (such as antibiotics and corticosteroids)]] may lead to false negative results.

Medicines [[reducing inflammation]] and medicines [[affecting the production of your blood cells (such as corticosteroids or antibiotics)]] may affect the results of your examination.

**Comment:** In the ST, the embedded clause consists of a complex of two clauses linked through alternation (or). The corresponding TT construction, however, consists of not one, but two NGs (Medicines ... and medicines ...) with a postmodifying embedded clause each. As a result, the ST clause-rank type of complexing, which is [extending: alternative] (or), is replaced by [additive] extension (and) at group rank in the TT. It might be objected that because a change of rank is involved, the shift cannot be explained with reference to the same system (TYPE OF EXTENSION). However, the clause-rank system and the group-rank one in fact overlap with respect to the options involved at both ranks in the above case: in the clause-rank system, the terms are [additive]/[varying]/[alternative] (cf. above and section 5.4), i.e. one more than the group-rank system, which only comprises [additive] and [alternative], as already mentioned. These two terms, in other words, are the ones with regard to which the two systems are comparable.

It should be mentioned that in the other occurrence of a cross-rank shift in TYPE OF EXTENSION (P60), the movement is from group to clause rank. It has been considered unnecessary, however, to represent the analysis here. It should also be mentioned that the above example (S30) is the only incident of all the shifts in TYPE OF EXTENSION (at group rank, clause rank, and between ranks) where the direction is from [alternative] to [additive]. Although the shifts in complexing belong within the logical metafunction, the effect of these changes, however, has greater affinities with that of many of the experiential shifts, which create ST-TT semantic distance. Although the units affected are small, there is no denying that the exchange of or with and is responsible for a clear variation in meaning, albeit relatively inconsiderable.

**8.2.3. Shifts in interpersonal systems at clause rank (MOOD)**

The following section will present the shifts charted at different points of delicacy within the system network termed MOOD, i.e. the network of interpersonal clause-rank systems:
Fig. 5.2.4b. The general system network of the interpersonal clause grammar (MOOD). Source: IFG3: 135 (adapted by author)

8.2.3.1. Shifts in FREEDOM

As one of the most general systems in the MOOD system network, changes in FREEDOM might have been expected to be frequent, but the opposite is in fact the case. In the entire SPC-into-PIL corpus, 21 occurrences have been registered, evenly spread across the texts with approximately three instances per text on average. No systematic tendency can be identified, with around half the instances representing a movement from [free] to [bound], and the other half the opposite, i.e. from [bound] to [free]. Two examples of each type of movement will be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D34 - 4-4.4: (α:) Patients should also be told (β:) that it might take longer than usual [[to stop bleeding]] …</th>
<th>48-2: (β:) If you cut or injure yourself, (α:) it may take longer than usual [[for [[bleeding]] to stop]].</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: In the ST, that it might take longer than usual … is a dependent clause which has acquired the status of a dominant one (α) in the TT. The reason is the •omission of the ST α-clause and the •addition of a thematic β-clause (i.e. a clause occupying the role of Theme in the clause complex as a whole) in the TT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P36 - 4-4.5:</td>
<td>32-2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(α:) It should be noted (β:) that the adverse reactions may be intensified.</td>
<td>Any side effects [[that happen]] may be more serious.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** The ST α-clause has been omitted in the TT, leaving the ST β-clause as the sole, and hence [free], clause in the TT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G103 - 7-4.5:</th>
<th>38-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During and for up to two months after treatment with Gilenya vaccination may be less effective. (1:) The use of live attenuated vaccines may carry a risk of infections (2:) and should therefore be avoided.</td>
<td>During and for up to 2 months after treatment with Gilenya, you should not be given certain types of vaccine (live attenuated vaccines) (β:) as they could trigger the infection [[that they were supposed to prevent]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** The ST 1-clause (which is [free]) in the second sentence has been converted into a [bound] (hypotactically enhancing) TT clause, i.e. *as they could trigger the infections* ....

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S22 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>25-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Radiopharmaceuticals should be received, used and administered only by authorised persons in designated clinical settings. Their receipt, storage, use, transfer and disposal are subject to the regulations and the appropriate authorisations of the competent authorities.</td>
<td>Because there are strict laws covering the handling, the use and disposal of radioactivity. (α:) technetium(99mTc)-besilomab is always used in a hospital or a similar setting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comment:** In the TT, a clause complex (β^α) has been formed out of the two separate ST sentences. Apart from being reversed in order (the second of the ST sentences has been assigned thematic status in the TT complex), what is a [free] clause in the ST has become a [bound] one (β) in the TT.

Just as no clear pattern is detectible in these shifts, no clear effect is discernible either, at least none directly related to the shift in register from the expert- to the lay-oriented. Rather, the shifts are more safely interpreted as being part of the extensive textual reorganization that characterizes the rewriting between the STs and TTs as such (for a further discussion, see section 8.5.2.1).

### 8.2.3.2. Shifts in POLARITY

Only 8 instances of shift in POLARITY ([positive]/[negative]) have been found, which makes this type of change even less frequent than shifts in FREEDOM. However, all occurrences are similar in nature, since in all cases the change is from [positive] to [negative] polarity. Two examples will be given:

---

154 In this case, *textual* should not be understood in its SF sense. I simply mean 'reorganization of the text'.
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A23 - 4-4-6:
(α:) Fluticasone furoate should be used in pregnancy (β:) only if the benefits to the mother outweigh the potential risks to the foetus or child.

19-2:
(αα:) Do not use Avamys (αβ1:) if you are pregnant, (αβ2:) or planning to become pregnant, (β:) unless your doctor or pharmacist tells you to.

Comment: The combination of the [imperative] mood type and [negative] polarity in the TT αα-clause is derived from the ST modulated proposition (should be used) and the ensuing qualification (only if ...).

M41 - 4-4.6:
(α:) It is unknown (β:) whether mifamurtide is excreted in human milk.

24-2:
(α:) It is not known (β:) whether MEPACT passes to human milk.

Comment: The change from [positive] polarity in the ST α-clause to [negative] polarity in the TT α-clause is combined with the selection of an antonym (ST: unknown – TT: known).

In all cases, the effect of the shifted polarity may be interpreted as the achievement of ‘unequivocalness’ or ‘overtness’: what are more subtle types of negation or restriction in the STs - as in should be used ... only if ... (the example from A23) or unknown (M41) - is shifted into unmistakable negation in the TTs. The effect of the shift type is thus akin to •explicitation (see section 8.4.2).

8.2.3.3. Shifts in FINITENESS
Although FINITENESS ([finite]/[non-finite]) is a system that is open to [bound] clauses only (cf. section 5.2 - figure 5.2.4b), shifts in FINITENESS have in fact turned out to be relatively more frequent than shifts in POLARITY and FREEDOM, which are open to all clauses. Thus, 30 instances have been registered altogether, but not evenly spread across the corpus, with half the changes occurring in Gilenya (the Gilenya TT, however, is a good deal longer than the other texts - see Appendix G). Nor do the changes exhibit any systematic tendency: in 17 out of the 29 instances, a [non-finite] ST clause has been converted into a [finite] TT clause, leaving 12 instances where the opposite type of shift (from [finite] to [non-finite]) has taken place. Three examples will be given:

D78 - 2-4.2.:
DuoCover should be given as a single daily 75 mg/75 mg dose.

3-4.2.:
For oral use.
It may be given with or without food.

49-3:
The usual dose is one tablet of DuoCover per day [[to be taken orally with a glass of water, with or without food]].

Comment: The TT embedded clause (to be taken …) is [non-finite], but derived from the [finite] ST clause it may be given ... (it is Subject and may the Finite).
Before initiating treatment with Gilenya, a recent complete blood count (CBC) (i.e. within 6 months) should be available. Before you start Gilenya, your doctor will confirm whether you have enough white blood cells in your blood.

Comment: Whereas the ST β-clause is [non-finite] (before initiating …), the corresponding TT clause (β) is [finite], containing a Subject (you) and a Finite (start).

However, in a pandemic situation, it may be appropriate [to give the vaccine] … However, in a pandemic situation, you may still be given the vaccine.

Comment: In the TT clause, a Subject (you) and a Finite (may) have been introduced, which makes the clause [finite]. The corresponding TT clause (the embedded clause to give the vaccine), on the other hand, is [non-finite].

Whether intended or not (and the present investigation is not concerned with intent), shifts from [non-finite] to [finite] must be deemed to result in a (slight) decrease in formality, since the obligatory element of a [finite] clause, i.e. the Mood (Subject+Finite), is where the speaker/writer 'invests' herself in the proposition/proposal, and where the proposition/proposal is made negotiable (cf. section 5.2.1). In other words, [finite] clauses are more interactive, and hence more 'personal' in Tenor than [non-finite] clauses. Hence, a clearer majority of shifts from [non-finite] to [finite] clauses might have been expected in the transformation of expert-oriented texts into lay-oriented ones, and the presence of a not inconsiderable minority of shifts representing the opposite 'direction' is therefore surprising. The [finite]-into-[non-finite] shifts must be interpreted as a concomitant of the rewriting as such, but cannot be regarded as a phenomenon which supports the transformation from expert- to lay-orientation. Whether these shifts are outright counterproductive to the lay-oriented skopos of the TTs, however, must be left an open question.

8.2.3.4. Shifts in SUBJECT PERSON
Shifts in SUBJECT PERSON ([interactant]/[non-interactant]) represent another type of INTRA translation strategy of moderately frequent occurrence: 39 of these changes occur in relatively even distribution across the texts. Completely in accordance with the changes in NOMINAL PERSON (see section 8.2.6.1), the direction of change in SUBJECT PERSON is uniformly from [non-interactant] to [interactant], and in all cases the [interactant] subject person is you, i.e. the addressee of the text. Examples are:

If symptoms are persistent and worsening, …

If you have long-lasting or worsening symptoms, …

Comment: The Subject of the ST clause is symptoms, whereas in the TT it is you. The change of Subject is accompanied by a change in TYPE OF RELATION: the ST clause is [rela-
tional: intensive] (are), and the TT clause [relational: possessive] (have).

In a number of cases, the change in SUBJECT PERSON occurs in tandem with a shift in VOICE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G140 - 2-4.2: If a dose is missed ...</th>
<th>39-3: If you forget to take a dose ...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: The shift from what is a [receptive] clause in the ST to an [operative] one in the TT has necessitated the insertion of an item (you) to serve as Actor (analysed as explicitation - see section 8.4.2). This item (you), which doubles as Subject, entails a change in SUBJECT PERSON, in that the ST Subject a dose is [non-interactant]. It should be emphasized, however, that although the insertion of you in connection with shifts in VOICE is the natural choice in this particular register, the selection of a specifically [interactant] Subject is not an automatic consequence of the shift in VOICE as such. For this reason, the shift in SUBJECT PERSON needs to be registered independently.

What may also need to be emphasized is that the system of SUBJECT PERSON pertains to clause rank, and that accordingly the grammatical environment of the comparative ST-TT analysis is the clause. Hence, what matters is whether the Subject selected in two corresponding clauses across the ST-TT divide differs in terms of PERSON. Whether the Subject is constituted by the same participant or not (and mostly it is not) is irrelevant. When, on the other hand, the same participant is referred to in spite of the change in SUBJECT PERSON, the shift is simultaneously one in NOMINAL PERSON:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V24 - 3-4.4: Patients [[receiving Victoza in combination with a sulphonylurea]] may have an increased risk of hypoglycaemia.</th>
<th>23-2: (αα:) You may get hypoglycaemia (low blood sugar) (αβ:) when using Victoza together with a sulphonylurea (β:) as sulphonylureas increase the risk of hypoglycaemia.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Comment: The change is from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee] at two different levels of comparison: at clause rank, the ST ranking clause (Patients ... may have ...) and the corresponding TT clause (the αα-clause) differ in SUBJECT PERSON: the ST-clause Subject is Patients, whereas the TT Subject is you. Moreover, since the NGs realizing the Subject refer to the same participant across the ST-TT divide, a shift at group rank must be registered as well, i.e. one in NOMINAL PERSON. (For a further analysis of shifts in NOMINAL PERSON, see section 8.2.6.1).

With regard to the effect of these shifts, there can little doubt: they clearly represent one of the shift types which serve to change the strongly 'impersonal', subject-oriented Tenor of the STs into a more reader-oriented one in the TTs.
8.2.3.5. Shifts in MOOD TYPE

Fig. 5.2.1. The system of MOOD TYPE and dependent systems. Source: IFG3: 23 (adapted by author)

In the STs, instructions regarding use of the medicine are often realized by modulated declaratives, such as Patients should be advised to take precautions … (V37). As previously noted (see section 5.2.1), [declarative] clauses encode propositions (statements, to be specific), but modulated declaratives are in some cases semantically close to proposals (commands) (IFG3: 148-49). Since, however, the [imperative] mood type is the most congruent realization of a command (LC: 438-39), it is consistent with the lay-orientedness of PILs that when a shift in MOOD TYPE occurs (always in connection with instructions transferred from ST to TT), the direction of the shift is in nearly all cases from [indicative: declarative] to [imperative]:

D85 - 3-4.2:  
(β-clause from D84: If a dose is missed,) (α1:) patients should take the dose immediately …

49-3:  
(β1:) If you forget to take a dose of DuoCover, … (α1:) take your tablet straightaway …

Comment: The ST modulated declarative (should take) has been transformed into an [imperative] clause in the TT (take your tablet …).

J46 - 6-4.6:  
… men treated with cabazitaxel should use effective contraception throughout treatment …

28-2:  
Use a condom during sex …

Comment: As in the previous example, the ST modulated declarative (should use) has been replaced by an imperative in the TT (use)

In a few cases, the ST [declarative] clause does not contain modulation, although the rhetorical (or ‘pragmatic’) function is nevertheless instructional, as in the following example:

D62 - 6-4.6:  
DuoCover is contraindicated during the third trimester of pregnancy.

49-2:  
Do not take DuoCover during third trimester of pregnancy.

As previously mentioned, congruent realization refers to the situation where an entity of meaning is realized by the most obvious or natural choice at the lexicogrammatical stratum (cf. section 5.6), such as the realization of a command by means of an imperative or a question by means of an interrogative.
Comment: The TT imperative (*do not take*) is derived from the TT declarative, in which the instructional aspect is lexicalized in *contraindicated*.

Only one single case has been registered in which a source-text imperative has been changed into a TT declarative:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J62 - 16-6.6:</th>
<th>29-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(α:) Always dilute the concentrate for solution for infusion with the supplied solvent (β:) before adding to infusion solution.</td>
<td>(α:) JEVTANA must be prepared (diluted) (β:) before it is given.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In this case, the imperative is to be found in the ST α-clause (*always dilute ...*), and the declarative (modulated) in the ST (*must be prepared*). The reason is that the administration of the medicine is to be handled by medical staff, and not the patient him/herself. Therefore, the TT on this point cannot be interpreted as instructive, but rather as purely informative (i.e. ‘for your information we can tell you that this is how the medical staff are supposed to handle the medicine.’)

Since, as noted above, instructions are most congruently expressed in imperatives, a high frequency of shift from the [indicative] to the [imperative] mood type might be expected when instructions are transferred from ST to TT, but the opposite is in fact the case: only 14 instances of shift in MOOD TYPE have been registered altogether, including the instance in J62 (last example above) where the direction of change was [imperative] → [indicative: declarative].

8.2.3.6. Shifts in MODAL DEIXIS

![Fig. 5.2.3. MODAL DEIXIS and dependent systems. Source: IFG3: 135 (adapted by author)](image)

One of the moderately frequent types of shift within interpersonal clause-rank systems occurs in MODAL DEIXIS: in fact, 27 instances have been counted, in relatively even distribution across the corpus (apart from Avamys, in which the shift type does not feature). The changes moreover exhibit a consistent pattern: in the overwhelming majority of occurrences, the shift is from [modality] to [primary tense]:
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G125 - 2-4.2:</th>
<th>39-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The treatment should be initiated and supervised by a physician [[experienced in multiple sclerosis]].</td>
<td>Treatment with Gilenya will be overseen by a doctor [[who is experienced in the treatment of multiple sclerosis]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ST *should* makes the clause deictically modal, whereas TT *will* realizes [primary tense] in the TT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S46 - 2-4.2:</th>
<th>26-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The recommended activity of technetium (99mTc) besilesomab should be between 400 MBq and 800 MBq.</td>
<td>The recommended activity administered intravenously is between 400 to 800 MBq …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: As in the above example, [modality] (realized by *should*) has been selected in the ST clause, but [primary tense] (*is*) in the TT.

The majority of instances are in fact similar to the two above examples: the modality of the ST clause more specifically consists in [modulation] (in most cases realized by *should*; in a single instance (P21) by *shall*), which is replaced by [primary tense] ([present] or [future]) in the TT. As a consequence, the semantic element of obligation encoded in the ST disappears in the TT. The modulated propositions obviously serve to make the STs instructional or directive in rhetorical function, whereas the absence of modulation in the corresponding TT propositions makes these purely informative (‘this is what will happen / how you will be treated’).

In only four instances, the modality type in the ST is [modalization] and not [modulation]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G48 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>36-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… patients receiving beta blockers, or other substances [[which may decrease heart rate …]]</td>
<td>… if you are taking medicines [[called beta blockers «(which slow the heartbeat)&gt;&gt;]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST embedded clause is modalized as a result of *may*, whereas the corresponding TT clause *which slow the heartbeat* is non-modalized, which means that the semantic element of possibility vanishes from the TT. Beta blockers are no longer represented as having the *possible* effect of decreasing the heart rate, but may rather be inferred to do so invariably.

And in one single instance, the ST modality departed from in the TT is neither [modulation] nor [modalization] but ability/potentiality (cf. IFG3: 621): 156

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V46 - 3-4.2:</th>
<th>23-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victoza … can be injected subcutaneously …</td>
<td>Victoza is given as an injection under the skin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

156 Ability/potentiality is a marginal aspect of modality, which is the reason why it has been ignored in the account of modal options in the interpersonal clause grammar (section 5.2.3).
Comment: ST can encode ability or potentiality (IFG3: 621), which has not been transferred to the TT, in which [primary tense] (is) has been selected. In other words, the sense of option is not present in the TT.

Only in very few instances is [primary tense] in the ST changed into [modality] in the TT, as in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST Clause</th>
<th>TT Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DuoCover has no or negligible influence on the ability to drive and use machines.</td>
<td>DuoCover should not affect your ability to drive or to use machines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: [Primary tense] in the ST (has) has been replaced by [modality] (should) in the TT. It is not entirely clear whether should in this case represents a semantic element of obligation, or – contrary to the usual meaning of should – in fact rather probability, i.e. ‘the medicine is unlikely to affect …’

### 8.2.3.7. Shifts in modality

Certain shifts involving modality cannot be categorized as changes within the system of [Modality Deixis](#), either because ST and TT are both deictically modal ([modality] has been selected) or deictically temporal ([primary tense] has been selected), or because either the ST or the TT clause in question is [non-finite]. Nor can they be categorized as shifts within the system of [Modality Type](#) (see section 5.2.3), in that they consist in the introduction of an extra element of modality in the TT in comparison with the ST, whereas a change in [Modality Type](#) entails the presence of a modal element on both sides. Only six instances of this type of shift (changes in modality) have been counted altogether, of which three different types will be analysed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST Clause</th>
<th>TT Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>With repeated confirmation of liver transaminases above 5 times the ULN, treatment with Gilenya should be interrupted ...</td>
<td>(β:) If your test results indicate a problem with your liver (α:) you may have to interrupt treatment with Gilenya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST clause is modulated (should), but contains no modalization. The TT α-clause, on the other hand, is modalized (may, encoding probability) as well as modulated (have to). The change is thus from absence to presence of modalization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ST Clause</th>
<th>TT Clause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… blood pressure should be regularly monitored during treatment with Gilenya.</td>
<td>… your doctor may want to check your blood pressure regularly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: As in the previous example, no modalization is present in the ST, whereas the TT features may. Apart from this, the texts exhibit a change in [Modulation Type](#) ([obliga-
tion]/[inclination]): ST *should* encodes a degree of [obligation], which has been replaced by [inclination] in the TT through *want to*. This is the only case of change between the two types of modulation registered in the whole corpus.

Before the next example is introduced, it needs to be mentioned that as a parallel to grammatical metaphor within the experiential metafunction (see section 5.6), certain types of interpersonal meaning (especially in the area of modality) also lend themselves to metaphorical realization (see IFG3: 613-616), i.e. expression by means of a (lexico)grammatical form other than the most natural or obvious choice. However, because interpersonal metaphor is only observable in a mere two or three instances in the corpus (TT in G121, ST in G122, and possibly ST in A13), what would inevitably be a lengthy grammatical account was excluded from the introduction to SFG (ch. 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G121 - 8-4.7:</th>
<th>39-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gilenya has no or negligible influence on the ability to drive and use machines.</td>
<td>Gilenya is not expected to have an influence on your ability to drive and use machines.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ST and TT alike are temporal with respect to MODAL DEIXIS, but in the TT *is ... expected to* must be interpreted as as a metaphorical realization of what might be more congruently expressed by a modal Adjunct like *presumably* (cf. IFG3: 613-616), i.e. *Gilenya presumably has no influence ....* In this way, an element of probability has been introduced in the TT which does not figure in the ST.

Only one case (occurring in G34) involves the introduction of potentiality. In the other five cases, the ST-TT difference consists in the introduction of modalization (probability) in the TT.

Whether any specific translational effect can be attributed to these shifts, however, must be left an open question.

**8.2.3.8. Shifts in NEGATIVE TYPE**

The last example in the previous section (G121) also contains one of the only two instances of change in NEGATIVE TYPE. The system of NEGATIVE TYPE (IFG3: and LC: 479-84) is a sub-system of [negative] polarity (i.e. the entry condition is the term [negative] in the interpersonal system of POLARITY - see section 5.2, figure 5.2.4b, where, however, the system of NEGATIVE TYPE has not been included). Considering that a mere two instances of shift within this system has been recorded in the entire corpus, an account of this very specific area of grammar (which would inevitably have had to be taken to considerable detail) was deemed unwarranted in the chapter on SFG (ch. 5). Suffice it say, therefore, that the most indelicate set of options in the system is [general] and [specialized], the former being realized by *not* at clause rank, and the latter by e.g. *no* at group rank. In the above instance (in G121), the ST negation is [specialized], figuring as Deictic at group rank (*no ... influence*), whereas in the TT it is [generalized], being simply realized by *not*. The other occurrence of this type of shift is exactly similar (D70).
**8.2.3.9. Shifts in MODALITY TYPE**

Shifts between types of modality ([modulation]/[modalization]) are also extremely infrequent, with only three cases noted in the corpus. In two of the cases, the shift is from [modulation] to [modalization], as in:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J35 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>28-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The dose of cabazitaxel should be reduced …</td>
<td>(α:) Your doctor may reduce the dose of JEV-TANA …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The modalization of the TT (may) replaces the modulation (should) of the ST. In this way, a semantic element of probability takes the place of obligation.

In both cases, the shift facilitates a change in rhetorical function from the instructional/directive in the ST to the purely informative in the TT, exactly as was the case with shifts in MODAL DEIXIS from [modality] to [primary tense] (see section 8.2.3.6). The third case, it should be noted, does not really involve a change between [modulation] and [modalization]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A29 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>19-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It may cause irritation of the nasal mucosa.</td>
<td>In some patients this can cause irritation in the inside of the nose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The type of modality involved in the TT is potentiality (can), which, as previously noted, is a marginal case in the system of modality (IFG3: 621), being neither modulation nor modalization. In the present case, the semantic change involved is slight: In the ST an element of probability is present (may), which is semantically close to the potentiality of the TT. In terms of rhetorical function, then, no change has taken place, ST and TT alike being 'informative'.

**8.2.3.10. Shifts in MODAL VALUE**

Shifts in MODAL VALUE ([low]/[median]/[high]) occur in a small number of cases (seven altogether), all of them pertaining to [modulation]. Two examples will be given:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G101 - 6-4.5:</th>
<th>38-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anti-neoplastic, immunosuppressive or immune-modulating therapies should not be co-administered due to the risk of additive immune system effects …</td>
<td>(α:) You must not use Gilenya together with such medicines (β:) as this could intensify the effect on the immune system …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ST should is [median] in MODAL VALUE, whereas TT must is [high] (IFG3: 622). Semantically, the difference involved is one between ‘strong recommendation’ and ‘outright prohibition’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M14 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>23-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
… administration should be delayed or discontinued. MEPACT administration may need to be delayed or discontinued.

Comment: Once again, the ST modulation (*should*) is [median] in VALUE, and the TT [high] (because of *need to* - cf. IFG3: 624). (Apart from this change, the TT is modalized (*may*), which the ST is not, i.e. an element of probability has been introduced in the TT which is absent from the ST.)

All seven cases (four in *Gilenya*, two in *Mepact* and one in *Scintimun*), represent exactly the same type of shift, i.e. from [median] to [high]. A possible interpretation of the effect of these shifts is that, like shifts in POLARITY (see section 8.2.3.2), they contribute to 'unequivocalness' in the TTs, as in the example from G101, where the 'outright prohibition' encoded by the [high] modal value (*must*) leaves no scope for doubt or choice.

**8.2.3.11. Shifts in PRIMARY TENSE**

With regard to shifts within the system of PRIMARY TENSE ([past]/[present]/[future]), only six instances have been registered altogether, four of which are from [past] to [present]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G42 - 3-4.4: Conduction abnormalities were typically transient and asymptomatic. (1:) They usually did not require treatment (2:) and resolved within the first 24 hours on treatment.</th>
<th>36-2: Irregular heartbeat usually returns to normal in less than one day.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: In all three ST clauses, including the 2-clause of the second sentence, the primary tense is [past] (2-clause: <em>resolved</em>). This has been changed to [present] (<em>returns</em>) in the TT.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the above example and in one other case (of [past] into [present]), the reason for the shift is that the ST in this place reports on the results of clinical trials, from which a statement of general value is derived in the TT. In the other two [past]-into-[present] shifts, on the other hand, no particular effect is discernible.

In the last two of the altogether six instances of change in PRIMARY TENSE, the 'movement' is in both cases from [present] to [future]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G88 - 12-5.1: (1:) Peripheral lymphocyte count increases are evident within days of stopping fingolimod treatment (2:) and typically normal counts are reached within one to two months.</th>
<th>38-2: This will usually go back to normal within 2 months of stopping treatment.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The tense of the TT clause is [future] (<em>will</em>), whereas in the corresponding ST clause (the 2-clause), it is [present] (<em>are</em>). The effect of the shift is to convert what is a statement of a general state of affairs (ST) into a prediction (TT), viz. of what the patient can specifically expect after the treatment is discontinued.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A13 - 3-4.4:
(α:) It is recommended (β:) that the height of children [[receiving prolonged treatment with nasal corticosteroids]] is regularly monitored. …

18-2:
The doctor will check your child’s height regularly, …

Comment: In this case, too, the primary tense of the relevant ST clause (β) is [present] (is), whereas in the TT it is [future] (will). However, semantically, more is involved than a mere change from a report on a present state of affairs (ST) to the prediction of a future one. This is because the proposition of the ST β-clause must be understood in the context of the α-clause (it is recommended), which might in fact be interpreted as yet another manifestation of interpersonal metaphor, in this case a metaphorical realization of modulation (a degree of obligation): the clause complex It is recommended that the height of children … is regularly monitored could in fact be rephrased, with the exact same semantic value, as the height of children should be regularly monitored, with the modulation (the medium-degree obligation) overtly expressed by should. In this way, the effect of the shift should rather be interpreted along the lines of a change in rhetorical function from the instructional/directive to the purely informative, as in connection with shifts in MODAL DEIXIS.

It thus turns out that there is far from any uniform effect to be induced from shifts in PRIMARY TENSE in the corpus.

8.2.3.12. Change in MOOD ASSESSMENT
A single change in the most general system of MOOD ASSESSMENT (presence/absence of a mood Adjunct) has been registered:

P21 - 3-4.4:
… immunisation shall be postponed …

32-2:
… your vaccination will usually be postponed …

Comment: No mood Adjunct is present in the ST, whereas the Adjunct usually has been introduced in the TT.

Representing a shift in a system in which the options are presence versus absence of a particular type of grammatical item, the selection of the term [+mood assessment] is equivalent to •addition, i.e. the introduction of a TT element which is no way inferable from the ST. The only difference between this particular type of shift and •additions is that the present case is analyzable in systemic terms, and hence must be.

8.2.3.13. Shifts in more delicate systems of MOOD ASSESSMENT
As pointed out in section 5.2, the selection of a mood Adjunct opens up more delicate systems of mood assessment (systems of mood Adjuncts):
Three instances (but three only) of shifts in these more delicate systems have been identified, of which two are identical changes, following consecutively in two different sentences in the same text (S22 and S23). One of these two is:

**S23 - 2-4.2:**
This medicinal product … should only be handled by authorised personnel.

**25-2:**
It is always handled by trained and qualified people.

Comment: The ST mood Adjunct *only* has been replaced by another mood Adjunct, *always* in the TT. In the system of mood Adjuncts, the shift is thus from [intensity: counterexpectancy: limiting] to [modality: modalization: usuality]. As already noted, the same shift occurs in the preceding segment (S22), i.e. from ST *only* to TT *always.*

The third of the three instances is:

**P57 - 3-4.2:**
… preferably into the deltoid muscle or anterolateral thigh (depending on the muscle mass).

**33-3:**
This will usually be in the upper arm.

Comment: In this case, the two Adjuncts in question both encode modality. ST *preferably* must be interpreted as an Adjunct of [modulation: obligation], whereas TT *usually* is one of [modalization: usuality].

In terms of translational effect, the latter of the above examples is parallel to the shifts in MODAL DEIXIS from [modality] to [primary tense], in that both types are linked with a change in rhetorical function: the STs are instructional whereas as the TTs are purely informative. This transformation is less clearly the result of the change of mood Adjunct in the former of the two examples (ST ... *should only be handled* vs. TT *is always handled*). It would appear that even if no change of mood Adjunct had taken place in this case (TT *is
only handled by...), it would not change the purely informative rhetorical function of the TT proposition. The effect of this particular change (ST only → TT always) must therefore be left an open question.

8.2.4. Shifts within the textual metafunction at clause rank

8.2.4.1. Shifts in VOICE

Of all clause-rank systems, VOICE turns out to be the one exhibiting the highest number of shifts, with 40 instances recorded. Moreover, a consistent pattern is manifest with regard to this system, since in all cases except one the direction is from [receptive] in the ST to [operative] in the TT. The distribution of the shifts is relatively even across the corpus, yet it is to be noted that Mepact and Scintimun feature only one shift each, the one in Scintimun (S15) being in fact a shift in a more delicate system named BENEFACTIVE VOICE.\(^{157}\)

Examples of shifts from [receptive] to [operative] are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D84 - 3-4.2: If a dose is missed</td>
<td>49-3: If you forget to take DuoCover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P56 - 3-4.2: Immunisation should be carried out by intra-muscular injection …</td>
<td>33-3: They will give Pumarix as an injection into a muscle.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{157}\) Since a rather lengthy grammatical account would be necessary to detail this single shift (the only one recorded in this very specific system), it has been deemed more expedient to omit the account (but see Appendix 11, S15).
Comment: As in the previous example, the [receptive] voice of the ST (*immunisation should be carried out*) has been changed into [operative] in the TT. Because there are lexical changes at work as well (ST *immunisation … carried out* has been replaced by TT *give*), the Goal is not the same in the two clauses: in the ST, the Goal is realized by the nominalization *immunisation*, whereas in the TT the function is taken up by *Pumarix*, which must be interpreted as an explicitation necessitated by the choice of *give* as Process, which grammatically requires a Goal. Since it must be considered implicit in ST *Immuni-isation*, TT *Pumarix* is explicitation and not addition.

V43 - 2-4.2.: ...., the dose should be increased to 1-2 mg. 23-3: (α:) Your doctor will tell you (β:) when to increase it to 1.2 mg once a day.

Comment: In this case, the shift in VOICE occurs in combination with a shift in FINITENESS: the ST clause is [finite], the TT β-clause [non-finite]. Thus, the TT clause is without a Subject/Actor, but the Goal (*it*) is the same as in the ST (*the dose*) (the preceding TT sentence features the starting dose, which has been replaced by the anaphoric pronoun *it* in this segment.)

As mentioned at the beginning of this section, only in one single case has an ST [operative] clause been transformed into a TT [receptive] one:

J62 - 16-6.6: (α:) Always dilute the concentrate for solution for infusion with the supplied solvent (β:) before adding to infusion solution. 29-3: (α:) JEVTANA must be prepared (diluted) (β:) before it is given.

Comment: In a previous analysis of this segment (see section 8.2.3.7), it was shown that the ST imperative (*dilute*) encodes an instruction to the hospital staff, whereas the TT modulated declarative reflects an obligation that is not directed at the reader of the TT. Being a purely textual phenomenon, the shift from the [receptive] voice in the ST to the [operative] in the TT, on the other hand, is unrelated to the change in interpersonal semantics. As a comment on the quality of the TT wording, however, it might be pointed out that had an [operative] TT clause been chosen, it would have had the advantage of not only being the more congruent choice of textual organization, but also of making explicit whose duty it is to prepare the solution (*The hospital staff must prepare Jevtana ....*).

The predominance of shifts from [receptive] to [operative] clauses must be considered fully in accordance with the lay-oriented skopos of the TTs: from a purely grammatical perspective, the conflation of Subject and Actor (and Theme) is the unmarked option (IFG3: 58), i.e. the most obvious choice, and, in terms of registerial prevalence, there appears to be a lesser preference for the [receptive] voice in spoken than in written discourse (cf. LC: 598). The [operative] voice may thus be regarded as more colloquial, and the [receptive]

8.2.4.2. Shifts in THEME SELECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declarative Clause</th>
<th>THEME SELECTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Unmarked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject/Theme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject and Theme not conflated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5.3.1. The system of THEME SELECTION.
Sources: IFG3: 80; LC: 540 (adapted by author)

Shifts in the system of THEME SELECTION, from [marked] structures to [unmarked] ones, might be expected to be frequent in interregisterial INTRA, since, as noted in section 5.3, [marked] theme selection is typical of written discourse, whereas as spoken-style texts are usually associated with [unmarked] thematization. Nevertheless, as few as 13 cases of change in THEME SELECTION have been identified in the entire corpus, with two text pairs (Scintimun and Victoza) being completely devoid of shifts within this system. Of the 13 shifts recorded altogether, three are in fact from [unmarked] to [marked], one instance of which is:

G38 - 3-4.4:
Initiation of Gilenya treatment results in a transient decrease in heart rate …

Comment: ST initiation of … treatment (Subject and Actor) has been transformed into a circumstantial element in the TT (At the beginning of treatment), but left in thematic position. The Subject of the TT clause, on the other hand, is Gilenya, which has been transferred to the Rheme. This means that the TT thematic structure is [marked], unlike the ST, where it is [unmarked].

One of the ten instances of shift from [marked] to [unmarked] theme selection is the following:

D41 - 4-4.4.:
In children under 18 years of age, there is a possible association between ASA and Reye’s syndrome.

Comment: There is a possible association between acetylsalicylic acid (ASA) and Reye’s Syndrome when products containing ASA are given to children or adolescents with a viral...

158 It ought to be mentioned that another reason for the recommendation to avoid the [receptive] voice is an alleged detrimental effect on comprehensibility (Charrow 1988: 98; Becker Jensen 1998: 90; 2007: 50). Whereas this criticism is plausible, it appears, however, that it is specifically concerned with the possibility of agent deletion in [receptive] clauses, which, in SFG terms, is the province of the more specific system of AGENTIVITY, and not VOICE as such (cf. section 5.3.2).
Comment: Apart from a shift in THEME SELECTION, the TT is affected by one in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY: the ST prepositional phrase *In children under 18 years of age* has been expanded into a clause (TT β-clause), whereby the ST segment is turned into a TT clause complex. In this complex, the sequence is [unmarked] (α^β), whereas the opposite (with the β-clause in thematic position in the complex, i.e. β^α) would have been a [marked] structure. It should be acknowledged\(^{159}\) that the shift in THEME SELECTION registered here involves a comparison between a clause-rank phenomenon in the ST with one above clause level (clause complexity) in the TT. This, however, does not change the fact that the ST and the TT segment alike can be described in terms of thematic structure, and be seen to differ in that respect.

In terms of effect, the shifts from [marked] to [unmarked] theme selection - few though they are - may be interpreted as a contribution to the more spoken style that is characteristic of the TTs. However, whether the opposite effect is to be attributed to the four instances of the opposite movement ([unmarked] to [marked]) - i.e. whether they are potentially counterproductive to the TT skopos of lay-orientedness - is too certain and will be left an open question.

### 8.2.4.3. Shifts in COHESION

As previously observed, the TTs exhibit extensive restructuring in comparison with their STs, at clause and clause complex level, at the level of paragraphs and even the text as a whole. There is thus very limited parallel sequentiality between STs and TTs, which means that it is the exception rather than the rule that sentences follow each other in the same order in ST and TT. A consequence of this disruption in parallel linearity is that cohesive relations in ST-TT segments often defy comparison. This is the reason why only five instances of change in COHESION, including one shift in REFERENCE, have been registered. Three of these occurrences involve a shift from lexical to referential cohesion, as in the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G16 - 12.5.1.:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(β:) By acting as a functional antagonist of S1P receptors on lymphocytes, (αα:) fingolimod phosphate blocks the capacity of lymphocytes [[to egress from lymph nodes]], (αβ:) causing a redistribution, rather than depletion, of lymphocytes. This redistribution reduces the infiltration of pathogenic lymphocyte cells into the central nervous system, …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>35-1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(α:) Gilenya helps to protect against attacks on the CNS by the immune system (β1:) by reducing the ability of some white blood cells (lymphocytes) [[to move freely within the body]] (β2α:) and by stopping them (β2β:) from reaching the brain and spinal cord.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the ST, there is (among other things) a lexical tie between the two sentences:

\(^{159}\) The reason why this particular instance has been selected for comment is its somewhat dubious nature exactly.
the term *pathogenic lymphocyte cells* is a hyponym of *lymphocytes* in the previous sentence. In the TT, on the other hand, *some white blood cells (lymphocytes)* in β1 corresponds to the first mention of ST *lymphocytes*, but in the following ranking clause (β2α) cohesion is created by means of anaphoric reference (*them*) instead of a lexical tie.

A single case of change from lexical to conjunctive cohesion has been registered:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M54 - 3-4.2:</th>
<th>24-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEPACT must be reconstituted, filtered using the filter provided and further diluted prior to administration. After reconstitution, filtering using the filter provided and further dilution,</td>
<td>The freeze-dried powder has to be reconstituted into a liquid suspension, filtered using the filter provided and further diluted before use.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the M54 ST segment, cohesion between the two sentences is achieved through repetition of the lexeme *reconstitut(e/-ion)*, whereas in the TT (M55) the conjunctive expression *then* replaces the ST temporal Circumstantial of which *reconstitution* is part.

And a single case of change from conjunctive to referential cohesion has been found:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P45 - 6-4.8:</th>
<th>32-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1:) This medicinal product contains thiomersal ...</td>
<td>Pumarix contains thiomersal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P46 - 6-4.8: <em>(continuation of the previous segment)</em> ... (2:) and therefore, it is possible [[that sensitisation reactions may occur]].</td>
<td>32-2: This may cause an allergic reaction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the ST, the cohesive marker *therefore* ties the 2-clause conjunctively to the 1-clause. In the TT, on the other hand, the cohesion is referential, achieved by means of the anaphoric pronoun *this* in P46.

Finally, one single instance of shift in REFERENCE has been identified:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A28 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>19-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Avamys contains benzalkonium chloride.</td>
<td>Avamys contains benzalkonium chloride.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A29 - 4-4.4:</td>
<td>19-2:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It may cause irritation of the nasal mucosa.</td>
<td>In some patients this can cause irritation in the</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment: Both clauses (ST and TT) in A29 contain anaphoric reference to benzalkonium chloride in the preceding sentence, the difference being that ST it is personal reference, whereas TT this is demonstrative.\textsuperscript{160}

In terms of effect, these (few) cohesive changes lend themselves to no obvious interpretation, being apparently unrelated to the specific ST-TT shift in register (from the expert- to the lay-oriented). Therefore, no interpretation will be offered.

8.2.5. Shifts in rank

In the charting of shifts that involve 'movements' between ranks, four general types encompassing two 'directions' each have been identified in the corpus, three of which involve genuine rank shift, and one 'specious' type that can only be said to have affinities with such shifts. The four types are: 1) (section 8.2.5.1) shifts whereby a clause as a whole changes status from a ranking to a downranked clause or vice versa, or where constituents in a ranking clause become occupants of an embedded clause or the reverse; 2) (section 8.2.5.2) the change of an item from clause- to group/phrase-rank constituency or vice versa; 3) (section 8.2.5.3) the 'specious' type of rank shift, whereby a source-text NG which serves as a clause constituent (Actor, Carrier or the like) becomes 'encapsulated' in a TT PP, or the reverse, i.e. where a source-text NG is 'extracted' from a non-embedded PP to realize a clause-rank function directly by leaving the preposition behind; 4) (section 8.2.5.4) •de-metaphorization, i.e. the conversion a of NG or PP into a clause, or the reverse, i.e. •metaphorization, which is the conversion of a clause into a nominal group or PP. In contradistinction to type 2), •de-metaphorization equals the transformation of a source-text item (NG or PP) as a whole into a clause and •metaphorization the opposite), whereas in type 2 a source-text item is only 'moved' out of a group or phrase and inserted in a TT clause instead. As will appear from the analyses of specific instances of •de-metaphorization and •metaphorization, these two shift types in effect constitute a whole complex of changes, in which, however, rank shift is a central element.

8.2.5.1. Shifts between ranking and downranked clauses

In view of the higher degree of clause complexity to be expected from a text type (the PIL) which can be expected to be more spoken in mode than its origin (the SPC), the direction of change to be expected when shifts occur between ranking and embedded clauses would be predominantly ‘upwards’, i.e. for embedded clauses to be shifted to ranking ones rather than the other way around.\textsuperscript{161} However, although the ‘upward’ direction is indeed more

\textsuperscript{160} As previously noted, COHESION is an area of the grammar which, owing to the very limited number of shifts recorded in the corpus, it was decided to exclude from the grammatical accounts in ch. 5. For the subtypes of REFERENCE, see IFG3: 550-61 and Halliday and Hasan (1976: 37-87).

\textsuperscript{161} It is to be remembered that the spoken mode is characterized by marked clause complexity (cf. section 5.6), in the sense that spoken discourse typically consists of relatively complex series of clauses strung together to form sentences (Halliday 1989: 76-87). The written mode, on the other hand, is characterized by simplicity in this respect: sentences typically consisting of fewer, but lexically denser clauses consisting of complex NGs (ibid.: 61-67; cf. section 5.6). What is important here, is that since embedded clauses function as group/phrase-rank constituents, their presence does not entail greater clause complexity: a simplex (sentence consisting of only one clause) may feature a NG with e.g. an embedded clause as Postmodifier and still
frequent than the reverse (6 ‘downward’ shifts and 11 ‘upward’), the total number of changes recorded under this sub-type (17) is too low for the difference to be significant. Moreover, whether the effect of the ‘upward’ shifts is really to contribute to a more spoken style must be deemed rather uncertain, and it is therefore safer to regard the shifts (in both directions) simply as a contribution to the extensive restructuring concomitant on the re-wording as such.

Examples (one of each direction) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G70 - 5-4.4:</th>
<th>37-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(β:) If patients report visual disturbances at any time while on therapy, …</td>
<td>Be sure [[to tell your doctor about any changes in your vision]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST ranking clause has been transformed into a [non-finite] embedded clause that serves as Postmodifier in the adjectival NG *sure* …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3-4.3:</th>
<th>31-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, in a pandemic situation, it may be appropriate [[to give the vaccine]] …</td>
<td>However, in a pandemic situation, you may still be given the vaccine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: What is a [non-finite] embedded clause in the ST (*to give the vaccine*) has become a [finite] ranking clause in the TT (*you may still be given the vaccine*).

### 8.2.5.2. Shifts between group/phrase and clause rank

Unlike the sub-type of rank shift considered above, shifts between clause and group/phrase rank are relatively frequent and moreover exhibit a consistent pattern, with 50 instances out of a total of 62 in this category representing 'upward' movement, i.e. from group/phrase to clause rank, as in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G41 - 3-4.4:</th>
<th>36-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Gilenya treatment … may also be associated with atrioventricular conduction delays.</td>
<td>Gilenya can also cause an irregular heartbeat, especially after the first dose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: *Gilenya* has been upranked from Premodifier in the ST NG *Gilenya treatment* (in itself a part of an embedded PP, i.e. of *Gilenya treatment*, which postmodifies the Head *Initiation*) to clausal constituent status (Subject/Actor) in the TT. Thus, what is ‘packed’ into a single NG in the ST (*initiation of Gilenya treatment*) has been divided up as two separate NGs in the TT (*Gilenya* and *especially after the first dose*), each of which serves a clause-rank function (Subject/Actor and Adjunct/Circumstantial).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D73 - 4-4.4.:</th>
<th>49-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

be a simplex. If, however, in the rewriting from ST to TT a clause is shifted from embedded to ranking, i.e. non-embedded, status, this will typically result in the presence of an extra ranking clause in a sentence, and hence increase the degree of clause complexity.
Patients with rare hereditary problems of galactose intolerance, the Lapp lactase deficiency or glucose-galactose malabsorption should not take this medicinal product. (βα:) If you have been told by your doctor (ββ:) that you have an intolerance to some sugars (e.g. lactose), (αα:) contact your doctor (αβ:) before taking this medicine.

Comment: TT an intolerance to some sugars corresponds to at least ST galactose intolerance, and probably also the Lapp lactase deficiency and glucose-galactose malabsorption. The ST items form a nominal-group complex (cf. section 8.2.2.3) in the PP of galactose ..., which serves as Postmodifier in the NG hereditary problems of .... The TT item, on the other hand, holds clause constituent status, functioning as Complement in the interpersonal structure and Attribute in the experiential structure.

As both of the above cases variously illustrate, the 'upward' shifts mostly consist in the movement of NGs 'out of' ST embedded prepositional phrases,162 which is why this particular type of shift can safely be interpreted as contributing to a more spoken style in the PILs compared with the SPCs, considering that the shifting of items 'out of' groups/phrases into clauses brings about the lower degree of NG complexity which, as previously noted (see section 5.6), is characteristic of spoken registers in comparison with written ones. In a few cases, the shifted ST item only comes to occupy a clausal constituent role indirectly, viz. by becoming encapsulated in a non-embedded TT PP:

G113 - 7-4.6: Before initiation of Gilenya treatment, women of childbearing potential should be counselled regarding the potential for serious risk to the foetus and the need for effective contraception during treatment with Gilenya.

Comment: The TT NG reliable methods of birth control is derived from the ST NG effective contraception. Both NGs are part of a prepositional phrase (ST for ... / TT about ...), but the two PPs differ in status, the one in the ST being a downranked PP (Postmodifier in the NG the need for ...), and the one in the TT (with ...) being a non-embedded one, i.e. a PP which realizes a clause-rank function. Two other instances (G122 and M55) represent the exact similar type of ‘upward’ movement. As with the two above examples, such shifts also contribute to a decrease in NG complexity.

An example of the ‘downward’ shift from clause to group/phrase rank is the following, where the item in question (Victoza) is a clause constituent (Subject/Carrier) in the ST and NG in a postmodifying PP (of Victoza) in the TT:

V14 - 3-4.4: (1:) There is limited experience in patients with inflammatory bowel disease and diabetic gas- 22-2: The use of Victoza is not recommended in patients with inflammatory bowel disease and/or

162 As previously mentioned (see section 5.5.1), embedded prepositional phrases refers to ones which serve as constituents in NGs, typically as Postmodifier, as in the man in the black suit. Non-embedded PPs are ones which function as constituents at clause rank.
troparesis (2:) and Victoza is therefore not recommended in these patients.

And another example is:

M14 - 3-4.4: If symptoms are persistent and worsening, …

23-2: If you have long-lasting or worsening symptoms, …

Comment: In the ST, persistent and worsening are clause constituents (Complements/Attributes), but owing to the change in SUBJECT PERSON (from ST symptoms to TT you) and the concomitant change of symptoms from the role of Subject/Carrier in the ST to Complement/Attribute in the TT, the two corresponding adjectives (TT long-lasting and worsening) have been downranked to serve as Premodifiers in the NG whose Head is symptoms.

In accordance with the theory of the written character of complex NGs, such 'downward' movements are potentially counterproductive to TT accessibility, or at least do not contribute to the enhancement of the accessibility of the TTs in comparison with the STs. Thus, what is gained by the change in SUBJECT PERSON in the last example may - unfortunately - be lost, or at least counteracted, by the rank shifts.

8.2.5.3. NG 'encapsulation' in / 'extraction' from PPs

In the majority of cases (11 out 14), the 'direction' of change is for a nominal group to leave the PP in which it is encapsulated in the ST and to shift into 'unencapsulated' realization of a clause function in the TT instead, as in the following example:

G140 - 2-4.2: (β:) If a dose is missed (αα:) treatment should be continued with the next dose (αβ:) as planned.

39-3: (β:) If you forget to take a dose, (αα:) take the next dose (αβ:) as planned.

Comment: ST the next dose is duplicated in the TT, but whereas the NG is part of a PP (with ...) in the ST, it serves as a clause constituent (Complement/Goal) in the TT.

One of the few cases of the opposite 'movement' is:

A43 - 2-4.2: However, it may take several days of treatment to achieve maximum benefit …

19-3: Some people will not feel the full effects until several days [[after first using Avamys]].

Comment: Here, the NG several days ..., which serves as Complement/Attribute in what is a [relational: circumstantial] clause in the ST, becomes part of the TT PP until several days ..., which serves as a circumstantial element/Adjetct.

In a very few, exceptional cases, which are in effect somewhat different in character from those commented on above, the shift is best characterized as a change from constituency in a PP to constituency within a nominal group:
Cabazitaxel is not recommended during pregnancy ...

JEVTANA should not be used in pregnant women ...

Comment: ST pregnancy, which is the NG of the PP during pregnancy, has been shifted to the function of Premodifier in the TT NG pregnant women. The shift is accompanied by a change in word class (transcategorization) from noun to adjective.

The structural change in the above example has its exact counterpart, i.e. with the opposite direction of change, in the following instance:

Pumarix may be used in lactating women. Pumarix may be used during breast-feeding.

Comment: In this case, the Premodifying lactating in the ST NG lactating women has been transcategorized as a noun (the gerund breast-feeding) in the TT, where it occupies the position of NG in the prepositional phrase during breast-feeding. (Apart from the structural shift, a change of lexis is obviously involved as well (lactating → breast-feeding), which, however, is not the concern at present.) The present example is one out of just two cases where a source-text Premodifier changes into the role of NG in a prepositional phrase.

What is very uncertain is whether any specific effect can be attributed to the shifts in this section, and this question will therefore be left unanswered.

8.2.5.4. De-metaphorization and metaphorization

De-metaphorization is a frequent type of change in the corpus, with 83 instances registered. Below, a number of examples will be given to illustrate the full range of the way this type of change is manifested in the INTRA corpus:

Avamys is indicated for the treatment of: the symptoms of allergic rhinitis

Avamys nasal spray is used (β:) to treat symptoms of allergic rhinitis …

Comment: This is the one of the most ‘straightforward’ examples of de-metaphorization, in which a source-text NG (the treatment of the symptoms of allergic rhinitis) is transformed into a clause (here: the β-clause) in the TT. The change centrally consists in the reconstrual of the nominalized process (ST treatment) as a verbal group (TT to treat) which is assigned the function of Process in the TT. The other part of the reconstrual is the change of rank whereby symptoms of allergic rhinitis is shifted from being part of the Postmodifier in the ST NG to clause constituency in the TT, where it serves as Goal in the [material] clause that has emerged as a result of the conversion.

As appears from the above example, the shift type is in fact a complex of changes which are all automatic consequences of, and therefore to be treated as, different aspects of the de-metaphorization as a whole. The transformation of a source-text NG into a TT clause
thus typically involves not only a change of rank whereby elements in a nominal group are upranked to serve as clause constituents, but also transcategorization, usually of a noun ‘back’ into a verb as in the above case, as well as a change in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY affecting the whole segment of which the TT is part (cf. section 8.2.2.1). A change in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY thus occurs in the above example, where the •de-metaphorization introduces an extra clause, transforming what is a simplex in the ST into a TT clause complex (α^β). It should be emphasized that in accordance with the principle of explanatory economy (see section 8.1.6), these concomitant changes, because they must be interpreted as automatic consequences of the •de-metaphorization, are not recorded as separate changes. It must be admitted that it is in fact debatable whether a shift in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY (from simplex to complex) is to be regarded as an automatic consequence of clausal •de-metaphorization, since this is clearly not always the case (thus in the example below (from G106) the simplex is retained in the TT). Nevertheless, as previously mentioned, in many instances there is a clear link between •de-metaphorization and a change in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY, and when this is the case, the shift from [simplex] to [complex] has not been treated as a change worth recording in its own right.

What has not changed in the above example, on the other hand, are the lexemes: in spite of the transcategorization and the changes in rank, the lexemes treat, symptom, allergy- and rhinitis have all been transferred from ST to TT. In other cases, however, there are lexical changes at work concurrently with the •de-metaphorization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G54 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>37-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A core pharmacodynamic effect of Gilenya is a dose-dependent reduction of the peripheral lymphocyte count ….</td>
<td>Gilenya lowers the white blood cell count ….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The example is parallel to the previous one as far as the change in grammatical structure is concerned: the ST NG (a dose-dependent) reduction of the peripheral lymphocyte count is the base of two of the clause constituents in the TT, i.e. lowers (Process) and the white blood cell count (Goal), but both are the result of lexical choices which represent a •decrease-in-technicality in comparison with the ST lexemes. (For a detailed analysis of lexical changes in the INTRA corpus, see section 8.3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In some cases, slightly different patterns of grammatical change are involved in the •de-metaphorization:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G106 - 7-4.5:</th>
<th>38-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>At treatment initiation in patients receiving beta blockers, … caution should be exercised because of the additive effects on heart rate (see section 4.4).</td>
<td>Use of Gilenya together with such medicines could intensify the effect on heartbeat in the first days after starting Gilenya.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Comment: Where the two previous examples represented the most typical case of •de-metaphorization, anchored in the transformation of a nomen actionis into a verb that was made to serve as a TT clause constituent (Process), the present example deviates from this pattern, in that the Process of the TT clause is derived, not from a nominalized process in
the ST, but from an adjective: TT *intensify* is derived (and transcategorized) from ST *additive*, whereas TT *effect* is a •DT of ST *effects*, which has been upranked from the status of Head in the ST NG to Goal in the TT clause but is unaffected by any change in word class. As in the above example, the grammatical changes are accompanied by lexical ones: the ST lexeme *add-* and TT *intensify* are linked by •synonymy, and the same applies to ST *heart rate* and TT *heart beat*.

Comment: In this case, the •de-metaphorization has resulted in two clauses, one of which is a downranked one (*to control ...*). The ST adjectival Premodifier *insufficient* has been converted into the Process and Attribute (*are* and *enough*) of a [relational] clause, and the Head of the ST NG (the nominalized process *control*) has been transcategorized into a verb and assigned the function of Process (*to control*) in the embedded clause. The other ST Premodifier, the adjective *glycaemic*, has been converted into a fully-fledged NG, viz. *your blood sugar levels*, complete with Deictic, Premodifiers and Head, to serve as Goal. (Obviously, the two TT items *are* ... *enough* and *blood sugar levels* are also the results of lexical changes: a •decrease-in-formality in the former case, and a •decrease-in-technicality in the latter.)

In some cases, such as the latter, the Subject of the TT clause emerging from the •de-metaphorization originates in another ST item. Thus, in the above example the Subject of the TT clause (*metformin or a sulphonylurea alone*) largely consists in a •DT of two corresponding ST items. Often, however, the Subject of the TT clause cannot be traced to any manifest ST item:

Comment: The underlined ST NG has been converted into Process (*may have placed*) and Goal (*stent*), but the Subject/Actor of the clause, *your doctor*, has no explicit ST origin.

The same pattern is seen in connection with a certain, fixed type of ST-TT pair that recurs in most of the texts of the INTRA corpus:

*(J9: Contraindications)*

*(J9: Do not use Jevtana if)*
Hypersensitivity to cabazitaxel, ...

you are allergic (hypersensitive) to cabazitaxel, ...

Comment: the nominalization hypersensitivity is converted into Process (are) and Attribute (allergic (hypersensitive)) in the TT clause, and the Subject/Carrier you, which has no explicit ST base, has been inserted. (For the interpretation of this type of insertion in terms of shift type, see section 8.4.2)

With regard to translational effect, •de-metaphorization must be regarded as a clear contribution to the fulfilment of the lay-oriented skopos of the TTs, in as much as these shifts clearly contribute to making the TTs more spoken in character and more accessible than the STs, since, as previously shown (see section 5.6), the clausal wordings that emerge from •de-metaphorization are characteristic of the spoken mode, representing the congruent (i.e. natural or most obvious) way of construing semantic figures (process-participant configurations - see sections 5.1 and 5.6).

What is also in complete accordance with the lay-oriented skopos of the PILs is the fact that the opposite type of shift, i.e. •metaphorization, turns out to be quite rare in the INTRA corpus: only eleven instances have been recorded, as compared with the 83 instances of •de-metaphorization. Examples are:

With regard to translational effect, •de-metaphorization must be regarded as a clear contribution to the fulfilment of the lay-oriented skopos of the TTs, in as much as these shifts clearly contribute to making the TTs more spoken in character and more accessible than the STs, since, as previously shown (see section 5.6), the clausal wordings that emerge from •de-metaphorization are characteristic of the spoken mode, representing the congruent (i.e. natural or most obvious) way of construing semantic figures (process-participant configurations - see sections 5.1 and 5.6).

What is also in complete accordance with the lay-oriented skopos of the PILs is the fact that the opposite type of shift, i.e. •metaphorization, turns out to be quite rare in the INTRA corpus: only eleven instances have been recorded, as compared with the 83 instances of •de-metaphorization. Examples are:

S6 - 2-4.1:
Scintigraphic imaging, … for determining the location of inflammation/infection in peripheral bone in adults with suspected osteomyelitis.

Comment: In the TT, the Head of the underlined NG (detection) is derived, by •synonymy of the lexeme, from the Process of the underlined ST [non-finite] clause (determining), and the postmodifying PP of sites of inflammation and/or infection is derived from what is Goal in the TT clause (the location of inflammation/infection). Sites and location are also linked by •synonymy.

3-4.4.:
(αα:) Patients should inform physicians and dentists (αβ:) that they are taking DuoCover (β:) before any surgery is scheduled …

4-4.4.:
… DuoCover should be discontinued 7 days prior to surgery

Comment: This is a case where an ideational metaphor (surgery) is already present in the ST. However, ST surgery enters into a clausal structure where it serves as Goal and where is scheduled is Process. In the TT, the ST Process has been downranked as an adjectival Premodifier in the NG a planned surgery (planned being a •synonym of ST scheduled).
6-4.6: 
… cabazitaxel may cause foetal harm in exposed pregnant women.

28-2: 
JEVTANA … may affect the foetus.

Comment: This is a special case in which no shift in rank is involved, but which is nevertheless mentioned in this connection because the change in question is related to ideational metaphor: Since ST foetal is an adjective derived from the noun foetus, the change may best be characterized as re-nominalization, whereby the adjective is transformed into a nominal group.\textsuperscript{163} Categorizing the shift merely as •transcategorization would be an inadequate interpretation, explaining only the change of word class (adjective → noun) and not the transformation of the adjective into a nominal group (\textit{the foetus}).

Especially in those cases where the •metaphorization involves downranking of a semantic figure from clause to group/phrase rank the effect of the shift type must be deemed the opposite of •de-metaphorization and hence potentially counterproductive to the lay-oriented TT skopos.

8.2.6. Shifts within NG systems and other group-rank shifts

8.2.6.1. Shifts in NOMINAL PERSON

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{nominal_group_systems.png}
\caption{Fig. 5.5.1.1a. Nominal group systems. \textit{Source: LC: 650 (adapted by author)}}
\end{figure}

One of the frequent types of shift at group rank is in the system of NOMINAL PERSON (70 instances). In all cases without exception, the change is from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee], and in the vast majority of cases specifically from patient(s) in the ST to you in the TT. Clearly, this pattern is directly linked with the difference in skopos between the STs\textsuperscript{164} and TTs, the former being aimed at medical specialists with instructions concerning the patient, and the latter being directly aimed at the patient as the intended reader. The following is a typical example of the change:

\textsuperscript{163} In the SF literature, \textit{nominalization} is used not only about the change of word class from e.g. a verb or an adjective into a noun, but to the creation of a nominal group out of some semantic entity or other (cf. Halliday and Matthiessen 1999: 269; cf. IFG3: 438).

\textsuperscript{164} It is to be acknowledged that the term \textit{skopos} is most often used about the TT only, but Reiss and Vermeer (1984/2013: 92) do refer to the communicative purpose of the ST as \textit{skopos} as well.

219
In patients with a history of asthma or other chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, …

- if you have a history of asthma or other breathing disorders.

Comment: The [interactant] NG you is clearly derived from [non-interactant] patients in the ST, despite the fact that ST patients serves as the Head of a nominal group in a prepositional phrase, and TT you has a clause-rank function (Subject). The ST construction in patients with … and its corresponding TT clausal rewording is frequently seen in the INTRA corpus and will be analysed in detail in section 8.4.1.

8.2.6.2. Shifts in NUMBER

Another relatively frequent type of NG shift is in NUMBER ([singular]/[plural]). Like changes in NOMINAL PERSON, shifts in NUMBER are often related to the change in skopos between ST and TT, though not as consistently as the shifts in NOMINAL PERSON: in 20 out of the 27 recorded instances of NUMBER change, the movement is from [plural] in the ST to [singular] in the TT, and it is this 'direction' especially that can be interpreted as being linked with the change in target readership:

Severe active infections, active chronic infections (hepatitis, tuberculosis).

if you have a severe active infection or active chronic infection such as hepatitis or tuberculosis.

Comment: The ST segment is part of a list of contraindications (medical circumstances where use of the medicine is not recommended). The plural number of the two ST NGs reflects the generic nature of the text’s recommendations, in that the SPC is concerned with the whole range of cases where the medicine is contraindicated. Being intended for the individual patient, the PIL, on the other hand, chooses the singular, presumably because it is unlikely (or medically impossible?) for a patient to have more than one infection at a time.

There are cases where the opposite direction of change ([singular] → [plural]) may also be linked with the change in readership:

… and can be injected in the abdomen, in the thigh or in the upper arm.

The best places to give yourself the injection are the front of your thighs, the front of your waist (abdomen), or your upper arm.

Comment: As a recommended injection site, ST the thigh in the singular is generic in reference. A possible interpretation of the choice of plural number (your thighs) in the TT, on the other hand, is that the patient might misunderstand the generic reference of the singular

165 The NG system of NUMBER (see IFG3: 43) has not previously been accounted for since it must be deemed self-explanatory.
In some cases, however, the change in NUMBER (both ‘directions’) appears to be simply a concomitant of the rewriting as such, and not related to the change in skopos. This would seem to be the case in the following two examples, the first of which represents a change from the plural to the singular, and the next the opposite direction (the relevant NGs are underlined in the text, and no further comment is deemed necessary):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S9 – 3-4.3:</th>
<th>M15 - 3-4.4:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypersensitivity to the active substance, to other murine antibodies or to any of the excipients.</td>
<td>In patients with a history of asthma or other chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Exactly how many cases of change in NUMBER are clearly related to the change in skopos has not been possible to decide, but the skopos-relatedness appears to apply to the majority of instances.

### 8.2.6.3. Shifts in **INDIVIDUATION** (?)

In a number of instances, the product name (*Avamys, Gilenya etc.*) is used in the TT to replace a common noun in the ST, as in example the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A5 - 5-5.1:</th>
<th>18-1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fluticasone furoate is a synthetic trifluorinated corticosteroid [[that … has a potent anti-inflammatory action]].</td>
<td>(α:) Avamys works (β:) to decrease inflammation [[caused by allergy (<em>rhinitis</em>)]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The active substance of the product (*Fluticasone furoate*) is referred to in the ST, whereas the name of the medicinal product as such (*Avamys*) has been chosen in the TT.

In the texts (SPCs and PILs alike), the capitalization of the product names shows that these have the status of proper names. This gives rise to the possibility that the shift type in question may be explained by reference to the system of **INDIVIDUATION** ([class]/[named individual]), which in the words of Matthiessen (LC: 658), is *the choice between construing a participant as a named instance by using an individual name (‘proper name’) for it or construing it in some other way*, i.e. by a designation other than a proper name. However, on closer deliberation, this possibility (of explaining the shift type in question by reference to INDIVIDUATION) has been rejected, since, as noted by Sager (1990: 70), industrial product names are names of *classes* and not individuals, which is also the case when the names
of the medicinal products are used in the SPCs and PILs. Thus, in the above example *Avamys* means ‘the class of medicine called *Avamys’*. **INDIVIDUATION**, on the other hand, is concerned with the different ways a participant can be singled out as an individual, which is why this system has been ignored in the analysis. Instead, the change in the above example must be explained (only) as holonomy (cf. section 8.3.6.2): as the active substance of *Avamys, fluticasone furoate* is a part (but only one among several) of the medicinal product.

### 8.2.6.4. Shifts in DETERMINATION systems: DEIXIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF DEIXIS</th>
<th>PERSON</th>
<th>MOOD OF DEIXIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>specific</td>
<td>interactant</td>
<td>determinative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-specific</td>
<td>non-interactant</td>
<td>interrogative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NON-SPECIFIC TYPE</td>
<td>non-selective</td>
<td>TOTAL SELECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 5.5.1.3. The system network of DETERMINATION. *Sources: IFG3: 313; LC: 696 (adapted by author)*

Shifts in the most general of the DETERMINATION systems, that of DEIXIS, are slightly more frequent than changes in NUMBER, and are even more evidently linked with the change in skopos between the SPCs and PILs. This is best illustrated through examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A13 - 3-4.4:</td>
<td>(&lt;a&gt;α&lt;/a&gt;:) It is recommended (&lt;b&gt;β&lt;/b&gt;:) that the height of children [[receiving prolonged treatment with nasal corticosteroids]] is regularly monitored.</td>
<td>18-2: The doctor will check your child’s height regularly, …</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Apart from a change in NUMBER, the difference between the ST NG <em>children</em> and TT <em>your child’s</em> is that the former is deictically [non-specific], and the latter [specific: personal] (<em>your</em>).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G117 - 8-4.6:</td>
<td><em>Fingolimod is excreted in milk of treated animals during lactation …</em>. Due to the potential for serious adverse reactions to fingolimod in nursing infants, women receiving Gilenya should not breastfeed.</td>
<td>38-2: (1:) Gilenya can pass into breast milk (2:) and there is a risk of serious side effects for the baby.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: As in the above example, not only is there a difference in NUMBER between ST <em>nursing infants</em> and TT <em>the baby</em>, the latter is deictically [specific], whereas the former is [non-specific].</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 28 out of 36 instances registered, the direction of change in DEIXIS is the same as in the two above examples, i.e. from [non-specific] to [specific], and in most cases it is the altered skopos which sets itself through: as noted in the above section, the advice of the SPCs is generic, being concerned with any user of the medicine, whereas the PILs are written so as to be (or appear) focused on the specific circumstances of the reader. This difference manifests itself even in this very particular area of grammar, NG DEIXIS. In the case of the opposite direction of change ([specific] to [non-specific]), on the other hand, the shifts appear incidental, as in the following example (with the NGs in question underlined, and no further comment deemed necessary):

| M25 - 4-4.5: The chronic or routine use of corticosteroids should be avoided during treatment with MEPACT. | 24-2: You must not use MEPACT with regular use of corticosteroids. |

**8.2.6.5. Shifts in TYPE OF DEIXIS**

Shifts within the more delicate system of TYPE OF DEIXIS ([personal]/[demonstrative]) are less frequent (only 14 occurrences), but are completely consistent with the change of skopos: in all instances except one, [demonstrative] deixis (in all cases realized by the definite article) is replaced with [personal] deixis, as in the following example:

| S24 - 3-4.2: In order to obtain images of best quality and to reduce the radiation exposure of the bladder, ... | 25-2: In order to obtain images of best quality and to reduce the radiation exposure of your bladder, ... |

Once again, the type of change reflects the fact that the PIL, unlike the SPC, is aimed directly at the patient as reader. In the more delicate system whose terms are [demonstrative: selective]/ [demonstrative: non-selective]\(^{166}\), on the other hand, the single case of shift recorded appears unrelated to the skopos change:

| J55 - 5-4.4: The solvent contains 573.3 mg ethanol 96% (15% v/v), equivalent to 14 ml of beer or 6 ml of wine. | 28-2: This medicine contains 15% v/v ethanol (alcohol), equivalent to 14 ml of beer or 6 ml of wine. |

Comment: TT *This medicine* corresponds to ST *The solvent*, but the [non-selective] the has been replaced by the [selective] this for no apparent reason. Thus, no enhancement of readability seems to be achieved by the change, and nor does it relate the text any more specifically to the individual patient.

\(^{166}\) The system is not named in either LC or IFG3, but is part of the DETERMINATION network (see fig. 5.5.1.3 above and in section 5.5.1.3).
8.2.6.6. Shifts in NUMERATION and QUANTIFICATION

One segment exhibits a shift in NUMERATION as well as the dependent system of QUANTIFICATION:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P51 - 2-4.2: Adults from the age of 18 years onwards: One dose of 0.5 ml at an elected date. A second dose of 0.5 ml should be given after an interval of at least three weeks.</th>
<th>32-3: Adults from 18 years onwards: you will receive two doses of Pumarix.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Since TT two must be a derivation from ST one as well as second, the change from the latter (ST second) involves a shift from ST [ordinative] to TT [quantitative] numeration. Apart from that, a shift in QUANTIFICATION is involved, ST one being replaced by TT two, which has automatically led to a shift in NUMBER (doses) as well.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the only other shift in NUMERATION (D63), the 'direction' of change is the opposite, i.e. from [quantitative] to [ordinative]. In none of these shifts (the two in NUMERATION and the one in QUANTIFICATION) can any specific effect be identified with certainty, and no interpretation of this aspect (possible effect) will therefore be attempted.

8.2.6.7. Shifts in PARTIAL SELECTION

A few instances of change in PARTIAL SELECTION ([determinate]/[indeterminate]) have been registered, but too few (five) to be deemed significant. Moreover, three out of the five instances are found in a single text (DuoCover). One of these is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D31 - 3-4.4.: … before any surgery is scheduled …</th>
<th>48-2: if a surgery (including dental) is planned.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: ST any surgery is [determinate] in, whereas TT a surgery is [indeterminate].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No specific effect appears to be attributable to the above shift, and this in fact seems to apply to all five cases registered, irrespective of ‘direction’ (in three cases, the movement is from [determinate] to [indeterminate], as in the above example, and the reverse in the other two). It therefore appears safe to interpret these shifts simply as incidental concomitants of the rewriting as such.
### 8.2.6.8. Structural changes, NG: shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION

Shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION ([premodified]/[postmodified]) occur with relatively high frequency (49 instances recorded) and exhibit a very consistent pattern, since in all cases except two the 'direction' of change is from [premodified] to [postmodified], as in the first example below:

| S9 - 3-4.3: | 24-2: |
| Hypersensitivity to the active substance, to other murine antibodies | if you are allergic (hypersensitive) to besilomab, to antibody from mouse origin or any other antibodies, … |

Comment: The ST Premodifier *murine* has been rephrased as the TT prepositional phrase *from mouse origin*, which serves as Postmodifier in the NG whose Head is *antibodies*.

In a number of cases, the change from Pre- to Postmodifier is associated with a lexical •decrease-in-technicality, as in the above example, where the ST item in question (*murine*) is technical, whereas the corresponding TT *from mouse origin* is non-technical. A similar example occurs in D109, where the ST technical term *pulmonary haemorrhage* is replaced by the non-technical *bleeding inside the lungs* in the TT, with the ST Premodifier *pulmonary* corresponding to the TT Postmodifier *inside the lungs*. In other cases, however, no such •decrease in technicality is involved, as in M109 where the ST technical term *upper respiratory tract infection* (Premodifier underlined), has been changed into TT *infections of the upper respiratory tract* (Postmodifier underlined).

Only two instances of the opposite direction of change, i.e. from Postmodifier to Premodifier have been registered, one of which is:

| G71 - 5.4-4: | 37-2: |
| … (α:) evaluation of the fundus, including the macula, should be carried out. | (αα:) Your doctor may want (αβ:) you to undergo an eye examination, (β:) especially if: |

Comment: The TT Premodifier *eye* corresponds to ST *of the fundus, including the macula* (the two TT terms are •meronyms of *eye*). The postmodifying structure could have been retained in the TT without problems (*examination of the eyes*), and may have been transformed into a Premodifier for reasons of language economy, or may be a purely incidental change.

As for the effect of the vast majority of shifts which convert Premodifiers into Postmodifiers, two may in fact be identified, one of which is immediately observable: it consists in a 'dilution' of the NG, in so far as it is 'spread out' across more words. Thus, the previously mentioned TT item from M109, *infections of the upper respiratory tract*, is two words longer than its ST base *upper respiratory tract infections*, the extra words being *of the*. However, it is important to emphasize that no decrease in NG complexity is the result, which is seen by comparing the internal structure of the two NGs: where the ST NG consists of a string of three Premodifiers (*upper, respiratory, tract*) leading up to the fourth item, the Head (*infections*), the TT NG is initiated by the Head, but then postmodified by a
PP consisting of a preposition (of) and a nominal group consisting of a Deictic (the), two other Premodifiers (upper, respiratory) and the Head (tract). If anything, the TT NG may be said to be slightly more complex than its ST counterpart. Nevertheless, there is a good chance that the conversion of Pre- into Postmodifiers helps enhance the accessibility of these TT NGs. Thus in the case of the ST upper respiratory tract infection, the reader is required to process three premodifying words (upper, respiratory, tract) before reaching the Head/Thing infection. In the TT version infections of the upper respiratory tract, on the other hand, the Head/Thing is the first word encountered. There appears to be good reason to believe that since the Thing, in Halliday's words, is 'the semantic core of the nominal group' (IFG3: 325), NGs in which access is provided to this core at once are easier to process than ones where the reader is forced to penetrate a Chinese-box type of structure (cf. IFG3: 329) before reaching the point where it finally becomes clear what the NG 'is really about'. If this interpretation is sound, the shifts from [premodified] to [postmodified]) support the lay-oriented skopos of the TTs by enhancing readability.

8.2.6.9. Other structural changes in NGs

Apart from shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION, certain other shifts in the internal structure of NGs have been registered. These are changes in the 'hierarchical' status of an item within a nominal group, from the 'lower' or peripheral status of Pre- or Postmodifier to the 'higher' or central status of Head. 18 of such changes have been registered, with six instances representing an ‘upward’ movement, i.e. a change from peripheral to central status, and nine instances of the opposite direction. The remaining four cases (one of which will be detailed below) cannot be contained within this dichotomy of ‘upward’/ ‘downward’ movement.

An example of 'downward' change in hierarchical status is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P42 - 4-4.7:</th>
<th>32-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the effects …</td>
<td>Some effects …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST NG is structured as Head (Some) + Postmodifier (of the effects), whereas in the contracted TT NG some has been converted to Premodifier (Deictic in the experiential structure) and effects promoted to Head.

An example of ‘upward’ change is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A51 - 2-4.2:</th>
<th>20-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients … may use two spray actuations in each nostril once daily …</td>
<td>… your doctor may increase the dose to 2 sprays in each nostril once every day …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The omission of actuations in the TT has changed spray from serving as Premodifier in the ST to Head in the TT. The transfer of the plural desinence (ST actuations → TT sprays) must be regarded as an automatic consequence of this change.

The following is one of the four instances which defy categorization in hierarchical terms, because the change does not pertain to logical structure (Head + modifiers), but to experiential NG structure:
Onset of action has been observed as early as 8 hours after initial administration. However, it is usually effective within 8 to 24 hours of use.

Comment: hours is Head in the ST NG 8 hours after initial administration and in the TT NG 8 to 24 hours of use alike, but its experiential function is different: it is Thing in the ST, but Numerative (together with 8 to 24) in the TT, where the Thing is realized by use (cf. IFG3: 333-34).

Unlike shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION, the shifts analysed in the present section cannot be associated with any function that is specifically related to the enhancement of TT accessibility. Rather, they must be regarded as a group-rank manifestation of the extensive structural reorganization which is integral to this type of INTRA.

8.2.6.10. The VG: Shifts in ASPECT

In the VG, one specific type of shift, viz. in the system of ASPECT (see below), will be commented on here because it actually features in all text pairs except one. Other VG shifts recorded, on the other hand, are both very few in number and absolutely marginal in relation to the lay-oriented TT skopos. Accordingly, they have been deemed unworthy of attention here.

Since the grammar of the VG was ignored in the grammatical accounts in ch. 5, the system of ASPECT has not previously been accounted for, and now must be: it is a two-term system which constitutes the choice between two types of non-finite verb form, viz. infinitival and participial (IFG3: 349). All text pairs except Scintimun exhibit a shift within this system in connection with the same, recurring pair of headlines:

| A25 - 4-4.7: | 19-2: |
| Effects on ability [[to drive and use machines]] | Driving and using machines |

Comment: ST to drive and use are infinitives, whereas TT driving and using are participles. It appears that the reason for the change is the omission of ST effects on ability in the TT, which necessitates the use of participles (*to drive and use machines would not be possible as a headline). Thus, these shifts must be interpreted simply as a concomitant of the rewriting as such.

Only one instance of the opposite 'direction' (and outside the fixed set of headlines analysed in the previous example) occurs in the entire corpus:

| S52 - 6-4.9: | 26-3: |
| …, (αα:) the radiation dose delivered to the patient must be reduced (αβ:) by increasing as much as possible the elimination of the radionuclide by forced diuresis and frequent micturitions,‖ and by the use of laxatives to promote | (β:) However, if this does occur, (α:) you will be asked to drink plenty of water and to take laxatives [[to increase the elimination of the product from your body]]. |
faecal excretion.

Comment: Here, the direction of change is from a participial form in the ST αβ-clause (by increasing) to an infinitival one in the TT (to increase in the embedded clause). This shift, too, must be interpreted as a concomitant of the rewriting as such, with no specific translational effect - especially in relation to the fulfilment of the lay-oriented skopos - being discernible.

A few other VG shifts have been recorded, but ones that are so few and insignificant that they will be ignored in this account so as to limit the space devoted to minute shifts of very limited importance. Similarly, at the rank below (word rank), the only shift type recorded, which is transcription (changes in word class), will be ignored for the same reason. It should be mentioned that at clause rank also, two single shifts have been left out of the account, viz. one in CLAUSE SEQUENCING and one in DIRECTION OF IDENTIFICATION (a [relational]-clause system not accounted for in the chapter on SFG (ch. 5)) for being too marginal, both in frequency and effect, to deserve comment here. The account of grammatical shifts therefore ends here.

8.3. Shifts registered within the lexical zone of the grammar-lexis cline

8.3.1. •Synonymy

In the second of the two methodological chapters (ch. 6), •synonymy was included among the category of lexical shifts, and most of the instances recorded in this category do indeed involve items that are clearly lexical in nature. However, in accordance with the cline perspective on the relation between lexis and grammar, •synonymy between items further towards the grammatical zone of the cline have also been recorded. This particularly applies to cases involving prepositions (located 'midway' on the cline (IFG3: 45)), which is a relatively frequent occurrence. Altogether, •synonymy is a frequent shift type, with 79 occurrences recorded in the corpus as a whole.

No actual sub-classification of the way •synonymy is instantiated in the corpus will be attempted, e.g. with respect to degree (total synonymy vs. near-synonymy as a possible distinction). Nevertheless, while no attempt has been made to distinguish total semantic correspondence from quasi-synonymy, it must be acknowledged that instances do vary in the degree of co-text-independence with which a set of items are recognizable as •synonyms. 168 Thus, items whose •synonymy is deemed obvious independently of the co-text are pairs like those in the list immediately below. Exactly because their •synonymy has been considered uncontroversial and immediately recognizable, the examples will be given without comment:

(D48:) drug → medicine
(D85:) regular → usual

167 But see V50 and D107, respectively, in the appendix containing the analyses (Appendix 11).
168 Co-text refers to context in the sense of ‘surrounding text’. The term co-text is preferred in order to avoid confusion with context in the SFL sense of the term, i.e. as the stratum above semantics in the stratified model of language (see sections 2.2 and 2.9).
These are all examples of items from the lexical pole of the grammar-lexis cline. A few cases of •synonymy between prepositions are also immediately recognizable:

- (G113:) regarding → about
- (P25:) following → after
- (V13:) below → under
- (V24:) in combination with → together with

In one particular instance, the •synonymy between two grammatical items is identifiable independently of the co-text:

- (M54:) must → has to (Comment: both are modal items encoding a high degree of obligation).

In two specific cases (pertaining to items that are clearly lexical), the •synonymy may be obvious to medical specialists, but certainly not to readers outside the medical profession:

- (A4:) corticosteroid → glucocorticoids
- (V7:) thiazolidinedione → glitazone

In the former of these two cases (A4), it is to be gathered from the ST (the Avamys SPC) as a whole that the two terms are synonymous. Further proof is that in a particular instance, the Danish translation of the SPC (European Medicines Agency 2009: 5 [section 5.1]) has kortikosteroid where the English original has glucocorticoids. In the latter case (V7), the •synonymy was established by consulting an online medical dictionary (Farlex inc. 2012: [entry: glitazone]).

In the following, examples will be given of the type of •synonymy that may only be apparent when the co-text is taken into consideration. Since these instances are not self-evident, the co-text as well as a comment will be provided in each case:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Co-text</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D16 - 3-4.3:</td>
<td>Third trimester of pregnancy</td>
<td>47-2: If you are in your last trimester of pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: Because a trimester is a third of a period divided into three sections, the third trimester is necessarily the same as the last of the three.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G60 - 5-4.4:</td>
<td>37-2: … if you have or have had visual disturb-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If patients report visual disturbances at any time while on therapy, evaluation of the fundus, including the macula, should be carried out.

Comment: ST *evaluation* and TT *examination* are both used in the sense of ‘medical investigation’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G108 - 7-4.5:</th>
<th>38-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… caution should be exercised because of the additive effects on heart rate (see section 4.4).</td>
<td>… because it could intensify the effect on irregular heartbeat.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: This is a segment previously commented on (in connection with *de-metaphorization*, section 8.2.5.4), where it was also noted that *synonymy* is involved between ST *additive* and TT *intensify*. This example illustrates that for the purposes of this thesis, *synonymy* pertains to the lexical root of the two items in question, regardless of word class in the specific instance. In the present case, *synonymy* is identified between the ST lexeme *add*- and TT *intensify*, since there would be clear semantic correspondence between *intensify* and a verbal derivation of the lexeme *add*-: *add to the effect* would mean the same as TT *intensify the effect*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M44 - 5-4.7:</th>
<th>24-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some very common or common undesirable effects of MEPACT treatment (such as dizziness, vertigo, fatigue and blurred vision)</td>
<td>Some very common and common side effects of MEPACT treatment (such as dizziness, vertigo, fatigue and blurred vision) …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The co-text (the identical wordings *some very common or common* and of *MEPACT treatment* as well as the identical examples given in the parentheses) dispel any possible doubt whether ST *undesirable effects* and TT *side effects* refer to exactly the same class of phenomena.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G28 – 3-4.4.:</th>
<th>36-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… patients with sitting heart rate less than 55 beats per minute</td>
<td>… if you have a slow resting heart rate (less than 55 beats per minute).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: As in the preceding example, the co-text makes it clear that *sitting* and *resting heart rate* alike refer to the pulse rate observable when the patient is at rest.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G113 – 7-4.6.:</th>
<th>38-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… effective contraception …</td>
<td>… reliable methods of birth control …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: ST *effective* and TT *reliable* are both used in the sense of ‘producing the desired result’ (in this case the prevention of pregnancy).
An ambiguous, and recurring, case is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V10 - 5-4.8:</th>
<th>22-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... when Victoza is <strong>used</strong> in combination with a sulphonylurea.</td>
<td>– if you are also <strong>taking</strong> a sulphonylurea …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the analysis, ST *use-* and TT *take-* have been interpreted as *synonyms*, but what complicates this interpretation is the question of **process type**: Both verbs can without problems be identified as ones serving as Process in [material: transformative] clauses (see section 5.1.1), but with regard to the sub-categorization of transformative clauses in the system of **type of outcome** ([elaborating]/[extending]/[enhancing] - cf. section 5.1.1), *take* is listed (IFG3: 188; see also Appendix 4) as belonging to the [extending] category, whereas *use* must be interpreted as [elaborating],\(^{169}\) the point being that synonymy between verbs in different categories is unlikely, if not impossible. However, the categorization in the IFG3 list (and the corresponding one in LC: 246-48) must be read as referring to the type of clause in which a given verb typically serves as Process. Thus, when *take* is listed in the [extending] category, it is the possessive meaning of the verb that is referred to, i.e. ‘appropriate’ or ‘remove’. This sense, however, is clearly not the one encoded in the present instance (and in 3 other cases in the INTRA corpus as a whole), where it is clear that *take* and *use* are both used in the sense of ‘consume’. This sense either belongs in the [elaborating] category, or represents a marginal case where elaboration shades into extension.

With regard to co-text-dependent *synonymy* between items further towards the grammatical zone, examples are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D85 - 3-4.2:</th>
<th>49-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within less than 12 hours <strong>after</strong> regular scheduled time …</td>
<td>… within 12 hours <strong>of</strong> your usual time …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In combination with *within*, ST *of* also assumes the meaning ‘after’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P42 - 4-4.7:</th>
<th>32-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of the effects mentioned <strong>under</strong> section 4.8. ...</td>
<td>Some effects listed <strong>in</strong> Section 4 …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: *under* and *in* are here used in the same locative sense.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A26 – 4-4.7:</th>
<th>19-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… fluticasone furoate is not expected [[to affect this ability]].</td>
<td>Avamys is unlikely [[to affect your ability [[to drive and use machines]].</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Considered as isolated lexical items, *expected* and *likely* would hardly qualify

\(^{169}\) This is my interpretation, since *use* is not included among the examples listed in either IFG3 or LC.
as •synonyms, but if interpreted as instances of grammatical (interpersonal) metaphor (cf. section 8.2.3.9), the two underlined expressions (ST \textit{is not expected to} and TT \textit{is unlikely to}) can be seen to encode the same type of modality, viz. medium-value modalization, and have accordingly been interpreted as synonymous expressions.

A dubious case where •synonymy appears to be the best interpretation is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2-4.2.</th>
<th>29-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{... administered as a 1 hour intravenous infusion} …</td>
<td>\textit{... a drip (infusion) into one of your veins (intravenous use) … for about an hour}.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The ST ordinal \textit{1} has been replaced by the indefinite article (\textit{an}) in the TT without any change in numerical value (the semantic change that \textit{can} be noted is due to the •addition of TT \textit{about}). Because of the numerical correspondence, no good reason can be found why the shift should not be categorized as •synonymy.

A final category is represented by those cases where the •synonymy shades into the shift type termed •decrease-in-formality in this thesis. Examples are:

(G67:) \textit{re-initiate} → \textit{resume}
(P14:) \textit{immediately} → \textit{straight away}

In both cases, a •decrease-in-formality may be involved between the two items in each pair, but in that case the difference must be deemed insignificant, and not sufficiently marked for the two pairs to be recorded as cases of formality change.

With regard to translational effect, •synonymy bears resemblance to the shifts in especially the experiential systems (such as PROCESS TYPE) in the grammatical zone of the grammar-lexis cline: in most cases, •synonymy produces variation in experiential meaning, though mostly only very slight. The limiting cases are those where the correspondence in meaning can be deemed total.

8.3.2. Syntagmatic shifts

8.3.2.1. •Expansion

•With 144 occurrences registered, •expansion must be considered a very frequent shift type in the corpus, of which, however, only relatively few (26 altogether) occur in isolation. What this means is that in the other 118 instances, •expansion occurs in combination with •decrease-in-technicality (see below). These instances (those which involve combination) will be explored in section 8.3.3.1, whereas the present section will only be concerned with those instances which occur in isolation. The question of translational effect will also be deferred to section 8.3.3.1.

Some of the instances of ‘isolated’ •expansion are recurring ones, such as the rewording of the ST item \textit{daily}, either as TT \textit{every day} (A47, A51, A52, J6, J66, ), as TT \textit{a day} (A50) and TT \textit{per day} (D78), and as TT \textit{once a day} (V42). Another recurrent case is ST miss re-
phrased as *forget to take* (D84, D85, G139, G140). Singular cases are ones like the following:

(G65:) **risk of → chance of developing**

(G113:) **contraception → methods of birth control**

These are cases where •expansion works in tandem with •synonymy, which means that the ST item is replaced by different lexical items altogether. This applies to the above-mentioned rephrasing of ST *miss as* *forget to take* as well.

In other cases, only part of the •expansion is constituted by different lexical items:

(G48:) **beta blockers → medicines called beta blockers**

(P8:) **vaccinees → Persons who are vaccinated**

(S18:) **tumours → tumoral pathology**

(V25:) **sulphonylurea → the sulphonylurea medicine**

(V46:) **injected → given as an injection**

In all these examples, the part of the TT unit which is not a duplication of the ST lexeme (such as *pathology* in S18) must be considered inherent in the ST item, and does not represent added meaning, for which reason •addition is not considered part of the change. The same principle applies to two instances involving prepositions, where in the examples below the ‘extra’ element (in bold types) does not add new meaning:

(G56:) **up to (2 months) → for up to**

(G146:) **6 weeks → for 6-8 weeks**

It should be acknowledged that some instances of •expansion border on •explicitation, as in the example from G48 (medicines called beta blockers), where TT *medicines called* may be interpreted as an explanatory insert (i.e. ‘beta blockers are a type of medicine’). However, in order to be able to make a clear distinction, categorization as •explicitation has been reserved for the introduction of further clause-rank constituents (see section 8.4.2), whereas in the example from G48 medicines called combines with beta blockers to form a nominal group.

**8.3.2.2. •Compression**

In comparison with •expansion, •compression is a much less frequent shift type (only 27 occurrences registered). Nevertheless, and perhaps not surprisingly, the various patterns apparent in connection with •expansion are reversely mirrored in similar patterns of •compression. Thus, in some cases two or more ST lexical items are replaced with a single, but different TT item:

M25 **chronic or routine → regular**

M60 **signs and symptoms → side effects**

V17 **fluid depletion → dehydration**

---

170 As in the above examples, the underlined TT items are those transferred from the ST.

171 -8 is an •addition.
This also applies to a small handful of cases where the Process and Attribute of a source-text [relational] clause are compressed into a single TT verb:

(D70:) *have an influence on* → *affect*  
(M44:) *have an effect on* → *affect*  
(G104:) *be effective* → *work*

The predominant type of compression, however, is the pattern where a lexical NG constituent in the ST is omitted, leaving a Modifier to assume the role of Head in the TT:

(A47:) *spray actuations* → *sprays*  
(e.g. A16:) *medicinal products* → *medicines*

The latter of these two instances is a fixed type of rewording between the SPCs and PILs, recurring in all texts in the INTRA corpus, in certain texts even more than once. The exact reverse of the case where the ST verb injected (V46) was expanded into *given as an injection* occurs in:

(M55:) *administered as an infusion* → *infused*  
- where *administered as* must be considered implicit in the lexeme *infuse* and therefore wisely omitted in the TT.  
In two specific cases, compression intersects with a decrease-in-technicality:

(G84:) *forced expiratory volume and diffusion capacity for carbon monoxide* → *lung function*  
(G95:) *paediatric population* → *children*

In certain cases, it is less clear whether the compression is accompanied by a decrease in technicality:

(G32:) *diabetes mellitus* → *diabetes*  
(J47:) *seminal liquid* → *semen*

The ST items in these two cases are both technical terms that are unlikely to occur outside specialist registers, whereas the compressed TT forms are likely to be part of the average, adult lay reader’s vocabulary. However, because the two TT items are technical in origin (both are Greek/Latin lexemes derived from the field of medicine), they have not been taken to represent a decrease-in-technicality.

With regard to translational effect, compression might be thought to make TTs more 'compact' and hence less accessible to the lay readership, but, considering the actual instances noted and commented on above, compression can hardly be considered counterproductive to the lay-oriented TT skopos. The effect of the shift type therefore remains elusive and must be left an open question.

8.3.3. Shifts in technicality

Among the categories of lexical shifts, decrease-in-technicality is by far the most predom-
inant type, and one of the most prevalent shift types altogether, being in fact extremely pervasive in the INTRA corpus (294 instances registered), which is completely in accordance with what is to be expected of specialized texts rewritten for a lay audience. Rather obviously, the translational effect of •decrease-in-technicality is enhanced TT accessibility, and in a great many instances the shift type must be considered a precondition for the fulfilment of the lay-oriented TT skopos. Conversely, there can be no doubt that shifts representing •increase-in-technicality are potentially counterproductive to TT accessibility, which is why it is no surprise that these shifts are in fact very rare in the corpus.

8.3.3.1. •Decrease-in-technicality

As in previous sections, any real sub-classification of this particular type of shift is deemed neither expedient nor possible, which means that what is to be exemplified below are the various tendencies in the way •decrease-in-technicality is manifested. Thus, a clear tendency is for ST Greek/Latin-derived items to be replaced by TT items of Germanic origin:172

(A78:) epistaxis → nosebleeds
(D13:) haemorrhage → bleeding
(G21:) cutaneous → skin173
(G32:) oedema → swelling
(G60:) ophthalmological → eye
(G180:) asthenia → weakness
(J45:) lactation → breast-feeding
(J64:) infusion → drip
(P92:) pruritus → itching

In other cases, the TT item is in fact not of Germanic origin, which, however, makes little difference:

(D110:) dyspepsia → indigestion
(G40:) symptoms → effects
(G64:) therapy → treatment
(J26:) hypersensitivity → allergic
(M12:) disorders → problems
(P2:) prophylaxis → prevent

All these TT items are ultimately of Greek or Latin origin, but must nevertheless be considered part of the core vocabulary of modern English, and thus well-known to the average lay reader. What some of these pairs illustrate, however, is the consequence of replacing a technical item with a non-technical one: the semantic specificity of the ST item is lost and replaced with more general meaning in the TT. This is the case with at least TT treatment, problems and prevent, where the corresponding ST items (therapy, disorders and prophylaxis) are semantically subject-specific, meaning 'medical treatment', 'medical problems'...

172 Where no other reference is given, information regarding the etymology as well as the meaning of items commented on has been obtained from Wiktionary (2012).

173 As in connection with the analysis of •synonymy, what is recorded here are lexemes that correspond to each other across the ST-TT divide. The items may differ in word class between ST and TT because of possible grammatical changes at work in the co-text.
and ‘prevention of disease’ respectively. Another example of semantic loss is the previously mentioned pair oedema → swelling (G32), where the TT item obscures the fact that oedema refers to swelling as a result of the build-up of fluid. However, the loss of semantic specificity in such cases rarely presents any problem, since the specific sense in which a given TT item should be read (e.g. prevent as referring to prevention of disease) usually appears from the co-text of the item.

In some cases, the mechanism behind the transformation of a technical term into a non-technical item consists in what Vermeer (2008: 7) terms morphem(at)ic translation (reminiscent also of calque or loan translation (Matthews 2005: 45)), whereby the individual morphemes constituting the specialized (Greek/Latin) term are translated into core-lexical English words, thus resulting in a multi-word item:

(D13:) intracranial → within the brain
(M55:) intravenous → into your veins
(P56:) intramuscular → into a muscle
(P90:) dyspnoea → shortness of breath
(S30:) haematopoietic system → the production of ... blood cells
(V46:) subcutaneously → under the skin
(V37:) hypoglycaemia → (getting) low blood sugar

Thus, in the first three of these examples, the ST morpheme intra- is translated into the TT prepositions within or into, and ST -cranial becomes TT brain, ST -venous becomes TT vein(s), and ST -muscular becomes TT muscle. In exactly the same way, ST sub- (V46) is translated into under, and ST -cutaneous as TT skin. In hypoglycaemia (V37), ST hypo- is not translated directly as *under, which would be the literal meaning (Berg 1968: 852), but as TT low, ST -glyc- (literally ‘sweet’ (Berg 1968: 141) has found its way into the TT as sugar, and ST -aemia as TT blood (the Greek morpheme is derived from ἄιµα (haima), which means ‘blood’ (Berg 1968: 17)). Similarly, in haematopoietic system (S30), ST haema(to)- has once again become TT blood, and -poietic (derived from Greek ποιέω (poieo), which means ‘make’ or ‘produce’ (Berg 1968: 650)) has resulted in TT production. What these examples illustrate, moreover, is how •expansion is frequently at work concurrently with •decrease-in-technicality, as noted in a previous section, and especially where this intersection occurs, the effect may be characterized as a ‘dilution’ or ‘de-compacting’ of ST lexis, consisting in the 'spreading out' of ST semantic content across more TT words.

In a number of cases where •decrease-in-technicality and •expansion intersect, however, only part of the TT item is a result of translation of Greek/Latin morphemes. This tendency was already manifest in the above example from S30 (haematopoietic system → the production of ... blood cells), where TT cells cannot be traced back to any specific ST morpheme. Similar cases are:

(G34:) hypertension → high blood pressure
(M12:) cardiovascular → heart and blood vessels

- where in the latter of these two examples TT heart is derived from ST cardio-, and vessels from ST –vascular, but where TT blood is, at the most, implicit in –vascular and has
no separate ST morpheme as its base. The former case is exactly similar, in that TT *blood*
has no explicit ST origin, whereas TT *high* is derived from ST *hyper-* and TT *pressure*
from ST *-tension*. Cases where the combination of •decrease-in-technicality with •expansion
is even further removed from a literal translation of Greek/Latin morphemes are:

(D80:) *myocardial infarction* → *heart attack*
(M12:) *vasculitis* → *inflammation of the veins*
(G55:) *uveitis* → *inflammation or infection of the eye*
(G27:) *antiarrhythmic* → *for irregular heartbeat*
(M16:) *bronchodilators* → *medicine for your asthma*

The listing of these five examples is intended as an indication (but nothing more than that)
of a cline extending away from literal translation. Thus, in the first example, TT *heart* can
be traced back to ST *-cardial*, whereas the ST base of TT *attack* may be identified as *infarction*,
which, however, literally means ‘clogging’. No TT item directly corresponds to the
ST morpheme *my-* (derived from Greek *µύω* (*myo*, meaning ‘closes’ or ‘narrows’
(Berg 1968: 497)). In both of the next two cases (*uveitis* and *vasculitis* as ST items), TT *inflammation/infection* can in fact be traced back to the ST suffix *-itis*, which indeed de-
notes inflammation in the anatomical area in question (Kristensen 1962: 285), and TT *in-
flammation/infection* is thus not a literal translation (which is not really possible), but ra-
ther a lexification of this suffix. In the pair *vasculitis* → *inflammation of the veins* (M12),
TT *veins* is not a literal translation of the ST morpheme *vascu-* (which would be *vessel*),
but in fact represents a hyponym (*vein* being one of two specific types of blood vessel. In
the pair, *uveitis* → *inflammation or infection of the eye*, ST *eye* can be traced to the ST
morpheme *uve-*, which, derived from Latin *uvea*, refers to one the three layers constituting
the eye (Wiktionary 2012: [entry: *uvea*]), making TT *eye* a holonym (because the *uvea*
is part of the eye). In the two last examples (*antiarrhythmic* → *for irregular heartbeat* (G27)
and *bronchodilators* → *medicine for your asthma* (M16)), the mechanism behind the trans-
formation is further removed from literal translation, with the former of these two (G27)
bordering on, and the latter (M16) having actually crossed the border into •paraphrase.
Thus, in the G27 instance, individual semantic elements from the ST item may be said to
recur in corresponding TT elements, without representing anything like a total semantic
match: ST *anti-* recurs in TT *for*, ST *-a-* recurs in TT *irregular* and ST *-rhythmic* in TT *heartbeat*. In *bronchodilators* → *medicine for your asthma* (M16), a rendering closer to
literal translation would be something like *medicines that expand your airways* (with *exp-
and* derived from *dilators* and *airways* from *bronch-,* whereas the actual TT item con-
stitutes of a •hyperonym (*medicine*) of the whole ST item in combination with another item
(*for your asthma*), which is only contextually, and not semantically, related to the ST, by
indicating the therapeutic area of the medicine. This last example has been in fact been
categorized as a combination of •hyperonymy and •paraphrase in the same item.

The intersection between •decrease-in-technicality and •hyperonymy is in fact a relatively
frequent occurrence. In some cases, the •hyperonymy is immediately apparent because two
technical hyponyms form the ST base of one TT item, as in:

\[174\] This example, of course, does not represent •expansion, but merely a •decrease-in-technicality, since the
same number of words is involved on both sides of the ST/TT divide.
In the first of these examples, both of the two specific types of blood pressure (systolic and diastolic) are mentioned in the ST, whereas in the TT only the superordinate blood pressure is used, which concurrently represents a decrease-in-technicality (the more technical hyperonym appears to be arterial pressure (cf. Wikipedia 2012a)). Similarly, in the second example TT lung problems covers the two more specific lung disorders mentioned in the ST, i.e. respiratory disease and pulmonary fibrosis, and in the third example ST excipients and active substance are subsumed in TT ingredients. It has not been ascertained whether any technical terms corresponding to the superordinate ingredients and lung problems exist. The two TT items are considered non-technical because they are either not restricted to specialized medical discourse (ingredients) or unlikely to occur in such registers, which may well apply to both ingredients and lung problems. In the fourth example, on the other hand, (fructose and sorbitol → sugars) the technical superordinate corresponding to sugars would be saccharides (cf. Wikipedia 2012d).

In other cases, the identification of superordination in combination with the decrease-in-technicality has required some research:

(G87:) peripheral lymphocyte → white blood cells
(G92:) lymphocyte → white blood cells
(J11:) neutrophil → white blood cells

It turns out that the technical term of which white blood cells is the non-technical version is leucocytes (cf. Wikipedia 2012f), and that the ST items in the three above examples are different subtypes of this superordinate concept. It should perhaps be pointed out that even though the TT item white blood cells consists of more words than the respective ST items, expansion cannot be recorded as one of the changes behind the TT item, exactly because of the hyperonymy. In other words, TT white blood cells can be interpreted as expansion of the superordinate term leucocytes, but not of the actual ST items. The TT item is thus rather a kind of ‘shadow expansion’, but this is hardly a viable analytical concept.

Yet another example is:

(P24:) serology test → blood test

- where research was needed to confirm the intuition that a serology test is a type of blood test (Wikipedia 2012e). In one particular instance, on the other hand, the question of possible hyperonymy had to be left unanswered:

(G76:) hepatic injury → liver problems

In this case, it was not possible to ascertain whether ST hepatic injury is a superordinate term corresponding to TT liver problems in generality, or whether it represents a subtype of liver problem. Whatever the correct answer may be in this specific case, it may be surmised that the reason for the use of hyperonyms in combination with a decrease-in-tech-
nicality is that either no non-technical designation can be found at the same level of specificity (which seems to be the case with terms like serology test and excipients) or that the alternative which does exist is not deemed sufficiently non-technical. Thus, an alternative to lymphocyte would be lymph cell (cf. Farlex inc. 2012: [entry: lymph cell]), which however retains the morpheme lymph- from the technical term. The three words white, blood and cells, on the other hand, all belong to core English lexis. These deliberations, of course, must remain speculation.

8.3.3.2. •Increase-in-technicality
As previously mentioned, instances of •increase-in-technicality are very rare. Moreover, five out of the eight instances recorded conform to a particular pattern where the ST wording the active substance is replaced with the actual name of the substance in the TT, as in:

(S9:) active substance → besilesomab

Because the names of particular substances encode a much higher degree of specialized information than the generic term active substance, this type of shift must be taken to represent an •increase-in-technicality. The remaining three cases are:

(G83:) increase → elevation
(S15:) used → administered
(S18:) tumours → tumoral pathology

In the first of these instances, TT elevation is categorized as a technical term by OALD (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2013: [entry: elevation]), which ST increase is not. In the next example, TT administered is the term often used in the SPCs (and registered as a medical term in Sliosberg (1975)), but mostly avoided in the PILs. In the last of the three cases the TT technical term pathology is not even present in the ST.

8.3.4. Shifts in formality
As defined in section 6.5.2, •decrease-/•increase-in-formality are the types of shift where a (typically ST) lexical item which is not restricted to specialized medical registers, but nevertheless associated with the registers of academic/bureaucratic/professional discourse ('officialese'), is changed into a more colloquial item (or vice versa, though this is rare – see below).

8.3.4.1. •Decrease-in-formality
Like •decrease-in-technicality, •decrease-in-formality is a relatively frequent type of lexical change (80 instances counted), and one which exhibits a relatively uniform pattern: in the vast majority of cases, a Latin-derived item is replaced with a core-lexical one of Germanic origin, as in the following cases:175

(A43:) maximum → full
(D30:) inform → tell
(G38:) initiation → beginning

175 As previously, the etymology of items has been ascertained by consulting Wiktionary (2012).
The last example (V7) represents an intersection of •decrease-in-formality and •expansion, and in the example from M5 (in combination → together) •decrease-in-formality is combined with •compression.

In a minority of cases, the TT item is in fact not Germanic in origin:

Prevent, similar, reduce and ingredients are all ultimately Latin in origin, but these TT items must nevertheless be regarded as being closer to core English vocabulary than the corresponding ST items. Thus inhibit, analogue and mitigate are all categorized as ‘formal’ in Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (2013: [entries: inhibit, analogue, mitigate]) and constituents (ibid. [entry: constituent]) is listed as an academic term.

As previously touched on (see section 5.7), formality is a matter of degree, which also reflects itself in the difference between specific lexical items: certain items are easily recognizable as being far apart on a scale of formality, whereas other items are less easily distinguishable in this respect. In a few instances, therefore, it has proved impossible to decide whether a difference in formality is in fact involved, or whether two items are simply to be regarded as •synonyms, as in the following case:

The solution has been to categorize pairs like this 'merely' as •synonyms, which is at least partially true (but not necessarily the whole truth) even if a difference in formality is in fact involved. If such a difference does not apply, however, categorization as •decrease-in-formality would be wrong.

8.3.4.2. •Increase-in-formality

As was also the case in connection with the exemplification of lexical shifts in technicality, differences in word class or other morphological differences are due to grammatical changes at work concomitantly with the lexical change.
With only two instances registered, \textit{increase-in-formality} is an extremely rare phenomenon in the INTRA corpus – completely as expected. The two cases are:

(S21:) \textit{persons} $\rightarrow$ \textit{personnel}  
(S26:) \textit{children} $\rightarrow$ \textit{patients}

Both TT items denote institutional roles, which makes them more formal in character than the respective ST items, which simply denote human categories.

\textbf{8.3.5. Shifts in delicacy}

\textbf{8.3.5.1. \textit{Hyperonymy}}

As previously noted, \textit{hyperonymy} is a type of change that quite frequently co-occurs with \textit{decrease-in-technicality}, in fact virtually as often as not: 25 instances of intersection with \textit{decrease-in-technicality} have been counted, as opposed to 27 cases where the \textit{hyperonymy} manifests itself independently, i.e. without involving any difference in technicality between ST and TT item.\footnote{In five of these 26 cases, it should be noted, \textit{hyperonymy} intersects with \textit{paraphrase}. These cases will be taken up for comment in section 8.4.1.} This, however, does not prevent the individual cases from representing different levels of technicality as \textit{pairs}, i.e. relative to other ST-TT pairs. Examples of pairs at a relatively low level of technicality (in the sense of being easily comprehensible to lay readers) are:

(D11:) \textit{drugs} $\rightarrow$ \textit{product}  
(D63:) \textit{Duocover} $\rightarrow$ \textit{product}  
(G114:) \textit{Gilenya} $\rightarrow$ \textit{medicine}

In a number of instances elsewhere in the corpus, the TT uses the product name where the ST has the \textit{medicinal product}. The latter, in other words, is a \textit{hyponym} of \textit{product}, which means that \textit{Duocover} (in D63), as a specific type of \textit{medicinal product} is also a hyponym of \textit{product}, and conversely that the latter is \textit{hyperonym} of \textit{Duocover}. Along the same lines, \textit{medicine}, being synonymous with \textit{medicinal product}, is a \textit{hyperonym} of \textit{Gilenya} (G114). Being also a synonym of \textit{medicinal products}, \textit{drugs} is likewise a hyponym of \textit{product}.

Other non-technical examples are:

(G70:) \textit{disturbances} $\rightarrow$ \textit{changes}  
(G84:) \textit{reductions} $\rightarrow$ \textit{effect}

- where the \textit{hyperonymy} may be less easily recognizable, but where nonetheless \textit{disturbance}- must be regarded as a type of \textit{change}, and \textit{reduction}- as a type of \textit{effect}.

With respect to more technical cases, examples are:

(J4:) \textit{a docetaxel-containing regimen} $\rightarrow$ \textit{chemotherapy}  
(J65:) \textit{prednisone} and \textit{prednisolone} $\rightarrow$ \textit{corticosteroid medicine}  
(M21:) \textit{calcineurin inhibitors} $\rightarrow$ \textit{immunosuppressants}
- in two of which cases specialized medical information had to be obtained for the hyperonymic relation to become clear. In certain other cases, however, although technical terms are involved, the •hyperonymy is immediately recognizable by being effected through the •omission of one or more NG Classifiers:

(G103:) live attenuated vaccines → vaccines
(P24:) human immunodeficiency virus-1 (HIV-1), hepatitis C virus and HTLV-I → viruses

As pointed out by Halliday and Matthiessen (1999: 197), the introduction of Classifiers creates hyponymy (cf. section 5.7), which is exactly the case in the above examples, where e.g. attenuated vaccines are a type of vaccines, and live attenuated vaccines (presumably) a sub-category of attenuated vaccines. Accordingly, TT vaccines is a •hyperonym of ST live attenuated vaccines. As in the other cases treated in this section, no •decrease-in-technicality is involved, since both Head nouns (vaccines and viruses) originate in specialized medical registers, but the •hyperonym is consistent with the lay-oriented skopos of the TTs, since the average lay reader must be presumed to be familiar with the two •hyperonyms, but hardly a hyponym like live attenuated vaccines.

8.3.5.2. •Hyponymy
In comparison with •hyperonymy, •hyponymy is a more marginal phenomenon in the INTRA corpus, manifesting itself in only 22 instances, in comparison with the 52 cases of •hyperonymy. This marginality of the phenomenon is also what is to be expected from PILs as a lay-oriented text type, considering that a •hyponym usually encodes more specific meaning than its hyperonymic ST base. This increase in semantic specificity may also be the reason why •hyponym in the INTRA corpus only in very few instances (four) combines with •decrease-in-technicality, which, as previously noted, applies to half the instances of •hyperonym. Three of these instances (of intersection between •hyponymy and •decrease-in-technicality) consist in a replacement of the technical ST item extremity (whose non-technical equivalent is limb) with either arm or leg in the TT (M85 (two occurrences) and P93).

To some extent, •hyponymy in the INTRA corpus is a reverse reflexion of the tendencies exhibited by the independent cases of •hyperonymy, i.e. the instances that are not combined with a •decrease-in-technicality. Thus:

(J44:) chemotherapeutic agent → Jevtana
(P45:) medicinal product → Pumarix
(S42:) product → Scintinum

- where the ST item indicates the class of which the individual product (designated by name in the TT) is a specific type. A comparable case, which however does not involve a product name, is:

(P30:) medicinal products → vaccines

\[178\] See Dansk Lægemiddel Information A/S (2012: [entries: kemoterapi and docetaxel]) for J4 and Wikipedia (2012b) for M21. In J65, the •hyperonymy is apparent from the co-text.
In a few cases, exactly as in connection with certain cases of •hyperonymy, the level of technicality is too high for the •hyponymy to be immediately recognizable:

(D10:) the active substances → clopidogrel and acetylsalicylic acid
(M21:) calcineurin inhibitors → tacrolimus

In yet other cases, the •hyponymy must in fact be said to enhance the accessibility of the TT:

(J46:) contraception → condom
(P35:) limbs → arm
(V16:) gastrointestinal side effects → vomiting, nausea and diarrhea

In all three cases, the TT items cannot be said to represent a •decrease-in-technicality (in the last of the three cases because no more technical terms exist), but the increase in semantic specificity introduced by the hyponyms nevertheless equals greater concreteness in these cases.

From the above analyses it is to be concluded that no clear tendency can be identified with regard to the translational effect of •hyponymy in the corpus, and this question will accordingly be left unanswered.

8.3.6. Part-whole relations

8.3.6.1. •Meronymy

•Meronomy is virtually absent from the INTRA corpus, the single case registered being:

(G16:) central nervous system → the brain and spinal cord

- where •meronomy consists in the fact that the brain and spinal cord are parts of the central nervous system.

8.3.6.2. •Holonomy

In comparison with •meronomy, •holonomy is more frequent, with 27 occurrences counted, most of which, however, conform to a very specific pattern where the name of the active substance is replaced by the product name:

(A5:) fluticasone furoate → Avamys
(G16:) fingolimod → Gilenya
(J35:) cabazitaxel → Jevtana
(M28:) mifarmurtide → Mepact
(V33:) liraglutide → Victoza

Except for the last case, these pairs all occur repeatedly in the respective texts, numbering 17 instances altogether. A different type of •holonomy is:

---

179 In both of the following two cases, the •hyponymy was established on the basis of information in the co-text.

243
The relation between ST a dose and TT Duocover/Gilenya consists in measure (‘a dose of Duocover/Gilenya’), which, according to Martin and Rose (2007: 90), also constitutes •meronymy, making Duocover and Gilenya •holonyms of a dose.

It should also be mentioned that two cases of intersection between •holonymy and •decrease-in-technicality have been identified, one of which is:

(G71:) evaluation of the fundus, including the macula ... → eye examination

ST the fundus and the macula are both parts of the eye, which makes the latter a •holonym. The •decrease-in-technicality is seen from the fact that a technical version of the TT wording would be *ocular examination.

Especially in those cases where the •holonymy consists in the replacement of the name of the active substance in the ST with the product name in the TT, the shift type must be deemed to support the lay-oriented skopos of the PILs, since the patient is likely to be more familiar with the product name than the highly technical name of a chemical substance.

8.3.7. •Antonymy and •converses
The list of antonyms occurring in the INTRA corpus is short and will be given in full:

(D60:) given → taken
(G34:) uncontrolled → controlled
(J65:) administer- → take
(M16:) administer- → take
(M41:) unknown → known
(P25:) false → correct
(V32:) unknown → known

As is to be expected, the •antonymy is in some cases accompanied by a change in POLARITY (G34, M41, P25 and V32), consisting in the introduction of not in the TT. Thus, the ST co-text in P25 is ... hypertension uncontrolled by medication ..., and the surrounding TT text is ... high blood pressure that cannot be controlled by medicines ... . It should also be remarked that two instances involve •decrease-in-technicality apart from the •antonymy, viz. J65 and M16: TT take is the antonym of the core-lexical word give, which would be the non-technical counterpart to the actual ST lexeme administer-.

The list of •converses is even shorter than the list of antonyms:

(J22:) receive → give
(J44:) administer → get-
(J60:) administer → have
(M13:) administer → receive-
(P51:) give- → receive
The five instances are really variations of the first case (J22), where *receive*, which is synonymous with *get* and *have* in some other instances, is the converse of *give*. In three cases the ST item is not *give* but the more technical *administer* (see comment on this pair of virtual synonyms in the previous section).

As for translational effect, *antonymy* and *converses* must be deemed to represent to represent *variation* in experiential meaning, though of the same, rather limited kind that was seen to be the case with *synonymy*.

8.4. Pragmatic shift types
As mentioned early in this chapter, *omissions* have not been registered in the analyses, and will accordingly not be accounted for. *Additions*, on the other hand, have in fact been registered, but will also be ignored in the present account, being irrelevant from a derivational point of view (see also the discussion in section 8.5). Only two other pragmatic shift types have been recorded in the corpus, viz. *paraphrase* and *explicitation*, both of which, however, have turned out to be both multifaceted and very frequent in their manifestation, as will appear from below.

8.4.1. *Paraphrase*
On a par with *DT* and *addition*, *paraphrase* belongs to the most pervasive shift types in the INTRA corpus, with a total of 363 instances registered, which means that the shift type is present in more than a third of all analytical segments (analytical segments, of which there are 931 altogether, are the size of one TT sentence on average - cf. section 8.1.2). In the analyses, *paraphrase* has also turned out to be a rather heterogeneous type of shift, manifesting itself in a wide variety of shapes.\(^{180}\) To some extent, the manifestations of *paraphrase* in the corpus represent a cline extending from instances that are not far removed from being analysable in terms of grammatical and/or lexical change, to instances with no lexicogrammatical points of contact whatever, i.e. instances with an only (very) distant semantic relatedness between ST and TT. At the same time, this cline may be regarded as a cline of the translational effect of the shift type: *paraphrase* produces *variation* in experiential meaning (see also the discussion in section 8.5), and the cline thus also pertains to the degree of this variation.

8.4.1.1. The heterogeneity of *paraphrase*
To illustrate the heterogeneity of *paraphrase* in the corpus, and more specifically the above-mentioned cline of ST-TT experiential distance created by the *paraphrase*, two examples will be given, one from each pole of the cline. Thus, an instance only slightly removed from lexicogrammatical shift types is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S19 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>24-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… patients with haematological malignancies …</td>
<td>if you have any blood disease.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{180}\) Because of the heterogeneity among the individual instances, the following exemplification (in all the sub-sections accounting for *paraphrase*) cannot make claims to exhaustiveness, but is intended to reflect as many of the identifiable tendencies as possible. Fixed, recurrent types of *paraphrase*, of which there is a certain set in the corpus, will all be exemplified.
Comment: This is one of the recurrent types of •paraphrase, which is in fact close to •de-metaphorization (and has accordingly been termed •clausal paraphrase), in that a source text NG (consisting of the Head patients and the postmodifying PP with haematological malignancies) is transformed into a clause (a [relational: possessive] one) in the TT, consisting of the conjunction if, the Subject/Carrier you, the Finite+Predicator/Process have and the Complement/ Attribute any blood disease. Apart from the conjunction (if), the introduction of which must be interpreted as a result of the •clausal paraphrase as a whole, the individual constituents of the TT clause can in fact be traced back to individual items in the ST NG: TT you is derived from ST patients through a change in NOMINAL PERSON (from ST [non-interactant] to TT [interactant: addressee]), and TT any blood disease is derived from ST haematological malignancies by means of a •decrease-in-technicality.181 The origin of TT have is the least obvious, but can in fact be traced to ST with, the two items being connected through the semantic element of possession that recurs in the ST preposition and the TT verb alike. In fact, the present case may be taken as an illustration of the SFG interpretation of the PP as a ‘shrunken clause’ (see section 5.5.2), in which the preposition serves a function similar to the Process/Predicator in a ‘proper’ clause. This may be even more clear if a wording like *patients with a blood disease is reworded as *patients who have a blood disease, where it should be clear that the two versions are virtually synonymous. Nevertheless, categorization as •de-metaphorization hinges on the ability of key lexemes to be transcategorized into a different word class (typically, as illustrated in section 8.2.5.4, the ability of a nomen actionis to be converted 'back' into a verb), and the fact that the same or corresponding lexemes are not involved in the case of ST with/TT have is the very reason why the present example must be assigned to category of •clausal paraphrase and not •de-metaphorization.

An instance from the other extreme of the cline is:

G67 - 5-4.4:
A decision on [[whether or not Gilenya therapy should be re-initiated after resolution of macular oedema]] needs to take into account the potential benefits and risks for the individual patient.

37-2:
(β:) If you have had macular oedema, (αα:) talk to your doctor (αβ:) before you resume treatment with Gilenya.

Comment: The TT section of interest in this connection is the αα-clause (talk to your doctor), which has no lexical and grammatical points of contact with any ST items at all, and whose ST base is indeed uncertain. If the TT clause can be deemed to originate in the ST NG a decision (on), the derivation must be categorized as •clausal paraphrase, and the relation between ST and TT best characterized in terms of a time sequence: a decision (on re-initiation of therapy) will be made after the patient has talked with the doctor. This interpretation must be considered tenuous, however, and, if deemed untenable, only leaves the option of categorizing the section as •addition instead, in other words as a TT unit without any ST base. Because of this interpretive uncertainty, the unit has had to be left uncatego-

181 Only the most important changes behind the derivation will be mentioned here. For a full analysis, see the analytical appendix (Appendix 11).
Apart from these two indications of the extremes in the span of variety in *paraphrase, no attempt will be made to determine the location of individual instances on this cline.

8.4.1.2. Combination with other shift types

Another aspect of the heterogeneity in the way *paraphrase manifests itself in the corpus is that the shift type very often combines with other types of change. Thus, in a great many cases, the *paraphrase includes an element of rank shift which is reminiscent of *de-metaphorization, in that, concurrently with the *paraphrase, the item in question is converted from group/phrase rank in the ST to clause rank in the TT. This phenomenon has been termed *clausal paraphrase in the analyses (and cf. the first of the two examples analysed in the preceding section). Another, similarly frequent phenomenon is the inclusion of a lower degree of technicality or (less frequently) of formality in the *paraphrase. These cases have been termed *non-technical paraphrase and *informal paraphrase, respectively. Both types of combination are featured in the following example, which will serve to (further) illustrate what differentiates *clausal paraphrase from *de-metaphorization, and *non-technical paraphrase from the lexical shift type which has been termed *decrease-in-technicality. The example is one of the recurrent ST-TT pairs and, moreover, another of those instances which is close to lexical and grammatical shift types:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M53 - 2-4.2: Method of administration</th>
<th>24-3: How MEPACT is given</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M45 - 2-4.2: Posology and method of administration</td>
<td>24-3: HOW TO USE MEPACT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The first of these two rather similar pairs (M53) must be analysed as *de-metaphorization, whereas the other one (M45) is *clausal paraphrase. In the former case, the ST NG is transformed into a TT clause, with the key lexical point of contact being the nominalized ST administration, from which the TT Process given is derived by means of the transcategorization which is inherent in the *de-metaphorization and through a *decrease-in-technicality. As for TT How, the ST base is Method, which is located in a different zone on the grammar-lexis cline (in the lexical zone, whereas how is a grammatical item¹⁸²), but whose semantic content (‘manner’/ ‘procedure’) is nevertheless so close to TT how that the two items are virtually synonymous, only with the latter item representing a *decrease-in-formality. Finally, TT MEPACT, which has no explicit ST base, has been categorized as *explicitation. (For a reasoned account of *explicitation in connection with *de-metaphorization and *paraphrase, see section 8.4.2).

The latter of the two examples (M45), on the other hand, must be categorized as *clausal paraphrase. This is because it is to be gathered from the co-text (the PIL section of which the TT segment is the headline) that How to use MEPACT covers dosage as well as admin-

¹⁸² The shift from ST method to TT how is one of the very few instances of shift from a grammatical to a lexical item. Hence, no more space will be devoted to this type of shift, i.e. change along the grammar-lexis cline.
istration of the medicine. In other words, TT use is derived from both ST Posology and administration, but is semantically too far removed from the ST base to be explained in terms of a lexical shift type (e.g. *synonymy or *compression), which presupposes semantic (near-)equivalence or closeness of meaning (cf. section 6.5). However, in spite of the semantic distance, a difference in the degree of technicality between ST and TT items can, and accordingly must be registered in the analysis, in that ST Posology and administration are technical terms, which TT use is not. Hence, the shift has been categorized as *non-technical paraphrase. In fact, owing to the element of rank shift noted above, the full analysis of the shift is *non-technical and clausal paraphrase, since both aspects (both the lower degree of technicality and the rank shift) are concurrently present in the *paraphrase, which is frequently the case.

Before leaving the example, it should be noted that the *paraphrase extends to the whole of the TT headline, but the two items How and MEPACT can be, and therefore have been analysed separately along the same lines as above, i.e. the way the items were analysed in section M53.

It should be noted that although *non-technical paraphrase refers to shifts which are *paraphrase in the first instance, and which include an element of lower TT technicality, these shifts are in certain cases only marginally distinct from the lexical shift type termed *decrease-in-technicality, as in the following examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G37 – 3-4.4</th>
<th>36-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... atrioventricular conduction delays ...</td>
<td>... irregular heartbeat ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: it appears that irregular heartbeat is most correctly to be regarded as a symptom of, but strictly speaking not the same as atrioventricular conduction delays, which refers to delays in the electrical impulse that makes the heart chambers contract and expand (cf. Kristensen 1962: 61). The relationship between the two NGs (ST and TT) is therefore best characterized as one consisting in cause and effect, and not in semantic identity, which is the reason for categorizing the change as *paraphrase. (For further examples of *paraphrase being based on a cause-effect relationship between ST and TT unit, see below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D25 - 4-4.4</th>
<th>48-2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>... transient ischaemic attack ...</td>
<td>... a clot in an artery of your brain ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The two NGs (ST and TT) are not semantically identical, but, as in the preceding example, are related as effect and cause: an ischaemic attack consists in a shortage of blood in an area of the brain (Kristensen 1962: 284) which is caused by a clot blocking the flow of blood to the area in question.

Apart from the highly prevalent combinations of *paraphrase with 'clause-ification' and a lower degree of either technicality or formality, a much more marginal tendency should also be mentioned, viz. combination with *hyperonymy, which occurs in five instances.
One instance has in fact been commented on previously (see section 8.3.3.1), viz. the translation of ST bronchodilators as TT medicines for your asthma (M16). Other examples are ST tinea infections → TT fungal infections affecting the skin, hair and nails (G175), and Lymphoma → TT cancer of the lymphatic system (G190), which are both parallel to the instance from M16: in both cases the Head or Premodifier + Head constitutes the •hyperonym (fungal infections in G175 and cancer in G190), which is then followed by a Post-modifier/Qualifier containing the •paraphrase. As previously noted (section 8.3.3.1), the •paraphrase in M16 consists in a reference to the therapeutic area of the medicine, whereas affecting the skin, hair and nails (G175) and of the lymphatic system (G190) refer to the part of the body affected by the disease.

8.4.1.3. The nature of the ST-TT link in •paraphrase

The last examples given in the preceding section (of •paraphrase combined with •hyperonymy) indicated the nature of the ST-TT link observable in those specific cases, viz. TT reference to the therapeutic area of the medicine denoted by the ST item, or TT reference to the part of the body affected by the disease referred to by the ST. In the following, the nature of the other types of ST-TT link observable in •paraphrase will be detailed. It must be emphasized, however, that only the general tendencies can be identified, and no kind of typology with clear-cut categories established.

Especially in those instances where the shift is not far removed from grammatical and lexical changes, one tendency consists in the recurrence of semantic features from the ST in the TT, typically in a different type of grammatical environment or in a different location on the grammar-lexis cline:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G146 - 6-4.4:</th>
<th>39-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(β:) If a decision is made [[to stop treatment with Gilenya]] (αα:) a 6 week interval without therapy is needed, …</td>
<td>(β:) After stopping Gilenya (αα:) you may have to wait for 6-8 weeks …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The semantic element of ‘pause’ in ST interval recurs in TT wait, and the element of necessity in ST needed recurs in TT have to.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P11 - 3-4.3:</th>
<th>31-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History of an anaphylactic (i.e. life-threatening) reaction to any of the constituents or trace residues (egg and chicken protein, ovalbumin, formaldehyde and sodium deoxycholate) of this vaccine.</td>
<td>you have previously had a sudden life-threatening allergic reaction to any ingredient of Pumarix (listed in Section 6) or to anything else that may be present in very small amounts, such as: egg and chicken protein, ovalbumin, formaldehyde or sodium deoxycholate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The semantic element of ‘presence’ in ST trace (= ‘a presence of something that is indicative of something else that is now absent’) recurs in TT present, and TT small amount(s) is part of the meaning of ST residue (= ‘a small amount left over from a larger amount of something’).
**A58 - 5-4.9:**

**Overdose**

*If you use more Avamys than you should*

Comment: This pair of headlines is one of a number of fixed pairs that appear in most, if not all of the texts (this one in all except *Jevtana*). The whole of the TT headline has been interpreted as a clausal paraphrase of ST *Overdose*, with the two semantic features ‘too much’ and ‘quantity’ in *overdose* being recognizable especially in TT *more ... than ... should*. The semantic recurrence, however, is such that neither of the two features is confined to a specific TT word. It is the configuration of the three TT words together which realizes the semantic combination ‘too much’ and ‘quantity’. (TT *you* and *Avamys*, it should be noted, are part of the clausal paraphrase, but are also given separate interpretations. These will be accounted for when the segment is taken up again in section 8.4.2).

**G31 - 4-4.4:**

... patients *without a history of chickenpox* ...

*36-2: if you have never had chickenpox.*

Comment: The semantic element of ‘absence’ in ST *without* is recognizable in TT *never* and the feature ‘past’ in ST *a history* recurs in TT *have ... had*. The transformation of ST *a history of* into a past form of TT *have* is another ST-TT pair of items which appears several times in the corpus.

Another tendency consists in a type of ST-TT relation where the two units (ST and TT) are linked, not via recurring semantic features, but through implication, whereby one of the units (typically the TT) is logically inferable from the other (typically the ST):

**P8 - 3-4.4:**

*A protective immune response may not be elicited in all vaccinees.*

*31-1: As with all vaccines, Pumarix may not fully protect all persons who are vaccinated.*

Comment: The underlined TT unit can be logically inferred from the ST: since vaccination does not necessarily elicit a protective immune response (ST), the medicine may not protect the persons vaccinated (TT).

**G67 - 5-4.4:**

*A decision on [[whether or not Gilenya therapy should be re-initiated after resolution of macular oedema]] needs to take into account the potential benefits and risks for the individual patient.*

*37-2: If you have had macular oedema, (aa:) talk to your doctor (αβ:) before you resume treatment with Gilenya.*

Comment: Resolution of the syndrome (ST) logically implies that that the patient has had it (TT).

**G63 - 5-4.4:**

*Macular oedema with or without visual symp-

*37-2: Gilenya may cause swelling in the macula, a*
Toms has been reported in 0.4% of patients treated with fingolimod 0.5 mg, ... condition [that is known as macular oedema] ...

Comment: The small percentage of patients affected by the syndrome, as reported in the ST, implies that Gilenya may cause it (TT).

J4 - 2-4.1:  
JEVTANA ... is indicated for the treatment of patients with ... prostate cancer previously treated with a docetaxel-containing regimen ... 

Comment: Here, too, the relationship is one of logical implication: the reason for using the medicine (Jevtana) to treat cancer that has previously been treated with a different type of medicine can only be that the first attempt was ineffectual, which inevitably leaves the cancer to progress.

There are also cases where the logical inferability works in tandem with the recurrence of semantic features:

G51 - 4-4.4:  
(αα:) VZV vaccination of antibody negative patients should be considered ... 

36-2:  
(β:) If you are not protected against the virus, (αα:) you may need a vaccination ...

Comment: The β-clause has been interpreted as a clausal paraphrase of ST antibody negative patients, the connection consisting mainly in logical inferability: if the patient has no antibodies (against the virus in question), it logically follows that s/he is not protected against the virus. Additionally, the semantic content of ST negative recurs in TT not.

In yet other cases, the connection between the ST and TT unit is more adequately described in causal terms:

J20 - 4-4.4:  
Neutropenia is the most common adverse reaction of cabazitaxel. 

27-2:  
During treatment with JEVTANA, it is more likely that your white blood cell count may be reduced.

Comment: Whether the underlined TT unit is derived from only one, or both of the two ST segments, the relation is a causal one: because neutropenia (a too low amount of white blood cells (Kristensen 1962: 388)) has been identified as the most common side effect of

183 The TT Subject (you) has been analysed separately as a change in NOMINAL PERSON, derived from ST patients = [non-interactant] → TT [interactant: addressee].
the medicine, it is likely that this will in fact occur, i.e. that the patient’s white blood cell count will be reduced.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V3 - 8-5.1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(β:) Thus, when blood glucose is high, (α1:) insulin secretion is stimulated (α2:) and glucagon secretion is inhibited.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>22-1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(αα:) It helps (αβ:) your body reduce your blood sugar level (β:) only when blood sugar is too high.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The stimulation of insulin secretion and inhibition of glucagon secretion mentioned in the ST is what causes the reduction of the blood sugar level referred to in the TT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A51 - 2-4.2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patients [not adequately responding to one spray actuation in each nostril once daily …] may use two spray actuations …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20-3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(β:) If symptoms are very bad (αα:) your doctor may increase the dose to 2 sprays …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Once again, the link between the underlined units may be captured in terms of cause and effect: if the patient does not adequately respond to the medicine, i.e. if the medicine does not work properly, the effect manifests itself in strong symptoms.

In yet other cases, the link between ST and TT unit is better characterized as consisting in purpose:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>G122 - 8-4.7:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(α:) On initiation of Gilenya treatment it is recommended (β:) that patients be observed for a period of 6 hours …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, at initiation of treatment you will have to stay at the doctor’s surgery or clinic for 6 hours ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The purpose of patient’s having to stay at the clinic (TT) can be found in the corresponding ST unit, which is to be observed.

As previously indicated, the current account merely aims to chart tendencies, and these are not always properly distinguishable. Thus, in certain cases the distinction between logical implication and a causal relation is far from obvious:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J48 - 6-4.6:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… men treated with cabazitaxel should use effective contraception throughout treatment …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>28-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(α:) You are advised (β1:) not to father a child during and up to 6 months after treatment …</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: It seems that the ST-TT relation may be described in terms of cause and effect as well as logical inferability: if the patient uses effective contraception, the effect is that no child will be conceived, but the non-conception is also logically implied by the use of

---

184 According to Kristensen (1962: 224), glucagon is a hormone which has the opposite effect of insulin, i.e. it keeps the blood sugar level high.
effective birth control.

12-5.1.: (β:) By acting as a functional antagonist of S1P receptors on lymphocytes, (αα:) fingolimod phosphate blocks the capacity of lymphocytes [[to egress from lymph nodes]] …

35-1: (α:) Gilenya helps to protect against attacks on the CNS by the immune system (β1:) by reducing the ability of some white blood cells (lymphocytes) [[to move freely within the body]] …

Comment: In this case, too, it is uncertain whether the ST-TT link is most adequately captured in terms of a causal relation or logical implication: the reduced capacity of lymphocytes to move freely within the body, as the TT has it, may be interpreted as the effect as well as the logical implication of their reduced ability to leave (ST: egress from) the lymph nodes.

Finally, there are cases of •paraphrase where the link between ST and TT simply defies characterization:

A47 - 2-4.2: The recommended starting dose is two spray actuations …

20-3: The usual starting dose is 2 sprays …

Comment: The connection between ST recommended and TT usual may possibly be regarded as a causal one (2 sprays is the usual dose, because this is what is recommended), but this is only a possibility.

The specific nature of the ST-TT link is similarly ambiguous in certain fixed pairs:

D1 - 2-4.1: Therapeutic indications

47-1: WHAT DUOCOVER IS AND WHAT IT IS USED FOR

Comment: This is a fixed pair of headlines which recurs in all texts in the INTRA corpus. The underlined TT unit is a •non-technical and clausal paraphrase of ST therapeutic indications because it is a rendering, in completely different and non-technical terms, of the approximate meaning of the ST unit (another, semantically closer but more unwieldy rendering would be *what Duocover is recommended as treatment for), but any more precise description of the nature of the ST-TT relation does not appear possible.

M7 - 3-4.3: Contraindications

23-2: Do not use MEPACT

Comment: This is another of the fixed pairs of headlines recurring in all texts,185 and in fact the ‘negative’ counterpart of the preceding example. In this case, too, no precise char-

---

185 In one text (Pumarix, P10), the TT wording is varied as Pumarix should not be given. The ST (Contraindications) is the same, however.
acterization can be given as to the nature of the ST-TT relationship established by the •paraphrase.

This concludes the account of •paraphrase in the corpus.

8.4.2. •Explicitation
Like •paraphrase, •explicitation is a highly frequent type of change in the INTRA corpus, with 331 instances registered, which means that around a third of all analytical segments feature this shift type. Unlike •paraphrase, however, which, as the preceding section showed, is a multi-faceted shift type, the manifestations of •explicitation can be divided into two relatively distinct categories: one is the ‘traditional’ type of •explicitation which consists in the presence of a TT item which is ‘extra’ in comparison with the ST, but whose presence can be interpreted as serving a purpose of clarification. The second category also consists in the presence of an ‘extra’ element, but in this case the item’s presence can be associated with specific grammatical shifts, such as changes in voice, •de-metaphorization or •paraphrase. Both categories, however, are consistent with the overall translational effect of •explicitation, which is identical with what the very name implies, i.e. that of making an implicit part of the ST explicit in the TT (cf. section 6.6.3).

8.4.2.1. Items serving a purpose of clarification
Examples of the 'clarifying' sub-type of •explicitation are:

| S46 - 2-4.2: The recommended activity of technetium (99mTc) besilesomab should be between 400 MBq and 800 MBq. |
| 26-3: The recommended activity administered intravenously is between 400 to 800 MBq (Mega-Becquerel or MBq is a unit used to measure radioactivity). |

Comment: The TT clause inside the parentheses is one of those instances of •explicitation which is most clearly related to the lay-oriented skopos of the TT: by providing a definition of the technical term MegaBecquerel, the TT clause can only be interpreted as an explanatory comment inserted for the benefit of the lay reader.

The use of parentheses in the TT is in fact a frequent indicator of •explicitation (though obviously not an automatic indicator):

| J55 - 5-4.4: Excipients The solvent contains 573.3 mg ethanol 96% (15% v/v), equivalent to 14 ml of beer or 6 ml of wine. |
| 28-2: This medicine contains 15% v/v ethanol (alcohol), equivalent to 14 ml of beer or 6 ml of wine. |

Comment: As in the previous example, the TT parenthesis (alcohol) must be interpreted as an insertion explaining the meaning of a technical term (in this case ethanol) in non-technical terms. The difference between this and the previous example is that the present instance is only implicitly a definition, which is in fact the shape that these parenthetical in-
assertions usually take: the parenthesis can be interpreted as an elliptical, [relational: identifying] clause which, in full, would be *which is/means alcohol (hence with a Token-Value structure, where which would serve as Token, and alcohol as Value).

D25 - 4-4.4:  
In patients with recent transient ischaemic attack or stroke …  
48-2:  
if you have had a clot in an artery of your brain (ischaemic stroke) …

Comment: This is another prevalent type of parenthetical insertion, which, however, is the reverse of the type analysed in the preceding example. In the present instance, it seems inappropriate to characterize the function of the parenthesis as explanatory, since the parenthetical item (ischaemic stroke) is the technical term for the preceding TT item (a clot in an artery of your brain). Apparently, the purpose of the parenthesis is to specify what exactly is meant (and hence the precise, technical term) by the non-technical expression. (The fact that this introduction of a technical term runs counter to the lay-orientedness of the skopos is a different matter!)

A8 - 3-4.3:  
Hypersensitivity to the active substance or to any of the excipients of Avamys  
18-2:  
if you are allergic (hypersensitive) to fluticasone furoate or any of the other ingredients of Avamys.

Comment: The example has been selected for comment partly because the segment represents a pair of formulaic wordings which recur in all texts except Pumarix, but also because it is representative of a question which many instances of explicitation give rise to, and which relates to the derivational relationship of the TT item to its ST base. Thus, in the present example, TT allergic must be analysed as being derived from ST hypersensitivity (by means of a decrease-in-technicality and as part of de-metaphorization). As in the preceding examples, the TT parenthesis (hypersensitive) must be interpreted as a technical specification of what is non-technically referred to as allergic and hence as explicitation. At the same time, however, hypersensitive is obviously a duplication of the ST lexeme from which allergic is derived (hypersensitive). Thus, somewhat paradoxically, the bracketed TT item has to be recognized as DT as well as explicitation.

In a limited number of cases, the explicitation consists in exemplification:

V7 – 2-4.1:  
In combination with:  
– Metformin and a sulphonylurea or metformin and a thiazolidinedione in patients with insufficient glycaemic control despite dual therapy.  
22-1: (V5: … (β:) when)  
– metformin in combination with a sulphonylurea (such as glimepiride or glibenclamide) or metformin in combination with a glitazone (such as rosiglitazone or pioglitazone) are not enough to control your blood sugar levels.

Comment: In both of the two parentheses in the TT, i.e. (such as glimepiride or glibencla-
mide) and (such as rosiglitazone or pioglitazone), the wording such as indicates that the
substances referred to are mentioned as examples of the item immediately preceding the
brackets, i.e. sulphonylurea and glitazone, respectively.

In a number of other instances, there is nothing – such as brackets – to indicate that a TT
item represents •explicitation, and no more specific purpose such as exemplification or
exploration – as in previous occurrences - can be identified:

S30 - 4-4.5:
Active substances [[which inhibit inflammation
or affect the haematopoietic system (such as antibiotics and corticosteroids)] may lead to
false negative results.

Comment: The three final TT words, of your examination have no counterpart in the ST,
but must be considered implicit in ST results, and this is the reason why the item has been
categorized as •explicitation.

D17 - 3-4.4:
Special warnings and precautions for use

Comment: This is a fixed ST-TT pair of segments recurring in all texts. Whereas TT spec-
cial is a •DT of the same word in the ST, and TT care is a •paraphrase of ST precautions186
and possibly also warnings, TT take is best interpreted as •explicitation, since – while it
belongs with TT care as part of the idiomatic expression take care – it may be regarded as
being implicit in ST precautions: the meaning is implicitly precautions to be taken. Like-
wise, TT with DuoCover must be interpreted as •explicitation, in that the precautions for
use referred to by the ST obviously relate to the medicinal product without mentioning it.

M8 - 3-4.3:
Hypersensitivity to the active substance or to
any of the excipients.

Comment: The TT parenthesis (hypersensitive) in this fixed ST-TT pair has previously
been identified as •explicitation. TT other and of MEPACT, however, belong to the same
category, because each of the items must be deemed implicit in ST the excipients, which187
implicitly refers to those ingredients other than the active substance and obviously part of
the product.

186 TT care and ST precautions are semantically close, but not close enough for •synonymy to apply. OALD
defines care as 'attention or thought that you give to something that you are doing so that you will do it well
and avoid mistakes or damage' (Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2013: [entry: care]), whereas precau-
tion is defined as 'something that is done in advance in order to prevent problems or to avoid danger' (ibid.
[entry: precaution]).

187 In the medical section of TheFreeDictionary, the technical, pharmaceutical term excipient (Farlex inc.
2012: [entry: excipient]) is defined as an inactive substance that serves as the vehicle or medium for a drug.
8.4.2.2. •Explicitation in connection with grammatical shifts

The TT segment in the last example above (M8) in fact contains yet another instance of •explicitation, but one of those which belongs to the other of the two general categories, i.e. those implicit ST items which are brought out in the TT as a result of grammatical changes. Thus, in the above example, the TT segment as a whole is interpretable as a •de-metaphorization of the ST nominalization hypersensitivity (to the active substance etc.), which corresponds to the [relational: intensive] clause *[somebody] is hypersensitive (consisting of Carrier – Process – Attribute). The •de-metaphorization, however, has required the insertion of a Carrier which is only implicit in the ST nominalized structure, viz. the patient – in the TT represented as you. •Explicitation of a participant in connection with •de-metaphorization is in fact relatively frequent in the INTRA corpus, with altogether 23 occurrences registered, about half of which are either exactly similar to the example just analysed (because, as mentioned, it belongs to a formulaic pair of wordings recurring in most of the texts), or consist in •explicitation of the same type of participant, i.e. of the Carrier in a TT [relational: intensive] clause. In most other cases, the explicitated participant is the Actor in what becomes a TT [material] clause, one example of which is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D7 - 2-4.1:</th>
<th>47-1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… including patients undergoing a stent placement …</td>
<td>For the treatment of this condition your doctor may have placed a stent in the blocked or narrowed artery to restore effective blood flow.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the TT [material] clause, the Process (have placed\textsuperscript{188}) and the Goal (a stent) are derived from the ST ideational metaphor a stent placement, whereas the Actor (your doctor) is a result of •explicitation.

Since •de-metaphorization is often seen to require the •explicitation of a participant, it is hardly surprising that the phenomenon also occurs in connection with certain cases of •clausal paraphrase, though less frequently (15 instances counted):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A58 - 5-4.9: Overdose</th>
<th>20-3: If you use more Avamys than you should</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comment: The TT has previously been analysed as one of the repeated instances of •clausal paraphrase (see section 8.4.1.2), but it was mentioned that while TT you and Avamys are part of the •paraphrase, the two items also need separate interpretations. Thus, TT you has been interpreted as •explicitation because the patient is the implicit agent of the overdosing. An overdose also presupposes a medium (something of which too much is taken), for which reason the medicine (TT Avamys) has likewise been categorized as •explicitation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A type of grammatical shift which is accompanied by •explicitation almost as frequently as •de-metaphorization is shift in VOICE from [receptive] to [operative] (19 instances counted). Before the link between this type of shift and •explicitation is explored, however, the

\textsuperscript{188} It should be noted that the modal may has been interpreted as an •addition, having no base in the ST.
system of VOICE and the dependent system of AGENTIVITY will be recapitulated for good measure:

![Diagram of VOICE and AGENTIVITY systems](image)

**Fig. 5.3.2. VOICE and AGENTIVITY. Source: IFG3: 183 (adapted by author)**

As the system graph reflects, and as mentioned in the account of the clausal system of VOICE (see section 5.3.2), the system of AGENTIVITY is enterable upon selection of the term [receptive] (IFG3: 183). In other words, whereas the presence of an Actor is a *sine qua non* in [operative] clauses, the option between including or leaving out the Actor is open to [receptive] clauses. This means that a shift from a [receptive: non-agentive] to an [operative] clause necessitates the introduction of an Actor, and it is this insertion which has been categorized as •explicitation. Further justification for this interpretation will be given in connection with the following example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>J35 - 4-4.4:</th>
<th>28-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The dose of cabazitaxel should be reduced ...</td>
<td>Your doctor may reduce the dose of JEVTANA ...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: In the ST clause, which is [receptive], the Actor has been omitted, but is present in the TT (as *Your doctor*) as a necessary consequence of this clause being [operative]. Since the shift (from absence to presence) cannot be explained in terms of the system of AGENTIVITY (because, as already mentioned, this system only applies to [receptive] clauses), the explanation chosen in these instances is •explicitation. This is deemed the most apt categorization since the absence or presence of the Actor in [material] clauses is only a question of ‘visibility’. A [material] clause, be it [operative] or [receptive], always presupposes an Actor, but the Actor may be ‘invisible’ or explicit (cf. IFG3: 297-98).

The single case where the insertion of a participant in connection with a shift in VOICE does not have to be explained as •explicitation is the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P13 - 3-4.3:</th>
<th>31-2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>However, in a pandemic situation, it may be appropriate [[to give the vaccine]] ...</td>
<td>However, in a pandemic situation, you may still be given the vaccine.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: Apart from the shift in VOICE from [operative] in the ST embedded clause to [receptive] in the TT, the difference consists in the presence of a Recipient (TT *you*), which is absent in the ST. The change can in fact be captured in the system of RECIPIENCY, which is enterable when a [material: transformative: extending] clause (in the [material]-
clause system of TYPE OF OUTCOME - see section 5.1.1) is selected, which is the case in ST and TT alike (the Process is give in both cases – cf. Appendix 4). The terms in the system of RECIPIENCY are presence versus absence of a Recipient ([+Recipient]/[no Recipient]), which obviates the need to categorize the introduction of TT you as •explicitation.

In the two cases where the insertion of a participant in the TT is concomitant on a shift in the general system of PROCESS TYPE, on the other hand, the ‘extra’ TT element must be interpreted as •explicitation. One of the two cases is:

| G90 - 6-4.4: Laboratory tests involving the use of circulating mononuclear cells require larger blood volumes due to reduction in the number of circulating lymphocytes. |
| 38-2: (1:) Otherwise, it may not be possible for the doctor to understand the results of the test, (2:) and for certain types of blood test your doctor may need to take more blood than usual. |

Comment: As mentioned in the previous analysis of this pair of segments (see section 8.2.1.1), a shift in PROCESS TYPE is involved between the ST clause, which is [relational: possessive] (owing to the Process require - cf. Appendix 5) and the TT 2-clause, which is [material] (take - cf. Appendix 4). The shift is accompanied by the introduction of TT your doctor. The element has been interpreted as •explicitation because the ST proposition concerning the need for larger blood volumes in connection with certain types of laboratory tests can be read as an implicit injunction on the patient’s doctor to make sure that a sufficiently large blood sample is taken as a basis for these tests.

Finally, •explicitation in some cases combines with shifts in the interpersonal system of FINITENESS. In the five cases in question (all of them limited to one text pair, viz. Gilenya), it is uncertain, however, whether the ‘extra’ TT item warrants categorization as •explicitation, or is rather an added element which is in fact not implicit in the TT. One example is:

| G91 - 4-4.4: (β:) Before initiating treatment with Gilenya, (α:) a recent complete blood count (CBC) (i.e. within 6 months) should be available. |
| 38-2: (β:) Before you start Gilenya, (α1α:) your doctor will confirm (α1β:) whether you have enough white blood cells in your blood … |

Comment: An automatic consequence of the change from ST [non-finite] to TT [finite] in the two corresponding β-clauses is the insertion of a Subject, which allows for the introduction of a participant (in terms of experiential structure). This is the Actor, realized by you. It is uncertain, however, whether the implied Actor of the ST β-clause is the patient (TT you), or rather the patient’s doctor, since treatment appears more naturally associated with the patient in the role of object rather than agent (or, phrased in SFG terms, the process treat appears more naturally associated with patient in the participant role of Goal than Actor.) Nor can the question be solved by reference to traditional grammatical ‘rules’, since initiating in the ST β-clause is an example of the so-called ‘dangling’ participle warned against by traditional school grammars, i.e. a participle whose implied subject (i.e. subject in traditional grammatical terms) cannot be identified as the one in the α-clause, which is a recent complete blood count. It therefore cannot be decided whether TT you
should be treated as explicitation or addition.

Because of the ambiguity with regard to explicitation versus addition, these five cases have been included in neither category.

This concludes the account of explicitation in the corpus.

8.4.3. Intersemiotic translation
One particular section of the TTs (section 4: Side effects) abounds with instances of translation which transcends INTRA altogether, being in fact inter- and not intrasemiotic. However, the intersemiotic translation is of a very particular nature, consisting in the conversion of ST mathematical signs into TT words in all cases. One example is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4-4.8.</th>
<th>21-4.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very common ≥1/10</td>
<td>Very common side effects (These can affect more than 1 person in 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment: The intersemiotic translation occurs exclusively, but repeatedly, in connection with specification of frequency intervals for side effects, and in all cases mathematical signs in the ST are translated into lexicogrammar in the TT. Thus the ST sign ‘>’ has become more than in the TT, and the ST sign ‘/’ has been rendered as in in the TT.

Intersemiotic translation like this must be deemed to enhance the accessibility of the TTs, completely on a par with a number of the INTRA shift types. Reading words rather than having to decipher mathematical signs can only be easier for lay readers.

8.5. Discussion of results
In the following, the results of the analyses will be generalized in two different ways: first (section 8.5.1), the relative prominence of individual shift types will be characterized on the basis of the frequencies noted in the analyses, and next (section 8.5.2) the shift types will be typologized according to the nature of their contribution to the interregisterial rewriting. This classification, which will consist in the induction of 'genera' of shift types, will at the same time amount to a general characterization of lay-oriented interregisterial INTRA, as exemplified by the transformation of SPCs into PILs.

8.5.1. Relative prominence of the shift types identified in the corpus
The preceding three sections (8.2 - 8.4) have detailed the full range as well as the nature of the shift types manifested in the corpus, in which connection a distinction was in some cases made between types that could be deemed conducive to the fulfilment of the lay-oriented TT skopos, and types that had to be regarded as potentially counterproductive to this skopos. In the next section (8.5.2), these distinctions will matter, but in the present section the nature of individual shift types will be disregarded, and the individual types grouped only in respect of frequency. In some cases, two or several 'directions' of shifts within e.g. the same grammatical system (such as VOICE) are distinguished as individual shift types (because a difference in effect is attributable to each 'direction') and in other cases not.
In terms of frequency, five shift types can be unequivocally identified as the absolute 'top league': •DT, •paraphrase, •decrease-in-technicality, •explicitation and •addition are all very prominent in all texts. Apart from this 'top league', three groupings have been identified: frequent, moderately frequent and infrequent shift types. Frequent ones are those which are consistently present in all texts, and they include the following:

- shifts in PROCESS TYPE
- shifts in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY from [simplex] to [complex]
- shifts in VOICE, from [receptive] to [operative] (in terms of frequency, however, this shift type occupies the 'border zone' between the present category and the one next below, since the shift type is in fact not instanced in all texts)
- •de-metaphorization
- 'upward' shifts between group/phrase and clause rank
- shifts in NOMINAL PERSON from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee]
- shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION from [premodified] to [postmodified]
- •synonymy
- •expansion
- •decrease-in-formality
- •hyperonymy

The next category is constituted by the moderately frequent shift types, i.e. those which are present in all or the majority of the texts, but with only a couple or, at the most, a small handful of occurrences per text. They include the following:

- shifts in FREEDOM
- shifts in FINITENESS from [non-finite] to [finite]
- shifts in SUBJECT PERSON from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee]
- shifts in MOOD TYPE from [indicative: declarative] to [imperative]
- shifts in MODAL DEIXIS from [modality] to [primary tense]
- shifts between ranking and downranked clauses
- 'downward' shifts between clause and group/phrase rank
- shifts in NUMBER from [plural] to [singular]
- shifts in DEIXIS from [non-specific] to [specific]
- shifts in TYPE OF DEIXIS from [demonstrative] to [personal]
- •compression
- •hyponymy
- •holonomy

Finally, the last band consists of the decidedly infrequent shift types, viz. those which are present in only some of the texts and with 1-2 occurrences per text at the most. They include the following:

- shifts in TYPE OF DOING
- shifts in TYPE OF OUTCOME
- shifts in IMPACT
- shifts in TYPE OF RELATION
- shifts in CIRCUMSTANTIATION
- shifts in clause-rank, experiential constituent status
- shifts in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY from [complex] to [simplex]
- shifts in TAXIS
- shifts in CLAUSE SEQUENCING
- shifts in TYPE OF ENHANCEMENT
- shifts in TYPE OF EXTENSION
- shifts in POLARITY
- shifts in mood assessment
- shifts between types of modal Adjunct
- shifts in FINITENESS from [finite] to [non-finite]
- shifts in MOOD TYPE from [imperative] to [indicative: declarative]
- shifts in MODAL DEIXIS from [primary tense] to [modality]
- shifts in modality
- shifts in NEGATIVE TYPE
- shifts in MODALITY TYPE
- shifts in MODAL VALUE
- shifts PRIMARY TENSE
- shifts in THEME SELECTION from [marked] to [unmarked]
- shifts in THEME SELECTION from [unmarked] to [marked]
- shifts in COHESION
- NG 'encapsulation' in 'extraction' from PPs
  - metaphorization
- shifts in NUMBER from [singular] to [plural]
- shifts in DEIXIS from [specific] to [non-specific]
- shifts in NUMERATION and QUANTIFICATION
- shifts in PARTIAL SELECTION
- structural changes in NGs
- shifts in ASPECT (VG)
  - increase-in-technicality
  - increase-in-formality
- meronymy
- antonymy and converses

Two conclusions emerge from the above lists: the 'species' of shifts at work in the lay-oriented INTRA investigated must be considered highly diverse, with 68 different types registered. However, not only are these shift types highly diverse in nature, as detailed in the preceding accounts (sections 8.2 - 8.4), they also differ hugely with regard to frequency. It thus turns out that SPC-into-PIL INTRA is based on a relatively small number of types that are consistently manifested or even highly prominent in the corpus, while at the same time featuring a much larger collection of only sporadically instanced types.

8.5.2. *Lay-oriented INTRA typologized: genera of shift types*

In contradistinction to the preceding section, where the 'species' of shifts were grouped according to frequency (and frequency as the sole criterion), the 'genera' below have been induced on the basis of a very different kind of commonality between individual 'species', viz. INTRA function, i.e. the type of contribution to the rewriting that could be attributed
to the individual shift types. In this connection, as will appear from below, the nature of the contribution made by the individual 'species' to the specifically lay-oriented skopos of the TTs has been central. Moreover, three criteria were adopted which led to the exclusion of a minor number of 'species' from a place in any 'genus': 1) only derivational shift types have been considered, which led to the exclusion of •addition and •omission. 2) Among the derivational species, only those which represent lexicogrammatical change have been considered, in that rewording was the central element in Jakobson's definition of INTRA (1959/2012: 127). This is the reason why •DT, which represents derivation without rewording, has also been excluded from consideration. 3) Finally, since the main aim of the thesis is a charting of the mechanisms which constitute lay-oriented INTRA, only those shift types have been included which could be deemed either contributory to, or, as a minimum, compatible with the lay-oriented skopos of the TTs. This means that potentially counterproductive species have been ignored, which, as the previous analyses have shown, include •increase-in-technicality, •increase-in-formality, shifts in VOICE from [operative] to [receptive] and •metaphorization. The few and (in terms of frequency) minor shifts whose contribution to the interregisterial rewriting has been left an open question or interpreted as incidental concomitants of the rewriting as such will also be left out of consideration.

Seven 'genera' of shifts have been identified on the basis of the previous analyses:

- structural reorganization (section 8.5.2.1)
- ideational variation (section 8.5.2.2)
- clarification (section 8.5.2.3)
- concretization (section 8.5.2.4)
- dilution/de-compacting (section 8.5.2.5)
- neutralization (section 8.5.2.6)
- personalization/individualization (section 8.5.2.7)

Before a detailed definition of each 'genus' is embarked on in the following sub-sections, several general comments on the typology will be necessary: first, as a point of terminology, it is to be noted that dual terms, such as dilution/de-compacting, have been chosen for some of the genera. It should be made clear that in these cases only one genus is referred to, but dual terms have been preferred where these were deemed better able to capture the nature of a genus than a single term would. Second, it must be noted that although the majority of the shift types will be assigned to a single genus only, the nature of certain species makes the possibility of multi-genus membership a necessary feature of the typology, in that a minor number of species must be recognized as spanning several genera. This means that the genera identified here differ in nature from those of natural sciences like botany or zoology, where a genus comprises a clearly delimited set of species which belong to one genus only. As opposed to this, the genera below are less distinct concepts that are rather to be conceived of as ones intended to capture the general 'motifs' or tendencies that characterize lay-oriented interregisterial INTRA. Once again, an analogy may be appropriate: previously, when the generic nature of translation shifts was detailed, this was done through recourse to metaphors derived from transport and geography (see section 6.3). Here, biological metaphors may be of use, in that the collection of genera to be induced may be regarded as the 'anatomy' of lay-oriented INTRA and the individual genera as its 'organs'. The set of shift types that constitute a genus, then, may be compared to the phys-
iological processes associated with each organ.

What should also be emphasized is that the below generalization flouts the borders inherent in the previous typologies of shifts presented in this thesis. As already mentioned, the typology below will ignore the question of frequency, which was the determining factor behind the classification in section 8.5.1. Also, the below typology will be seen to largely cut across the boundaries of the classification adopted in chapter 6 (analytical framework, part 2), where especially the parameters of lexicogrammatical organization (grammar-lexis cline, metafunction, rank etc.) were exploited in a typologization suited to the particular methodological needs of the thesis. Thus, whereas some of the below genera will either be predominantly grammatical and others predominantly lexical in nature, some will include types from all three original main categories (grammatical, lexical and pragmatic). Moreover, there are cases where different aspects of a single shift type will be assigned to different genera. This is partly the reason why some species will be seen to span more than one genus.

8.5.2.1. The genus of structural reorganization

The first of the six genera identified is structural reorganization, which includes a rather diverse group of species:

- shifts in CLAUSE SEQUENCING
- shifts in FREEDOM
- shifts in THEME SELECTION from [marked] to [unmarked]
- rank shifts: shifts between ranking and downranked clauses
- rank shifts: shifts between group/phrase and clause rank
- shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION from [premodified] to [postmodified]
- structural changes within NGs
- shifts in logogenesis

With the exception of shifts in logogenesis, all belong in the grammatical category of shift types, and all have part in the extensive restructuring of textual units which is characteristic of this specific type of rewriting. There are two points of diversity among the species, on the other hand. First, they vary hugely when it comes to the size of the textual units affected by the shift: from NG-internal restructuring (structural changes within NGs and shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION) as the smallest units to shifts in logogenesis as the most far-reaching changes (for a definition of shifts in logogenesis, see section 6.6.5). It should be noted that although shifts in logogenesis have not been registered in the analyses (cf. section 8.1.4), the instantiation of this shift type in the corpus is extensively evidenced in the extremely divergent linearity of TTs in comparison with their STs (cf. section 8.1.1). For this reason, shifts in logogenesis must be recognized as a member of the present genus.

The second point of diversity among the species consists in the fact that some of them cannot really be seen to contribute to the fulfilment of the specifically lay-oriented TT skopos. This applies to most shifts in rank and to structural shifts within groups (NGs). Shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION from [premodified] to [postmodified], on the other hand, have been credited with enhancement of readability, just as the specific type of rank shift that pertains to the 'movement' of elements from group/phrase rank to clause rank has been argued to contribute to a more spoken style in the TTs.
8.5.2.2. *The genus of ideational variation*

The present genus includes species from all three original main categories of shift types, i.e. grammatical, lexical and pragmatic. The list is the following:

- shifts in **PROCESS TYPE**
- shifts in **TYPE OF DOING**
- shifts in **TYPE OF OUTCOME**
- shifts in **TYPE OF RELATION**
- shifts in **CIRCUMSTANTIATION**
- shifts in clause-rank, experiential constituent status (nuclearity/peripherality)
- shifts in **TYPE OF EXTENSION**
- shifts in **TYPE OF ENHANCEMENT**
- •synonymy
- •antonymy
- •paraphrase

The commonality of these shift types is two-fold: they are all responsible for a degree of semantic *difference* between STs and TTs, and these differences all pertain to ideational meaning - some of them experiential, such as shifts in **PROCESS TYPE** and •synonymy, and a few to logical meaning (shifts in **TYPE OF EXTENSION** and **TYPE OF ENHANCEMENT**). This genus of shift types, and especially the prominence of a shift type like •paraphrase in the corpus, bears witness to the fact that semantic variation is an integral part of lay-oriented interregisterial INTRA: as previously posited, STs and TTs are related in meaning, but very often they do not mean (quite) the same. That, however, is a state of affairs which has been argued to be constitutive of translation as such (see section 3.3.2), though undoubtedly the shifts in meaning involved in much TRP are more limited. However, a point of divergence among the individual species is the *degree* of ideational difference they effect. Some species, especially •paraphrase and shifts in **PROCESS TYPE**, often involve marked ideational variation, whereas •synonymy has been identified as the limiting case in this genus, representing only negligible or even virtually non-existent semantic deviation. In a different respect, on the other hand, it is difficult to differentiate between the individual species, viz. when it comes to the degree to which they contribute to the lay-oriented aspect of the TT skopos. •Paraphrase may possibly be awarded pride of place in this connection, since in a number of cases it appears that the conversion of specialized wordings into lay-oriented ones would not be *possible* without •paraphrase. Nevertheless, the contribution of this shift type to TT accessibility is most evident when it enters into combination with an extra and more obviously lay-oriented element, viz. a lower degree of technicality or formality (in •non-technical or •informal paraphrase).

8.5.2.3. *The genus of clarification*

The species subsumed under the genus of *clarification* are the following:

- •explicitation (sub-type: insertion of explanatory/specifying parentheses)
- shifts in **RECIPIENCY** from [no recipient] to [+recipient]
- shifts in **POLARITY**
- shifts in MOOD TYPE from [indicative: declarative] to [imperative]
- shifts in MODAL VALUE from [median] to [high]

What unites the above shift types is the contribution they can all be seen to make to the creation of 'unequivocalness' in the TTs. In the case of •explicitation, the genus extends to those manifestations in the corpus\(^{189}\) which consist in the insertion of parentheses that clearly serve a purpose of clarification (those carrying the message 'this is what we really mean by the term preceding the parenthesis'). A contribution to 'unequivocalness' was also the effect seen to be linked with shifts in POLARITY and MODAL VALUE, and likewise the shifts in MOOD TYPE from modulated declaratives to imperatives may be interpreted as counteracting indeterminacy: as previously noted (see section 8.2.3.7), the [imperative] mood type constitutes the congruent way of expressing a command, which makes this grammatical choice a more straightforward and unequivocal type of realization than the (slightly) less determinate alternative, i.e. the modulated declarative.

\textbf{8.5.2.4. The genus of concretization}

\textit{Concretization} is a genus whose shift types are all part of other genera as well. The members are three only:

- •de-metaphorization
  - the element of 'clause-ification' in •clausal paraphrase
- •explicitation (sub-type: insertion of participants)

As pointed out in section 5.6, grammatical metaphor produces more abstract discourse, which means that the opposite effect, i.e. greater concreteness, is an effect which must logically be attributed to •de-metaphorization. Since the element of 'clause-ification' in •clausal paraphrase (the conversion of a nominal group or PP into a clause) is closely parallel to •de-metaphorization, the same effect is attributable to this shift type also. With regard to •explicitation, the relevant manifestations are those which consist in the insertion of participants in the TTs which are only implicit in the STs, as has been shown to take place especially in connection with shifts in VOICE from [receptive] to [operative]. •de-metaphorization and •clausal paraphrase (see section 8.4.2). The effect of these insertions, too, must be characterized as concretization, since discourse which explicitates (all) participants involved in or affected by the processes in question must be considered more concrete in character than discourse which leaves (some) participants implicit.

\textbf{8.5.2.5. The genus of dilution/de-compacting}

The genus of dilution/de-compacting comprises a rather small set of species:

- shifts in CLAUSE COMPLEXITY from [simplex] to [complex]
- •de-metaphorization
  - the element of 'clause-ification' in •clausal paraphrase
- shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION from [premodified] to [postmodified]
- •expansion

\(^{189}\) The other 'half' of the manifestations of •explicitation have been assigned to the next genus, for reasons to appear below.
These shift types are quite uniform in translational effect, all of them leading to a decrease in density or ‘compactness’ of lexicogrammatical realization, either because ST units are ‘spread out across’ more words in the TT or because a nominal group or PP is converted into a clause. Such ‘de-compacting’ must be presumed to lead to enhanced readability for lay readers.

8.5.2.6. The genus of neutralization
The following shift types are the ones assigned to the genus of \textit{neutralization}:

- \textbullet{} decrease-in-technicality
- \textbullet{} decrease-in-formality
- \textbullet{} hyperonymy
- \textbullet{} holonymy
  - the 'non-technical' element of \textbullet{} non-technical paraphrase
  - the 'informal' element of \textbullet{} informal paraphrase
- shifts in \textit{theme selection} from [marked] to [unmarked]
- shifts in \textit{voice} from [receptive] to [operative]

All these shift types contribute to the fulfilment of the lay-oriented TT skopos by removing obstacles to accessibility through neutral/unmarked lexicogrammatical TT selections which bring the TTs closer to the registers of everyday, colloquial discourse. Thus, in the lexical zone the genus consists of shifts resulting in items that are neutral/unmarked with respect to technicality, formality, etymology and semantic specificity: neutrality/unmarkedness of technicality and formality arises from \textbullet{} decrease-in-technicality and \textbullet{} decrease-in-formality, respectively, and from the 'non-technical' and the 'informal' element of \textbullet{} non-technical and \textbullet{} informal paraphrase. All of these, moreover, typically involve a change away from lexical items of especially Greek/Latin derivation into ones of Germanic origin. Constituting core English vocabulary (cf. Carter 1998: 45; cf. Kisbye 1992: ch. 4; cf. Baugh and Cable 1978: 55), lexical items of Germanic descent represent the etymologically unmarked choice. Similarly, hyperonyms must be regarded as the neutral selection in comparison with hypoynyms, considering the lower degree of semantic specificity which hyperonyms encode (cf. Eggins 1994: 105). Whether \textbullet{} holonymy as such can be regarded as the neutral/unmarked lexical choice as such is unclear, but the way \textbullet{} holonymy is instantiated in the corpus has been shown to consist in the selection of items (typically the product name instead of the highly technical name of a specific chemical substance) which are bound to be more familiar to the lay reader.

As appears from the above list, the genus also includes two shift types from the grammatical zone, viz. shifts in \textit{voice} from [receptive] to [operative] and in \textit{theme selection} from [marked] to [unmarked]. In both cases, one of the options ([operative] voice in the former and [unmarked] theme selection in the latter) must be considered the unmarked choice (IFG3: 58) which is more consistent with the registers of colloquial communication as such.

8.5.2.7. The genus of personalization/individualization
The last of the seven genera exclusively consists of grammatical shift types:
- de-metaphorization
- shifts in FINITENESS from [non-finite] to [finite]
- shifts in SUBJECT PERSON from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee]
- shifts in NOMINAL PERSON from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee]
- shifts in MODAL DEIXIS from [modality] to [primary tense]
- shifts in MODALITY TYPE from [modulation] to [modalization]
- shifts in PRIMARY TENSE from [present] to [future]
- shifts in NUMBER, especially from [plural] to [singular]
- shifts in DEIXIS from [non-specific] to [specific]
- shifts in TYPE OF DEIXIS from [demonstrative] to [personal]

Several related, yet separate 'motifs' are intertwined in the above list. First of all, some, but
not all, of the above shift types effect a change from the highly impersonal Tenor of the
STs to the rather more personal one which dominates the TTs. Central in this respect are
shifts in SUBJECT PERSON from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee], in NOMINAL
PERSON from [non-interactant] to [interactant: addressee], and in TYPE OF DEIXIS from
[demonstrative] to [personal], but shifts in FINITENESS from [non-finite] to [finite] also con-
tribute a more personal, or perhaps rather a less impersonal Tenor by introducing a Mood
element (cf. section 8.2.3.5), and the same applies to de-metaphorization and clausal
paraphrase, for the same reason (cf. section 5.6), but only in those cases where the result is a
[finite] clause, of course. Yet, the shifts in SUBJECT PERSON, NOMINAL PERSON and TYPE
OF DEIXIS have a further, rather obvious significance: they change the status of the patient
in the texts, from what is a 3rd-person role in the STs into the role of addressee in the TTs.
In other words, instead of only being talked about, the patient is addressed directly. These
shifts thus contribute to the fulfilment of a very specific aspect of the skopos, viz. the
change of target group not only from expert to lay readers, but lay readers specifically in
the role of end users of the product. This has also been argued to manifest itself in the
shifts in MODAL DEIXIS from [modality] to [primary tense], in those in MODALITY TYPE
from [modulation] to [modalization], and in those in PRIMARY TENSE from [present] to [fu-
ture]. Admittedly, the specific change in readership (from medical expert to patient) may
not be sufficiently clearly reflected in the label chosen for the genus (personalization/indi-
vidualization), but the second part of the label (individualization) does allude to the altera-
tion of the generic perspective of the STs into the TT orientation towards the individual
reader's circumstances. This effect has been shown to inhere (especially) in the shifts in
NUMBER, particularly those from [plural] to [singular], and in the shifts in DEIXIS from
[non-specific] to [specific].

8.5.2.8. Concluding remarks on the typologization
A general characteristic of the above typologization which needs to be clearly stated is the
difference, not only in nature but also in the extent to which the genera of shifts contribute
to the fulfilment of the lay-oriented skopos. The order in which the genera have been pre-
sented is in fact intended to reflect a cline in this respect, i.e. from least to most pro-
nounced contribution. Graphically:
This means that the genera of structural reorganization and ideational variation are ones which do play a strong part in the rewriting as such, but whose link with the lay-oriented skopos is the least clearly identifiable. Clarification, concretization and dilution/de-compacting may be regarded as occupying a middle region on the cline, being more clearly lay-oriented in nature, and the genus which most unequivocally contributes to enhanced accessibility is neutralization - especially, it would appear, the species of •decrease-in-technicality and the 'non-technical' aspect of •non-technical paraphrase, which are in many cases an absolute prerequisite for the fulfilment of the lay-oriented skopos. Without these shifts, the TTs would in all likelihood be largely incomprehensible to lay readers. At the extreme of the cline is found personalization/individualization, which consists of species whose significance has been shown (in some cases) to go beyond lay-orientedness, being specifically concerned with reorienting the texts to a readership of patients. In this way, the cline may also be taken to reflect the degree to which the genera are likely to occur outside the particular type of rewriting investigated: personalization/individualization may well be specific to SPC-into-PIL INTRA, whereas neutralization is likely to be a characteristic of lay-oriented INTRA as such, yet unlikely to occur outside lay-oriented INTRA in any significant measure. Further up the cline, the genera are more likely to occur in other types of rewriting also, with structural reorganization a probable feature of any kind of translation (INTRA or TRP), albeit hardly to the extent encountered in the present investigation.
Chapter 9. Conclusion: research contributions and research avenues

9.1. Theoretical contributions

In terms of theory, the contributions of this dissertation are mainly to be found within translation theory. As for linguistic theory, the investigation has relied on the SF interpretation of the organization and functioning of language, but only limited contribution has been made to the development of SFL. Certain weaknesses in the theory have been noted, especially in the modelling of the contextual stratum as a tripartite construct (Field, Tenor and Mode), whose individual parameters were criticized for being in some cases not sufficiently clearly defined. It was pointed out that there is a marked potential for the development of SF theory in the extension of the relatively crude contextual parameters into degrees of delicacy similar to those achieved at the stratum of lexicogrammar. With regard to the lexicogrammatical stratum, the Hallidayan description (i.e. SFG) has been accepted more or less wholesale, but reservations were expressed with regard to a certain aspect of the 'grammar-lexis cline hypothesis', viz. the postulate that the systemic distinctions in the grammatical zone of the cline may be extended into the lexical zone, and hence that it would be possible to model lexical distinctions as a continuation of grammatical ones. The view taken here is that much more charting of the intermediate zone assumed to link grammar and lexis is needed for the postulate to become sufficiently persuasive. However, since this thesis belongs within TS, and not linguistics, it has been written with no ambition of contributing to the solution of these problems.

Instead, as mentioned above, the theoretical contributions of this thesis lie within translation theory. Most importantly, the thesis has contributed to the inclusion of INTRA in the concept of translation, and hence in the object field of TS. This was achieved by critically examining the traditional assumption of interlinguality as a defining characteristic of translation, and by adopting a non-essentialist position which entailed abrogating the criterial status of equivalence. As repeatedly emphasized in this thesis, STs and TTs in the specific type of INTRA investigated here often do not 'mean the same', but this was shown to be a characteristic of traditional, interlingual translation as well. Instead, a definition of the concept of translation was arrived at which posited the following, criterial elements: derivation from a source text, relevant (i.e. skopos-dependent) similarity, mediation and semiotic border-crossing. Moreover, a definition of INTRA was achieved through modification and expansion of the translation typology proposed by Gottlieb (2008a). While certain aspects of Gottlieb's TRP typology were amended, most of his INTRA categories were accepted, but the particular category relevant to the present thesis (termed paraphrase by Gottlieb (ibid.)) was redefined in the light of SF theory, viz. as interregisterial INTRA, and the category was shown to be a superordinate one that had to be further sub-divided, viz. into expert-oriented and lay-oriented interregisterial INTRA, respectively.

9.2. Methodological contributions

Methodologically, the primary contribution of the thesis consists in the operationalization of SFG for translation analysis. As mentioned in the introductory chapter, the applicability of certain parts of SF theory has enjoyed long-time recognition in TS, e.g. in connection with translation quality assessment (see section 1.4.), but this is not true of the SF grammat-
tical accounts and their usefulness to the analysis of translation shifts. What this thesis has achieved is the formulation of a comprehensive analytical framework scaffolded on the parameters of SFG, i.e. grammar-lexis cline, rank, metafunction and axis. One part of the framework, the one concerned with shifts in the grammatical zone of the grammar-lexis cline, was derived purely from SFG, whereas in the lexical zone a number of categories were adopted from Chesterman's (1997) typology, though integrated into the SFG-based framework, which meant classifying the lexical shift types according to metafunction and axis. Moreover, certain categories were introduced which were absent from, or only implicitly part of Chesterman's typology. Finally, a third super-category (of shift types not describable in lexicogrammatical terms) was taken over from Chesterman, with a number of individual categories adopted to compensate for certain lacunae in the SFG-based apparatus. The framework as a whole was shown to be applicable to INTRA and TRP alike, i.e. both types of intrasemiotic translation (or, to be quite correct, the two types of intrasemiotic translation in which both sides of the ST-TT divide consist in verbal language).

In spite of the care taken to assert the broad applicability of the analytical framework, it (the framework) might in fact be criticized for not being comprehensive enough in scope, being confined to verbal types of intrasemiotic translation. Considering the translation-theoretical stance adopted in this thesis, i.e. that the concept of translation must be expanded to encompass any kind of semiotic border-crossing, a methodology applicable to inter- and intrasemiotic translation alike would indeed be desirable, and the formulation of such a framework might be identified as a future methodological research avenue for TS. Moreover, formidable as the challenge appears, some indication may be given here as to how such a task might be approached: first, point of departure must be taken in a 'diagnosis' of the limitations that make the present analytical apparatus inapplicable to anything but verbal, intrasemiotic translation (INTRA and TRP). These 'shortcomings' can be found to reside in the fact that the framework is modelled to capture shifts at the stratum of lexicogrammar, which appears to be exactly what makes it inoperable vis-a-vis intersemiotic translation. This is because, as previously mentioned, verbal language as a higher-order semiotic (see section 4.1) is characterized by having a stratum of lexicogrammar with its own internal organization, intervening between the stratum of meaning (semantics) and the stratum of expression (phonology). This was shown to be absent from a type of semiotic such as proto-language, i.e. the infant stage of language development (see section 4.1), which was characterized by the direct association between meaning and sound without any intervening stratum. If this semiotic 'architecture', i.e. the direct conjunction of expression and meaning, is taken to apply to non-verbal semiotic modes as well (pictures, music, gesture etc.), an analytical framework applicable to inter- as well as intrasemiotic translation would have to be formulated at the stratum of meaning. Such a project may even be feasible, considering Kress and van Leeuwen's (2005: 15) observation that the same three general functions realized by verbal language, i.e. the ideational, the interpersonal and the textual metafunction known from SF theory, are in fact inherent in any semiotic mode. This is the case because:

Any semiotic mode has to be able to represent aspects of the world as it is experienced by humans. In other words, it has to represent objects and their relations in a world outside the representational system [i.e. it has to have an ideational function]. (Kress and van Leeuwen 2005: 42)
Any semiotic mode has to be able to project the relations between the producer of a (complex) sign, and the receiver/reproducer of that sign. That is, any mode has to be able to represent a particular social relation between the producer, the viewer and the object represented [i.e. it has to have an interpersonal function]. (Ibid.)

Any semiotic mode has to have the capacity to form texts, complexes of signs which cohere both internally with each other and externally with the context in and for which they were produced [i.e. it has to have a textual function]. (Ibid.)

Thus, an analytical apparatus for intra-, as well as intersemiotic translation based on the Hallidayan conception of semantics may be within the bounds of realism.

9.2.1. Evaluation of the analytical framework: the translation analyst's dream
Having accounted for the methodological contribution of this thesis above, what remains in this connection is an evaluation of the functionality of the apparatus vis-à-vis translation analysis. Thus, a critical appraisal of the framework might take issue with what may sometimes appear to be an overwhelming degree of granularity in its distinctions. Admittedly, the granularity has sometimes made the framework strenuous in application, although, of course, analysts' convenience can never be a serious consideration. In fact, the most serious criticism that may be levelled against the framework is that it is not fine-grained enough. This is because the specificity of the lexicogrammatical categories of SFG was intended to safeguard the very reliability of the analyses. The broader categories of less detailed frameworks found e.g. in textbooks on translation were deemed suitable for didactic purposes (see section 6.2), but unsuitable for analytical purposes, because too broad and vaguely defined. The reliance on SFG (grammatical and lexical categories) enabled the analytical categories to be defined with much more rigour, and the highest hopes of an SFG-inspired translation analyst, therefore, would be to see the lexicogrammatical categories of SFG expanded to cover all shifts occurring in any type of translation. In other words, the ambition would be to have the apparatus extended into the area covered by the 'pragmatic' super-category of shift types. Admittedly, some of the 'pragmatic' categories must be accepted as being logically indispensable. This includes categories such as •omission and •addition, the reason being that only derivational shifts are logically analysable in lexicogrammatical terms: in the absence of lexicogrammar on one side of the ST-TT divide (as is the case with •omission and •addition), lexicogrammatical categories are logically inapplicable. The real challenge, on the other hand, resides in the category termed •paraphrase. Sub-divisions of this category were established, some of which did in fact incorporate lexicogrammatical parameters (e.g. •clausal paraphrase), but still the category must be deemed considerably broader in scope and less rigorously defined (see section 6.6.7) than most of the lexical and grammatical categories. The only remedy, it appears, would be for the systemic descriptions of SFG to be extended much further in delicacy, i.e. well into the lexical zone. The reason is that •paraphrase often involves shifts between lexical items too far apart to count as •synonymy, and hence the possibility of charting the exact paradigmatic 'route' from one item to the other would require much more systemic mapping of lexical territory. However, considering the previously mentioned formidable of this task, this must indeed remain 'the grammarian's dream' (and the translation analyst's!), to quote Hal-
9.3. Empirical contributions

Apart from contributing empirical results, the empirical investigation constitutes the other important component in the contribution to opening up INTRA as a hitherto neglected research area within TS. As pointed out in the introductory chapter and in the literature review in section 4.4.2, empirical investigation of especially lay-oriented INTRA is next to non-existent.

Empirically, the contribution of the thesis consists in the findings emerging from the investigation of SPC-into-PIL INTRA. These findings constitute the answers to the research questions, which will be repeated here for good measure:

RQ1: What is the range, nature and relative prominence of the specific types of micro-level strategies identifiable in the derivation of PILs from SPCs?

RQ2: On the basis of the nature and range of micro-level strategies identified in answer to RQ1, what genera (of strategies) may be induced as key principles of lay-oriented INTRA?

In answer to the first question, the whole range of shift types recorded in the corpus was charted in chapter 8, and the nature of each individual species, as manifested in the texts, was detailed (with a few exceptions - see section 8.2.6.10). The investigation uncovered an extremely diverse range of species, numbering 68 altogether and registered across the three metafunctions, across ranks and in both the grammatical and the lexical zone of the gramm-lexis cline, as well as in the category not describable in lexicogrammatical terms (the 'pragmatic' category). Moreover, in answer to the question of prominence, a quantitative element was introduced to establish the relative frequency of the individual species. This part of the investigation also revealed extreme diversity: the species were grouped in four bands of frequency, and a pattern of 'inverse proportionality' emerged: the higher the frequency, the smaller the number of species in a band. Thus, a small handful of very prominent species were identified at one end of the spectrum and a much longer list of rare ones at the other end. Once again, the nature of this specific inquiry (the quantitative investigation) must be emphasized: it was quantitative by being numerical (the occurrence of the individual species was counted), but owing to the diverse 'size' and nature of the items quantified (the shift types), and owing to the rather crude definition of frequency bands and to the limited size of the corpus, no statistical inferences were in any way possible. Rather, the inference to be made from the four-band categorization pertains to the likelihood of prominence in the population as a whole. In other words, the higher the frequency of a given species in the corpus, the greater the likelihood of prominence in the population of SPC-into-PIL text pairs as a whole. Thus, the five individual members of the 'top band', which were all highly frequent across the corpus, are likely to be prominent ones in the population as a whole also. What the nature and size of the corpus do not allow is inference to the whole population of the exact relative frequencies of the species. Given a larger corpus, the...

---

190 What is referred to as 'micro-level strategies' in RQ1 has been termed shift types since chapter 6.
individual species might well have to change membership of frequency bands (e.g. 'one band up' or 'one band down'). Yet, it may be noted that in spite of the limited size of the corpus, the quantitative findings were in general relatively consistent, i.e. the level of frequency manifested by a given species was in general relatively uniform across the individual text pairs. Never were e.g. 30 instances of one and the same species found in one text pair but only 2 in another of comparable length. Thus, in view of this consistency and in view of the high degree of homogeneity that characterizes the two text types, it may be hypothesized that were the investigation to be reproduced in a larger corpus, the relative frequencies would be approximately the same.

In answer to RQ2, a typological hypothesis was formulated which consisted in the induction of seven genera of shifts: *structural reorganization, ideational variation, clarification, concretization, dilution/de-compacting, neutralization and personalization/individualization*. These genera were induced according to the nature of the individual species' contribution to the rewriting, especially in relation to the lay-oriented skopos, resulting in a typology intended to reflect the general mechanisms of lay-oriented interregisterial INTRA. Thus, whereas the grouping into 'frequency bands' of the individual species of shifts in the corpus could only (and even with clear reservations) be generalized to SPC-into-PIL INTRA, the seven-genus typology was formulated to represent the key principles of lay-oriented INTRA as such. However, in this connection the 'cline hypothesis' presented in section 8.5.2. should be emphasized, i.e. the hypothesis that the seven genera form a cline in their degree of lay-orientedness. Thus, the genus termed *structural reorganization* was hypothesized to be the one most likely to be prevalent in other types of rewriting also; *neutralization* was hypothesized to be the 'core' genus in terms of lay-orientedness, and it was surmised that *personalization/individualization* might well be specific to SPC-into-PIL INTRA. A corollary of these hypotheses is the following: if further species were to be registered in other specific types of lay-oriented INTRA, they will either be subsumable under the seven above-mentioned genera (most likely, in fact, one of the six other than *personalization/individualization*), or form a new genus specific to the particular type of lay-oriented INTRA in question. It may be hypothesized, however, that the likelihood of new species turning up is limited. This is because, as mentioned several times, a wide and highly diverse range of species pertaining to all parameters of lexicogrammatical organization was uncovered in the present investigation. Hence, if new species appear, they are most likely to be few.

### 9.4. Research perspectives

Several times in this thesis, INTRA has been profiled as an underresearched area of TS, and further exploration of this field therefore remains an obvious research avenue. This includes those other types of INTRA only briefly mentioned in chapter 4, such as INTRA between dialects and sociolects, but also further research into other types of interregisterial INTRA: *expert-oriented* interregisterial INTRA appears to be a wholly uninvestigated phenomenon, and other specific types of lay-oriented INTRA similarly await further exploration. Moreover, a further avenue would be a *comparative* investigation of the two branches of interregisterial INTRA. Thus, while it may be hypothesized that the patterning of shift types in lay-into-expert INTRA is the opposite of that uncovered in expert-into-lay,
such a hypothesis would be in serious need of empirical testing.

Like the present investigation, the above suggestions would all belong in the purely descriptive branch of TS. However, there may also be certain applied uses to be derived from the present findings. Most obviously, the analyses of this thesis might fruitfully be fused with investigations into the readability of PILs, for descriptive as well as prescriptive purposes: first of all, readability research has uncovered a number of features in the PILs which have been found counterproductive to readability (for references, see section 4.5.2). Shift analysis of SPC-into-PIL INTRA, on the other hand, would be able to explain, or at least add to the explanation of poor readability in the PILs, by identifying the types of derivation (shift types) responsible for the problematic types of wording. The answer, nevertheless, may well turn out to be relatively simple: in section 8.1.4, the 'translationese' (source-text interference) of lay-oriented INTRA was identified as the lack of sufficient rewording, i.e. as DT of ST wordings. This gives rise to the hypothesis (completely unsubstantiated though it is) that DT may be a significant cause of poor readability in the PILs. Whereas the prescriptive inference of this hypothesis - were it to prove correct - would consist in a rather simple, negative recommendation, viz. to avoid or minimize DT, positive recommendations may also be derived from the findings of the present study. This may be relevant in so far as the advice of style guides concerned with lay-oriented texts (e.g. Becker Jensen 1998; 2007) may not be sufficient in the production of a text type like PILs, considering that PILs are derivational products, written to be consistent with an anterior, expert-oriented text. Thus, advice à la "avoid technical terms and choose lay terms instead" (cf. ibid.: 125) may not be sufficient, since, as the analyses of the present study have shown, technical terms may be reworded in a number of ways (e.g. through decrease-in-technicality with or without expansion, hyperonymy etc.). Therefore, in order to identify what specific shift types, e.g. in connection with the rewording of technical terms, are the most likely facilitators of accessibility, a possible research avenue would consist in user testing of the various possibilities. A specific hypothesis to be tested in this way is also the one advanced in section 8.2.6.8, i.e. that shifts in TYPE OF MODIFICATION from [pre-] to [postmodified] lead to enhanced accessibility. Such a claim is only properly corroborable/falsifiable through user testing. Yet other hypotheses to be tested in this way concern shifts in e.g. THEME SELECTION from [marked] to [unmarked] and shifts from modulated declaratives to imperatives, both of which types have been argued (from a purely grammatical point of view) to be conducive to accessibility, but which have nevertheless turned out to be only relatively sparsely manifested in the corpus. User testing would be needed to ascertain whether such shifts ought to be employed in greater measure in SPC-into-PIL INTRA. Altogether, the results of such tests would form the basis of concrete recommendations, equalling the conversion of shift types into INTRA techniques that may guide future SPC-into-PIL translators.

\[191\] For the distinction between shifts and techniques, see section 6.1.
Summary in English

This PhD thesis is concerned with an area of Translation Studies which has hitherto received little attention, viz. intralingual translation. More specifically, it is concerned with the charting of the micro-level translation strategies (shift types) occurring in the intralingual rewriting of an expert-oriented text type (as STs) into a lay-oriented one (TTs).

With regard to data, the TTs belong to a user-oriented medical genre, the so-called Patient Information Leaflet (PIL), whose comprehensibility is essential to end receivers (consumers of medicine) and even mandated by EU law. In the EU, PILs in all other languages than English are in fact the product of a double set of translational processes, involving interlingual translation as well intralingual derivation. More specifically, all non-English PILs have been translated from an English version, whereas the English PIL is in itself a translational product, being intralinguially derived from the specialized text type named Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC) which lays out the ‘technical details’ of the medicinal product.

The incorporation of intralingual derivation in the concept of translation reflects the theoretical basis of the thesis, which is R. Jakobson's (1959/2012: 127) tripartite typology, according to which intralingual as well as intersemiotic derivation count as translation on a par with interlingual transfer. The specific type of intralingual translation involved in the derivation of a PIL from a SPC is lay-oriented interregisterial derivation, involving a shift in contextual values like formality and technicality in the rewriting from a specialist-oriented to a lay-oriented text type. In its conception of register, the thesis is theoretically based on the linguistics of M. A. K. Halliday, who stresses the interrelation of context and text, viewing register, or text type, as the textual correlate of a particular configuration of contextual parameters of which target readership is one.

Methodologically, the investigation is based on the traditional type of approach known from comparisons of interlingual source and target texts, viz. the ‘coupled-pairs’ method, involving detailed lexicogrammatical comparison of ST and TT micro-segments. The analytical framework is primarily derived from the grammatical theory of M. A. K. Halliday and C. M. I. M. Matthiessen, whose Systemic-Functional Grammar (SFG) has been operationalized in the investigation of lexicogrammatical shifts between a source text and its interregisterially derived TT. SFG, however, has proved unable to capture all shift types occurring in translation, which is why the framework has been supplemented by a number of concepts adopted from A. Chesterman (1997).

Empirically, the investigation has accomplished two things: on the one hand, the whole range and the nature of the individual micro-level shift types occurring in SPC-into-PIL INTRA have been charted. Moreover, the relative prominence of these individual types has been established, though without recourse to any statistical methods. Thus, a small number of extremely frequent shift types have been identified, viz. direct transfer, addition, explicitation, paraphrase and lexical decrease in technicality. Apart from this, larger groups of less frequent types have been identified.

Secondly, on the basis of the range and nature of the shift types charted in the analyses, a typologizing hypothesis has been formulated which consisted in the induction of genera of shifts in lay-oriented intralingual translation. Seven such genera have been formulated, viz. structural reorganization, ideational variation, clarification, concretization, dilution/de-
compacting, neutralization and personalization/individualization. The typology was cou-
pled with the hypothesis that the seven genera form a cline of lay-orientedness: the further
along the cline (corresponding to the order in which the genera are mentioned above) a
genus is located, the higher the degree to which it is deemed to contribute to the lay-
orientedness of the TTs. The genus termed structural reorganization is thus held to com-
prise shifts that may well occur in any kind of translation, be it intra- or interlingual,
whereas at the opposite pole personalization/individualization was deemed likely to be
exclusive to the rewriting of SPCs into PILs as a specific type of lay-oriented INTRA. Of
the seven genera, the one termed neutralization was hypothesized as the central one in lay-
oriented INTRA as such, i.e. central in the fulfilment of a lay-oriented TT skopos.
Dansk sammendrag


Hvad angår data, tilhører målteksterne en medicinsk genre, nemlig de såkaldte indlægssedler, som i medfør af EU-lovgivning er underlagt et krav om at være let forståelige for modtagerne, dvs. den almindelige medicinforbruger. I EU er indlægssedler på alle andre sprog end engelsk faktisk at betragte som oversættelsesprodukter i dobbelt forstand: de er alle interlingvalt oversat fra den engelske version, men ydermere er den engelske version i sig selv et resultat af en oversættelsesproces, idet den er intralingvalt afledt af den specialiserede teksttype som kaldes *Summary of Product Characteristics* (SPC) indeholdende produktets tekniske specificationer.


Hvad angår empiriske resultater, er der med undersøgelsen opnået to ting: på den ene side set er det lykkedes at kortlægge hele spændvidden af de *shift types* som forekommer i omskrivningen af SPCer til indlægssedler, samtidig med at der er gennemført en karakteristik af de enkelte *shift types* sådan som disse manifesterer sig i omskrivningen. Yderligere er der foretaget en bestemmelse af de enkelte typers hyppighed - dog uden nogen som helst
brug af statistiske metoder. Opgørelsen har indkredset en lille gruppe af meget hyppigt forekommende shift types, nemlig de som på engelsk benævnes direct transfer, addition, explicitation, paraphrase og lexical decrease in technicality. Derudover har opgørelsen identifieret andre, større grupper af mindre hyppigt forekommende typer. For det andet er der på baggrund af kortlægningen af de forekommende shift types og de enkeltes beskaffenhed formuleret en typologi bestående i syv 'genera', altså en gruppering efter 'art'. De syv genera er (på engelsk) structural reorganization, ideational variation, clarification, concretization, dilution/de-compacting, neutralization og personalization/individualization. Typologien er suppleret med den hypotese at de syv genera kan indplaceres på et kontinuum som afspejler hvor næverdt dets medlemmer er forbundet med den undersøgte type omskrivning (SPC til indlægsseddel), og i hvor høj grad det enkelte genus kan siges at bidrages til indfrielsen af måltekternes lægmands-orienterede skopos: jo længere henne ad skalaen et genus er indplaceret (og rækkefølgen svarer til den ovenfor nævnte), i jo højere grad bidrager dets enkelte medlemmer til det specifikke formål som består i at gøre målteksterne læsbare for den almindelige medicinforbruger. Det genus der er benævnt structural reorganization, må således betragtes som bestående af shifts som kun er perifert forbundet med det nævnte skopos, og som må forventes at forekomme i enhver slags oversættelse (inter- som intralingval). I den anden ende af skalaen, derimod, er det forventeligt at personalization/individualization er unik for lige præcis omskrivningen af SPCer til indlægssedler. Det genus som er benævnt neutralization, kan derimod fortolkes som det centrale i lægmands-orienteret henseende.
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