Abstract

Sentence adverbs (SAs) take the whole sentence into their scope and express the speaker’s viewpoint, opinion or comment on an action, or some sort of modality assessment on the event. They do not offer any information on how the action occurred and this is what makes them different from manner adverbs. It is interesting to investigate the strategies that two Romanian translators adopt in their renderings of C. S. Lewis’s *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Magician’s Nephew*, since C. S. Lewis does not shy away from using adverbs in his writings. Retranslation in itself is quite an intriguing phenomenon to analyze, but in this case what makes it even more interesting is the way in which the translators chose to render a grammatical structure which behaves in a very heterogeneous manner.
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INTRODUCTION

This article discusses the strategies employed by two different translators in adapting sentence adverbs to Romanian. The corpus used here is made up of sentence adverbs that appear in the first volume\(^1\) of *The Chronicles of Narnia* by

\(^1\) *The Magician’s Nephew* (1955) is the sixth of the seven Narnian chronicles and the first if the order of the narrated events is taken into account. (Editors’ note)
C. S. Lewis. The two translated versions are 23 years apart, and it will also be interesting to see whether the translators of the second version took the original translation as a point of reference for their endeavour and whether any of them is more ‘source-oriented’ or ‘target-oriented’ in Eco’s (88) terms. I anticipate that both translations will be a mixture of the two since they are not so far apart. Sentence adverbs may appear in sentence-initial or sentence-final position, while those that appear to be a comment of the speaker may also be placed in medial position, preceding the lexical verb, the auxiliary, and sometimes between auxiliary and lexical verb. The fact that in English these adverbs are placed in different positions, sometimes yielding different interpretations, makes this investigation even more intriguing.

SENTENCE ADVERBS IN ENGLISH AND ROMANIAN. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

One of the more traditional classifications of sentence adverbs, henceforth SAs, is supplied by Jackendoff (47). He refers to them as speaker-oriented adverbs and investigates some distributional facts making a clear distinction between Sentence adverbs (propositional modifiers) and VP adverbs which only modify predicates. Adverbs such as probably are ruled out from a sentence final position because they have a relatively “high” position in the sentence while VP adverbs such as quickly are allowed there since they appear in a “lower” position. Thus, in Ernst’s (69) terms, adverbs such as probably, obviously modify a proposition or a fact, whereas a VP adverb, such as quickly, modifies a specified event, being thus assigned the manner interpretation.

(1) He obviously could play the piano. SA
*He quickly could play the piano. VP adverb
He could play the piano quickly.

The distribution of adverbs in the clause gives rise to the issue related to their mobility. An adverb such as obviously refers to the likelihood of the truth of the proposition, strangely may modify an illocutionary verb (paraphrase: It is strange to me the fact that), obviously also modifies a fact. Therefore, all these adverbs which occur high in the clause modify a fact or a proposition which are both clausal subtypes of Fact-Event Object (see Ernst 79 for a detailed explanation). Their occurrence, lower in the clause, never triggers a grammatical outcome. Therefore, these adverbs are never associated with the specified event type which triggers the manner interpretation, as is the case of quickly. The only instance
when such adverbs appear in final position is when they are separated by means of a comma and relevant intonation.

Another test used to identify sentence adverbs is their ability to appear between the subject and a modal verb in a finite construction.

(2) He *certainly* could play the piano *effortlessly*.
   He could play the piano *effortlessly*.
   *He *effortlessly* could play the piano *certainly*.

According to Jackendoff (97), there are three basic positions in which a -ly adverb can occur: initial position, final position without intervening pause, and auxiliary position between the subject and the main verb.

There are -ly adverbs which can occupy all these three positions. There are differences between the interpretation of these -ly adverbs regarding the positions in which they can occur. They exhibit ambiguity concerning the different readings they have, namely subject-oriented or manner readings, due to the different positions in which they surface.

(3) John cleverly / clumsily dropped his cup of coffee.
   *Cleverly / Clumsily*, John dropped his cup of coffee.
   John dropped his cup of coffee *cleverly / clumsily*.

The first example in (3) is ambiguous between the readings of the following two examples, and it can be approximately paraphrased as seen below:

(4) It was clever / clumsy of John to drop his cup of coffee.
   The manner in which John dropped his cup of coffee was clever / clumsy.

Cinque (11) refers to SA as higher adverbs, characterized by a fixed relative order and offers numerous examples to prove his strict ordering from various Italian dialects that appear to allow the co-occurrence of different types of SAs. So, he follows Jackendoff’s classification of speaker-oriented adverbs and further subdivides them into:

a) domain adverbs: *politically, legally, artistically, theoretically, economically, ethically.*
b) pragmatic adverbs: *frankly, sincerely, honestly, truthfully.*
c) evaluative adverbs: *luckily, (un)fortunately, happily.*
d) modal (epistemic) adverbs: *probably, allegedly, possibly, presumably.*
e) modal (evidential) adverbs: surely, certainly, undoubtedly, evidently, obviously Cinque (11)

These adverbs correspond to Quirk et al.’s 1985 “viewpoint adverbs” and to Parsons’s 1990 “frame adverbials”. Huddleston & Pullum (765-766) call these adverbs “domain adverbs/adjuncts”. They are part of the larger class of sentence adverbs (cause-oriented adjuncts), next to other four subclasses: modality adverbs (necessarily), evaluation adverbs (fortunately), speech act-related adverbs (frankly) and connective adverbs (moreover), (see Huddleston & Pullum 576).

Following Cinque’s classification of higher / sentence adverbs for English, Protopopescu (163) provided a similar subdivision for Romanian SAs. What makes it intriguing in the case of Romanian is their partial ability to select the construction with complementizer că as well as. While some Romanian SAs do not allow the presence of the complementizer, in the case of others this selection is optional or even obligatory. The first class, however, that of domain adverbs, never allows că selection. The different degree of insertion of SAs sets Romanian apart from other Romance languages and from English in that Romanian compensates for the apparent lack of adverbs (most of them are derived by means of zero derivation from their corresponding adjectives) with prepositional phrases (e.g. din păcate, din fericire, cu siguranță).

In the corpus under investigation, we have only found three of the four subtypes of SAs: evaluative (fortunately, unfortunately), modal epistemic (apparently, probably, perhaps, etc.) and modal evidential adverbs (surely, certainly, undoubtedly, evidently, obviously).

TRANSLATION STRATEGIES

As part of the corpus discussing strategies used in the translation of SA, I have chosen the two existing Romanian versions of C. S. Lewis’ The Magician’s Nephew. The first one is done by Larisa Avram in 1997 and reprinted in 2005 by RAO Publishing House, henceforth referred to as target text 1 (TT1) (LA) and the more recent one is a collaboration between two translators, Irina Oprea and Radu Paraschivescu, from 2020, published by Arthur Publishing House, henceforth referred to as target text 2 (TT2) (IO&RP). It will be interesting to see how the two translations fare as far as SAs are concerned, since Larisa Avram is a professor of English linguistics, whose doctoral thesis dealt with modal verbs, while Radu Paraschivescu is not only a well known writer but also a very accomplished translator of English literature. Our expectation is that the paraphrasing strategy by means of a prepositional phrase (PP) will be productive for Romanian adverbs,
since Romanian is partly adverbial in the sense of Swan (183) and as argued in Protopopescu (69).

**TRANSLATING EVALUATIVE ADVERBS**

Evaluative adverbs display three features which distinguish them from other adverb classes. Evaluative adverbs are veridical, non-opaque and scopal (see Bonami & Godard, 275). Veridicality means that a simple declarative sentence with an evaluative systematically entails the corresponding sentence without the evaluative, in other words the sentence can survive and retain its grammatical correctness without the evaluative. Non-opacity refers to coreferring expressions which can be substituted in their scope and this can be seen in (1), where the whole sticky mass forms a chain with the anaphoric pronoun it. The scopal character of evaluatives refers to their participation in scope ambiguities correlated with their syntactic position. The examples below do not show a relevant illustration of this particular feature. It is also worth mentioning that this particular set of properties distinguishes evaluatives from modal adverbs, in that modal adverbs are only scopal in nature. They do not exhibit veridicality of non-opacity.

(1) “The Bear lobbed the whole sticky mass over the top of the enclosure and unfortunately it hit Uncle Andrew slap in the face (not all the bees were dead).” (145)

„Ursul reuși să arunce fagurii cu miere în cușcă și, din greșeală, îl lovi pe unchiul Andrew peste față (viespile nu muriseră toate).” (LA 127)

„Ursul aruncase fagurele lipicios spre unchiul Andrew, plesnindu-l cu el peste față (nu muriseră toate albinele).” (IO&RP 162)

TT1 resorts to a PP paraphrase strategy, while TT2 simply omits translating the evaluative. The TT2 omission strategy seems to follow along the lines of the veridicality feature of evaluatives in Bonani & Godard (275) the sentence can easily survive without the translation of the evaluative, just like the English version could do without fortunately.

(2) “Fortunately the front door of the house was-open and the housemaid was standing in the doorway staring at the fun (what a day that girl was having!) so the children had no difficulty in bustling Uncle Andrew indoors before anyone asked any questions.” (154)

„Din fericire, ușa de la întrare era deschisă și fata în casă stătea în prag, uitanându-se la ce se întâmplă pe stradă (ce distracție!), așa încât copiii îi dădură un ghiont unchiului Andrew să intre înainte să-i întrebe cineva ceva.” (LA 134)
The same set of properties applies to the example in (2). In this case, TT1 employs a PP paraphrase again and so does TT2. Therefore, we could conclude that, at least for this subclass of SAs, TT1 is consistent in their choices while TT2 is split between omission and PP paraphrase, the omission of the evaluative being supported by the veridicality property of this class of adverbs.

TRANSLATING MODAL EPISTEMIC ADVERBS

Epistemic modality has been defined as “an evaluation of the chances that a certain hypothetical state of affairs under consideration (or some aspect of it) will occur, is occurring or has occurred in a possible world” (Nuyts 21), and so it seems to be strongly connected to the idea of truth and the authors’ responsibility concerning their statements.

Cornillie (47) proposes a disjunctive model, where epistemic modality and evidentiality are perceived as distinct categories. This is also our opinion as it goes along with our analysis of SAs. An important thing that needs mentioning in this case is the fact that these domains are not mutually exclusive. One expression may exhibit either evidential or epistemic readings. Cornillie also argues that “confusion concerning the overlapping of these domains is due to the frequent association of the mode of knowing and the degree of the speaker’s commitment concerning the proposition. In his view, modes of knowing do not really imply any degree of authorial certainty, evaluation, commitment or likelihood of the proposition to be true.” (Almeida, 18)

By far, one of the richest classes of SAs in English, epistemic adverbs appear to have developed gradually in English, see Wierzbicka (247). She also argues that the evolution and rise of this category in English “is related to the rise of verbal epistemic phrases, such as I presume, I assume, I gather, I understand, and I suppose.” (247) Both categories are the same, and in both cases they can be linked with the emphasis on the limitations of human knowledge, on the need to distinguish knowledge from judgment, and on differentiating between different “degrees of assent.” This seems to fall in line with Vișan’s view that the parenthetical I think may also acquire the function of “an epistemic qualifier (expressing evidentiality, commitment of the speaker) at the level of discourse.” (26-27)

In the examples in (3) we provide an illustration of instances of equivalence in both TT1 and TT2 for probably.

[136]
(3) “If anyone had asked him “Where did you come from?” he would probably have said, “I’ve always been here.””(27)

„Dacă l-ar fi întrebat cineva de unde vine, ar fi spus probabil:
– Sunt aici dintotdeauna.” (LA 10)

„Dacă l-ar fi întrebat cineva de unde venea, probabil ar fi răspuns că trăise dintotdeauna acolo.” (IO&RP 32)

Here, both TT1 and TT2 opt for the instance of the adverb without the complementizer că, but for different reasons. TT1 places the adverb in final position right before a dialogue, while TT2 opts out of the dialogue, transforming it into reported speech, hence the introduction of a reporting verb that in turn selects the same complementizer which would have otherwise been selected alongside probabil. Therefore, at least at surface level both translators resort to equivalence.

(4) “The horse had aimed a kick at him which would probably have killed him.”

„Calul fusese cât pe-aci să-i tragă un picior, ceea ce probabil l-ar fi omorât.” (LA 67)

„Calul se repezise să-i tragă o copită care probabil că l-ar fi omorât.” (IO&RP 87)

(5) “The Bulldog, who had been sniffing Uncle Andrew all over, raised its head and said, “It’s an animal. Certainly an animal. And probably the same kind as those other ones.”” (113)

„Buldogul, care-l tot adulmecase pe unchiul Andrew, spuse, ridicându-şi capul:
– E animal. E cu siguranţă animal. Şi, probabil, din aceeaşi specie cu ceilalţii trei.” (LA 97)

„Buldogul, care-l adulmecase conștiincios pe unchiul Andrew, îşi ridică hotărât capul şi zise:
– E un animal. În mod sigur. Şi probabil că e din acelaşi soi cu ăilalţi.” (IO&RP 124)

In this set of examples, however, TT1 is consistent with their choice of adverb without the complementizer, while TT2 opts for equivalence with the complementizer included in the structure.

The following set of examples (6) and (7) offers an illustration of the strategy of substitution for TT1 in (6) and for TT2 in (7).

(6) “We shall probably discover a gang of desperate criminals and get a reward.”(8)

„S-ar putea să dăm de vreo bandă de criminali disperaţi şi-o să primim o recompensă.” (LA 6)
“Probabil că să descoperim niște bandiți disperați și-o să primim o recompensă.” (IO&RP 13)

(7) “The two drinks *probably* had something to do with it, and so had his best clothes.” (67)
„Probabil că și cele două pahare pe care le băuse contribuieră la asta, precum și hainele lui cele mai bune.” (LA 57)
„Se prea poate ca asta să ș i se fi tras și de la paharele de băutură, și de la hainele cele bune.” (IO&RP 74)

In both sets of examples (6) and (7), one of the translators chose substitution with a formally reflexive verb, where the other chose equivalence with adverb and complementizer and the other way round. Interestingly, in the case of substitution, the form of the verb chosen is a reflexive which in Romanian performs a similar pragmatic function making the structure impersonal, much as the passive voice does in English by deleting the *by* agent. This strategy makes the substitution of the adverbs with a more or less impersonal verb form sound more natural.

**TRANSLATING MODAL EVIDENTIAL ADVERBS**

Evidential adverbs may be explicitly employed by the author to indicate their stance or attitude towards their texts. Stance is a difficult concept to study and apply, as it covers a wide range of meanings. Stance is in itself a meaning rather than a form, as pointed out by Hunston:

> The phenomenon of stance is a meaning, a type of meaning, or several types of meaning, rather than a form [...] it is always acknowledged that identifying stance entails more than simply locating those forms, and that interpreting the role of stance in discourse entails a deeper understanding of the discourse as a whole that can be obtained from looking at the immediate co-text of an individual lexical item. (27-28)

In the same vein, Cornillie’s definition of evidentiality follows this trend, and thus evidentiality “refers to the reasoning processes that lead to a proposition” (47), whereas epistemic modality as we have seen in the previous section “evaluates the likelihood that this proposition is true” (47).

Below we offer a few examples of how the adverb *apparently* is used in the target text and how the translators go about solving the problem of rendering it into Romanian. In Romanian there is the equivalent adverb *aparent*, but translators in particular seem to avoid it because it is too neological and because it is associated with an interpretation along the lines of “on the surface of things”. Having this in mind, it is understandable why this equivalent is not present in any
of the contexts in the two versions of the translations. The main strategy adopted here by the translators is that of substitution with the verb “a părea” which has a closer interpretation to the English “apparently”. TT2 in particular seems to be very fond of the reflexive form with se, thus rendering the sentences more neutral in (9) and (10). TT1 also resorts to the reflexive in (11). This relates to the idea of stance or attitude the author, in this case the translator, adopts towards the text.

(8) “The pool was apparently only a couple of inches deep.” (30)  
„Nu părea să aibă mai mult de câţiva centimetri adâncime.” (LA 25)  
„Apa nu părea să fie mai adâncă de câţiva centimetri.” (IO&RP 35)

(9) “The Witch was apparently recovering her strength.” (28)  
„Vrăjitoarea părea să-şi revină.” (LA 51)  
„Se părea că Vrăjitoarea îşi recăpăta forţele.” (IO&RP 66)

(10) “The young woman had apparently been in the middle of a washing day, for she wore an apron, her sleeves were rolled up to the elbow, and there were soapsuds on her hands.” (56)  
„Tânăra femeie părea să fi fost întreruptă de la spălat rufe, căci purta șorț, avea mâncile suflecate până la coate și mâinile puste de clăbuc.” (LA 103)  
„Se părea că tânăra avusesese mai multe de spălat, căci purta șorț, avea mâncile suflecate până la cot și mâinile acoperite de clăbuc.” (IO&RP 131)

(11) “Of course, Digory knew that Polly could get away by her own ring as easily as he could get away by his. But apparently the Witch didn’t know this.” (66)  
„Bineînţeles că Digory ştia că Polly se poate întoarce cu inelul ei, tot aşa cum şi el se putea întoarce cu al lui. Dar se pare că Vrăjitoarea nu ştia asta.” (LA 123)  
„Fireşte că Digory ştia că Polly putea să plece folosindu-şi propriu inel la fel de uşor cum ar fi făcut-o cu al lui. Dar Vrăjitoarea părea sà n-o ştie.” (IO&RP 157)

The following set of examples are paired together because in both cases TT1 opts for omission, while TT2 chooses substitution with the verb “a părea”. Omission does not seem to be the right route in this case since evidentials do not behave like evaluatives which are optional due to non-opacity. This is why TT1 is impoverished due to the lack of an equivalent – be it a proper equivalent or some sort of substitution or paraphrase.

(12) “The air had apparently suited him as well as it had suited Uncle Andrew.” (46)  
„Aerul de-acolo îi pria şi lui asemeni unchiului Andrew.” (LA 86)  
„Se părea că aerul curat îi făcuse la fel de bine ca unchiului Andrew.” (IO&RP 109)
(13) “Old Great-Uncle Kirke had died and this meant, apparently, that Father was now very rich.” (74)
„Bătrânul unchi Kirke murise, ceea ce însemna că tata era acum foarte bogat.”
(LA 137)
„Bătrânul Kirke, fratele bunicului, murise, iar asta părea să însemne că tata devenise foarte bogat.” (IO&RP 176)

In what follows we look into the only example containing the adverb undoubtedly.

(14) “Uncle Andrew’s temper at last got the better of his fears.”
“Yes, Ma’am, I would,” he said. “Most undoubtedly I would. (43)
„Unchiul Andrew reuși, în sfârșit, să-și învingă teama.
– Da, doamnă, exact, zise. Bineînțeles că așa aș face.” (LA 78)
„În cele din urmă, unchiul Andrew își recăpătă cumpătul și-și alungă frica.
– Da, coiță, chiar așa, zise el. Cum te văd și cum mă vezi.” (IO&RP 100)

TT1 resorts to equivalence by using the adverbsbineînțeles combined with the complementizer că which is quite regular in Romanian. TT2, however, opts for what some might interpret as mistranslation or what others might interpret as substitution with an idiom Cum te văd și cum mă vezi. Thisexpression renders the general idea of undoubtedly, so in our view this is a case of substitution. The fact that this expression is a set phrase in Romanian seems to be in line with an idea of a target oriented type of translation in Eco’s terms. So, in this case the translators chose to bring in the local flavour of the language, making the text even more familiar to the native eye, than, say, an equivalent or some paraphrase.

An adverb that is more frequently used in the text is certainly. Therefore, below we provide several examples of certainly and its renditions in TT1 and TT2.

(15) “Polly had now quite got over her fright and felt sure that the old gentleman was not mad; and there was certainly something strangely attractive about those bright rings.” (13)
„Lui Polly nu-i mai era frică și era de-acum sigură că bătrânul domn nu e nebun; iar inelele acelea strălucitoare te atrăgeau într-un mod ciudat.” (LA 11)
„Lui Polly îi trecuse spaima și fu sigură că domnul în vârstă nu era nebun; în plus, exista cu siguranță ceva neobișnuit de atrăgător la inelele acelea.” (IO&RP 18)

(16) “The old gentleman, who was certainly Uncle Andrew, had just succeeded in standing up and was rubbing his bruises.” (78)
„Bătrânul, care era unchiul Andrew, tocmai reușise să se ridice și-și pipăia zgârieturile.” (LA 66)
„Domnul în vârstă, care era într-adevăr unchiul Andrew, tocmai se ridicase și-și pipăia vânătăiele.” (IO&RP 86)
In (15) and (16) TT1 simply omitted the adverb altogether, which is quite puzzling since this version becomes thus impoverished. No explanation comes to mind as to why the translator chose this. TT2, on the other hand chooses a PP paraphrase using cu siguranță că and equivalence with într-adevăr in (16).


In (17) it is again TT1 that has a rather strange option. It can either be interpreted as a mistranslation or as some sort of substitution with a verbal phrase containing a copula “a fi” and the adjective “adevărat” (true). And while the idea behind certainly and true can be said to be similar, it is still strange that the Romanian translator chose it. TT2 preserved the PP paraphrase as in (15) above.

(18) “The strangest thing was that, almost before he had looked about him, Digory had half forgotten how he had come there. At any rate, he was certainly not thinking about Polly, or Uncle Andrew, or even his Mother. He was not in the least frightened, or excited, or curious.” (27) „Lucrul cel mai ciudat era că, înainte chiar de a se uita în jur, aproape uitase de ce venise acolo. Şi cu siguranță că nu se gândea nici la Polly, nici la unchiul Andrew şi nici măcar la mama. Nu-i era deloc teamă; şi nu era nici emoţionat, nici curios.” (LA 22) „Cel mai ciudat lucru era că, înainte să se uite bine-n jur, Digory aproape că nu mai ştia cum ajunsese aici. În orice caz, nu se mai gândea nici la Polly, nici la unchiul Andrew şi nici măcar la mama lui. Nu simţea teamă, agitaţie sau curiozitate.” (IO&RP 32)

(19) “At any rate, when they had both put on their greens and come back to the edge of the water, and taken hands again, they were certainly a good deal more cheerful and less solemn than they had been the first time. (35) „În orice caz, după ce-şi puseră amândoi inelele verzi şi după ce se apropieră de marginea apei şi se luară iar de mână, erau evident cu mult mai veseli şi mai relaxaţi decât fuseseră prima dată.” (LA 30) „În orice caz, când îşi puseră inelele verzi şi se întoarseră pe marginea apei, prinzându-se din nou de mâini, se arătară mult mai veseli şi mai puţin solemnii decât prima dată. (IO&RP 40)
Examples (18) and (19) suggest the opposite situation, in which TT2 completely omits translating certainly, while TT1 chooses a PP paraphrase in (18) and equivalence in (19). Example (20) seems to bring agreement in both versions, since the translators opted for equivalence in both cases, with într-adevăr in TT1 and chiar in TT2.

In the end, is one example where both TT1 and TT2 choose the PP paraphrase.

(21) “She paused for a moment to look once more at the deserted city — and if she was sorry for all the evil she had done there, she certainly didn’t show it — and then said:” (55)

„Se opri şi mai aruncă o privire spre oraşul părăsit. Dacă se căia pentru răul pe care-l făcuse acolo, cu siguranţă că ştia să-şi ascundă regretele.” (LA 47)

„Tăcu o clipă, mai aruncă o privire către oraşul părăsit – iar dacă-i părea rău pentru ce prăpăd făcuse acolo, cu siguranţă că se pricepea să-şi ascundă simţirile –, apoi spuse:” (IO&RP 62)

Their choice is different in the next example:

(22) “Certainly, she was not at all the sort of person one would like to take home.” (56)

„Fără îndoială, nu era genul de persoană pe care să vrei s-o duci la tine acasă.” (LA 47)

„Hotărât lucră, Regina nu era deloc o persoană dintr-acelea pe care ai vrea să le duci la tine acasă.” (IO&RP 62)

In (22), TT2 resorts to a paraphrase with a noun phrase (hotărât lucră > decided thing) that could be loosely translated into English with the adverb decidedly. As was the case in (14) above, the translators of TT2 went for the target-oriented approach in their translation, whereas TT1 resorted to the PP fără îndoială (without a doubt). These choices are different from that in (21) where both TT1 and TT2 opted for cu siguranţă că. This choice may have to do with the placement of certainly in the sentence, since in (21) it appears in a post-subject / preverbal position, while in (22) it is used in sentence initial position separated by a comma, and it appears to be closer to a comment by the author towards the event described in the sentence.
CONCLUSIONS

This article explored the various translation strategies available in Romanian for rendering SAs in two versions of the The Magician’s Nephew by C. S. Lewis. As expected, due to the type of partly adverbial nature of Romanian the strategy of paraphrasing adverbs by means of a prepositional phrase proved to be quite productive. Otherwise, it appears that substitution, usually by a verb, is also preferred by both versions and TT1 favours equivalence overall. Below we provide a summary of our findings.

Out of the 25 contexts that were under analysis from the two available translations, it appears that TT1 exhibits a slight preference for equivalence and PP paraphrase, which is in consonance with what we know about SAs. TT2 exhibits an unexpected preference for substitution, with equivalence ranking second. If we are to consider paraphrase and PP paraphrase under the same category, then TT2 would rank closer to TT1 and the substitution strategy which it appears to favour. Both translations display a similar number of omissions and mistranslations.

As expected, PP paraphrases were well used in both translations. What was surprising was the number of omissions in both versions. As we have seen, some of these omissions can be explained and there are arguments in favour of that, while in other cases no reason can be found for the choice made by the translator to omit the adverb since the resulting text is impoverished.
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