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Figure 9.1 The distribution of indefinite pronouns with out of the ordinary in BNCfiction vs. ENPC+ (in percentages)

Figure 9.2 Collocational and colligational environment of out of the ordinary vs. utenom det vanlige (in percentages)
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Table 10.3 reveals that the distribution of congruent vs. non-congruent forms differs slightly between the translated and the source texts. While the translations show a preference for non-congruent correspondences in five of the six colligational contexts, the sources show a more varied preference. The Norwegian source texts give rise to four of the colligational contexts; zero correspondences are most prominent when the pattern is followed by \textit{V-ing}, a congruent correspondence is favoured when followed by a direct object, while congruent and non-congruent correspondences are equally frequent when followed by a PP.

Figure 10.1 gives an overview of congruent vs. non-congruent (incl. \(\emptyset\)) correspondences, regardless of direction of translation.

Clear cross-linguistic tendencies emerge: four of the colligational environments markedly attract a non-congruent correspondence (\textit{V-ing}, PP, \textit{V-ed}, Adv), while one is almost uniquely found with a congruent correspondence (NP/dO).

With only six instances, ADJP/oP is evenly divided between congruent and non-congruent correspondences.

The survey of types of correspondences offered above suggests that Norwegian does not have a pattern similar to the English one, the only exception being \textit{found} REFL where a good match seems to exist; thus it will be the starting-point for our more in-depth contrastive analysis.

Figure 11.1 Translations of \textit{få tak i} according to its inflected forms (in percentages)
Figure 11.2 Sources of få tak i according to its inflected forms (in percentages)

Figure 11.3 Correspondences of få tak i overall (in percentages)
Table 11.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Norwegian translation</th>
<th>Norwegian source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>få tak i</td>
<td>fått</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>har x fra</td>
<td>plukket opp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tok tak i</td>
<td>befant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fikk kontakt med</td>
<td>fikk med meg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bet seg fast i</td>
<td>fisket til seg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hentet</td>
<td>skaffet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (6 past tense/3 participle) 9 22
Total (12 past tense/8 participles) 10 24

Compared to the observations made for få tak i in Figure 11.3 above, there is less variation in the correspondences of get hold of. While single-word verbs, including get, and the ‘other’ category were seen to be common correspondences of få tak i, a similar tendency is not noted for the Norwegian correspondences of get hold of, where få tak i is the only one that is frequently used. These facts may point to two different explanations concerning the relative overuse of both patterns in the translated texts as compared to the original texts.

Figure 11.4 Correspondences of get hold of overall (in percentages)

Figure 13.3 Cross-linguistic semantic prosodies: from low (-) to high (+)

Appendix 3 Translation Corpus Aligner (TCA) 2 (Figure based on documentation accompanying TCA2)