

REPETITION IN ENGLISH VS. NON-REPETITION IN SLOVENE: HOW DIFFERENT NORMS OF GOOD WRITING CHANGE THE STYLE OF TRANSLATED TEXTS

Marija Zlatnar-Moe

1. Introduction

In translations from English into Slovene, literary as well as non-literary, there is one stylistic change that appears in nearly every text: repetitions in English texts are avoided in their Slovene translations. This article will show how the rule of non-repetition changes the style of literary translations from English.¹ The rule seems to override orientation to the source among inexperienced translators, and it influences the style and occasionally the contents of translations by even the most experienced translators. The characterization of literary personages, the style of the text, and sometimes the intensity of a scene may be affected.

I will demonstrate these effects with examples from a range of fictional works, and will also discuss some of the possible reasons for the strength of the rule, such as whether norms of good writing taught in schools and style manuals differ between Slovene and English-speaking cultures. Another possible reason is the important role of text editors in Slovene publishing, since they often seem to be more stylistically conservative than translators.

2. Non-repetition in literary translations and how it affects the target text

Non-repetition is one of the most common stylistic shifts in Slovene translations of English literary texts. It appears in all genres, in the work of all translators, from beginners to the most experienced. The rule appears to persist over time since it appears in most recent translations as well as in older ones. The differences in the use of repetition between Slovene and English are not due to linguistic differences between the two languages, as is the case with, for example, the use of the dual in Slovene or present perfect in English. They are due simply to the prevailing opinion on whether repetition is stylistically acceptable and to what degree: In Slovene

¹ I chose to study translations from English, because this is where the results of different approaches to repetition are most visible. It seems likely that this rule also strongly influences original writing in Slovene, as well as the way Slovenes write English texts.

culture, good style means a great deal of variation on the word level and avoidance of repetition. As we shall see, in English-speaking cultures, repetition is not so much of an issue as long as it is used reasonably and does not drift into wordiness.

The decision that a Slovene translator of an English literary text is faced with is primarily whether to opt for a more source-oriented translation or a more target-oriented one. (S)he can decide to produce a translation that will follow the original by using repetition in all instances where it has been used in the source text (running the risk of being seen as a not very good translator) or (s)he can decide to produce a target-friendly translation and look for synonyms or near synonyms for the repeated items in the source text, ignoring the author's choices. In the case of a literary text, this decision is not easy. The translator is not only faced with the two cultures and their rules as to what makes good writing, but also has to take into account her/his own conviction in the matter, as well as the function that repetition has in the source text: it can be used in characterization, for emphasis, to add intensity to a scene, or for other reasons.

For this study, I have chosen seven² literary translations, ranging from popular fiction to canonical literary texts: the two most recent complete translations of Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, Paul Auster's *Brooklyn Follies*, the fifth part of the *Harry Potter* series (*Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*) by J. K. Rowling, *The Color of Magic* by Terry Pratchett, *The Lord of the Rings* by J. R. R. Tolkien, and Nick Hornby's *About a Boy*.

The translations were done by translators with different levels of experience, ranging from young translators, though not complete beginners, to very experienced Slovene literary translators, some of whom have received state prizes.

A striking case in *Harry Potter* is the use of proper names and the translator's strategies for replacing them. In the source text, either proper names or personal pronouns are used. This is the strategy used throughout the series. The solutions in the target text are more varied. To avoid the repeated use of names, the translator decided to use one main description throughout the book (sometimes interspersed with a few others). Thus Harry is often referred to as "the young wizard," Hermione becomes "the young witch," Ron is "the redhead," Neville "the chubby boy," and other students are sometimes referred to as "friend, classmate," etc. Most of the nicknames are neutral, but "the redhead" and "the chubby boy" could be understood as mildly pejorative, especially when compared with the

² More translations were used in the study, for example Haddon's *The Curious Incident with the Dog in the Night* (for details see Noč 2007), and McCarthy's *The Road*, but further examples have been omitted here for the lack of space.

completely neutral use of personal names in the source text. In this case, replacing descriptions with proper names did not influence the content or the atmosphere very strongly. The real problem with repetition in this text is the mechanical way the replacements are made. As soon as there is a danger of a name recurring in the next sentence, it is replaced, resulting in a sequence of references to the same person that looks like this: Harry – 0 – Harry – 0 – Harry – young wizard – Harry – boy – Harry – boy, and so on. Because of its regular use throughout the book, (not to mention the whole series of seven books), this solution becomes very visible and eventually also disturbing³ to the reader.

Similar changes can be found in the Slovene translation of Dan Brown's *The Da Vinci Code*, where names are also frequently omitted or replaced. The translator often decided simply to delete the name instead of replacing it, or replaced it with a pronoun instead of a description. Because of that, the text is not as marked by all the descriptions as that of the first example. There are also examples of replacing a name with a description (Langdon, for example, becomes "the American"), but they are not very frequent.

The next example differs from the first two in that avoidance of repetition actually changes the atmosphere of the scene and renders the participants' feelings less intense. The scene is that of a quarrel between Will and Marcus's mother in Nick Hornby's *About a Boy*, a novel in the popular fiction sub-genre "lad lit." The book alternates between the points of view of the boy (Marcus) and the grown-up (Will). The section analyzed is written from the boy's point of view, which is important, because there were significantly more interventions by the translator in those chapters than in the ones written in grown-up voices. The interventions were often aimed at avoiding repetition and especially polysyndeton. Consider the case of expletives, and in particular one four-letter word that is used in the original with increasing frequency as the quarrel develops (figure 1). The term "fucking" appears six times, while the only item that repeats itself in the translation is the rather mild "vsak zajebani dan posebej." In the other four instances, the translator chose different curses, often much milder than their English counterparts. These changes affect the style because the speaker (Will) appears much less coherent and more upset in the source text, inserting one and the same expletive at ever shorter intervals. In the Slovene, the first three renderings are weaker than the English ones, as are the translations of "sod the pair of you" and "you can piss off." The latter is not even an expletive in the Slovene translation. In the latter part of the quarrel, the Slovene expletives increase in strength, but because they vary,

³ The evidence for this reception can be found on the Slovene Harry Potter fan sites at <http://forum.hpslo.com/>.

they do not achieve the intensity suggested by the constant repetition of the English term. As a result, the character development is harder to spot: in the scene where Will finally loses his cool and does most of the swearing, he appears much calmer in the Slovene version than the English one.

Figure 1. Expletives appearing in Will and Marcus's mother's quarrel

English	Slovene
what the hell	Kaj za vraga
fucking choice	Prekleta izbira
fucking uninvited	Prekleta vrata
I won't fucking bother	Naj me vrag, če ga bom še kdaj
Sod the pair of you	Pojdita v rit, drug za drugim
Now you can piss off	Da vaju več ne vidim tu
Every single fucking day of the week (twice)	Vsak zajebani dan posebej (twice)
How shit everything was	Kako je vse skupaj eno veliko sranje
I used to be a fucking kid	Saj sem bil otrok, jebenti
And I used to go to a fucking school	Tudi jaz sem hodil v kurčevo šolo
Don't give me any shit	Zato mi ne serji

Likewise, in Paul Auster's *Brooklyn Follies*, the translator's reluctance to repeat elements lessens the emotional intensity of the storyteller, in this case a young woman who has just escaped a fanatically religious husband, and who is telling her uncle what had happened to her (emphases mine).

1. I had to choose. It was all or nothing, he said. An act of faith or an act of rebellion. Life with **God** or life without **God**.

Moram se odločiti. Vse ali nič, je rekel. Dejanje vere ali dejanje upora. Življenje z **bogom** ali **brezbožno** življenje.

2. Well, now I had my blouse, and **it was as good as a weapon, as good as a loaded gun**.

No, zdaj sem tudi jaz imela svojo bluzo, **ki je bila prav spodobno orožje, nič slabša od nabite pištole**.

3. **He shook his head. He shook his head**, and I started to cry again and this time it was for real.

[sentence missing] **Zmajal je z glavo** in spet sem začela jokati in tokrat so prihajale solze iz srca.

4. If you try to drag me back there, **I'm gone from your life, gone from your life forever...**

Če me boš še kdaj poskusil odvreči tja, [clause missing] **bom za vedno odšla iz tvojega življenja...**

5. **I probably would have died in that house.** It's that simple, Uncle Nat. **I would have died in that house**, and then my husband and the good Reverend Bob would have carried me out in the middle of the night and dumped my body in an unmarked grave.

Najbrž bi v tej hiši umrla. Tako je to, stric Nat. **Umrla bi** [phrase missing] in David in prečastiti Bob bi me sredi noči odnesla na pokopališče in zakopala moje truplo v kakšen neoznačen grob.

The young woman uses repetition to emphasize the most fateful moments and events in her story, and often repeats not only words and phrases, but clauses and sentences as well to underline the importance of an event. And while repeated words and short phrases sometimes appear in the Slovene translation, all repeated clauses and sentences are gone. This not only lessens the emotional intensity, but also slightly elevates the register of the monologue.

The last examples of this type are from Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, not popular fiction, and from the work of two very experienced and respected translators, not beginners. In neither case is repetition avoidance a prevailing translating strategy. But in each case an isolated but significant instance can be found at the beginning of the translation (both examples are from act I) that shows how strong the rule of non-repetition is even among experienced Slovene translators. The first example is from the translation by Janko Moder (Shakespeare 1989a) and is found in act 1, scene 1, where Horatio tries to get the Ghost to speak (figure 2). In the English text (Shakespeare 1989b), repetition is used in a way that is still recommended today: to emphasize and connect. In the target text, this effect is somewhat weaker because different ways of expressing "speak" are used, and also because the final "speak" loses its prominent position at the very end. It must be said, however, that non-repetition makes less of a difference in a drama than in the other examples, since the total effect depends not only on the words of the text but on the acting, the music, the costumes, etc. Nevertheless, just as in the previous examples, the emotional intensity of the scene is reduced, and the style of the scene is calmer. This is unusual for

the translation in question.⁴ At this point in the text there is no good reason for either the characters or the reader/spectator to be calm. From the use of punctuation, it seems that the translator was well aware of that, but the rule of non-repetition was still stronger.

Figure 2. From act I, scene 1 of *Hamlet*

<p>If thou hast any sound or use of voice, Speak to me. If there be any good thing to be done That may to thee do ease, and grace to me, Speak to me; If thou art privy to thy country's fate, Which happily, foreknowing may avoid, O, speak; Or if thou hast uphoarded in thy life Extorted treasure in the womb of earth, For which they say your spirits oft walk in death, Speak of it, stay and speak.</p>	<p>Prikazen! če imaš glas in znaš kaj reči, govori z mano! Če je treba kaj dobrega storiti, kar tebi v mir bo, meni v dušni prid, povej! Če veš, da kakšna stvar grozi državi in z vednostjo lahko jo odvrnemo, na dan z besedo! Ali če si v življenju si nagrabil zakladov in jih skril v naročje zemlje, kar vam menda ne da miru po smrti, povej mi, Duh! Govori! Stoj!</p>
---	--

The second example is from Milan Jesih's translation of *Hamlet* (Shakespeare 1995), which is more source-oriented than Moder's and also more conservative. The example (figure 3) is the only case where the style of the text was influenced by the non-repetition rule.

Figure 3. From act I, scene 2 of *Hamlet*

<p>But you must know your father lost a father, That father lost, lost his – and the survivor bound In filial obligation for some term To do obsequious sorrow.</p>	<p>a tudi oče izgubil je očeta, vedi in ded očeta ... Prav, potomec določen čas je dolžen skazovati svojo bolest –</p>
--	--

These words are spoken by Claudius, the grand master of repetition in *Hamlet*. Repetition is one of his main rhetorical strategies (for example in the dialogue where he tries to get Laertes to kill Hamlet). Therefore the strategy of replacement in this case actually influences the characterization of the king, and also veils his intention, since his manipulation and his skill are less obvious than in the source text.

⁴ Moder's translation is intentionally intense, polemical, and sharp, according to the translator's introduction to the text.

In *The Lord of the Rings*, the situation is slightly different. While repetition as such is not used much in the source text, polysyndeton is. It occurs between clauses within a sentence and also between sentences, which gives the text an archaic, sometimes almost biblical air. In the Slovene version, polysyndeton between sentences very often disappears, but there are also a few examples of disappearance of polysyndeton within a sentence (repetitive elements in bold):

And there came Gandalf on foot **and** with him came one cloaked in gray; **and** they met before the doors of the Houses of Healing. **And** they greeted Gandalf **and** said: »We seek the Steward, **and** men say that he is in this House. Has any hurt befallen him? **And** the Lady Eowyn, where is she?

In tam je hodil Gandalf, z njim **pa** še nekdo, ogrnjen v sivo; **tako da** so se srečali pred vrati v Hiše zdravljenja. [**conjunction missing**]Onadva sta Gandalfa pozdravila **in** rekla: »Majordoma iščeva, **ki** pravijo, da je v tej hiši. Se mu je zgodilo kaj hudega? **In** gospa Eowyn, kje je?

The choice not to repeat in this case has led to a decrease in formality of the text—in English there is a slow, solemn rhythm to it, describing the discreet return of the long-lost king to his devastated realm. The polysyndeton also gives the reader the impression of a very old text, reminding him or her of old epic poems, the Bible etc. In the Slovene version the rhythm of the text is livelier, and the text is less solemn, and less archaic, moving on in a more fluent and modern way.

The examples from the last two texts are interesting because only one person or type of person is using repetition in each case, so avoiding repetition changes this person's style, which can influence the characterization and the implied relations with other characters in the text. The first text is *The Colour of Magic* by Terry Pratchett. Examples of disappearing repetition are numerous, but let us concentrate on the dialogue between a nobleman and a failed wizard about what to do with a foreigner who has come to the city.

«There is another point, of course. It would be a tragedy should anything untoward happen to our little visitor. It would be **dreadful** if he were to die, for example. **Dreadful** for the whole of our land, because the Agatean Emperor looks after his own and could certainly extinguish us **at a nod**. **A mere nod**. And that would be **dreadful** for you, Rincewind, because in the weeks that remained before the Empire's huge mercenary fleet arrived, certain of my servants would occupy themselves about your person in the hope that the avenging

captains, on their arrival, might find their anger tempered by the sight of your still-living body.”

Seveda pa to še ni vse. Mar ne bi bilo tragično, ko bi se našemu malemu gostu zgodilo kaj sitnega? Kako **nadležno** bi bilo, ko bi na primer umrl! **Nevšečno** za vso našo domovino, saj Agatejsko cesarstvo bedi nad svojimi podaniki in bi nas, **kot bi mignil**, izbrisalo z zemeljske plošče. **Samo s prsti bi moralo tleskniti**. In tedaj **bi seveda tudi ti tanko piskal**, moj Rincewind, kajti še preden bi se pred našimi obalami zbralo nepregledno ladjevje cesarskih najemnikov, bi se moji služabniki dolge tedne ukvarjali s tabo, v dobri nadi, da se bo bes maščevalnih vojskovodij po izkrcanju vsaj za silo polegel ob pogledu na tvoje skoraj živo truplo.

Like the young woman in *Brooklyn Follies*, the patrician uses repetition for emphasis. In this instance he possibly also finds that the failed wizard needs things repeated in order to understand them. Leaving repetition out in the Slovene translation therefore changes the characterization of the patrician as well as the relationship between him and the failed wizard to whom he speaks.

The last two examples are from a rather different genre of popular fiction, romance. They occur in *Tara Road* by Maeve Binchy, in a conversation between a recently divorced father and his children, one teenage girl and a preteen boy.

“Who will I marry?” Brian asked.” “**A person** who has been deprived of all their senses, but very particularly the sense of smell,” Annie said.” “That’s not right, is it, Dad?” “Of course not, Brian. Your sister is only making a joke. You’ll marry **a great person** when the time comes.” Brian ignored her again. “Is there any way of knowing its **the right person**, Dad?” “You’ll know.” His father was soothing. You didn’t, Dad. You thought Mam was **the right person** and she turned out not to be.” “She was **the right person** at the time, Brian.”

“In s kom se bom poročil jaz?” je vprašal Brian. “Z **osebo** brez kančka razsodnosti in z zamašenim nosom,” je rekla Annie. “Ni res, kajne, očka?” “Seveda ne, Brian. Tvoja sestra se samo šali. Ko bo prišel čas, se boš poročil **s sijajno žensko**.” Brian se spet ni zmenil zanjo. “Kako bom pa vedel, da je **oseba prava**, očka?” “Preprosto vedel boš,” ga je pomiril oče. “Ti že nisi, očka. Mislil si, da je mami **prava**, in potem se je izkazalo, da ni.” “Tisti čas je bila **prava**, Brian.”

As we can see, in the first example there is no repetition at all in the Slovene version, and in the second example, the noun is omitted from the

repeated clause. The result of this is that the children sound more grown-up in the Slovene version than in the English version. This is something that often happens to children in Slovene literary translations, as other studies have shown (Noč 2007, Zlatnar Moe 2010).

To sum up, reluctance to repeat elements standing close together is a feature that can be found in many different literary texts, genres, and fields, ranging from the classics to works of popular fiction, in drama as well as prose, and texts for adult readers as well as texts for children and adolescents. It is not restricted to only one type of element: whatever is repeated in the source text, be it a name, a word, a clause or a sentence, is very likely to be deleted or replaced in the translation, thus changing the style, and sometimes the characterization, relationships, and intensity of the text.

3. Non-repetition in Slovene

The majority of practising Slovene translators were educated in Slovenia and used Slovene language, literature, and writing textbooks. As practising translators, they rely mostly on the basic reference books that do not discuss stylistics at all—namely, bilingual dictionaries, monolingual dictionaries and, in a few cases, *Slovenski pravopis*, as was shown in an earlier study of Slovene literary translators and their practices (Zlatnar Moe 1999). Therefore, I have analyzed the textbooks used in schools, from elementary to the university levels, including all the basic reference sources, such as *Slovenska slovnica*, *Slovenski pravopis*, and *Enciklopedija slovenskega jezika*, as well as reference books dealing with communication, style, and “good writing.” Many of these sources mention repetition, several of them twice—first, when dealing with non-literary writing, and again in a chapter on literary style. In her classical textbook on style, *Besedna umetnost*, Silva Trdina (1958) discusses repetition in three separate chapters: on conciseness, accuracy, and figures of speech.

According to Trdina, conciseness and clarity suffer when repetition is used. It appears that these judgments largely apply to literary texts as well as to non-literary ones, since most of the examples in the book are drawn from literary texts, although she acknowledges that repetition can be used as a stylistic tool in literary discourse.

More recent style manuals generally follow their classical predecessor, dealing with repetition in the chapter on style, in the “conciseness” section. Pavlin Povodnik (1996: 33) warns elementary-school pupils against repetition of one and the same word, and encourages the use of synonyms.

High school textbooks also warn students about the danger of misuse of repetition in writing. They are a little more open to repetition on the lexical level, in the case of synonyms.

The authors also agree that repetition can be a very useful tool in suprasentential organization of a text and in the case of spoken communication. The example they give is from a literary text, although the chapter is on textual organization, not on literary stylistics (Dular and Korošec 1991: 76). The authors of the writing manual for the high school final exam (*Matura*) essay agree with the other two authors where repetition is concerned, advising against repetition on the word, clause, and sentence levels (Cuderman et al. 2003: 20).

University students seldom use basic, general reference works. Tomo Korošec's university-level textbook, *Stilistika slovenskega poročevalstva*, characterizes repetition as a stylistic device. The chapter on journalistic style advises avoiding repetition (Korošec 1989: 18), and the chapter on the relationships between the different parts of titles mentions repetition as one of the possible ways of writing a title (Korošec 1989: 56, 129). Another university-level textbook that deals with repetition as a stylistic device is *Mala literarna teorija* (Kmecl 1983), which will be discussed below.

Basic reference books for the Slovene language like *Slovenska slovnica* and *Slovenski pravopis* do not treat repetition as a stylistic device, which is understandable, since they also deal with stylistics only in passing. In *Pišem, torej sem* (Bajt 1994), another style manual, the author warns against repetition because it reduces the conciseness of the text as well as its originality and comprehensibility.

We can conclude, then, that Slovene reference books on style for all age groups recommend avoiding repetition and encourage the use of synonyms instead.

4. Repetition in literary texts

The rule of non-repetition generally applies to non-literary texts. For everyday non-literary discourse, non-repetition seems to be a good strategy, sparing readers the effort of struggling through verbose texts. However, when it comes to stylistically marked texts, for example in literature, the situation is rather more complicated, since repetition is a useful stylistic tool. Slovene writers' manuals agree that fiction is different and repetition is allowed. If Slovene writers' manuals deal with repetition as a stylistic tool at all, they agree with Trdina, who says that repetition can be a useful tool for emphasis. In this context, however, it is also necessary to consult another group of reference sources—i.e., textbooks and articles on literary theory and literary stylistics (for example, Kmecl 1983; Sajovic

2003). Kmecl discusses repetition on three occasions: when talking about rhyme and alliteration; in the chapter on refrain, anaphor, and epiphor; and in the article on polysyndeton. He sums up by saying that repetition is basically intentional neglect of the rule as it applies in non-literary texts. It is used to reach the reader on a sensual and emotional level in addition to the rational and conscious level (Kmecl 1983: 96).

We can conclude that the rule of non-repetition has been quite strong in the last decades, and it is likely to remain so since it is still very much present in elementary-school textbooks as well as in other manuals for writers. A user of Slovene learns early and often that repetition is unwanted in non-literary texts, and receives plenty of advice on how to avoid it. (S)he is less likely to discover that repetition is not always undesirable and that it is permissible in literary texts, since the point is rarely made in general writers' manuals.

Native English speakers' attitude to repetition by the native speakers of English, is somewhat different from the Slovene. Of the twenty different sources I have consulted, only four mention repetition at all. All of these (Troyka 1993, Larson 2009, KCI 2009, and Hairston 1981) make a clear distinction between deliberate and accidental repetition. Redundancy is frowned upon just as it is in the Slovene manuals, and there are detailed explanations of what type of repetition is undesirable and what it looks like.

The difference between English and Slovene style manuals is that the English ones do not a priori see repetition as a mistake that should be avoided. On the contrary, if they do mention it at all, they point to its usefulness in emphasizing important parts of the text or to its connecting role.

The main difference, then, between the English manuals' approach to repetition and the Slovene approach is that Slovene authors only allow repetition in literary texts and strongly discourage it in non-literary texts as a marker of bad style, while the English authors recommend its deliberate use, suggest that repetition is actually a skill that marks a good writer, and encourage people to use it.

This suggests that English-speakers, like Slovenes, are warned against repetition in their early education, but as their writing experience deepens, they are encouraged to use it productively as a useful stylistic tool.

So the situation that arises when translating texts from English into Slovene is this: On the source side, we have authors that have been actively encouraged to use repetition and shown ways to use it effectively. On the target side, we have translators, text editors, editors (and readers) who are convinced that repetition is basically bad writing.

5. The role of text editors?

There is another possible reason for the spread of avoidance of repetition in Slovene literary translations, and that is the stage of text editing. Most literary translations in Slovenia go through text editing, a process in which the text editor (who usually holds or is studying for degree in Slovene language and literature) checks for orthographic, grammatical, syntactical, and also stylistic problems. Sometimes text editors are familiar with the source language and text, but most often they work with the Slovene text alone, according to the rules and norms expressed in Slovene stylistic manuals. According to an earlier study on communication between the translator and the text editor (Zlatnar Moe 1999: 93–102), they mostly work alone, not together with either the translator or the source text, and that might result in a more conservative final version of the text. While an empirical study of this issue remains to be done, there are indications that this is sometimes the case (cf. Jankovič 2002: 20–21).

6. Conclusion

The rule of non-repetition of elements that stand close together in a text is very well known and respected among native speakers of Slovene. It is supported by school textbooks as well as by general style manuals. Slovene writers and readers therefore disapprove of repetition and try to avoid it. Repetition, however, is one of the standard tools of emphasis, connection, emotional intensifying, characterization, etc. in literary texts.

This rule probably influences the way Slovene writers write in other languages, but it is most visible in translations from repetition-friendly languages, such as English. English writers, supported by their reference books, seem to think that repetition is a useful tool when used wisely. Slovene writers (again, supported by their reference books) seem to think that repetition is undesirable, except for a few cases in literary texts. This is a useful and unproblematic attitude in most writing situations, but it can cause trouble for translators trying to transfer a repetition-friendly text into a repetition-hostile culture. They have to decide whether to adhere to the norms and rules of the source text or to the notions of good style in the target culture. In either case their challenge is to keep the text understandable, stylistically rich, and with an unchanged intention and message.

The analysis of seven literary translations from English shows that, where repetition is concerned, beginning translators often completely accept the target norms and neglect the source friendliness toward repetition. This behavior stands out because beginner translators are often highly source-oriented in other regards. They often explain their choice in terms of linguistic differences between the two languages, not stylistic ones. As their

experience increases, the awareness of the different role of repetition in both cultures increases as well, and at the same time the mechanical replacement of repetition with synonyms decreases. Nevertheless, the rule of non-repetition is strong enough to make its appearance even in the work of the most experienced translators, superseding norms of stylistic adequacy and influencing characterization, the register of the text, and the text's effect on the target reader.

University of Ljubljana, Faculty of Arts

Works Cited

- Auster, Paul. 2006. *The Brooklyn follies*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Auster, Paul. 2009. *Brooklynske norosti*. Trans. Miha Avanzo. Ljubljana: Vale-Novak.
- Bajt, Drago. 1994. *Pišem, torej sem: priročnik za pisanje*. Maribor: Obzorja.
- Binchy, Maeve. 1998. *Tara Road*. London: Orion.
- . 2002. *Hiša na Tari*. Trans. Aleksandra Rekar. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Brown, Dan. 2004. *The Da Vinci code*. London: Corgi.
- . 2005. *Da Vincijeva šifra*. Trans. Nataša Müller. Ljubljana, Mladinska knjiga.
- Cuderman, Vinko, Silvo Fatur, Rajko Korošec, Boris Paternu, Janja Perko, and Milan Nardin. 2002. *Esej na maturi 2003*. Ljubljana: Gyrus.
- Dular, Janez and Tomo Korošec. 1991. *Slovenski jezik 3*. Maribor: Založba Obzorja.
- Hairston, Maxine. 1981. *Successful writing: A rhetoric for advanced composition*. New York & London: Norton.
- Hornby, Nick. 2002. *Vse o fantu*. Trans. Mojca Krevcl. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- . 2005. *About a boy*. London: Penguin.
- Jankovič, Jaroslav. 2002. Branko Gradišnik, prevajalec in pisatelj: Troji prstani za vilinske kralje in pravica do zmotljivosti. *Delo, Sobotna priloga*, 26 January, 20–21.
- KCI. 2009. *KCI Reader-based writing style guide*, s.v. "Conciseness," www.kcittraining.com/styleguide/book/concise.html (accessed 30 March 2009).
- Kmecl, Matjaž. 1983. *Mala literarna teorija: priročnik za učitelje slovenščine na osnovnih in srednjih šolah*. Ljubljana: Univerzum.
- Korošec, Tomo. 1998. *Stilistika slovenskega poročevalstva*. Ljubljana: Kmečki glas.
- Larson, Gary B. *Garbl's editorial style manual*, s.v. "Concise, concisely, conciseness." home.comcast.net/~garbl/stylemanual/c.htm#concise (accessed 30 March 2009).

- Noč, Karin. 2007. Prevodni premiki in njihov vpliv na bralčeve predstave o Haddonovem romanu *Skrivnostni primer ali kdo je umoril psa* (v angl. *The Curious Incident of the Dog in the Night-Time*). BA thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Pavlin Povodnik, Monika. 1996. *Sporočanje za šolo in vsakdanjo rabo*. Ljubljana: Rokus.
- Pratchett, Terry. 1985. *The colour of magic*. London: Corgi Books, 1985.
- . 2004. *Barva magije*. Trans. Maja Novak. Ljubljana: Vale-Novak.
- Rowling, J.K. 2003a. *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*. New York: Listening Library (Random House).
- . 2003b. *Harry Potter. Feniksov red*. Trans. Jakob Kenda. Ljubljana: Epta.
- Sajovic, Tomaž. 2003. Slog je pomen, pomen je slog: Ivan Cankar: Edina beseda, Ciril Kosmač: Pomladni dan. *Slavistična revija* 51:165–80.
- Shakespeare, William. 1989a. *Hamlet, danski princ*. Trans. Janko Moder. Murska Sobota: Pomurska založba.
- . 1989b. *Hamlet*. New ed. Routledge.
- . 1995. *Hamlet*. 1995. Trans. Milan Jesih. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Tolkien, J. R. R. *The Lord of the Rings*. London: Allen & Unwin, 1968.
- . 2002–2003. *Gospodar prstanov*. Trans. Branko Gradišnik. 3 vols. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga.
- Trdina, Silva. *Besedna umetnost*. Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 1958.
- Troyka, Lynn Quitman. 1993. *Simon & Schuster handbook for writers*. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.
- Zlatnar Moe, Marija. 1999. Položaj leposlovja na Slovenskem. MA thesis, University of Ljubljana.
- Zlatnar Moe, Marija. 2010. Register shifts in translations of popular fiction from English into Slovene. In *Why translation studies matters*, ed. Daniel Gile, Gyde Hansen, and Nike Kocijančič Pokorn, 125–36. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing.

POVZETEK

PONAVLJANJE V ANGLEŠČINI IN NEPONAVLJANJE V SLOVENŠČINI: KAKO RAZLIČNESTILISTIČNE NORME SPREMINJAJO SLOG UMETNOSTNIH BESEDIL

Slogovna norma neponavljanja blizu skupaj stoječih prvin je v slovenski kulturi zelo močna in deluje tako v umetnostnih kot neumetnostnih besedilih. V angleško govorečih kulturah je položaj nekoliko drugačen, ponavljanje se priporoča kot slogovno sredstvo poudarjanja in razlage. Kadar so pisci in bralci besedila pripadniki iste kulture, je to dejstvo zanemarljivo, drugače pa je, kadar gre za prevajanje besedil. Pri neumetnostnih besedilih različno stališče do ponavljanja večinoma ne

predstavlja težav, pri umetnostnih pa zaradi doslednega izogibanja ponavljanju lahko pride do premikov na slogovni ravni, včasih pa tudi na drugih, npr. na pomenski. Zaradi tega je pomembno, da se tako prevajalci kot tudi drugi udeleženci prevajalskega postopka, posebej lektorji, zavedajo te razlike med obema stilistikama in da to vedenje ustvarjalno uporabijo pri prevajanju oz. lektoriranju.