

Structural repetitions and discourse relations in English-Turkish translations of TED talks

Özgür Şen Bartan

Kırıkkale University, Turkey/Contact: ozgursen1@yahoo.com 

Abstract

This study attempts to analyse translations of the discourse relations of the arguments with structural repetitions in the TED-MDB corpora consisting three texts (English) and their translations (Turkish). The main questions addressed in this paper are: a) Are connective relations used explicitly or implicitly together with repetitions? b) Which discourse relations are being used with repetitions? c) Do translators translate repetitions or omit them? The analysis shows that speakers of TED Talks mostly prefer to use these repetitions in their speeches with implicit discourse relations (66.6%), and translators translate them through implicit forms (54.8%). Moreover, the dominantly explicit usage of *and* in repetitive structures shows that the relations can be associated with an explicit connective *and*. Accordingly, ExpansionConjunction (addition) relations are frequently being used with repetitions at the beginning (73.8%). Also, mostly, the translators tend to omit repetitions at the beginning (92.9%).

© 2022 The Literacy Trek & the Authors – Published by The Literacy Trek

APA Citation

Şen Bartan, Ö. (2022). Structural repetitions and discourse relations in English-Turkish translations of TED talks. *The Literacy Trek*, 8(2), 186-202. <https://doi.org/10.47216/literacytrek.1119118>

Keywords

TED-Multilingual
Discourse Bank;
Discourse relations;
Implicitness;
Translations of
repetitions

Submission date
22.05.2022

Acceptance date
24.11.2022

Introduction

Together with other rhetorical devices, *parallelism* is used in persuasive speeches such as Ted-Talks, and within them, rhetorical devices are being used intentionally with a high level of competence. According to Leech and Short (2007), considering the structural repetitions at the beginning of sentences, sometimes, it is “obviously the aesthetics of form which tends to attract the reader’s attention, rather than the meaning” (p. 14). The researchers categorize structural repetition under the sub-title of figures of speech which is one of the elements of style. There are three main elements of figures of speech: grammatical and lexical; phonological schemes; and tropes. Parallelism is classified under the category of grammatical and lexical, and it has two types: repetition at the beginning (anaphora) and repetition *at the end* (epistrophe).

Corbett and Connors (1995) define anaphora (repetition at the beginning) as “the repetition of identical words at the beginning of successive phrases” (p. 416). It is a rhetorical device that features repetition of a word or phrase at the beginning of successive sentences, phrases, or clauses. In this study, the terms *anaphora* and *epistrophe* are not preferred to be used since, in linguistics, they have other definitions which have the possibility to create terminological ambiguity. Grammatical and lexical parallelisms are regarded as the cases of formal and structural repetition. Formal repetition is described as repeated use of an expression such as morpheme, lexical item, proper name, phrase, etc. which has already occurred in the context. The parallelisms are “identified as structural repetitions in which variable elements occur”, and “whatever form a parallelism takes, its effect is to foreground the relation between parallel words and phrases which fill the variable positions” (p.113). In short, parallelisms are structural repetitions which augment speakers’ messages, draw attention, give emphasis, create a rhythm, link, and compare or contrast ideas.

Moreover, Corbett and Connors (1995) pointed out that parallelism (repetition at the beginning) in the below example has a role to connect the clauses:

Three independent clauses are set down, one after the other (“**They may have it** in well-doing, **they may have it** in learning, **they may have it** even in criticising”). Although there are no conjunctions (asyndeton) to tie the clauses together grammatically, the clauses are connected by parallel structure and identical words. In addition to the functions that we noted in the analysis of Clark Kerr’s two sentences, parallelism can also be used for coherence. (p.416)

Corbett and Connors (1995) also suggested that parallelism can convey “antitheses of thought” as in this example: *Ask not what your country can do for you-ask what you can do for your country*. According to the researchers, they are “opposites” which can be “reconciled”. They suggested that opposites can be “reconciled only if they are co-ordinate, and one way to emphasize the co-ordinate value of opposites is to juxtapose them in a parallel grammatical structure” (p.512).

In literature, there are also studies on repetitions focusing on the effect of stylistic use and cohesive function of repetition of Key Words (KWs) in translation (Čermáková, 2015; Mastropierro & Mahlberg, 2017); the role of repetitions on repairs (Crible & Pascual, 2019), and parallelism effect in sentence processing (Frazier, Munn, & Clifton, 2000, p.358; Knoeferle & Crocker, 2009).

Čermáková (2015) studied the stylistic analysis of the source and target text (Eng-Finnish; Eng-Czech), and she analysed the repeated sequences of words in John Irving's novel *A Widow for One Year*, and found eight-word sequences that were repeated at least three times. She also made a list of keywords in the novel, using the *British National Corpus* as a reference corpus. By analysing the recurring sequences and the keywords they contained, Čermáková (2015) concluded that these repetitions played a significant stylistic role in the novel and that "translators show a marked stylistic strategy to avoid them" even though they should be sustained in the translation (p.355).

Crible and Pascual (2019) studied discourse markers and their combination with and within repetitions and self-repairs in native English, French and Spanish, and found that discourse markers and repetitions are more frequent outside than within repairs, which relates to their association with covert planning processes.

In psycholinguistics, specifically sentence processing studies, it is indicated that "processing of conjoined phrases is facilitated by syntactic parallelism, whether it is parallelism in the syntactic category of the conjuncts themselves or parallelism of the internal structure of the conjuncts." (Frazier, Munn, & Clifton, 2000, p. 358). This effect is called "parallelism effect" (Knoeferle & Crocker, 2009, p. 2239). By using eye tracking as a method, Knoeferle and Crocker (2009) tested further whether parallel structure affects processing of the second conjunct when people first inspect the second conjunct or rather only upon rereading of relevant left context. The researchers found "evidence for online parallelism mechanisms that operate incrementally and across the board" and parallelism effects in both structurally ambiguous and unambiguous sentences (p. 2362). And it is also claimed that parallelism mechanisms depend on the occurrence of the coordinating conjunction *and* (Apel et al., 2007; Frazier et al., 2000; Knoeferle & Crocker, 2009).

The research to date has tended to focus on the stylistic functions of repetition in literary translation (Abdulla, 2001; al-Khafaji, 2006; Ben-Ari, 1998) rather than its discursive role. Ben-Ari (1998, p. 68) concluded that avoiding repetition in translation is a "universal" and this is due to the fact that "considerations of adequacy come second to considerations of acceptability in the target culture". Therefore, the translations of parallel structures are needed to be studied in detail.

Also, according to Dancygier and Sweetser (2014), who redefine the term “figurative”, “understanding discourse crucially involves understanding the processes” concerning figurative language (p.11). According to the researchers, figurative structures are far from being just decorative, they are shaping cognitive construals in discourse, and the potential for figurative patterns is a universal (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2014). These estimates and conclusions together with new researches in figurative speech have heightened the need for investigating figurative language, specifically structural repetitions in translation as well. In this respect, this study attempts to analyse the discourse relations of the arguments with the usage of parallelism, specifically repetitions *at the beginning of* successive sentences (anaphora) in the TED-MDB corpora consisting three texts (English) and their translations (Turkish). In short, in the present study, the repetitive parallelistic forms of the clauses are investigated. The main questions addressed in this paper are:

1. Are connective relations used explicitly or implicitly together with repetitions?
2. Which discourse relations are being used with repetitions?
3. Do translators translate repetitions or omit them?

Literature Review

Explicitness and Implicitness of Discourse Relations

In recent years several studies investigating discourse relations in translation have been carried out using parallel and multilingual corpora, and they have contributed to the *Translation Universals (TU)* theory (Blum Kulka, 1978; Baker, 2001), and also understanding the variation in the types and frequency of conjunctions across languages. For instance, Zufferey and Cartoni (2014) used the multilingual corpus of parliamentary debates (Europarl) to understand whether explicitation phenomena (one of the features of TUs) were frequent. The results suggest an evidence that explicitation is “indeed a regular phenomenon in translations, regardless of the language pair involved” (Zufferey, 2020, p.98).

Translation universals (TUs) are defined as the inherent features revealed in translated texts (Baker, 1993). TUs include explicitation, simplification,

normalization, sanitization, convergence and so forth (Haoda Feng, Ineke Crezee & Lynn Grant, 2018). *Explicitation* is the tendency to make implicit information in the ST explicit in the translations, where such implicit information does not need to become explicit in the TT. *Implicitation* is defined as “rendering what is clearly stated in the source text into implicit information in the target text, with the same meaning or information embedded in the context” (Hu, 2016, p.98). The major causes of implicitation in translation were listed by Hu (2016) as the process of translation, linguistic and cultural differences, and the role of the translator.

In discourse relation, explicitness is the use of overt linguistic material in structuring information in clauses, and implicitness is not using an overt discourse connective. For instance, in Example (1), *and* is used as a discourse connective explicitly, however, in Example (2), there is no discourse connective between arguments which carry Expansion.Conjunction sense. Also, repetitions at the beginning can be seen in these examples from the study corpus.

(1) Explicit use:

“I wanted to protect my child from illness. And I wanted also to protect myself from illness.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (English, TED Talk no. 1756).

(2) Implicit use:

“There are only so many families dealing with schizophrenia, **Ø there are only so many families** of children who are transgender, **Ø there are only so many families** of prodigies -- who also face similar challenges in many ways -- **Ø there are only so many families** in each of those categories -- but if you start to think that the experience of negotiating difference within your family is what people are addressing, then you discover that it’s a nearly universal phenomenon.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (English, TED Talk no. 1756). Explicit connectives are being used frequently in both translated and non-translated texts (Marco, 2018, p.100). Concerning explicitness and implicitness, Leech and Short (2005) suggested that in the history of fiction writing, “there has been a progressive tendency, over the past three hundred years, to dispense with such logical connections between sentences, and to rely instead upon *inferred* connections” (p.201). According to them:

...the most conspicuous feature of linkage in modern fiction is its absence: or, speaking less paradoxically, we may observe that the modern novelist tends to rely on inferred linkage, or simple juxtaposition, rather than on overt signals. (p.201)

They illustrated “the extreme of inexplicitness” of Joyce passage:

Whores in Turkish graveyards. Learn anything if taken young. You might pick up a young widow here. Men like that. Love among the tombstones. Romeo. Spice of pleasure. In the midst of death we are in life. Both ends meet. Tantalizing for the poor dead. Smell of frilled beefsteaks to the starving gnawing their vitals. Desire to grig people. Molly wanted to do it at the window. Eight children he has anyway. (Penguin, 1978, p. 110)

They gave another example of implicitness from Mervyn Peake, *Gormenghast*, Chapter 1:

“**He has learned** an alphabet of arch and aisle: the language of dim stairs and moth-hung rafters (3). Great halls are his dim playgrounds: his fields are quadrangles: his trees are pillars (4). **And he has learned that** there are always eyes (5). Eyes that watch (6). Feet that follow, and hands to hold him when he struggles, to lift him when he falls (7). Upon his feet again he stares unsmiling (8). Tall figures elbow (9). Some in jewellery; some in rags (10).” (Mervyn Peake, *Gormenghast*, Chapter 1] (Leech & Short, 2007, p.113).

In this example, the researchers pointed out many syntactic parallelisms and other kinds of schematic patterning. And, they also stated that “the relations of meaning foregrounded in similarity or of contrast.” (Leech & Short, 2007, p.113). It is possible with this claim that the readers deduce the relations of the arguments implicitly in literature where there is high usage of figurative language.

Structural Repetitions (Parallelisms) in Persuasive Speeches and Ted-Talks

TED talks are considered as a specific genre as they are for specific audience. They are regarded as persuasive writing and speaking. Persuasion is “the process of creating, reinforcing, or changing people’s beliefs or actions” (Lucas, 2009, p. 324). Persuasive speech is something “a speaker does *with* an audience. Listeners engage in a mental give-and-take with the speaker” (Lucas, 2009, pp. 324-327). Lucas proposes that one of the four features of persuasive speech is language and ideas of the speaker. For instance, “I have a dream” speech by Martin Luther King, Jr. “is relatively a short and powerful speech in terms of persuasion”. According to Lucas “King makes extensive use of *repetition and parallelism* to reinforce his message and to enhance the momentum of the speech.” (2009, p. Appendix A2).

Many researchers illustrate Martin Luther King Jr.’s use of parallelism (repetition at the beginning) as a competent one. “I Have a Dream” speech is powerful and persuasive partly as a result of the usage of parallelism, structural repetitions at the

beginning. He repeats the “I have a dream” sentence eight times in his speech, and the discourse relations are implicit, which means he did not use an explicit connective between the arguments:

I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, the sons of former slaves and the sons of former slave owners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood.

I have a dream that one day even the state of Mississippi, a state sweltering with the heat of injustice, sweltering with the heat of oppression, will be transformed into an oasis of freedom and justice.(Lucas, 2009, p.Appendix A2)

The Corpus

This study examines a corpus consisting 3 TED Talks (ID. 1978, ID. 2150, ID. 1756) in English and their translations in Turkish in accordance with the guidelines of the PDTB-3. Two texts (1978, 2150) were selected from the previously annotated texts for the TED MDB project (Zeyrek et al., 2020), which is a multilingual resource where TED-talks are annotated at the discourse level in 6 languages, and an additional TED Talk (ID. 1756) was annotated for this study by a group of annotators, and checked by another annotator in order to determine inter-annotator agreement. For the additional TED Talk (ID. 1756) the inter-annotator agreement of the source text is 87% and the target text is 64.4% in all senses. There are seven texts which were annotated in the entire TED MDB corpus (Zeyrek et al., 2020), however, as the other texts does not contain repetitions, they were excluded from this study. The overall data of the parallel annotations is shown in Table 1.

Table 1. The parallel annotations of the three TED talk transcripts

Text IDs	English Words	Turkish Words	Total
ID 1756	3848	2891	
ID 2150	1050	723	
ID 1978	1759	1255	
Total	6657	4869	11,526

Also, in Table 3, there is the distribution of repetitions at the beginning (N 42) in the TED-MDB corpus in three texts.

Table 2. Distribution of repetitions at the beginning in the TED-MDB corpus within 3 source texts in English.

Text IDs in TED-MDB corpus			
1756	2150	1978	Total
28	9	5	42

Methodology

In the current study, the discourse has been analysed within the framework of the PDTB 3.0 sense hierarchy. It encompasses four main senses at Level-1 (Expansion, Contingency, Comparison and Temporal) with their sub-senses at Level-2 and Level 3 (See Table 3) (2019, p.17).

Table 3. PDTB-3 Sense Hierarchy

Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Temporal	Synchronous	-
	Asynchronous	Precedence
		Succession
Contingency	Cause	Reason
		Result
		NegativeResult
	Cause+belief	Reason+belief
		Result+belief
	Cause+SpeechAct	Reason+SpeechAct
		Result+SpeechAct
	Condition	Arg1-as-Condition
		Arg2-as-Condition
	Condition+SpeechAct	-
	Negative-condition	Arg1-as-negCond arg2-as-negCond
Arg2-as-negCond arg2-66as-6negCond		
Negative-condition+SpeechAct	-	
Purpose	Arg1-as-goal arg2-as-goal	
	Arg2-as-goal arg2-as-goal	
Comparison	Concession	Arg1-as-denier
		Arg2-as-denier
	Concession+SpeechAct	Arg2-as-denier+ SpeechAct

	Contrast	-	
	Similarity	-	
Expansion	Conjunction	-	
	Disjunction	-	
	Equivalence	-	
	Exception	Arg1-as-excpt	
		Arg2-as-excpt	
	Instantiation	Arg1-as-instance	
		Arg2-as-instance	
	Level-of-detail	Arg1-as-detail	
		Arg2-as-detail	
	Manner	Arg1-as-manner	
Arg2-as-manner			
Substitution	Arg1-as-subst arg2-as-subst		
	Arg1-as-subst arg2-as-subst		

Furtermore, 7 discourse relations (Explicit Relations, Implicit Relations, AltLex, NoRel, EntRel, Hypophora, and Attribution) were annotated for this study. In the PDTB Annotation Manual 2.0 (2007), two main connective types are explicit and implicit.

- *Explicit Relations:* Explicit discourse relations they are conveyed by an explicit connective.
- *Implicit Relations:* Implicit discourse relations lack an overt connecting device.

Results

This study investigates the translations of parallelism, specifically repetitions *at the beginning of* successive sentences in the TED-MDB corpora focusing on the discourse relations. The results will be presented within the framework of the research questions.

The first research question is: *Are connective relations used explicitly or implicitly together with repetitions?* and the analysis of the usages of the repetitions at the beginning in English and its translation to Turkish shows that writers and speakers of TED Talks mostly prefer to use repetitions at the beginning in their speeches with implicit discourse relations in English (66.6%), and as Table 4 shows,

translators translate them through mostly implicitation (54.8%), which means they do not use discourse connectives explicitly in both ST and TT.

Table 4. Implicit relations in Turkish translations

Implicit	Explicit	Total
23 (54.8%)	19 (45.2%)	42

The second research question is: *Which discourse relations are being used with repetitions?* and by using the PDTB Sense Hierarchy (Temporal, Contingency, Comparison and Expansion), it is seen that Contingency, Comparison and Expansion senses are being used as the first level sense hierarchy.

Accordingly, as Table 5 shows, ExpansionConjunction relations are frequently being used with repetitions at the beginning (73.8%). As the sense relations were aligned in both the source text (ST) and the target texts (TT), Table 5 contains the annotations of both the source and the target texts with their sub-senses at Level-2 and Level 3 (See Table 2).

The dominantly explicit usage of *and* (12 *ands*, 1 *and yet out of 19 connectives*) in repetitions at the beginning shows that, although implicit relations were seen in both source and target text, the relations can be associated with an explicit connective *and*.

Table 5. Senses in English and in Turkish within repetitions at the beginning

Senses	N
Expansion.Conjunction	31
CauseResult	4
CauseReason	1
LevelofDetail ARg2asDetail	2
ComparisonContrast	4
Total	42

Regarding the third research question, *Do translators translate repetitions or omit them?*, Table 6 shows that out of 42 repetitions at the beginning found in English

corpus, 7.1% (N 3) of them are translated as repetitions at the beginning. 38.1% (N 16) of them are translated as repetitions at the end, and 53.6% (N 22) of them were omitted, which means translators translated them by neither repetition at the beginning nor repetition at the end.

In short, mostly, the translators did not translate repetitions at the beginning (92.9%), instead, there were instances (38.1%) that repetitions at the end are used as the equivalence of repetitions at the beginning, which can be sometimes recommended due to the syntactic structure of Turkish.

Table 6. Frequency of translations of repetitions at the beginning in the TED-MDB corpus

	1756	2150	1978	Total
<i>Translated by repetition at the beginning</i>	2	1	-	3 (7.1%)
<i>Translated by repetition at the end</i>	9	5	2	16 (38.1%)
<i>Omissions</i>	17	3	3	23 (54.8%)
Total repetitions	28	9	5	42

Some examples of the repetitions at the beginning in TED-Talks and translations of Turkish can be seen in Table 7 under three categories that this study has classified. The interpretations of the examples will be discussed in the following section in detail.

Table 7. The examples of Turkish translations of repetitions at the beginning in English

Omissions	
1	<p>“We took him to the MRI machine, Ø we took him to the CAT scanner, Ø we took this day-old child and gave him over for an arterial blood draw.” Implicit ExpansionConjunction. [Expansion.Conjunction] (English, TED Talk no. 1756).</p> <p>“Onu MRI makinasına, Ø CAT tarayıcına soktuk, Ø bir günlük çocuğumuzdan kan almalarına izin verdik.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (Turkish, TED Talk no. 1756).</p>
2	<p>“And there are people who think that the existence of my family somehow undermines or weakens or damages their family. And there are people who think that families like mine shouldn't be allowed to exist.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (English, TED Talk no. 1756).</p> <p>“Benim ailemin varlığının kendi ailelerini sarstığını, zayıflattığını ya da zarar verdiğini düşünen insanlar var.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (Turkish, TED Talk no. 1756).</p>
Translated by repetitions at the end	
3	<p>“There are only so many families dealing with schizophrenia, Ø there are only so many families of children who are transgender, Ø there are only so many families of prodigies -- who also face</p>

similar challenges in many ways -- **there are only so many families** in each of those categories -- but if you start to think that the experience of negotiating difference within your family is what people are addressing, then you discover that it's a nearly universal phenomenon.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (English, TED Talk no. 1756).

“Sadece şizofreni ile uğraşan **o kadar çok aile var**, Ø çocukları cinsiyetini **değiştiren o kadar çok aile var**, Ø mucize bebeklere sahip **aileler var** -- ve onlar da bir çok yönden engellerle karşılaşıyorlar – Ø tüm bu kategorilerde **o kadar çok aile var ki** düşündüğünüzde ailelerinize onların farklılık olarak gördüğü farklılıklarınız üzerindeki uzlaşma sürecinde farkettiğiniz şey bunun neredeyse evrensel bir olgu olduğu oluyor.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (Turkish, TED Talk no. 1756).

- 4 “**I wanted to protect my child** from illness. **And I wanted also to protect myself** from illness.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (English, TED Talk no. 1756).

“Çocuklarımı hastalıktan **korumak istedim**. **Aynı zamanda** kendimi **de** hastalıktan **korumak istiyordum**.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (Turkish, TED Talk no. 1756).

Translated by repetitions at the beginning

- 5 “**Those hearing parents** tend to try to cure them. Ø **Those deaf people** discover community somehow in adolescence. [Cause Result] (English, TED Talk no. 1756). Ø **Those straight parents** often want them to function in what they think of as the mainstream world, **and those gay people** have to discover identity later on.” [Cause Result] (English, TED Talk no. 1756).

“**Bu ebeveynler genelde** çocuklarını iyileştirme eğilimindedirler. **Haliyle sağır insanlar** o kültürü ve topluluğu gençliklerinde keşfederler. [Cause Result] (Turkish, TED Talk no. 1756). Bir çok eşcinselin ebeveynleri heteroseksüeldir. Ø **Bu heteroseksüel ebeveynler** çocuklarını dünyada yaygın olduğu şekilde olmalarını istiyorlar, haliyle homoseksüel insanlar kimliklerini daha sonra keşfediyorlar.” [Cause Result] (Turkish, TED Talk no. 1756).

- 6 “...**but I believe that** a city is the sum of the relationships of the people that live there, **and I believe that** if we can start to document those relationships in a real way then maybe we have a real shot at creating those kinds of cities that we'd like to have.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (English, TED Talk no. 2150)

“**Fakat inanıyorum ki** bir şehir orada yaşayan insanlar arasındaki ilişkiler bütünüdür. Ø **İnanıyorum ki** bu ilişkileri gerçekçi bir şekilde belgelemeye başlayabilirsek sahip olmayı isteyeceğimiz tarzda şehirler yaratmayı deneyebiliriz.” [Expansion.Conjunction] (Turkish, TED Talk no. 2150).

Discussion and Conclusion

The present study was designed to examine discourse relations of the arguments with the usage of parallelism, specifically repetitions at the beginning, in the TED-MDB bilingual corpora (English-Turkish). Within the scope of the findings, the following conclusions can be drawn from the present study.

Firstly, 73.8% (N 31) relations between the arguments that have *repetitions at the beginning* are ExpansionConjunction. Also, CauseResult (N 4), CauseReason (N 1), LevelofDetail ARg2asDetail (N 2) and Comparison.Contrast (N 4) relations were observed in the corpora. Secondly, in both ST (66.6%) and TT (54.8%), implicit discourse relations were high in arguments with repetitions at the beginning.

Furthermore, 38.1% of the ST repetitions were translated by repetitions at the end, which is suggested for the equivalence of repetitions at the beginning due to the syntactic structure of Turkish. And lastly, the translators do not have the tendency to translate repetitions at the beginning (92.9%).

As Table 7 shows, in Example (1), the relation is ExpansionConclusion, the repetitions of the clauses are structural repetitions, and they contribute to the relations between the arguments. In line with this finding, Corbett and Connors (1995) defined the discursual function of parallelism as follows:

When we have to express a series of similar or equivalent "meanings," we usually resort to the grammatical device of compounding, and we reinforce the co-ordinate value of the compounded elements with the rhetorical device of parallelism (p. 405).

Corbett and Connors (1995) further stated that "the expansion, all of which takes place in the complement part of the sentence, is managed with a series of parallel structures" (p.406).

In Example (1), the repeated parallelism, '*we took him to the X, we took him to the Y, we took this day old child to Z.*', contributes the discourse relations. Also, it is obvious from this structural pattern that the "end focus" strategy was used. By repeating the same structures, the speaker puts the emphasis on the end of the sentences in line with the nature of *repetitions at the beginning*, and the relation between the arguments can be inferred as, in this case, Expansion.Conjunction. In PDTB-3 (Webber et. al., 2017), this tag is under Expansion label. Expansion is used for relations that

...expand the discourse and move its narrative or exposition forward. The tag Conjunction is used when both arguments bear the same relation to some other situation evoked in the discourse. It indicates that the two arguments make the same contribution with respect to that situation, or contribute to it together. (p. 25)

That's why; this study suggests that the usage of structural repetitions contributes the relations between arguments. The senses (either explicit or implicit) can be varied such as expansion (dominantly), causality, comparison and so forth. This is in line with the studies who showed that parallelism mechanisms depend on the presence of the coordinating conjunction *and* (Apel et al., 2007; Frazier et al., 2000; Knoeferle & Crocker, 2009, p. 2367), which have the potential to carry multiple relations (polyfunctionality).

However, in Turkish translations of Example (1), the pattern was observed in a different way: X, Y *we took, we let* Z. In this case, there remain two arguments, unlike ST, which has three arguments, and the relations of the arguments are still ExpansionConjunction. Similarly, In Example (2), the second argument is totally omitted. Also, it should be noted that in implicit relations, the reader can understand the discourse relation without explicit discourse connective. This research may serve as a base for future studies on possible discursual functions of structural repetitions. However, with a small sample size, caution must be applied, as the findings might not be transferable to the general tendency of translations of structural repetitions, implicitation and explicitation, and their discourse relations.

Concerning implicitness, based on Leech and Short's (2005) claim that authors have the tendency to use *inferred* connections in fiction, the implicitness in both ST and TT in TED-Talks may be explained by figurative language, in this case parallelism, in the examined TED-Talks. Although general tendency of translating connectives is explicitation which is claimed as "a regular phenomenon in translations, regardless of the language pair involved" (Zufferey, 2020, p. 98), in this study discourse relations with repetitions are conveyed implicitly in both ST and TT. Additionally, the results of this study support that translators, by using less words and by not repeating the structures, have the tendency of *simplification* which is one of the translation universals. Simplification refers to the tendency to 'unconsciously simplify language or message or both' (Baker, 1996, p. 176). Briefly, translators intuitively try to simplify the target text. This finding supports the simplification phenomenon of Blum Kulka's (1978) translation universals hypothesis.

Furthermore, in Examples (3) and (4), the translators prefer to use repetitions at the end as an equivalence of repetitions at the beginning. These examples may serve as accurate rendering for translations of repetitions at the beginning due to target language structure. Also, in Examples (5) and (6), repetitions at the beginning are translated by repetitions at the beginning, which shows that sometimes it is possible to find exact equivalence of them.

Lastly, it is claimed that the changing patterns of lexico-grammatical organization produce distinct shifts in the ontological character of the reality

constructed by the text” (Butt, 1988, p. 217). In other words, the mismatch of parallelism in translation can affect «the way the reader perceives that network, even if the level of cohesion is the same» (or similar) (Mastropierro & Mahlberg, 2017). Similarly, Čermáková (2015, p.374) points out that

one straightforward translation strategy would be to apply consistency in the translation of these repetitions by using the same lexical equivalents and keeping the number of repetitions as close to the original as the constraints of the target language allow. More careful stylistic analysis on the part of the translator may allow other translation strategies to reproduce the effect that repetitiveness creates for a reader.

In this respect, further research needs to be carried out to find out how parallelism impact cognition in detail.

As a conclusion, it is clearly seen that there are a number of important differences between ST pattern and TT patterns in terms of figurativeness, cognition and coherence. Therefore, the findings that this study has revealed and identified assist in our understanding of the role of figurative language in both ST and TT. Although figurative language is potentially “universal” (Dancygier & Sweetser, 2014:11) and repetitions play a significant role, translators show a “stylistic strategy to avoid them” (Čermáková, 2015, p.355). Understanding the discourse structure of the ST is crucial before translating in order to master the TT within the possibilities and differences of it. That’s why, translator training programs should include discourse relations and examining them in a parallel corpus can be effective, including figurative language, specifically structural repetitions.

Notes on the contributor

Özgür Şen Bartan is an Assistant Professor in the Department of Translation and Interpreting in English at Kırıkkale University. She received a B.A. from Hacettepe University, in English Linguistics in 2001, and an M.A. from Hacettepe University, in Sociology Department. She received her Ph.D. in Foreign Language Teaching, Linguistics from Ankara University in 2015. Her work focuses specifically on individual differences, the role of literature on foreign language teaching, literary translation, corpus studies, translation studies, and sign language interpreting.

References

- Abdulla, A. K. (2001). Rhetorical repetition in literary translation. *Babel* 47(4), 289-303. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.47.4.02abd>
- al-Khafaji, R.. (2006). In search of translational norms: The case of shifts of lexical repetition in Arabic-English translations. *Babel*, 52(1), 39-65. <https://doi.org/10.1075/babel.52.1.03alk>
- Apel, J., Knoeferle, P., & Crocker, M. W. (2007). Processing parallel structure: Evidence from eye tracking and a computational model. In S. Vosniadou, D. Kayser, & A. Protopapas (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 2nd European Cognitive Science Conference* (pp. 125–131). Taylor & Francis-
- Baker, M. (1996). Corpus-based translation studies: The challenges that lie ahead. In H. Somers (Ed.), *Terminology, LSP and translation studies in language engineering: In honour of Juan C. Sager* (pp. 175–186). John Benjamins-
- Ben-Ari, N. (1998). The ambivalent case of repetitions in literary translation. Avoiding repetitions: A “Universal” of translation?. *Meta* 43(1), 68–78. : <https://doi.org/10.7202/002054ar>
- Blum-Kulka, S., & Levenston, E. A. (1978). Universals of lexical simplification. *Language Learning*, 28(2), 399-415. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-1770.1978.tb00143.x>
- Butt, D. (1988). Ideational meaning and the ‘Existential Fabric’ of a poem. In Robin P. Fawcett and David Young (Eds.) *New developments in systemic linguistics. Vol. 2., Theory and Application.* (pp-174–218), Pinter Publishers.
- Čermáková, A. (2015). Repetition in John Irving’s novel *A Widow for One Year*: A corpus stylistics approach to literary translation. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 20(3), 355-77. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.20.3.04cer>
- Corbett, E. P. J., & Connors, R. J. (1965). *Classical rhetoric for the modern student*. Oxford University Press.
- Crible L., & Pascual, E. (2019). Combinations of discourse markers with repairs and repetitions in English, French and Spanish. *Journal of Pragmatics* 156, 54-67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2019.05.002>
- Dancygier B., & Sweetser E. (2014). *Figurative language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Frazier, L., Taft, L., Roeper, T., Clifton, C., & Ehrlich, K. (1984). Parallel structure: A source of facilitation in sentence comprehension. *Memory & Cognition* 12, 421–430.
- Frazier, L., Munn, A., & Clifton, C. (2000). Processing coordinate structures. *Journal of Psycholinguistic Research*, 29, 343–370.
- Haoda F., Ineke C. & Lynn G. (2018). Form and meaning in collocations: a corpus-driven study on translation universals in Chinese-to-English business translation, *Perspectives*, 26(5), 677-690, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676X.2018.1424222>
- Hu, K. (2016). *Introducing corpus-based translation studies*. Springer,

- Knoeferle, P., & Crocker, M. W. (2009). Constituent order and semantic parallelism in online comprehension: Eye-tracking evidence from German. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 62, 2338–2371. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17470210902790070>
- Leech, G. & Short, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction*. Longman.
- Lucas, S. E. (2009). *The art of public speaking*. Mc Graw Hill.
- Mahlberg, M. (2013). Corpus analysis of literary texts. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.) *The Encyclopedia of applied linguistics*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mahlberg, M. & Wiegand, V. (2020). Literary stylistics. In S. Adolphs & D. Knight (Eds.) *Routledge Handbook of English Language and Digital Humanities*. (pp-306-327), Routledge.
- Marco, J. (2018). Connectives as indicators of explicitation in literary translation: A study based on a comparable and parallel corpus, *Target: International journal of translation studies*, 30(1), 87-111. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.16042.mar>
- Mastropierro, L. & Mahlberg, M. (2017). Key words and translated cohesion in Lovecraft's *At the Mountains of Madness* and one of its Italian translations, *English Text Construction*, 10(1), 78-105. <https://doi.org/10.1075/etc.10.1.05mas>
- McIntyre, D. (2013). Corpora and literature. In C. A. Chapelle (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- Webber, B., Prasad, R., Lee, A., & Joshi, A. (2016). A discourse-annotated corpus of conjoined VPs. In *Proceedings of the 10th Linguistics Annotation Workshop* (pp. 22–31). Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Zeyrek, D., Mendes, A., Grishina, Y., Kurfalı, M., Gibbon, S., & Ogródniczuk, M. (2020). TED multilingual discourse bank (TED-MDB): A parallel corpus annotated in the PDTB style. *Language Resources and Evaluation*, 54(2), 587-613. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10579-019-09445-9>
- Zufferey, S. & Cartoni, B. (2014). A multifactorial analysis of explicitation in translation. *Target*, 26(3), 361–384. <https://doi.org/10.1075/target.26.3.02zuf>