

# **Epistemic force in contrast and translation: The case of *sans doute* and its translations in Swedish**

Carina Andersson

Uppsala University

## **1. Preliminaries**

This paper deals with adverbs of high probability in French and Swedish from a contrastive and translation perspective. The aim is twofold: firstly to account for important similarities and divergencies in the semantics of the most common epistemic adverbs in the two languages, secondly to shed light on source text influence in the translations. The starting point of the translation analysis will be the most frequent French adverb of high probability, *sans doute* ('without + doubt' *no doubt*)<sup>1</sup> and its translation equivalents in Swedish target as well as source texts. The translation paradigm will be analysed in order to see if there are significant differences in the use of epistemic adverbs in source texts compared to translations, but the translations also contributes with valuable data to further refine the contrastive analysis. Of special interest will be the epistemic force value, the degree of probability. The question is to determine whether the force value is maintained in the translation and to what extent it can be used to account for variations in the translation paradigm. On a general level, Swedish differs from French in that it has a wider range of probability adverbs having roughly the same position on the epistemic scale but being different with regard to other factors as (inter)subjectivity. In fact, in spite of several surface similarities and common structural features, closely related epistemic adverbs might vary considerably intra- and inter-linguistically in meaning, use and discourse function. That is why typological (Palmer 1986, 2001) and paradigmatic Nuyts (2001) approaches need to be completed with in depth contrastive analyses of specific expressions as showed by for example Simon-Vandenberghe & Aijmer (2007) and Kronning (2007, 2009). Epistemic expressions are rather poorly treated by both dictionaries and grammars, a fact that further motivates contrastive studies.

---

<sup>1</sup> Formally *sans doute* is a preposition phrase having the function of a sentence adverbial, but it constitutes a lexical unit. It is possible to insert a modifying element between the preposition and the noun (*sans aucun doute*, *sans le moindre doute*), but this gives another lexical unit. The expression thus seems highly lexicalised and will be treated as an adverb.

In order to capture a broad set of uses and to determine whether the translation paradigms differ between text types, data will be retrieved from three text types using two corpora compiled at Uppsala University. The main corpus is *C-ParaFras*, a Swedish-French Parallel corpus of mainly fiction (11 French and 10 Swedish originals plus their translations (*cf.* Andersson 2007: 29)<sup>2</sup> and a smaller part of popular science (five French and four Swedish originals with their translations, Svensson (2010: 54ff). The corpus is designed according to the model of Johansson (2007) but contains full length texts. That increases of course the impact of one text or one translator as it has not been possible to obtain exactly the same number of words in each text, but on the other hand makes it possible to distinguish a specific translator's profile. As the amount of words in each subpart of the corpus is not equal, comparisons are made in relative numbers (Biber *et al.* 1998:32-33). Data has also been retrieved from a comparable French-Swedish corpus of parliamentary debates, *C-ParLeur - Corpus du discours du Parlement Européen* (april 2006-mars 2008), designed by Coco Norén (Andersson & Norén 2010). The French part consists of 919 debates/460 000 words, the Swedish of 308 debates/111 400 words. In the present study only data from the French part have been used together with the Swedish translations that have been collected manually through the official web site of the European Parliament.

Table 1. Number of words in the corpora used, in total approximately 4 million words.

	<b>French source texts</b>	<b>Swedish target texts</b>	<b>Swedish source texts</b>	<b>French target text</b>
Fiction	575 000	590 000	530 000	560 000
Popular science	346 000	338 000	294 000	364 000
Debates	460 000	-	111 400	-
total	1 381 000	928 000	935 400	924 000

---

<sup>2</sup> The 2007 version has been updated with two new French and Swedish titles from the 21th century.

## Epistemic force in contrast: French and Swedish epistemic adverbs

Expressions of epistemic modality regulate the commitment that a modal subject (typically the speaker) manifests regarding the truth of the state of affairs described in an utterance. By means of a vast repertoire of morphosyntactic resources (*cf.* de Haan 2006) the speaker can express various fine grained evaluations ranging from highest degree of certainty (*certainly*) via degrees of probability (*probably, most probably*) to mere possibility (*perhaps*). The adverbs are in West Germanic languages according to Nuyts (2001:55) the "purest" expressions of epistemic force: "they are the most precise and specific means available for marking the degree of likelihood of a state of affairs". There can of course be variations in the degree of likelihood depending on contextual circumstances, but these are minor as compared to other expression types like mental state predicates. In fact, adverbs constitute, after adjectives which combine with a wider range of quantifiers (Nuyts 2001:99), the group of expressions that make the most fine grained distinctions between force values in both French and Swedish. Furthermore, epistemic adverbs, especially of high probability/certainty are historically prone to semantic change (van der Auwera & Plungian 1998) and synchronically tend to develop different discourse functions (Simon-Vandenberg & Aijmer 2007). Another characteristic feature of the epistemic adverbs, is that they, in contrast to adjectives for instance, are performative and never descriptive and therefore appear in the background of the information structure of the utterance (Kronning 1996:42, 2003:138, Nuyts 2001:39-41). The contrastive analysis will be concerned with two basic features in the epistemic semantic domain: force and subjectivity/evidential source.

Figure 1 shows how the most frequent French and Swedish epistemic adverbs<sup>3</sup> relate to each other on the epistemic scale (Gosselin 2010:86, Kronning 2007). Four regions can be distinguished: (quasi-)certainty,<sup>4</sup> very high probability, probability and possibility. The method proposed to test the internal force relations among the adverbs consist of coordinating two expressions by means of a grade expression like *even* : [p *even* q] (Kronning 2007:22f, Gosselin 2010:88). The correlation between the languages is in fact

---

<sup>3</sup> The evidential adverbs like *apparemment* 'apparently' are not included in this analysis.

<sup>4</sup> There is no consensus in the previous research on how to treat the top end of the scale. On the one hand certainty expression reinforce the truth value of the state of affairs; on the one hand the explicit mention of the certainty implicates that the truth is not granted, and thus involves the shadow of a doubt. That is why the term *quasi certainty* is used.

not obvious: to a large extent the expressions in both languages have a similar etymological source but have developed different meanings.

<i>sans aucun doute, (sans) nul doute, certainement<sub>1</sub>, sûrement<sub>1</sub></i>	<i>utan tvivel/tvekan, helt/alldeles säkert/säkerligen,</i>
‘without+any+doubt’, ‘zero+doubt’	<i>nog<sub>2</sub></i>
	‘without+doubt/hesitation’, ‘completely + certainly’
<i>très certainement, très sûrement</i>	
‘very+certainly’ ‘very+surely’	<i>mycket säkert/säkerligen</i>
	‘very + certainly’
<i>certainement<sub>2</sub>, sûrement<sub>2</sub>, à coup sûr</i>	
‘certainly’, ‘surely’ ‘at+strike+sure’	<i>säkert/säkerligen</i>
	‘certainly’
<i>très probablement</i>	
‘very+probably’	<i>mycket troligen</i>
	‘very + probably’
<i>probablement, sans doute</i>	
‘probably’, ‘without+doubt’	<i>antagligen, förmodligen, troligen, nog<sub>1</sub>, väl</i>
	‘presumably’
<i>peut-être</i>	
‘maybe’	<i>kanske, måhända</i>
	‘maybe’

Figure 1. Most frequent epistemic adverbs in French and Swedish ordered according to epistemic force

With respect to the expressions of certainty, the most striking divergence between the languages is that *sans doute* has lost its certainty meaning and been replaced at the top of the scale by the reinforced expression *sans aucun doute/(sans) nul doute*. In Swedish, the meaning of the formally parallel expression *utan tvivel* has not changed. Instead the noun *tvivel* ‘doubt’ is being replaced by *tvekan* ‘hesitation’ so that there are two competing expressions. Very high probability is expressed by two stems in French *certain* ‘certain’ (from lat. *certus*, ‘attested’) and *sûr* ‘safe/sure’. They form together with the suffix *-ment* the adverbs *certainement*

and *sûrement*. According to Guimier (1996:113), *certainement* and *sûrement* have different meaning depending on the position in the sentence and can convey both certainty and probability meaning. *Sûr* also appears in the lexicalised preposition phrase *à coup sûr* (for sure). The Swedish adjective *säker*, having the same type of etymological source as *sûr*,<sup>5</sup> has given rise to two synonymous forms; one morphologically identical to the neutral form of the adjective *säkert*, the other formed by the suffix *-ligen*. In parallel to *sans doute*, their force value has faded and they only express high probability. To express certainty, they must be completed by the quantifier *helt/alldeles* ‘completely’ (Svensk ordbok 2009). In fact, *säkert* seems particularly prone to combine with quantifiers, some forming a compound: *bombsäkert*, *bergsäkert*, *helt/alldeles säkert*, *så gott som säkert* (SAG 4:104). Probability is expressed in French by *probablement* and *sans doute*<sup>6</sup>, the latter being the most frequent (Kronning 2007). It cannot combine with the degree marker *très*, it is lighter and more stylistically neutral than *probablement*. Furthermore, it is used to introduce rhetoric concession (*presumably p but q*) mentioned in monolingual (*Petit Robert* 1993, TLFi) but not bilingual (*Norstedts stora franska ordbok* 2008<sup>7</sup>) dictionaries. The adverbs of probability are more numerous and formally more heterogenous in Swedish compared to French. Apart from *säkert/säkerligen*, they typically include a group of synonymous forms based on cognitive predicates (*anta/förmoda* ‘presume’, *tro* ‘believe’). They vaguely comment on the speech act describing it as an ‘assumption’ (SAG 4:104). *Troligen* stands out as the only one to combine with a degree marker and to correspond to a commonly used adjective (*trolig*). A third group consists of the monosyllabic particles *nog* and *väl* particularly frequent in spoken language. They are non stressed and subject to word order restrictions; they cannot be placed in sentence initial position<sup>8</sup> and they cannot form an utterance on their own. Furthermore, they are polysemic having also non probability meaning: *nog* emphasises the speaker’s conviction of the truth of the propositional content, *väl* expresses a demand of confirmation from the hearer (SAG 4:117f). Possibility, finally, is expressed by *peut-être* (‘may+be’) in French and *kanske* (‘may+happen’) in Swedish<sup>9</sup>.

Un utterance containing an epistemic modal expression indicates a belief about the truth of a state of affairs described in the utterance and hence contributes to describe a subjective evaluation, as opposed to

<sup>5</sup> Etymologically it stems from the Latin *securus* (*se* ‘without’ + *curus* ‘worries’). The epistemic meaning has been attested since 1686 (Svensk ordbok 2009) but it is still used with a manner meaning.

<sup>6</sup> We have not included the less frequent *vraisemblablement* and its Swedish correspondence *sannolikt*.

<sup>7</sup> Not under the entry *doute*, but at the Swedish entry *visserligen*, you find *certainement*, *sans doute*, *certes*.

<sup>8</sup> In sentence initial position *nog* doesn’t express probability but emphasis the speakers conviction of the truth of the propositional content and is especially usual in axiological contexts or in threats.

<sup>9</sup> There are also several less commonly used expressions of the same meaning: *kanhända* ‘can happen’, *kantänka* ‘can think’, *möjligen* ‘possibly’, *möjligtvis* ‘possible+manner’.

assertions which are presented as subject neutral and in some sense objective. According to Gosselin (2010:60) the truth of the utterance is then granted by an *instance de validation* (I) that could be the speaker and the other conversation participants or the general *doxa* (common opinion). An expression can be neutral with regard to the exact validation instance, or include that information in its semantics. In the latter case, the expression could be said to involve an evidential component, that is information about the source of the belief/knowledge justifying the assumption. In this regard, *sans doute* is a modally monosemic lexeme, because it doesn't inherently express whether the judgment is to be attributed to the speaker (subjectivity) or to a wider group of people (intersubjectivity) or result from an inference. Nevertheless the word *doute* establish a link to a cognitive attitude not present *probable*. On the contrary, the evidential dimension has a crucial role in distinguishing between Swedish adverbs of probability. This is clearly the case in the contrast *nog-väl*; *väl* has developed an evidential meaning indication that the hearer (or a wider group of people) is "appealed to as the source of knowledge" (Aijmer 1996: 399). The first occurrence in 11 provides an example. *Nog* on the contrary has the speaker as the source of belief or "instance de validation" (cf. Aijmer 1996:422). These meaning components have been reinforced in the "emphasising" and "demand for confirmation" uses. *Säkert/säkerligen* is different from *antagligen/förmodligen*: it can just like *nog* be used in contexts where the listener express emphatic sympathy. *Var inte orolig. Det går nog/säkert/säkerligen bra.* <sup>?</sup>*Det går antagligen/förmodligen bra.* 'Don't worry. It is probably going to be fine.' It thus seems that *säkert* still conveys a stronger commitment than the other probability adverbs, but it is not clear whether this is due to a higher degree of "subjectivity" or just a stronger force value, most probably a combination of both. The direct link to the epistemic emotional state makes it intuitively more subjective than *antagligen/förmodligen* evoking the notions of assumptions and reason. *Säkert* also has a higher frequency in fiction than in non fiction.

To summarise, French probability adverbs are more purely epistemic, the Swedish ones have greater variation. There are mere stylistic variants like *antagligen/förmodligen/troligen*; *säkert/säkerligen*. There are also semantic differences with regard to the validation instance (I) that could be summarised in the following way: a) I = speaker (*nog*, *säkert/säkerligen*), b) I = hearer (*väl*), c) I = non specified/intersubjective (*antagligen*, *förmodligen*, *troligen*). There are of course also divergences between the languages regarding word order restrictions but that goes beyond the scope of the present paper.

### **Sans doute: distribution in the corpora**

The absolute and relative (per 100 000 words) observed frequency of *sans doute* in the sub corpora is given in Table 2. A comparison is made with the stylistically more formal synonym *probablement*. In fiction *sans doute* is approximatively four times more common than *probablement*, in popular science about twice as common. In the translations compared to their originals, *sans doute* is less common in fiction but have quite the same relative frequency in the non fiction corpus. On the contrary *probablement* is more commonly used in translations of fiction than in fiction originals, but less commonly in the translation of non fiction.

Table 2. Distribution of *sans doute* and *probablement* in source texts and target texts

Text type	Expression	French source text		French target text		total
		frequency	f./100 000	frequency	f./100 000	
<b>Fiction</b>	<i>sans doute</i>	230	<b>40</b>	136	<b>24</b>	366
	<i>probablement</i>	54	<b>9</b>	94	<b>15</b>	148
<b>Pop science</b>	<i>sans doute</i>	70	<b>20</b>	64	<b>17.5</b>	134
	<i>probablement</i>	43	<b>12</b>	13	<b>4</b>	56
<b>Debates</b>	<i>sans doute</i>	45	<b>10</b>	-----	-----	45
	<i>probablement</i>	13	<b>3</b>	-----	-----	13

Table 3. Distribution of *sans doute* introducing a rhetoric concession in the corpora.

	Fiction		Pop science		Debates	total
	source texts	target texts	source texts	target texts	source texts	
concession	24	5	10	18	5	62 (11%)
others	206	131	60	46	40	483 (89%)
total	230	136	70	64	45	545 (100%)

## Epistemic adverbs in translation

The Swedish equivalents to *sans doute* in table 4 show a strong tendency towards formal equivalence, as expected. The tendency is the same in both translation directions, but a bit weaker in translations from Swedish. Among the target text equivalents there are only, apart adverbs, auxiliaries (*bör/borde/torde/måste*) all deontic with epistemic probability meaning; among the source text equivalents there are also some cases of mental verbs (*anta* ‘assume’, *tro* ‘believe’, *tolka* ‘interpret’, *inte veta* ‘not know’) and adjectives (*trolig*, *förmodad* ‘probable’). The shift from one category to another can be the effect of another structural change, or reflect a normalisation when a more marked expression corresponds to *sans doute*.

The translation paradigms reflect the semantic divergences between the languages, but also seem to reveal influences from the source language that to some extent vary between text types. As a matter of fact, the equivalents range over the whole epistemic scale from possibility to certainty, although the dominant group is that of probability adverbs. In a few cases the equivalent is an evidential adverb or verb (*tyckas/verka* ‘seem’). Swedish source texts of popular science stand out by having a greater lexical variation among the equivalents (negative expressions : *kan inte gärna* ‘is not likely to’ , *om inte annat* ‘the least’; impersonal constructions: *det är tveksamt* ‘it is doubtful’ , *man kan gissa* ‘one can guess’ *man kan hålla med* ‘one can agree’). Most of these expressions are not repeated more than one or twice and do not occur in the fiction corpus. *Knappast* ‘hardly’, a negative expression of very high probability that lacks a French correspondence, appears among the source text equivalents to *sans doute*. The translations in the rhetoric concession has its own pattern and will be treated separately.

Table 4. Equivalents to *sans doute* in Swedish target texts and Swedish source texts

<i>sans doute</i>	Fiction		Popular science		Debates
	target texts	source texts	target texts	source texts	target texts
<b>1. Certainty</b>	<b>8 (4%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>10 (17%)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>30 (65%)</b>
<i>utan tvivel/tvekan</i>	8	0	10	0	20
<i>otvivelaktigt; det råder ingen tvekan</i>	0	0	0	0	5

	Fiction		Popular science		Debates
<i>sans doute</i>	target texts	source texts	target texts	source texts	target texts
<i>others</i>					5
<b>2. Very high probability</b>	<b>50 (24%)</b>	<b>4 (3%)</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4 (9%)</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>säkert/säkerligen</i>	49	1	2	0	1
<i>med all/största säkerhet/sannolikhet</i>	1	0	0	2	0
<i>knappast</i>	0	3	0	2	0
<b>3. High probability</b>	<b>125 (60%)</b>	<b>102 (77%)</b>	<b>37 (61%)</b>	<b>34 (74%)</b>	<b>1</b>
<i>antagligen/förmodligen</i>	88 (42%)	35 (27%)	27	4	0
<i>troligen/troligtvis</i>	1	9 (7%)	7	7	0
<i>trolig/förmodad</i>	0	2	0	1	0
<i>rimligen/rimligtivs/sannolikt</i>	0	2	0	4	0
<i>nog</i>	22 (11%)	18 (27%)	3	2	0
<i>väl</i>	6 (3%)	25 (19%)	0	0	0
modal aux. ( <i>måste, bör, borde, torde, kan+neg</i> )	8 (4%)	5 (4%)	0	8	0
mental verb ( <i>anta, tro, tolka, inte veta</i> )	0	6 (5%)	0	2	1
<i>others</i>	0	0	0	6	0
<b>4. Possibility (<i>kanske, måhända, kan</i>)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>12 (9%)</b>	<b>5 (8%)</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>5. Evidentials (<i>naturligtvis, förstås, visst; tycks, verka</i>)</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>6. Others</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>7. Omissions</b>	<b>10 (5%)</b>	<b>7 (5%)</b>	<b>3 (5%)</b>	<b>3 (5%)</b>	<b>7 (17,5%)</b>
<b>total</b>	<b>206 (100%)</b>	<b>131 (100%)</b>	<b>60 (100%)</b>	<b>46 (100%)</b>	<b>40 (100%)</b>

*Antagligen/förmodligen/troligen* constitutes the largest group in source as well as target texts in both fiction and popular science, but are not at all present in *C-ParLeur*. Their unambiguous force value and relative subject neutrality illustrated in 1 and 2 explains perhaps their dominant position.

- |  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
| 1. No est assise en face de mon père, son visage est pâle, fatigué, elle vient <b>sans doute</b> de rentrer.   | No sitter mitt emot pappa, hon ser blek och trött ut, hon har <b>antagligen</b> nyss kommit hem.                                 | No sits opposite to dad, she looks pale and tired, she has <b>PROB</b> recently come home.                         |
| (F.DDV)  |  |  |
| 2. Une telle corrélation explique <b>sans doute</b> l'entreprise de revitalisation de la croyance au diable décidée récemment par l'Église catholique. (PS.RM) | Det här sambandet förklarar <b>förmodligen</b> varför den katolska kyrkan nyligen bestämde sig för att återuppväcka djävulstron. | This correlation <b>PROB</b> explains the recent revitalisation by the catholic church of the belief in the devil. |

*Antagligen/förmodligen* are however more dominant in the TT. One translator almost consequently translate *sans doute* with *förmodligen*, which makes the data a bit biased. *Troligtvis* on the other hand is more frequent in the ST. The over use of *antagligen/förmodligen* as the translation of *sans doute* is reflected in an overall higher relative frequency of these forms in TT as opposed to ST. The relative frequency of *antagligen/förmodligen* per 100 000 words attains 9/6 (ST) vs 16/22 (TT) in fiction and 1,5/1,7 (ST) vs 5/16 (TT) in popular science.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, a quick glance at the data shows that there is also an influence on the text structuring level. *Antagligen/förmodligen* most commonly appear in sentence initial position in the source texts and in the canonic mid position in the translations.

*Säkert/säkerligen*, is the second most common equivalent but only occurs in fiction and almost exclusively as TE. The use of *säkert* can here be motivated by the internal perspective it contributes to create by virtue of the subjective validation, as illustrated in 3 and 4. *Antagligen/förmodligen/troligen* would establish a more objective perspective, and *nog* would convey a somewhat weaker commitment.

---

<sup>10</sup> *Antagligen* corresponds in French fiction TT to *sans doute* and *probablement* in more or less the same degree (*probablement* 19, *sans doute* 22, others 8).

<p>3. Aux tables attenantes, des hommes plus larges et plus rustiques les observaient. Le service de protection. Les flics étaient <b>sans doute</b> là aussi, quelque part. (F.AR)</p>	<p>Vid borden intill satt större och rustikare män och bevakade dem. Livvakter. Polisen var <b>säkert</b> också där, någonstans.</p>	<p>By the adjacent tables, broader and more rustic men observed them. Bodyguards. The police where PROB there also, somewhere.</p>
<p>4. Monsieur Muller, il y a bientôt trente-cinq ans que j’enseigne, vous êtes <b>sans doute</b> le cinquantième élève à me faire le coup de l’ascenseur. (F.DDV)</p>	<p>Jag har undervisat i snart trettiofem år, monsieur Muller, och ni är <b>säkert</b> den femtionde eleven som försöker med hissvarianten.</p>	<p>I have been teaching for soon thirty five years, you are PROB the fiftieth pupil to try the elevator trick.</p>

In the non fiction, it is more difficult to argue that there is an internal perspective to respect, and that is probably explains why *säkert* is not common among this type of data. 5 gives an example though:

<p>5. le fait que les journalistes sont [...]en position d’infériorité structurale par rapport à des catégories qu’ils peuvent dominer occasionnellement [...] contribue <b>sans doute</b> à expliquer leur tendance constante à l’anti-intellectualisme. (PS.PB1)</p>	<p>Att [journalisterna] befinner sig i en position av strukturell underordning i förhållande till de kategorier de tillfälligtvis kan få makt över [...] är <b>säkert</b> en del av förklaringen till deras ständiga tendens till antiintellektualism.</p>	<p>the fact that the journalist are in a position of structural inferiority towards the categories they can occasionally dominate [...] contributes PROB to explain their constant tendency towards anti intellectualism.</p>
--	--	---

The lack of SE is due to the fact that the dominant translation in the fiction corpus of *säkert/säkerligen* is *sûrement/certainement*: *sûrement*: 50, *certainement* 18, *c’est sûr/il est sûr/certain* 8. Even if the force value of *säkert*, as well as for the French correspondences, is likely to vary depending on the context, these numbers seem to indicate a source language influence and that there is a stronger commitment expressed in the translations than in the original (especially when the adjective construction is used). Both *sûrement* and *certainement* are clearly over used in the translations of the fiction corpus (r.frequency: 5,2/2,6 ST vs 16/13 TT). In contexts of approximation, where the uncertainty is perhaps more clear other approximative expressions are sometimes, but not always, used (*au moins* ‘at least’, *bon/bonne* ‘good’).

6. Vi satt ensamma i **säkert** trettio minuter. (F.SL)      On est restés là tout seuls **une bonne** demi-heure.      We sat alone for **PROB** thirty minutes.

7. Han var lång, **säkert** 1,90. (F.SC)      Il était grand, **sûrement** 1,90 m.      He was tall, **PROB** 1,90 m.

A more detailed qualitative analysis would be needed in order to draw further conclusions.

*Nog* is a bit more common as a source equivalent than as a target equivalent in the material and due to its domination in (in)direct speech almost inexistent in the non fiction material.

8. Rönn såg på Martin Beck och sa: Jo, han har **nog** rätt. (F.SW)      Rönn regarda Martin Beck et dit: Il a **sans doute** raison.      Rönn looked at Martin Beck: He **PROB** is right.

9. C'était plutôt à lui de me présenter ses condoléances. Mais il le fera **sans doute** après-demain, quand il me verra en deuil. (F.AC)      Det var snarare han som borde beklaga sorgen. Men det kommer han **nog** att göra i övermorgon när han ser mig sorgklädd.      It was rather he who should offer his condolences. But he will **PROB** do it the day after tomorrow, when he will see me in mourning.

In a French-Swedish perspective, *väl* can be regarded as a unique lexical item, because in French there is no adverb having at the same time the probability meaning and the "demand for confirmation". It is therefore not surprising that *väl* is more often seen as source than as target equivalent to *sans doute*. In translation from Swedish the demand for confirmation/reliance on external evidence or refusal on the behalf of the subject to alone assume the responsibility for the assumption, disappears when translated by *sans doute*. In the French originals it is not at all mentioned and the context need to have clear indications of this kind for *väl* to be chosen as a translation.

10. [...] il jugea plus correct de d'abord se présenter : **sans doute** était-elle au courant, il venait de la part de sa fille Marthe [...] (F.JR)      [...] han fann det hövligare att först presentera sig: hon hade **väl** redan hört, han kom med hälsningar från hennes dotter Marthe [...]      [...] he considered it more polite to introduce first himself: she had **PROB** already heard, he came on behalf of her daughter Marth [...]

11. -Det är **väl** värt försöket, va? -Jo, - Ça en vaut la peine, **n'est-ce pas?** - It is worth a try, isn't it? - Yes, it  
 det är **väl** det, sa Rönn -Euh, **sans doute**, dit Rönn. PROB is, said Rönn hesitating.  
 tvivlande." (F.SW) légèrement dubitatif.

In spite of the fact that *sans doute* is not a semantic equivalent to *utan tvivel/tvekan*, these are attested as TE. As there are no contextual features which would account for a stronger epistemic interpretation in the given cases, this is clearly a case of formal interference of false friends from the source language. A quick glance at Table 4 above shows that this source text influence is particularly remarkable in the parliamentary debate. This is no surprise, as this is an extremely "functional" translation type whose purpose is perhaps mainly to give a rough record of the content. Nevertheless, the result is a considerable step away from the source text fidelity. The tendency is weaker in the non fiction corpus, but still certainty expressions account for 17 % of the translations. This is perhaps a more important deviance from the fidelity norm, since these texts are assumed to be translated with fidelity and are supposed to be read by a wide audience.

12. La question sociale est **sans doute** la première cause des problèmes de confiance entre les citoyens et les institutions européennes.  
 (D.wurtzip071128b)
- Det sociala problemet är **utan tvekan** huvudskälet till att våra medborgare inte litar på EU:s institutioner.
- The social question is PROB the first cause of the problem of confidence between the citizens and the european institutions.
13. Et les journalistes sont **sans doute** d'autant plus enclins à adopter le « critère audimat » dans la production [...] qu'ils occupent une position plus élevée [...] (PS.PB1)
- Och journalisterna är **utan tvekan** mer benägna att tillämpa "audimat-kriterier" ("gör det enkelt", "håll det kort" etc.) i sin produktion [...] ju högre positioner de besitter [...]
- And the journalists are PROB more inclined to adopt the audience ratings criteria in the production the higher position the have [...]

There are only few occurrences of possibility expressions as equivalents to *sans doute* in the material, as illustrated in 14 and 15. They appear in both source texts and target texts in fiction as well as non fiction, but not in all the texts.

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>14. Det måste ha varit känt vilka åsikter han hyste, men hans sociala status <b>kanske</b> gav honom en säkrare ställning. (PS.TF)</p>   | <p>Les opinions qu'il professait devaient être de notoriété publique, mais son statut social le protégeait <b>sans doute</b>.</p>  | <p>It must have been known which opinions he had, but his social status MAYBE gave him a more secure position.</p>  |
| <p>15. [...] om det aldrig händer nåt som förmår förskjuta det vanliga en smula, då <b>kanske</b> jag kommer att gå här i snömodden i samma gummistövlar när jag är 29 år också, och 59 och 79. (F. SC)</p> | <p>[...] si rien de nouveau ne vient changer l'état habituel des choses, je continuerai sans doute à marcher dans la neige fondue avec les mêmes bottes en caoutchouc quand j'aurai vingt-neuf ans, cinquante-neuf ans, soixante-dix-neuf ans.</p> | <p>[...] if nothing happens that can change the usual a bit, then I will MAYBE continue on in this slush in the same rubber boot when I am 29 years too, and 59 and 79.</p> |

In concessive structures, the translation equivalents of certainty (28) -*visserligen*, *visst*, *utan tvivel/tvekan*, *nog<sup>2</sup>*-, very high probability (5) and evidentiality - *uppenbarligen* 'obviously', *naturligtvis* 'naturally', *givetvis* 'of course' (5) - dominate together with the possibility marker *kanske* (6). Among the probability expressions, *förmodligen* only appears twice. The translation paradigm thus doesn't indicate any preference for a probability expression in Swedish. Instead the typical equivalent in source as well as target texts is the lexicalised form *visserligen* corresponding to French *certes* 'admittedly'. This rises the question whether *sans doute* has lost /maintained its certainty meaning in this context and whether the use of probability expressions to introduce rhetoric concession are less typical in Swedish.

- |   |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| <p>16. Sekulariseringsprocessen får <b>visserligen</b> "ett mäktigt uppsving" under 1700-talet, <b>men</b> den var begränsad till ett litet skikt och lämnade den stora befolkningen oberörd. (PS.TF)</p> | <p><b>Sans doute</b>, le mouvement de sécularisation connut « un puissant essor » au cours du XVIIIe siècle, <b>mais</b> il demeura limité à un petit cercle et n'affecta pas l'ensemble de la population.</p> | <p>The secularisation movement gets CONCESSION "a remarkable popularity during the 1800th century, <b>but</b> it was limited to a small circle and left the major part of the population untouched.</p> |
|---|--|---|

17. A ce moment, il s'est tourné vers moi et m'a désigné du doigt en continuant à m'accabler sans qu'en réalité je comprenne bien pourquoi. **Sans doute**, je ne pouvais pas m'empêcher de reconnaître qu'il avait raison. Je ne regrettais pas beaucoup mon acte. **Mais** tant d'acharnement m'étonnait. (F.JPS)

Just då vände han sig mot mig, pekade på mig och överöste mig med anklagelser utan att jag riktigt förstod varför. Jag kunde **visserligen** inte låta bli att erkänna att han hade rätt. Jag ångrade inte mitt handlande särskilt mycket. **Men** all denna upprördhet förvånade mig. (JS).

At this moment, he turned towards me and pointed at me while continuing to condemn me but i didn't really understand why. **CONCESSION** I could not avoid to recognise he was right. I did not much regret my act. But such an excitement surprised me.

More data would be needed to corroborate these hypotheses and understand how different epistemic markers are used in the rhetoric concession in the two languages.

## Conclusion

The aim of the present study was to shed light first on some important similarities and divergences in the semantics of adverbs of high probability in French and Swedish and secondly on the source text influence in the translation of epistemic markers across three text types. It appears that French probability adverbs have a more general meaning than the Swedish correspondences and can be used in a wider range of contexts. *Sans doute* is by far the most frequent one in all three text types in the corpora used. It has not one genuine semantic equivalent in Swedish and that is perhaps the reason why it is significantly less used in translations from Swedish than in French originals. In translations from Swedish, the stylistically more marked synonym *probablement* is more frequent in fiction but not in popular science. The Swedish adverbs of probability is more numerous and their semantics involve a parameter that is absent in *sans doute*, the source of the belief, or instance of validation, that could be the speaker (*nog, säkert/säkerligen*) or the hearer (or a larger group of people) (*väl*) but could also be left unspecified (*antagligen/förmodligen/troligen*).

A strong tendency in the corpus is the preference for semantically less complex or prototypical items. In the probability domain there is an over use of *antagligen/förmodligen* as target text equivalent compared to source text equivalent and this at the expense of more langue specific items as *nog, säkert, väl*. This corresponds to an over all higher relative frequency of the same forms in translated texts that is parallel

to the higher frequency of *probablement* in translations. This could be explained in terms of a normalisation or simplification at the lexical level that seems to be common in translation (Mauranen/Kujamäki 2004). It also gives some support the unique lexical item hypothesis (Chesterman 2007:16) according to which a translated text would manifest lower frequencies of linguistic elements lacking counterparts in the source language. That is why *sans doute* has *väl* as a source but not as a target equivalent.

There is a also tendency in the translations in the material to convey a higher force value than the original, partly because of semantic/pragmatic differences between formally and etymologically similar expressions. In the direction French-Swedish, this tendency is stronger in non fiction translation, *i.e* in the translation of popular science and parliamentary debates, where *sans doute* is translated by *utan tvivel/tvekan* to a significant extent. In the direction Swedish-French, *säkert* is to some extent translated by a stronger force value due to it's formal resemblance to *sûrement/certainement*. The translations from Swedish indicate that *sans doute* would be a better candidate in some cases. Actually, *säkert* is one of the most frequent Swedish epistemic adverbs and its force value is somewhat vague; it has clearly lost it's certainty meaning and seems to have a larger extension towards probability than the French lexical correspondences. Another argument supporting this hypothesis is the over use of *sûrement/certainement* in French translations as compared to French originals.

In the rhetoric concession finally, *sans doute* doesn't seem to have a typical Swedish correspondence in the probability domain. On the contrary, the translation data indicate that *sans doute* has kept it's certainty meaning in this context and functions in parallel to other items (such as *certes*) that indicates that the speaker fully accepts the validity of the first argument without considering it important for his/her argumentation.

## References

- Aijmer, Karin. 1996. "Swedish Modal Particles in Contrastive Perspective." *Language Sciences Vol 18, Issues 1-2*, January-April 1996. P 292-427.
- Andersson, Carina. 2007. *Équivalence et saillance dans l'expression de la localisation frontale dynamique en suédois et en français : étude comparative et contrastive de fram et de (s')avancer/en avant*.
- Andersson, Carina & Norén, Coco 2010. "Comparer la finalité dans le débat parlementaire: l'apport du corpus bilingue C-ParlEur. Langues et textes en contrastes." *Sens publique*. 13-14, Juillet 2010. S. 35-53.

- Biber, Douglas, Susan Conrad, Randi Reppen. 1998 *Corpus linguistics : investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge : Cambridge Univ. Press.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2007 "What is a unique item?" In Gambier, Miriam Shlesinger & Radegundis Stolze (eds.) *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies. Selected contributions from the EST Congress, Lisbon 2004* pp 3-13.
- De Haan, Ferdinand. 2006. "Typological approaches to modality." In Frawley, William (ed.) *The expression of modality*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Guimer, Clude. 1996. *Les adverbes du français: Le cas des adverbes en -ment*. Paris: Ophrys.
- Gosselin, Laurent. 2010. *Les modalités en Français. La Validation des Représentations*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Johansson, Stig. 2007. *Seeing through multilingual corpora : on the use of corpora in contrastive studies*. Amsterdam ; J. Benjamins, 2007
- Kronning, Hans. 1996. *Modalité, cognition et polysémie : sémantique du verbe modal devoir*. Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Kronning, Hans. 2003. « Modalité et évidentialité », in Birkelund, M., Boysen, G. & Kjærsgaard, P. S. (eds). *Aspects de la Modalité*, Tübingen, Max Niemeyer, Linguistische Arbeiten 469, p. 131-151.
- Kronning, Hans. 2007. Kronning, H., "Om epistemiska uttryck i de romanska språken", Kungl. Vetenskaps-Societeten / Royal Society of Sciences, Sweden. Årsbok 2006, Uppsala, 107-141.
- Kronning, Hans. 2009. "Talarens ansvar för sitt yttrande. Om epistemiska uttryck i de romanska språken", Kungl. Vitterhets Historie och Antikvitets Akademien, Årsbok 2009, Stockholm 2009, 177-199.
- Mauranen, Anna, Pekka Kujamäki (eds). 2004. *Translation universals : do they exist?* Amsterdam : Benjamins.
- Nuyts, Jan. 2001. *Epistemic modality, language, and conceptualization : a cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam ; John Benjamins
- Palmer, Frank Robert. 1986, 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- SAG. cf. Teleman *et al.*
- Simon-Vandenberghe, Anne-Marie & Karin Aijmer. 2007. *The semantic field of modal certainty : a corpus-based study of English adverbs*. Berlin ; Mouton de Gruyter.

- Svensson, Maria. 2010. *Marqueurs corrélatifs en français et en suédois : étude sémantico-fonctionnelle de d'une part- d'autre part, d'un côté- de l'autre et de non seulement- mais en contraste*. Uppsala : Acta Universitatis Upsaliensi.
- Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg, Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska akademins grammatik*. (SAG) Stockholm: Svenska Akademin.
- van der Auwera, Johan & Plungian Vladimir A. 1998. "Modality's semantic map." *Linguistic Typology* 2: 79-124.

## **Dictionaries**

- Le petit Robert*. Paris. 1993
- TLFi: *Trésor de la langue française informatisé*. <http://atilf.atilf.fr/>
- Norstedts stora franska ordbok : fransk-svensk, svensk-fransk*. 2008.
- Svensk ordbok utgiven av Svenska Akademien*. Norstedts. 2009.