Text Creation in Non-professional Translation: The Case of Repetition

Ewa Data-Bukowska
Jagiellonian University, Kraków

Den här artikeln analyserar förekomsten av enkla lexikala upprepningar i den så kallade "tredje koden" som representeras av 25 polska översättningar av en svensk icke-litterär text. Den fokuserar på motivationer som kan ligga bakom översättarnas olika beslut som gäller upprepningens användning och undvikande inom de insamlade texterna. Denna typ av undersökning gör det möjligt för oss att bättre förstå de processer som styr textproduktionen i översättningen, vilket kan betraktas som relevant för framtida forskning.

1. Introduction

Tannen's observation that "there is a universal human drive to imitate and repeat" (Tannen 1987: 215) has been confirmed by recent linguistic research. Discourse analysis points to the multifaceted presence of repetitions as a vital construal for indicating socio-cultural and language-cognitive contents (e.g. Johnstone 1987; Tannen 2007 [1989]). It has been also proved that repetition plays an important role in building text cohesion and coherence structure (e.g. Halliday & Hasan 1976; Harweg 1986). Yet the role of repetition in the so-called "third code" (Frawley 1984: 169) needs to be examined in more detail. How is repetition used in creating a text in translation – a text that is understood as a representation of another text and at the same time a text in its own right? Do translators sustain their established everyday language practice and resort to repetitions frequently e.g. by adding them into the target text? Or do they avoid repetitions, thus resorting to a strategy that is presumed a universal tendency in translation (Baker 1993)? What motivates the use of repetition in the process of translation? My article addresses these questions through the analysis of sample Swedish-Polish translations.

Research on repetition in translation is scare and the findings seem rather incoherent (see e.g. Abdulla 2001; Ali 2005; Blum-Kulka 1986; Boase-Beier 1994; Jabr 2001; Jawad 2009; Károly 2010; Klaudy & Károly 2000, 2002). In the field of Swedish-to-Polish translation no investigation upon this category has yet been undertaken. My article examines the use of one type of repetition, i.e., simple lexical repetition, defined as an at least double occurrence of a lexical

item in a given passage (see Tarasheva 2011: 6–13). Additionally, it focuses on motivations underlying translational decisions pertaining to the use of repetition within the collected translated texts. This kind of in-depth investigation of the diversity of approaches taken by translators was expected to enable us to better understand processes governing text production in translation and to improve the future research methods within the field of repetition.

2. The purpose and method of the research

The purpose of my study was to provide answers to the following research questions:

1. To what extent is repetition used by beginner translators within a single text?
2. Can the translators' translation decisions be regarded as common, i.e., concerning the majority (more than 50%) of the target texts/the analysed structures,[1] or rather should they be treated as elements of their individual styles (see e.g. Boase-Beier 2006)?
3. What motivations may underlie the translators' decisions as to the use of repetition?

My sample data consisted of a non-literary Swedish text (218 words) and its 25 Polish translations prepared by trainee translators (fourth-year students at the Department of Swedish Philology at Jagiellonian University of Kraków, who had just started the translation practice course).[2] An important condition for the collection of the data was to preserve the authenticity of the translators' behaviour. The students were asked to translate the text as if for an ordinary Polish readership. Texts were translated independently in the natural environment of each translator, who had dictionaries and other reference material at his/her disposal. All translators worked from their second language (Swedish) into their first language (Polish). They had a relatively good command of their L2, but certainly it was worse than their command of their L1 (the native language). The translations have been numbered 1–25 and when they are quoted in this text, they are referred to by these numbers.

For the purposes of the study, 14 translation units were selected to form the basis of the investigation. In comparison with other studies, e.g. Klaudy & Károly (2000, 2002), Károly (2010), the method of selecting the units for the purpose of the analysis was modified. Those studies analysed only the repetitions occurring in the ST, and then their realizations in the TT. I analysed identical lexical repetition and the translators' decisions in the following three linguistic settings (described thoroughly in 3 below):

---

[1] The limit of more than a half of repetitions recorded in each analysed case corresponds in practice to the occurrence of this phenomenon in thirteen and more target texts respective in eight and more TT structures.

[2] The source text was taken from Jan Svensson's compendium of text analysis *Kompendium I, Språklig textanalys*, Lund 1995, p.16.

3.1. when repetition was used in the ST;
3.2. the ST included structures that enable and enhance the use of repetition in the TT;
3.3. repetition was used in the TT spontaneously.

Category labelled as 3.1 above included all but one repetitions in the ST which were located within no more than two sentences.[3] Category 3.2 comprised all clearly elliptic structures in which repetition could have potentially been used.[4] Because one of the goals of the analysis was to investigate the collected translations as regards accidental repetitions, a principle was accepted that if such a phenomenon occurred in one of the target texts, the realization of the relevant ST structure was then investigated in all the remaining texts as well. Last but not least, taking into consideration Baker's (1993: 243) definition of translation universals that are conceived as "features which typically occur in translated text rather than original utterances and which are not the results of interference from specific linguistic systems", it was proved that all the investigated instances represent optional shifts of repetition (i.e. shifts which depend on the translator's decision)[5].

The use of repetition in the collected data was examined horizontally (in all the collected translations of the ST) and vertically (within each translated text). As the analysis of the collected target texts was cognitively inspired (see Jääskeläinen 2012) and focused on a better understanding of processes governing text production in translation, not on adequacy, *all* realizations of a given unit in the target texts were taken into account, even if some of the translators failed to render the sense of the original successfully. This in turn was connected with the assumption that "the third code" (as defined by Frawley 1984) may be seen as *interlanguage* (Toury 1980: 71–77) that can represent different levels of development in the human mind. For the same reason no editing corrections to the collected texts were made.

It should be emphasised, then, that the method used in the presented investigation enabled us to find out not only whether the investigated phenomena may be seen as universal but also to what extent they are individual characteristics of the translator's style.

---

[3] The analysis left out one repetition of a linguistic unit which did not fall into any category identified in the study and was translated into Polish incorrectly by the great majority of translators. This decision also helped to keep the proportions between the analysed units.

[4] As Swedish and Polish show differences in expressing ellipsis it was proved that all the investigated structures potentially may have their elliptical/non-elliptical equivalents in the target language (see Maciejewski 1991).

[5] Accidental lexical repetitions forced by systemic differences between Swedish and Polish (for example pertaining to expression of passive voice) were excluded from the analysis.

3. Description of the analysed structures

The analysis included the following types of conceptualization:

3.1 Repetition used in the ST

3.1.1 Anaphoric reference with a demonstrative pronoun

The Swedish text contained three cases of anaphoric reference based on the following schema: noun X → anaphoric demonstrative pronoun *denna* (variously inflected) + noun X. They represent the most prototypical way of building cohesion (and coherence)[6], based on strong coreference both in Swedish and in Polish. In the examples below the structures analysed were put in bold and underlined.

*(3.1.1a) Enligt förslaget slopas sjukförsäkrings**avgiften** för löntagarna. Och samtidigt avskaffas avdragsrätten för **denna avgift** redan vid 1976 års taxering.*

*(3.1.1b) Ett extra **avdrag** för lägre inkomsttagare införs. För pensionärer blir **detta avdrag** 500 kronor.*

*(3.1.1c) Den skattesänkning som den nya reformen medför äts till en del upp av höjningar av **kommun- och landstingsskatten**. **Dessa skatter** höjs med i genomsnitt en och trettiofem.*

3.1.2 Lexical repetitions of hyponymic character

The structures included in this category are based on the relation between a unit used in a narrower sense and the same unit used in a broader sense. In this case, the main function of the repetition is to preserve the clarity of content. The coreference is less clearly marked than in conceptualizations in (3.1.1).

*(3.1.2a) Lägsta **kommunalskatten** i landet får Danderyd utanför Stockholm med tjugoen och sextiofem medan Härjedalens kommun torde få den högsta **skatten** över tjugoåtta kronor.*

*(3.1.2b) Procentuellt är skattesänkningen störst vid **årsinkomster** upp till 20 000 kronor medan den i kronor räknat blir störst vid **inkomster** mellan 50 000 och 100 000 kronor.*

The conceptualization presented below belongs to the category of hyponymic structures, because the repetition here is based on the relation between the complex noun phrase and the subsequent simple definite nominal phrase. However, this is a less prototypical example of category 3.1.2, as it involves strong coreference. Thus, it can be regarded as a link between categories 3.1.1 and 3.1.2.

---

[6] In this article we adopt the point of view that cohesive devices at the surface level of the text contribute to the coherence of this text by making its unity clearer to the receiver (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981).

*(3.1.2c) Finansminister Sträng presenterade i dag **det <u>förslag</u> till skattereform** **som är följden av vårens Haga-uppgörelse med Folkpartiet**. <u>**Förslaget**</u> föreslås träda i kraft vid årsskiftet och innebär skatesänkningar för de flesta löntagare.*

3.2 ST structures that enable and enhance the use of repetition in the TT

This category consists of various elliptical structures. In (3.2.1a) and (3.2.1b) the ellipsis occurs as part of the compound, whereas in (3.2.2) it is part of the cataphoric construction.

*(3.2.1a) Ramen för de nya skattelättnaderna ska vara 4 miljarder kronor. Och det ska finansieras genom **höjda arbetsgivar<u>#</u>- eller social<u>avgifter</u>**.*
*(3.2.1b) Den skatesänkning som den nya reformen medför äts till en del upp av höjningar av **kommun<u>#</u>- och landstings<u>skatten.</u>***
*(3.2.2) Procentuellt är <u>**skattesänkningen**</u> störst vid årsinkomster upp till 20 000 kronor medan **den <u>#</u>** i kronor räknat blir störst vid inkomster mellan 50 000 och 100 000 kronor.*

In order to emphasize the mutual influence of neighbouring structures on the use of repetition in translation, the sentence preceding conceptualization (3.2.2), which for the sake of clarity was labelled (3.2.2a), was also included in this category, even though this kind of conceptualization, based on anaphoric reference, belongs to structures discussed in point 3.1 above and it was analysed as such in the study. The analysed input structure is then as follows:

*(3.2.2a) [...] och innebär <u>**skatesänkningar**</u> för de flesta löntagare. Procentuellt är <u>**skattesänkningen**</u> störst vid årsinkomster upp till 20 000 kronor medan [...].*

A different kind of ellipsis is illustrated in example (3.2.3):

*(3.2.3) Dessa skatter höjs med i genomsnitt en och trettiofem. Lägsta <u>**kommunal**</u>skatten i landet får **Danderyd <u>#</u>** utanför Stockholm med tjugoen och sextiofem medan **Härjedalens <u>kommun</u>** torde få den högsta skatten över tjugoåtta kronor.*

Here the relevant information is *kommun*, 'municipality,' stated explicitly with reference to *Härjedalen*, but omitted in the context of *Danderyd*. The place of omission was marked by #. This example is particularly interesting, because the situation in the ST makes it possible to assume that if the translator used a repetition providing the content lacking from the sentence, it would be the result of his or her analysis of the whole conceptualization, for the elliptic expression *precedes* the linguistic unit containing the explicit construction. It is also important to take into account the unit *kommunalskatten* 'municipal tax,' in which the relevant information – 'municipality' – is mentioned in the previous

context, which may have impact on the process of inference. It can therefore be stated that if a repetition were used with reference to *Danderyd*, it would be a case of extreme linguistic redundancy.

In (3.2.3) there is yet another structure enabling repetition. It was labelled (3.2.3a). The ellipsis marked by # refers to *kronor* 'Swedish crowns' stated explicitly further in the text.

(3.2.3a) *Dessa skatter höjs med i genomsnitt en och trettiofem. Lägsta kommunal-skatten i landet får Danderyd utanför Stockholm med tjugoen och sextiofem* **#** *medan Härjedalens kommun torde få den högsta skatten över tjugoåtta* **_kronor_**.

Another type of ellipsis is illustrated by (3.2.4), where the implied information is skatt/skatter 'tax/taxes'.

(3.2.4) *Av de kommuner som hittils beslutat i* **_skattefrågan_** *är det omkring hälf-ten som kommer att höja* **#**.

3.3 Repetition used in the TT accidentally (not categorized as either 3.1 or 3.2)

A starting point for the analysis of repetitions in translation can also be the target text. The analysis of collected translations makes it possible to single out a group of occasional repetitions used by some translators. In the collected material there are three such cases which, however, refer to the same input ST structure based on anaphoric pronominal reference. Since the repetition occurs here instead of the pronoun *det*, whose content is maximally schematic and which draws the reader's attention to complex conceptual content created in the previous discourse, this conceptualization was classified as enhancing the use of repetition and was analysed jointly with category 3.2.

(3.3.1) *Ramen för de nya skattelättnaderna ska vara 4 miljarder kronor. Och* **det** *ska finansieras genom höjda arbetsgivar- eller socialavgifter.*

4. Findings

The extent to which translators are willing to use repetition, and to which they try to vary the content in translation is presented in the table 1 below. The repetitions used in the TT were marked with X. The shadowed area refers to the repetitions used in the ST. The remaining cases concern structures which enhance the use of repetition. The table takes into consideration conceptualizations order in the ST (see the Appendix).

In the case of eight of the analysed structures – (3.1.1a), (3.1.1c), (3.1.2a), (3.1.2b), (3.1.2c), (3.2.1a), (3.2.3), (3.2.3a) – repetition was used by over 50% of

Table 1. The relative number of occurrences of repetitions in the collected translations with reference to conceptualizations order in the ST

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	Total	%
1	3.1.2c	×	(×)		×	(×)	×	(×)	×	×	(×)	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×		×	×	×	×		20	80
2	3.2.2a		×		×		×			×	(×)		×			×	×	×	×	×		×				×	12	48
3	3.2.2	×						×					×											×			4	16
4	3.1.2b	×	×	×!	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×!	×	×	×	×	×	×	×!	×	-	×!	×	×	×	21	84
5	3.1.1a	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×		×	×		×	×	×			×	×	×	×	×	17	68
6	3.1.1b	×	×	×			×			×	×	×					×	-		×		(×)	×	×			11	44
7	3.3.1		×			×										×								×			3	12
8	3.2.1a	×		×	×	×	×	×			×	×	×	×		×	×		×				×	×	×	×	16	64
9	3.2.1b																										0	0
10	3.1.1c	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×	×	×	×			×	×	×		18	72
11	3.1.2a	×	×		×		×	×	×	×	×	×!	×		×	×		×	×			×	×	×	×	×	16	64
12	3.2.3	×!	×!	×	×!		×!	×!	×	×!	×!			×!	×!	×!		×!				×!		×!	×!	×!	17	68
13	3.2.3a	×	×	×	×		×	×	×	×			×	×		×	×		×	×	×	×		×	×	×	17	68
14	3.2.4	×			(×)		(×)			×		(×)						×		(×)		×					8	32
Total		9	8	6	9	6	8	9	5	10	8	5	7	7	6	7	6	7	7	7	2	8	7	11	8	7		
3.1:(3.2+3.3)		5:4	5:3	3:3	5:4	4:2	5:3	5:4	3:2	7:3	6:2	3:2	4:3	4:3	5:1	4:3	5:1	5:2	5:2	5:2	1:1	5:3	6:1	6:5	5:3	4:3		

the translators (i.e. thirteen or more). This means that the phenomenon concerns the majority of the analysed ST structures. The number of repetitions regarding each of these structures reached 64-84% of the collected texts. Thus, from the global point of view, we may conclude that repetition is a strategy used commonly by non-professional translators, even though in the examined cases it would be possible to formulate content in a different way and avoid repetition altogether. The phenomenon consists not only in reproducing repetitions already existing in the ST, but also in adding repetitions in places where there are ST structures that enhance it. On the other hand, when it comes to the so-called accidental repetitions in the TT, the analysis failed to confirm their common character.

The representation of the category of repetition in translation becomes more complex when we focus on particular types of structures. It can be noticed that certain ST constructions are more conducive to content repetition in the TT. The vast majority of repetitions used in the collected material belong to category 3.1, which makes it possible to conclude that the phenomenon consists in copying the input structures. The only exceptions here are conceptualizations (3.1.1b) and (3.2.2a), in which content repetition was reproduced in less than 50% of the translations. Interestingly, copying the repetitions was the most intensive not in the case of anaphoric referential structures, whose function was to establish the most prototypical cohesive bonds, but in the case of conceptualizations based on hyponymic constructions. It is worth noting that in some of those cases the effect of repetition was even strengthened in the translation (marked by '!'), which conceptualization below representing a translation of (3.1.2b) illustrates. The translator repeated the structure *roczne dochody* (*årsinkomster*) 'annual incomes' in a narrower sense twice, though the ST repetition was based on hyponyms *årsinkomster / inkomster* 'annual incomes / incomes'.

*Procentowo obniżka podatków byłaby największa w przypadku **rocznych dochodów**, nieprzekraczających 20 000 koron, jednak licząc w koronach, najwięcej skorzystają Ci, których **roczne dochody** mieszczą się w przedziale od 50 000 do 100 000 koron.* (3)

From these observations we can also conclude that avoiding repetition in texts translated by beginner translators is marginal. That is why the thesis as to its universal character, as postulated by Baker (1993), cannot be confirmed.

The representation of the repetition is more polarised when it comes to elliptical structures – particularly (3.2.1b), (3.2.2), (3.2.4) and (3.3.1). In the case of three structures – (3.2.1a), (3.2.3), (3.2.3a) – repetition occurred frequently, i.e. in 64% and 68% of the translations. The rendering of (3.2.1a) below, in which the item *składki* (*avgifter*) 'contributions' is repeated, illustrates this kind of conceptualization:

*Ma to być sfinansowane przez środki uzyskane z podwyższonych **składek** pracodawców i **składek** socjalnych.* (1)

However, in the majority of the analysed elliptical structures, repetition was used no more frequently than in 50% of the texts. Of particular interest here is conceptualization (3.2.1b), in which none of the translators used repetition, even though this conceptualization very closely resembles that of (3.2.1a), where repetition was used in many translations. Example below shows one of renderings of (3.2.1b):

> *Obniżenie podatków, które niesie ze sobą nowa reforma, jest częściowo bilansowane podwyższeniem **podatków** lokalnych (gminnych i regionalnych).* (12)

Thus, on the basis of the collected material, the tendency to add repetition by beginner translators cannot be confirmed either.

Yet another image of repetition emerges when the translations are analysed individually. Does it mean, then, that the translators' decisions in this field should be treated as an aspect of their individual style?

The material gathered suggests three types (profiles) of the translator: the 'maximalists' chiefly act according to the ST structures, and if such structures allow repetition, they use it. Texts (23), (9), (1), (4) and (7) can be included in this group. The 'minimalists,' on the other hand, consistently avoid repetition. They treat the structures that enable the use of repetition in the TT only as a source of conceptual content and not pattern of its organization. This group includes translation (20), in which only two repetitions were identified, as well as translations (8) and (11), each of which contains five repetitions. The authors of these translations used repetition only in some clearly justified cases. For example, in (11) repetition was used as a result of splitting a long and complex ST sentence in (3.1.2a), which created the need to build coherence between the emergent separate elements and to add the item *podatek* (marked by #) 'tax':

> *Najniższy **podatek** gminny w kraju otrzyma Danderyd pod Sztokholmem. #**Podatek** będzie równy 21,65%. Natomiast Härjedalen powinno otrzymać najwyższy **podatek**, wynoszący powyżej 28 koron.* (11)

In the case of (20) repetition occurs in conceptualization (3.2.3a) as a necessary means of explicitation serving a better understanding of the text (see Klaudy 2001: 80-84). This may motivate the use of repetition of the item *koron* (#) 'crowns' in example below:

> *Najniższą w skali kraju wartość podatku lokalnego w wysokości 21,65 #**koron** zapłacą mieszkańcy gminy Danderyd pod Sztokholmem, podczas gdy w gminie Härjedalen będzie on najwyższy i wyniesie ponad 28 **koron**.* (8)

In such translations the TT undergoes considerable cohesive modifications.

The remaining 17 translations can be placed in between these two extremes. They contain 6–8 repetitions, which constitutes 42.85–57.14% of the analysed structures. It should be emphasized, however, that only five of the translators in this group used repetition in over 50% of the structures analysed – (2), (6), (10), (21) and (24).

Taking into consideration this factor sheds new light on the phenomena discussed here, since it turns out that the limit of 50% of repetitions used in the translated texts was observed in the work of only a minority of the translators (i.e. nine out of 25 people who took part in the experiment). On the basis of the analysis a conclusion can be drawn that in the vast majority of the translated texts, when looked upon individually, the tendency to use repetition as a means of verbalizing conceptual content cannot be observed. Thus, repeating content seems to be a characteristic strategy of only *some* of the translators. However, we cannot speak about a holistic approach to the text by the translators. Their decisions seem rather incoherent and accidental as it is shown in the table 1. In this context, Firth's claim that "unity is the last concept that should be applied to language" (Firth 1935: 67–68, quoted after Laviosa 2002: 9) can be evoked.

Can we say, then, that particular translators tend to avoid repetition? The analysis of the structures in the first category makes it possible to say that most of the translators (i.e. 20) used at least four exact copies of the seven repetitions occurring in the ST. This means that in non-professional translation reproducing repetitions is much more common than avoiding them. Hence, also when the translated texts are considered individually, the thesis about the universal character of avoiding repetition cannot be confirmed.

The translators who are characterized by the tendency to avoid repetition constitute the minority in the group analysed. Such a strategy was identified in seven texts. Particularly interesting is text (20), whose translator was nearly fully successful in avoiding repetition altogether, by getting rid of it six times.

In the case of elliptical structures, only four translators – (1), (4), (7) and (23) – introduced additional repetitions into more than 50% structures. Ten translators used repetition three times (42.85%). Thus, it shows clearly that introducing additional repetitions as a marker of the translator's individual style is also a marginal phenomenon.

5. Motivation

Let us have a look at some factors which may have caused translators' decisions in the most salient situations.

In (3.1.2b) and (3.1.2c), which in the ST contain hyponymic structures, the frequency with which the repetition is reproduced is the largest in the whole of the material gathered. A question arises then, why the repetition is reproduced so frequently with this kind of structures? One of the reasons may be the character of those units. They serve not only to build the coherence of the text, but first and foremost, to keep the level of its explicitness, which is meant to facilitate its comprehension by the reader. That is why using repetition here is not only cognitively economical (it requires a minimal conceptual effort on the part of the translator while reproducing the content of the original), but also communicatively useful. The minimal effort produces, therefore, a maximal effect.

In (3.1.1b) and (3.2.2a) the repetitions were preserved to a much lesser extent than in the remaining cases in category 3.1. The analysis so far has not made it possible to pinpoint any possible reasons for such a situation in (3.1.1b). In the case of (3.2.2a) a decisive factor may be the conceptual density between items in the text. The density of the conceptualization under question seems to be lower than e.g. of (3.1.1a), since the first item is taken as plural while the second one as singular – thus, they display a lesser degree of coreferentiality. That is why copying that relation is a less obvious strategy and the translator may be encouraged to re-organize the conception.

In (3.2.1b), on the other hand, no repetition of content was used, even though formally the structure resembles very closely that of (3.2.1a), whose realization involved repetition in 64% of the translations. A possible explanation for this may lie in the degree of complexity of the input structure, concerning rather the conceptual, and not formal, level of the sentence, as well as in target culture members' familiarity with the object of conceptualization.

An important factor in (3.2.1a) is the resulting translation difficulty of finding Polish equivalents for the Swedish concepts. To establish them one has to refer to a complex system of knowledge about the Swedish tax system, which is not identical to the Polish one. Translating such notions requires using longer and more informative linguistic constructions, which runs contrary to keeping the elliptical character of the ST expression. Example below, in which the item *składki* 'contributions' is repeated demonstrates this kind of cocneptualization:

*Środki te mają być uzyskane przez podwyższenie stawki **składek** odprowadzanych przez pracodawców lub **składek** na ubezpieczenie społeczne.* (3)

Repeating some of the content in such constructions, therefore, seems natural and falls within a broader translation phenomenon of explicitation. If we clarify a point in a text, we are more likely to use repetitions, the more so if the conditions encourage us to do so. At the same time, it is vital to remember that explicitation is by no means limited to repetition. Choosing it, the beginner translator acts economically by minimizing their cognitive effort.

In the case of (3.2.1b) we can speak of a maximal congruence of structures between the source and the target language, which allows for almost immediate reproduction, which requires from the translator less effort connected with processing of conceptual content. Thus, whenever it is possible, the translator seems to choose the more economical way of literal reproduction. Repetition is not used, for when there is no danger that a conceptualization might be incomprehensible or diverge from the norms of the target language, no additional content needs to be introduced to the translation. This, in turn, clearly indicates the cognitive basis of the phenomenon. Translators seem to conform naturally to cognitively motivated principles of the linguistic economy of usage.

Another factor which seems to influence the translators' strategies is the interaction of structures in the discourse, which is confirmed by reproducing con-

ceptualizations (3.2.2a) and (3.2.2). In (3.2.2a), the repetition was reproduced in twelve translations. In the next conceptualization, the repetition was used only in the texts which contained no repetition in the preceding sentence. The only exception here is translation (12), where the repetition occurs in both cases. This claim, however, deserves a more thorough analysis.

In (3.2.3) fifteen translators used repetition as a means of explicitation in place of the ST ellipsis (#). As a result, the same piece of information (referring to the concept of a municipality 'gminne, gmina') was expressed in the sentence for the third time (which was marked with '!' in table 1). The example below illustrates such a situation:

> *Najniższe podatki **gminne** w kraju płacić będzie **gmina** Danderyd pod Sztok-holmem – 21,25 koron na osobę, natomiast **gmina** Härjedalen płacić będzie prawdopodobnie najwyższy podatek – ponad 28 koron na osobę.* (4)

Though the amount of repetitions was possible to reduce:

> *Najniższą w skali kraju wartość podatku **lokalnego** w wysokości 21,65 koron zapłacą mieszkańcy **gminy** Danderyd pod Sztokholmem, podczas gdy w **gmi-nie** Härjedalen będzie on najwyższy i wyniesie ponad 28 koron.* (8)

> *Najniższą w skali kraju wartość podatku **lokalnego** w wysokości 21,65 koron zapłacą mieszkańcy **gminy** Danderyd pod Sztokholmem, podczas gdy w # Härjedalen będzie on najwyższy i wyniesie ponad 28 koron.* (E.D.-B.)

Also in this case we may ask about motivation behind this phenomenon. The repetition in translations of (3.2.3) and (3.2.3a) likewise springs from explicit-ation, i.e. the desire to provide the reader with the information needed to com-prehend the text. The translator's decision is, however, surprising, for the repeti-tion occurs in place of the ellipsis whose content can be freely deduced from the context. On the other hand, this is a piece of cultural information (about Sweden) which potentially can be unknown to the reader. In such a complex situation the translator's concern for the reader, which paradoxically implies underesti-mation, wins out. The translator does not assume that the reader will resort to certain inference processes which will allow him or her to extract the relevant information from the context at hand. The example cited above shows therefore that the principle of "meeting the reader halfway" or, as Pym (2008: 324) refers to it, the translators' strategy to reduce "their personal risk burden" (i.e. the risk of miscomprehension), is deeply rooted in the translator's awareness and may spring from his or her own intuition as a language user. The image of a potential reader of the translation, on the other hand, seems to be governed by its own principles. Its dominating feature is the assumption that s/he is not familiar with the source language culture.

8. Concluding remarks

On the basis of the research presented above, it can be concluded that, from the global point of view, repetition is used by translators to a wide extent, for it pertains to the majority of the constructions analysed in the text. This conclusion, however, is not confirmed when the translations are analysed individually. Only in a few cases can we talk about using repetition as an element of a particular translator's style.

Avoiding repetition turns out to be a marginal strategy when it comes to beginner translators. That is why it cannot be assigned a universal character. The results of the research may suggest that this universal feature, as postulated by translation scholars, is in fact a manifestation of a translation norm adopted by translators in the course of their translation practice. The research yielded similar results when it comes to adding repetition in translation. Both globally and individually, the wide extent of this phenomenon was not confirmed in the material analysed. Using additional repetition of content is limited only to some cases and certain constructions. Therefore, also in this case it is an individual feature of the translators style.

A closer look at the motivations underlying particular decisions on the part of beginner translators concerning the use of repetition in translation sheds new light on possible approaches towards this category in further research. Using repetition by beginner translators seems to have a common denominator which is their uncertainty and fear of taking firm decisions. When it comes to repetitions already existing in the ST, beginner translators mostly resort to loan translation i.e. copying (they do nothing to avoid those repetitions); also in the case of ST structures which favour repetition in the TT, novices mostly reproduce them (which means that they do not add any repetition). According to Lévy (1967) and Ivir (1981) translators resort to the Minimax strategy and look first for formal correspondences in their search for translation equivalents. This tendency is cognitively motivated as it is strictly connected with language users' ambition to economize on mental effort involved in any human action (see e.g. Zipf 1949). The research presented in this article confirms then this claim.

Finally, the occurrence of repetition in translations produced by beginner translators seems to be closely connected with explicitation of the TT content. It can also be viewed as an indicator of difficulty on the part of translators in realizing a given concept in translation. Thus, the main motivation behind the use of repetition in the TT is to provide the reader with the content which, according to the translator, is vital for comprehending the original. It is possible to notice, however, that in using repetition as a means of explicitation, the translator acts on the principle of minimal creativeness and minimal cognitive effort. Instead of modifying the content, he or she repeats the information which has already been expressed in the text and can be extracted by the reader. The Minimax strategy is then confirmed also here. This strategy seems to be safe for the translator, but

it has a significant influence on the TT, which consequently can be regarded as a mere representation of another text rather than a text in its own right.

References

Abdulla, A. K. 2001. "Rhetorical Repetition in Literary Translation." *Babel* 47 (4): 289–303.

Ali, S. S. 2005. "Pertinence and redundancy in poetic repetition: A translatological perspective." *Babel* 51 (4): 337–356.

Baker, M. 1993. "Corpus linguistics and translation studies: Implications and applications." Baker et al. 1993. 233–250.

Baker, M. (ed.). 2001. *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, assisted by K. Malmkjær. London & New York: Routledge.

Baker, M., Francis, G. & Tognini-Bonelli, E. (eds.). 1993. *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Beaugrande de, R. & Dressler, W. U. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Blum-Kulka, S. 1986. "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation." House & Blum-Kulka 1986. 17–36.

Boase-Beier, J. 1994. "Translating Repetition." *Journal of European Studies* 24(4): 403–409.

Boase-Beier, J. 2006. *Stylistic Approaches to Translation*. St. Jerome Publishing: Manchester.

Even-Zohar I. & Toury, G. (eds.). 1981. *Theory of Translation and Intercultural Relations.* Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University.

Firth, J. R. 1935. "The technique of semantics." *Transactions of the Philological Society*. 36–72.

Frawley, W. 1984. "Prolegomenon to a theory of translation." Frawley 1984. 159–175.

Frawley W. (ed.). 1984. *Translation: Literary, linguistic and philosophical perspectives.* London: Associated University Press.

Gambier, Y. & van Doorslaer, L. (eds.). 2012. *Handbook of Translation Studies, Vol. 3.* John Benjamins: Amsterdam/Philadelphia.

Halliday M. A. K. & Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

Harweg, R. 1986. "Wiederholung lexikalischer Elemente und Textkonstruktion." Heydrich & Petöfi 1986. 16–41.

Heydrich W. & Petöfi J. (eds.). 1986. *Aspekte der Konnexität und Kohärenz von Texten.* Hamburg: Buske.

House, J. & Blum-Kulka S. (eds.). 1986. *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation and Second Language Acquisition Studies.* Tübingen: Narr.

Hung, E. (ed.). 2002. *Teaching Translation and Interpreting 4. Building Bridges.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Ivir, V. 1981. "Formal correspondence vs. translation equivalence revisted." Even-Zohar & Toury 1981. 51–59.

Jabr, A.-F. M. 2001. "Arab Translators' Problems at the Discourse Level." *Babel* 47 (4): 304–322.

Jawad, H. A. 2009. "Repetition in Literary Arabic: Foregrounding, Backgrounding, and Translation Strategies." *Meta* 54 (4): 753–769.

Johnstone, B. 1987. "An Introduction." *Text* 7 (3): 205–214.

Jääskeläinen, R. 2012. "Translation psychology." Gambier & van Doorslaer 2012. 191–198.

Károly, K. 2010. "Shifts in repetition vs. shifts in text meaning: A study of the textual role of lexical repetition in non-literary translation." *Target* 22 (1): 40–70.

Klaudy, K. 2001. "Explicitation." Baker 2001. 80–84.

Klaudy, K. & Károly, K. 2000. "The Text-organizing Function of Lexical Repetition in Translation." Olohan 2000. 143–160.

Klaudy, K. & Károly, K. 2002. "Lexical Repetition in Professional and Trainees' Translation." Hung 2002. 99–114.

Laviosa, S. 2002. *Corpus-based Translation Studies. Theory, Findings, Applications*. Amsterdam/New-York: Rodopi.

Lévy, J. 1967. "Translation as a decision process". In: *To Honor of Roman Jacobson, II*. The Hague: Mouton. 1171–1182.

Maciejewski, W. 1991. "Ellipsis in Polish and Swedish: Some Typological Considerations." *Lingua Posnaniensis* XXII–XXXIII: 169–179.

Olohan, M. (ed.) 2000. *Intercultural Faultlines. Research Models in Translation Studies I. Textual and Cognitive Aspects*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Pym, A. (2008). "On Toury's laws of how translators translate." Pym et al. 2008. 311–328.

Pym, A., Shlesinger, M. & Simeoni, D. (eds.). 2008. *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in homage to Gideon Toury.* Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Tannen, D. 1987. "Repetition in Conversation as Spontaneous Formulaicity." *Text* 7 (3): 215–243.

Tannen, D. 2007 [1989]. *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Tarasheva, E. 2011. *Repetitions of Word Forms in Texts: An Approach to Establishing Text Structure*. Cambridge Scholars: Newcastle.

Toury, G. 1980. *In Search of a Theory of Translation*. The Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics: Tel Aviv.

Zipf, G. K. 1949. *Human Behaviour and the Principle of Least Effort. An Introduction to Human Ecology.* Cambridge/Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Press.

APPENDIX

Finansminister Sträng presenterade idag det förslag till skattereform som är följden av vårens Haga-uppgörelse med Folkpartiet. Förslaget föreslås träda i kraft vid årsskiftet och innebär skatesänkningar för de flesta löntagare. Procentuellt är skattesänkningen störst vid årsinkomster upp till 20 000 kronor medan den i kronor räknat blir störst vid inkomster mellan 50 000 och 100 000 kronor. Enligt förslaget slopas sjukförsäkringsavgiften för löntagarna. Och samtidigt avskaffas avdragsrätten för denna avgift redan vid 1976 års taxering. Vidare justeras skatteskalorna för att lindra marginaleffekterna. Ett extra avdrag för lägre inkomst-

tagare införs. För pensionärer blir detta avdrag 500 kronor. Finansministern gav vidare skatteutredningen tilläggsdirektiv för en provisorisk skattereform också för 1976 års inkomster. Utredningen ska bland annat försöka lindra skatten främst för låginkomsttagarna. Ramen för de nya skattelättnaderna ska vara 4 miljarder kronor. Och det ska finansieras genom höjda arbetsgivar- eller social-avgifter. Den skattesänkning som den nya reformen medför äts till en del upp av höjningar av komun- och landstingsskatten. Dessa skatter höjs med i genom-snitt en och trettiofem. Lägsta kommunalskatten i landet får Danderyd utanför Stockholm med tjugoen och sextiofem medan Härjedalens kommun torde få den högsta skatten över tjugoåtta kronor. Av de kommuner som hittils beslutat i skat-tefrågan är det omkring hälften som kommer att höja. Av landstingen har tretton beslutat om skattehöjning medan elva får oförändrad skatt.