



Catford's shift model of translation: a drama-based critical inquiry

Esmail Kalantari¹ and Amin Karimnia²

¹Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Fars Science and Research Branch, Iran

²Department of English, Islamic Azad University, Fasa Branch, Fars, Iran.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 1 August 2011;

Received in revised form:

22 September 2011;

Accepted: 30 September 2011;

Keywords

Shift,
Translation,
Drama,
Linguistic Element.

ABSTRACT

Assessment of Catford's (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) shift model of translation should not be simply seen as an applied model in translated scripts. There seems to be a need for more critical investigations on the model to bring forth its shortcomings when it is applied in translating dramas, since dramas differ from other types of scripts in that they are written to be played and the translation should evoke the same response to what has already been evoked by the original. Also, the shifts proposed in Catford's (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) model seem not to be of the same value and determining the degree of importance of each of these types of shift can be helpful in translator training. The article is trying to achieve these objectives by putting randomly selected twenty sentences of a play written by Woody Allen (1975) named "Death Knocks" and its translation by Hooshang Hessami (1376) in discussion. It was stated how different values might be attached to the types of shifts introduced by Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008). Besides, it was discussed how the similar response in drama translation could be achieved in the target language, i.e., Persian through a new type of translation shift.

© 2011 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Bell (1991) speaks about art and translation; according to him, translation is the expression in another language (or target language) of what has been expressed in the source language, in a way in which semantic and stylistic equivalences are preserved. Also, "the modern Anglo-American and Russian school of Translation Studies has claimed translation to be the form of literary activity aimed at producing the same communicative effect by means of interpretation of the source text; and the interpretative and communicative nature of translation is most clear in translating drama". Alenkina (2007, p. 1). Besides, Larsen (1984) believes that translation is the process that is based on the theory that is possible to abstract the meaning of a text from its original in the target language. Nida (1964) stresses that the responses of the ST and TT readers should be comparable. In drama responses are of great, if not the greatest, importance as the purpose of acting different types of drama is to achieve a somewhat same response.

"Drama is the specific mode of fiction represented in performance. The term comes from a Greek word meaning "action" (Classical Greek: δράμα, *drama*), which is derived from "to do" (Classical Greek: δράω, *drao*). The enactment of drama in theatre, performed by actors on a stage before an audience, presupposes collaborative modes of production and a collective form of reception. The structure of dramatic texts, unlike other forms of literature, is directly influenced by this collaborative production and collective reception" (From wikipedia, the free encyclopedia, p. 1).

Bassnet (1988, p. 3) notes: "Translation is rendering of a source language (SL) text into the target language (TL) so as to ensure that the surface meaning of the two will be approximately similar and the structures of the source language will be preserved as closely as possible but not so closely that the target language structures will be seriously distorted". In translation

shifts are of crucial importance to reach the ideal equivalence defined by Baker (1998, p. 77) as "the relationship between a source text ST and a target text TT that has allowed the TT to be considered as a translation of the ST in the first place". The number of shift occurred in translation seems to be in part related to genre of the translated text. If it is a play, based on the above mentioned facts about the features of translating dramas and the definition of drama, there seems to be a more fertile ground for shifts to occur. In plays, shifts are taken to task not only to make the script natural but to carry the features intended by the author to be acted. Therefore, as it turns out, other types of still unrecognized shifts take place.

Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) and Kitty van Lueven Zewart (1989, as cited in Munday, 2008) have introduced different types of shifts- they will be fully explained in the section of review of literature. But the question is, to what extend these shifts suffice and cover the mismatches in the assessment of a translation especially while a translated play is being assessed.

Paving the same path, the current study has faced some units or parts of them where some changes have been detected but not any categories or names. This is while in the above mentioned shift model the assumption is for the model to be responsible for all possible changes or shifts. Also, it is to be examined that the range of occurrence for each type of shifts displays a meaningful difference.

There are many occasions seen where the translator has - as s/he had to- manipulated the original text and in most of those occasions there seem to rest a logic behind the manipulation since the attempt is to provide the performers as well as the audience with the atmosphere built by the original. Besides, taking into account the introduced shifts by Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) in plays, one faces some kind

inefficiency of the model. An example investigated by this research is Woody Allen's "Death Knocks" and its translation. In this play, twenty sentences have been randomly selected and Catford's model (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) of shifts has been employed in order to theorize the well reasonable manipulations. But as mentioned above, the model fails to cover the shifts in this translation. Now, are the present shift models working enough in the case of drama translation? Doesn't it smell a need for a new shift to come forth? If it is so, what may the name of that new shift be? However the present study is not to answer these questions, it is aimed at drawing attentions to those shortcomings by exemplifying some randomly selected sentences of the mentioned play.

Literature Review

The term shift is used in the literature to refer to changes which occur or may occur in the process of translating. Since translating is a type of language use, the notion of shift belongs to the domain of linguistic performance, as opposed to that of theories of competence. Hence, shifts of translation can be distinguished from the systemic differences which exist between source and target languages and cultures (Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies, p. 1).

The term shift was introduced by Catford (1965). In Translation Studies, Munday (2008, p. 55) stated that: "shift is, small linguistic changes occurring in translation of source text"; and as Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) states, there are two types of shift, i.e., level shift and category shift. According to him, level shift is something expressed by grammar in one language and lexis in another. The example is Russian word *igrat* meaning, *to play* and *sigrat* meaning, *to finish playing*. Another example is the French conditional "trios tourists *auraient été tués*" corresponding to a lexical item in the English sentence "three tourists *have been reported killed*". Providing Persian example consider "the car" and its Persian translation "ân mâšîn" ¹ where the English grammatical "the" is translated into lexical "ân" in Persian.

Besides, as Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) states category shifts are comprised of four kinds: *structural, class, unit or rank and intra-system* shifts which are fully explained by catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) as follow: "*Structural shifts* which are the most common ones are the shifts in grammatical structure. For example, the *subject pronoun+ verb+ direct object* is the structure of sentence "I like jazz" in English. But, the *indirect object pronoun+ verb+ subject noun* is the structure of Italian translation "mi piace il jazz". The Persian example would be: " mæn šâm mikhoræm. " ² with subject+ object+ verb structure which is the translation of "I eat dinner." With subject+ verb+ object in English. *Class shifts* are defined as shifts from one part of speech to another. Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) points to the English sentence "*the medical student*" and the French "*un étudiant en médecine*" as examples where the English premodifying adjective *medical* is translated by adverbial qualifying phrase "*en médecine*". In Persian the adjective "khob" is the translation of the adverb "well" in "I speaks well." and its Persian translation "mæn khob hærf mizænæm." ³ *Unit shifts* and *rank shifts* take place when

the translation equivalent in the target language is at the different rank to the SL- rank refers to the hierarchical linguistic units of sentence, clause, group, word and morpheme (no example provided by him). The Persian example is: translating the word "psycholinguistics" as "motexæsesân-e râvânšenâsi-e zæbân" ⁴ which is a clause rather than a word." *Intra-system shifts* happen when the SL and TL have approximately corresponding systems but, where the translation involves selection of a non-corresponding term in the TL system. Catford (2000) considers *number* and *article* systems between French and English and he states that although similar systems operate in two languages, they do not always correspond. Thus, *advice* (singular) in English becomes *des conseils* (plural) in French, and the French definite article *la* in "Il a la jambe cassée" corresponds to the English indefinite article "a" in "he has a broken leg". Persian can be related to Arabic language as languages with approximately corresponding systems.

Another scholar in this area is Kitty Van Leuven-Zwart (1989, as cited in Munday, 2008). The comparative model by Leuven-Zwart (1989, as cited in Munday, 2008) has been a practical one proposed for studying syntactic, semantic, stylistic, and pragmatic shifts within sentences, clauses, and phrases of literary texts and their translations. Van Leuven Zwart's model (1989, as cited in Munday, 2008) is a comparative- descriptive model too, which divides selected passages into *comprehensible textual units* called *transemes*. For example, the sentence "she sat up quickly" is classed as a transeme, as it is corresponding Spanish TT phrase "se enderéo". Then she talks about the term *architranseme* as an invariant core sense of ST transeme. So, here the architranseme is "to sit up". Now a comparison is made between each separate transeme with architranseme and the relationship between the two transemes is established. Van Leuven Zwart's shifts division is as *modulation, modification and mutation*. In modulation one of the transemes tallies with the architranseme but, the other differs either semantically or stylistically. In the example above, the "sit up" would be classed as modulation since the English phrase vs. Spanish one has the extra element "quickly". Besides, modification is a case, in which both transemes show some form of disjunction- semantically, stylistically, syntactically, pragmatically, or some combination of these- compared to the architranseme. The example given by Van Leuven Zwart (1989, as cited in Munday, 2008) is, "you had to cry" and "hacia llorar" (it caused you to cry). And finally, mutation is put in discussion as a situation where it is impossible to establish an architranseme. This may be caused by addition, deletion or some radical change in meaning in the TT.

Methodology

Method and Data Collection

The article is trying to make use of models available in the field of Translation Studies which are about shifts taking place during the semantic transference in translation. One of these models is Catford's (2000) shift model in translation in which five types of shifts, i.e., level, structural, class, unit and intra-system, have been introduced. His model is based on categorizing and putting into name the observable changes as the units of translation in both SL and TL. Here, a famous play written by Woody Allen (1935) is under investigation and

¹ â: sounds /a:/ like "Amish" /a.mɪʃ/ š: like "she" /ʃi:/ : sounds /ʃ/

² â: sounds /a:/ like "Amish" /a.mɪʃ/ æ: sounds /æ/ like "apple" /æpl/ š: like "she" /ʃi:/ : sounds /ʃ/

³ æ: sounds /æ/ like "apple" /æpl/

⁴ â: sounds /a:/ like "Amish" /a.mɪʃ/ æ: sounds /æ/ like "apple" /æpl/ š: like "she" /ʃi:/ : sounds /ʃ/

twenty sentences have been randomly selected in order for the model to be applied on.

Data Analysis Procedure

The above mentioned twenty sentences were compared to their Persian equivalences in order to first, find the occurrence degree of each of them out, so that the objective of attaching different values to each type can be achieved. Secondly, through this comparison there were areas observed where a kind of unnamed shift occurs.

Findings and Results

Based on purpose sampling method twenty sentences of Woody Allen's play were selected and brought in appendixes as well as their translation by Hooshang Hessami (1376). Each pair of numbers includes both SL and the equivalent TL so that, possible shifts which may have occurred are detectable. According to these English sentences and their Persian equivalents the following table is designed to show the level of frequency observed for each shift type. Stars are taken as the signs for occurring shifts.

Now, let's calculate the number of each type of shifts. According to the table, within the twenty examples only in one case level shift has happened. Structural shift has happened in thirteen cases, class shift in two cases, and unit shift in five cases. This is while there is no trace observed for intra-system shift. Obviously, the result of the calculation shows meaningful differences among different shift types in accordance to total sum relating to each type. As it turns out, the structural shift displays an astonishing difference in comparison to others and this is totally in line with our expectation. Besides, class and unit shifts are showing almost a similar level, meaning they are occurring with a close rate within the translation. And finally, what attracts our attention is, intra-system shift which as the figure confess has not been observed at all. This does not mean that there is no place accountable for this kind, but at least one can conclude that this kind is very rare.

The conclusion of this part of data analysis would be as, since structural shift happens very often and automatically due to the structural specific feature of each language and since, Intra-System shift happens very rarely because of being bounded to this condition that both SL and TL must be of same origin, they are of less importance, that is to say that if they are neglected, no big hurt the translation will feel. What about unit and class types? As the figures display a logical rate of occurrence, this means that they are logical and therefore important shifts; meaning if the translator's eyes are closed to them there will be an unacceptable change in the meaning of the translation.

Keeping in mind the other objective of this study, let's see the amount of efficiency of this model in general. Leaving alone the level of frequency of each type of shifts, there are also some changes made by the translator while translating from English into Persian which although seem to be well reasonable, the current shift theories do not support them. This might be caused by whether the still unnamed shifts are not necessary or there rest some short comings within the shift types proposed by Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) in drama translation. Let's put some of these instances from this short play in discussion.

DEATH: Broke. It didn't break. It's a little bent. Didn't you hear?

/marg:/ šekâst, yâni nâškâst. ye khorde kâj šod. to chizi nâšnidi?⁵

With a close look we will soon find out that in sentence "it didn't break" is translated into "/yâni nâškâst /" in "5". What if it had been translated as "/nâškâst /" then the whole sentence would be "/šekâst, nâškâst /" which is neither natural nor dramatic enough in the middle of the play to be said. One might quibble that this is sort of explicitation, but the addition of an element is called explicitation if that element is presented to clarify the meaning of the SL chunk.

Here, no clarification is required and the word "/yâni /" is just added to bring about naturalness and maybe to keep the dramatic features of the sentence. As mentioned before, the skopos of translating dramas, if political issues and power relations neglected, is to receive the response in the target language equally to what already received by the original. Does the translation make people laugh or cry as the original has done before? Do the linguistic elements in the TL imply the impression which is conveyed by the SL linguistic elements?

In the example above, Woody Allen has used the structure "Broke" "It didn't break" Immediately after each other in order to, as it is slightly felt, show a sort of embarrassment in the character; this is while the Persian equivalent without the addition of the word "/yâni/" is not natural nor dramatic since the chunk like "/šekâst, nâškâst /" does not imply any sense of embarrassment.

Therefore, for the Persian structure to be equal to the English one, concerning dramatic features, the translator had to add an extra lexical element. This is to say that the wanted impression is not achieved by equal linguistic means in Persian and English languages. Notice the following equation:

SL impression = TL impression if SL structure = TL structure + additional linguistic elements
In order to breathe balance to the equation the null sign can be added to the SL structure as follow:

SL impression = TL impression if SL structure + Φ = TL structure + additional extra elements
Therefore, according to above equation: [Φ = additional linguistic element] meaning, the unseen capacity of the SL is shifted to linguistic elements in the TL. By unseen capacity of the SL here we mean that the sense of embarrassment which has been manifested in the SL by certain linguistic elements is not manifested in the TL by equal ones and in order to reach the sense of embarrassment as well as naturalness in the translation, the extra element / yâni / had to be added.

Notice the following examples:
DEATH: M&M's. What if the President came? He'd get M&M's, too?

/marg:/ / kâlbâs? bebinâm, âge reis jomhor omâde bod khonâet chi? be on hâem kâlbâs dodî midâdi?⁶

In the above example the English sentence "what if the president came?" is translated into "/bebinâm, âge reis jomhor omâde bod khonâet chi?/" in Persian. The Persian sentence has the extra elements / bebinâm / and /khonâet/ by which the translator has tried to provide the same impression to the SL impression. Here we are dealing with two extra elements but we

⁵ â: sounds /æ/ like "apple" /æpl/ š: like "she" /ʃi/ : sounds /ʃ/

⁶ â: sounds /a:/ like "Amish" /a:mɪʃ/ â: sounds /æ/ like "apple" /æpl/ š: like "she" /ʃi/ : sounds /ʃ/

can only account one of them as a shift from Φ to linguistic element. The first word which is brought in the beginning of the sentence doesn't seem to be a necessary one since the SL sentence could possess the word "see" and the dramatist has already decided on the absence of this element.

Therefore, it cannot be concluded that the use of this word was aimed at bringing about naturalness or the same impression. This is while, the second word /khonâet/ seems to be a well-reasoned one to be added to the translation; In Persian it certainly is more natural and meaningful to say: "/bebinâm, âge reis jomhor omâde bod khonâet chi?/" in comparison to the same translation without the word /khonâet/. Notice that the English sentence bears the same impression without the word "house" which is the synonym for the Persian one.

Also in this part of the dialogue,

NAT: I must fall on the floor, eh? I can't be standing over a sofa
when it happens?
/nat:/ / hâlâ hætmæn bâyâd biyoftâm kâfe otâgh?nemiše roye
kânâpe vâysâde bâšâm?/⁷

The same cause has influenced the process of translation. In the beginning of the Persian translation the phrase / hâlâ hætmæn / is added. / hâlâ / is the synonym for the word "now" and /hatman/ is the synonym for the word "sure" in English. If these words had been added to the SL, the dramatist would have meant falling on the floor exactly at the time the sentence was being told. In the translation these two shifts from Φ to lexical elements have occurred but did not cause to change the time of the SL and have kept the time meant by the dramatist. This is because in Persian the phrase / hâlâ hætmæn / is often used in the sentences only to stress what is going to happen and the word / hâlâ / doesn't make the time of the sentence present. Here, the SL sentence by its current elements especially the sound "eh?" at the end of it includes the same impression to what has been tried to make by the use of / hâlâ hætmæn / in the TL sentence. Notice that without these shifts the TL sentence would lose its naturalness as well.

And here,

DEATH: It is not interesting for you?

/marg:/ / hæmintoriš bârât jâleb nist?/⁸

The sentence "it is not interesting for you?" Is translated into "/hæmintoriš bârât jâleb nist?/. Again, the SL sentence could have been translated as "/in bârâye to jâleb nist?/" but, since it is more – as it is the matter of degree in this case-dramatic, the translator has added the word "hæmintoriš" to the original one in order to raise the same impression; what the impression exactly is, may be a function of different contexts.

These examples imply that there exist some another type of shift that occur during the translation from SL to TL but they are not theorized yet. This shift is more detected if a play is under investigation since dramatic features in such texts are of great importance; they are going to be played and a group of people are going to be impressed by that. These two factors urge the translator to transfer the similar effect of the SL by the means of the words as they have already urged the writer of the original to put them into words. So, having the duty of carrying above mentioned features, such a shift is necessary to happen and if so,

it must be named something and introduced to the field of Translation Studies.

Conclusion

According to the present study, on one hand, the shifts introduced to the field of translation studies do not occur with the same rate in the process of translation; some of them come up very often and other very rarely. On the other hand, shifts- as already have been assumed to be- are not just represented among linguistic elements, there are cases in which a kind of shift is necessary between an unseen capacity of the SL shown as Φ sign and linguistic elements of the TL.

So, this might not be wrong to conclude that: first, the shift types introduced by Catford (2000, as cited in Munday, 2008) are not of the same value concerning affecting the translation; as two of them are more important to the process of translation. Second, there seem to be another type of shift occurred while translating- especially if it is a play where the text needs to be speakable as well as containing the dramatic features- which there is no room accounted for that in the present models.

Consequently, there is a need for paying attention to the degree of importance for each type of shifts in translator training courses and also defining some room for still an unnamed shift as complementary efforts for shift models of translation.

Esmail Kalantari is an M.A student in Translation Studies and is preparing his M.A thesis at Islamic Azad University, Science and Research Branch, Fars, Iran.

Amin Karimnia is affiliated with the Islamic Azad University, Fasa Branch, Iran. He has published some papers in both ISI and non-ISI journals and has presented his articles at national and international conferences. His research interests are in the area of Discourse analysis, Sociolinguistics, Pragmatics, Translation and their interface with the issues in English Language Teaching.

References

- Alenkina, T. (2007). Translating Drama: From John Wilson's "The City of the Plague" to Alexander Pushkin's "Pir vo Vremya Chumy". Available from: http://aatseel.org/100111/pdf/program/2007/29d1_3alenkina_tatyana.pdf. [Accessed 16/4/2011].
- Allen, W. (1975). *Death knocks, From getting even*. Published by W. H. Allen.
- Baker, M. (1992). *In other words: A coursebook on translation*. London: Routledge.
- Bassnett, S. (1991). *Translation studies. Revised edition*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Bell, R. (1991). *Translation and translating: Theory and practice*. London and New York: Longman.
- Catford, J. C. (1965). *A linguistic theory of translation: An essay in applied linguistics*. London: Oxford University Press.
- From Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia. (accessed on line). Drama definition. Available from: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drama>. [Accessed 16/4/2011].
- Hesami, h. (1376). /mârg dêr mizânâd/. Persian translation of death knocks. Tehran: Tajrobe publication.
- Larsen, L. (1984). *Meaning based translation. A guide to cross language equivalence*. Lanham: University press of America.
- Munday, J. (2008). *Introducing translation studies: Theories and application*. London and New York: Routledge.

⁷ â: sounds /a:/ like "Amish" /a:ml/ æ: sounds /æ/ like "apple" /æpl/ š: like "she" /ʃi:/ : sounds /ʃ/

⁸ â: sounds /a:/ like "Amish" /a:ml/ æ: sounds /æ/ like "apple" /æpl/ š: like "she" /ʃi:/ : sounds /ʃ/

Nida, E. A. (1964). *Toward a science of translating: With special reference to principles and procedures involved in bible translating*. Leiden: Brill.

Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. (accessed on line). Shifts of translation.

Available from: <http://www.bookrags.com/tandf/shifts-of-translation-tf/>. [Accessed 6/5/2011].

Appendix

1) DEATH: Death. You got a glass of water?

1') /marg/: / ærz kârdâm- ke, mærg. bebinâm ye livân âb peidâ miš- e?/

2) DEATH: Is it Halloween?

2') /marg/: /emšæb šæb- e jæšn- e ghedisi chiziy- e? /

3) DEATH: Then I'm Death. Now can I get a glass of water - or a Fresca?

3') /marg/: /pæs mæn mærgâm dige. Hâlâ miše ye livân âb yâ âb mæ'dâni, chizi behem bedi?/

4) NAT: If this is some joke -

4') /nat/: /in yejor šokhiy- e.../

5) DEATH: Broke. It didn't break. It's a little bent. Didn't you hear?

5') /marg/: / šekâst, yâni næškâst. ye khord- e kâj šod. to chizi næšnidi?/

6) NAT: Sure, what do you care? You guys probably have all your expenses paid.

6') /nat/: / mælom- e næbâyâdam bærây- e jenâb âli mohem bâše, hætmæn bær o bâche- hâ mækhâreje šomâ ro pærdâkhtând./

7) DEATH: M&M's. What if the President came? He'd get M&M's, too?

7') /marg/: / kâlbâs? bebinâm, æge reis jomhor omæde bod khonât chi? be on hæm kâlbâs dodi midâdi?/

8) DEATH: It is not interesting for you?

8') /marg/: / hæmintoriš bærât jâleb nist?/

9) NAT: Oh, I can't wait for that! Is it going to hurt?

9') /nat/: / vây tâghâteš ro nædârâm, dârd hæm migire?/

10) NAT: I must fall on the floor, eh? I can't be standing over a sofa when it happens?

10') /nat/: / hâlâ hætmæn bâyâd biyoftâm kâfe otagh? nemiše roye kânâpe vâysâde bâšâm?/

11) DEATH: Because you fall on the floor! Leave me alone. I'm trying to concentrate.

11') /marg/: / bærâye in ke miofti kâf- e otâgh, velâm kon. nâsâlamâti bâyâd tæmærkôz dâšte bâšâm- hâ.

12) NAT: Why must it be on the floor? That's all I'm saying! Why can't the whole thing happen and I'll stand next to the sofa?

12') /nat/: / mæn fæghât migâm cherâ kâfe otâgh? hæmin! cherâ nemiše hæmeye on majêrâ vâghti etefâgh biofte ke mæn kenâre kânâpe istâde bâšâm?/

13) DEATH: My hand is like a basketball score.

13') /marg/: / dâste mæn- ro nâgo ke kheyli khit- e./

14) DEATH: If you didn't talk so much.

14') /marg/: / æz bæs ver zâdi to! /

15) DEATH: How would you like it if I got insulted quickly?

15') /marg/: / khošet miyâd pošte sâr- e hæm behem tohin beše?/

16) NAT: I said you look like me. It's like a reflection.

16') /nat/: / mæn goftâm to šæbihe mâni, engâr sibi ke æz vâsâet nesf kârdeh bâšând./

17) DEATH: I knew I shouldn't have thrown that nine. Damn it.

17') /marg/: / goftâm næbâyâd on noh ro mindâkhtâm. Lænâti./

18) NAT: Look who I'm dealing with.

18') /nat/: / mæn ro bebin bâ ki moâmele kârdâm./

19) DEATH: What are you talking about? You're going to the Beyond.

19') /marg/: / hich mifâhmi chi migi? Mage genâb âli næbâyâd beri on vâer?/

20) NAT: Hello, Moe? Me. Listen, I don't know if somebody's playing a joke, or what, but Death was just here.

20') /nat/: / ælo! Moe? Mænâm. Goš kon. Nemidonâm kasi bâ mæn šokhiš gerefte bode yâ chiz- e dige, be hæz hâl mærg hæmin hâlâ injâ bod.

Table 1: Level of Frequency for Each Type of Shifts

SAMPLES	LEVEL SHIFT	STRUCTURAL SHIFT	CLASS SHIFT	UNIT/RANK SHIFT	INTRA-SYSTEM SHIFT
01	---	---	---	*	---
02	*	---	---	*	---
03	---	*	---	---	---
04	---	---	---	---	---
05	---	*	---	---	---
06	---	*	---	---	---
07	---	*	---	---	---
08	---	---	---	---	---
09	---	---	*	---	---
10	---	*	---	---	---
11	---	*	---	---	---
12	---	*	---	---	---
13	---	---	---	*	---
14	---	---	---	*	---
15	---	*	---	---	---
16	---	*	---	*	---
17	---	*	---	---	---
18	---	*	---	---	---
19	---	*	*	---	---
20	---	*	---	---	---