

UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND
PHILOSOPHICAL FACULTY
SCHOOL OF HUMANITIES
English language and translation

Emma Maria Wilhelmiina Takkunen
Finnish unique items and their triggers in the original text

MA Thesis
September 2020

ITÄ-SUOMEN YLIOPISTO – UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND

Tiedekunta – Faculty Philosophical Faculty		Osasto – School School of Humanities	
Tekijät – Author <u>Emma</u> Maria Wilhelmiina Takkunen			
Työn nimi – Title Finnish unique items and their triggers in the original text			
Pääaine – Main subject	Työn laji – Level	Päivämäärä – Date	Sivumäärä – Number of pages
English Language and Translation	Pro gradu -tutkielma	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30.09.2020
	Sivuainetutkielma	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Kandidaatin tutkielma	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Aineopintojen tutkielma	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tiivistelmä – Abstract			
<p>This study is based on a translation universal by Tirkkonen-Condit (2002), the unique item hypothesis, focusing on what types of triggers in the original English texts trigger unique Finnish verbs in translations. This study hypothesizes that most Finnish unique items have clear stimulus in the original English text.</p> <p>The unique Finnish verbs used are the same ones used in Tirkkonen-Condit (2004), namely a group of verbs of sufficiency: <i>ehtii</i>, <i>jaksaa</i>, <i>riittää</i>, <i>uskaltaa</i>, <i>kelvata</i>, <i>mahtua</i>, <i>viitsiä</i>, <i>kehdata</i>, <i>viihtyä</i>, <i>malttaa</i>, <i>rohjeta</i> and <i>joutaa</i>. There are 189 cases of these verbs in the material. The data for this study is gathered from Oslo Multilingual Corpus.</p> <p>This study uses a new categorization of triggers to analyze the data. It uses three categories: 1: Clear, literal stimulus, 2: idioms and phrases, 3: no clear stimulus.</p> <p>This study finds that in this dataset the results do not support the hypothesis and a vast majority (133 cases) of unique items do not have a straightforward trigger in the original text. 20 cases have idioms or phrases as triggers and 36 cases have a clear trigger.</p>			
Avainsanat – Keywords Unique items, the unique item hypothesis, triggers in the original text, unique verbs, corpus			

ITÄ-SUOMEN YLIOPISTO – UNIVERSITY OF EASTERN FINLAND

Tiedekunta – Faculty Filosofinen tiedekunta		Osasto – School Humanistinen osasto	
Tekijät – Author <u>Emma</u> Maria Wilhelmiina Takkunen			
Työn nimi – Title Finnish unique items and their triggers in the original text			
Pääaine – Main subject	Työn laji – Level	Päivämäärä – Date	Sivumäärä – Number of pages
Englannin kieli ja kääntäminen	Pro gradu -tutkielma	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	30.09.2020
	Sivuainetutkielma	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Kandidaatin tutkielma	<input type="checkbox"/>	
	Aineopintojen tutkielma	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Tiivistelmä – Abstract			
<p>Tutkimus Tirkkonen-Conditiin (2002) uniikkianeshypoteesista, jota on ehdotettu käännösuniversaaliksi. Tutkimus keskittyy tarkastelemaan millaisia virikkeitä käännöksiin päätyvillä uniikeilla suomenkielisillä aineksilla on englanninkielisessä alkutekstissä. Tutkimuksen hypoteesi on, että suurimmalla osalla uniikkiaineksista on selkeä virike alkutekstissä.</p> <p>Tutkimukseen valitut uniikit suomenkieliset riittävyttä kuvaavat verbit ovat samat, joita on käytetty aiemmissa tutkimuksissa (Tirkkonen-Conditi, 2004). Verbit ovat <i>ehtiä, jaksaa, riittää, uskaltaa, kelvata, mahtua, viitsiä, kehdata, viihtyä, malttaa, rohjeta ja joutaa</i>. Tutkimusaineisto on kerätty Oslo Multilingual Corpusesta.</p> <p>Tutkimus käyttää analyysissä uutta kolmen kategorian mallia, jossa kategoriat ovat 1: selkeä virike, 2: fraasi tai idiomi ja 3: ei selkeää virikettä.</p> <p>Tutkimustulokset eivät tue hypoteesia, jonka mukaan uniikkiaineksilla olisi selkeä virike lähtötekstissä, vaan valtaosalla (133) tapauksista ei ole selkeää virikettä. 36 tapauksella on selkeä virike ja 20 tapauksella virikkeenä on fraasi tai idiomi.</p>			
Avainsanat – Keywords Uniikkiainekset, uniikkianeshypoteesi, virikkeet alkutekstissä, uniikit verbit, korpus			

Contents

Contents	4
1 Introduction.....	5
2 Corpora.....	7
3 Translation universals	9
4 Unique item hypothesis.....	12
4.1 Basic premises.....	12
4.2 Research on the unique item hypothesis	15
4.3 Research on the stimulus in the original text	19
5 Research data	22
5.1 Verbs of sufficiency	22
5.2. The corpus	24
5.3 Data collection.....	25
5.4 Issues	29
5.4.1 Technical difficulties	29
5.4.2 Issues with the data.....	29
6 Research method.....	31
7 Analysis and results	36
7.1 Quantitative analysis	36
7.2 Qualitative analysis	38
8 Discussion	61
8.1 Discussion on results.....	61
8.2 Discussion on approach and methodology.....	64
9 Conclusion	67
References.....	69

1 Introduction

This study aims to further explore the unique item hypothesis put forward by Tirkkonen-Condit (2004). Unique items are “linguistic elements that lack linguistic counterparts in the source languages” (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2002, 209). The unique item hypothesis postulates that unique items are underrepresented in translations, which has been previously supported by research on frequencies of different unique items, but the reason for this has only been speculated on. Previously the difficulty of processing large amounts of text has prohibited larger-scale research, but the developments in corpus-based translation studies gave rise to corpus-based translation studies (Baker, 1993) and made it possible to examine these types of phenomena on a large enough scale to bring out wider tendencies in the translations. Using the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (1999-2008) (OMC), this study aims to find out how unique items are stimulated to appear in translations and what different types of stimulus there are.

Underrepresentation is a key element of the unique item hypothesis and the reason given is often that unique items lack stimulus in the original text. The research question for this thesis rises from this lack of stimulus and is formulated as follows: If unique items are underrepresented due to a lack of clear stimuli, do the unique items that do manifest in translations have mainly clear stimuli in the source text? A secondary research question, that searches to further enlighten how unique items are used in translations and how that might affect how they are stimulated is: How do unique items function in translations and what are they used for?

The research question for this thesis derives from the unique item hypothesis. Tirkkonen-Condit (2005, 177-178) defines unique items as lexical, phrasal, syntactic, textual or any other feature of language that has no straightforward linguistic counterpart in any given language pair. Tirkkonen-Condit (2005) has further noted that unique items that are present in translations differ in their usage when compared to original Finnish texts. Eskola (2002, 264) defines the unique item hypothesis as a tendency in translations to “underrepresent unique linguistic items and overrepresent such items which have a clear, unambiguous and frequent equivalent which functions in a way as a stimulus in

the source text” (translation by author). In other words, unique items seem to manifest less in translated Finnish texts than in original Finnish texts.

Following the logic of Tirkkonen-Condit (2005) and Eskola (2002), if unique items are underrepresented due to lack of stimulus in the source text, it could be proposed that the cases that do appear in translations would have, in the majority of cases, clearer rather than ambiguous stimuli in the source text. Clear in this context could mean for example having a dictionary entry for the words in a bilingual dictionary.

A further hypothesis is that the difference in usage that Tirkkonen-Condit has mentioned may be related to the type of stimulus in the source text. If a key element of unique items is their lack of an equivalent in the source language, it may be that only one meaning or usage of a unique item is produced while other usages, which have no stimulus, are replaced by something that more closely resembles the stimulus in the original text.

Chapter 2 of this report will introduce the advances in corpora technology that allowed translation universals to be researched as well as some related terminology necessary to understand the theory. Chapters 3 and 4 will introduce the theoretical background of this study starting from the framework of Translation universals which gives rise to the unique item hypothesis, and previous research into the unique item hypothesis itself. Chapter 5 will present the research data used and the corpus it was gathered from and chapter 6 will present the method used in this study. Chapter 7 will present quantitative and qualitative analysis of the material and the results of the study, and chapter 8 will present discussion on the matter and possible further research ideas. Chapter 9, Conclusion, concludes the report.

2 Corpora

Before delving deeper into the theoretical background for this study, some basic definitions of corpora and corpus studies will be presented. This chapter first discusses corpora and how they are defined and what different types of corpora there are and secondly this chapter discusses some prominent corpora created and used, mostly from the perspective of translation studies.

A corpus is a collection of language (texts or transcribed spoken language) compiled electronically (or on paper, although this is not the preferred method in modern times) for language research, mainly to be used in the fields of corpus linguistics and corpus-based translation studies. Corpus linguistics is a field of study dedicated to studying language using corpora and corpus-based translation studies (CTS) is a field of study that applies corpus-based methods to translation studies (Olohan, 2004: 16).

Corpora are annotated on some level so they can be used using a corpus software to perform different kinds of searches. A raw corpus only has sequences of characters separated by spaces and no additional tagging and can only be used within those limitations, e.g. only type or token searches are possible (Kenny, 2004, 60). A tagged corpus has been annotated further, for example adding part-of-speech tagging to every word to indicate verbs, nouns etc. to allow searching for those (ibid.).

There are various different types of corpora that can be divided by the different languages, annotation and other features, and the terminology is still evolving, but there are some generally accepted types. (Kenny, 2004, 60) A **monolingual corpus** includes texts in one language. Opposed to monolingual, there are **bilingual corpora** which include texts from two different languages and multilingual corpora, which have sub-corpora consisting of texts in multiple languages (Kenny, 2009, 60). It is important to note that these types of corpora do not typically include translated texts, only texts that have been originally produced in the chosen language (Olohan, 2004, 13). An example of a monolingual corpus is the British National Corpus (BNC), compiled in Oxford University in the 90's. It consists of both written and spoken language from a variety of fields across the British Isles (<http://www.natcorp.ox.ac.uk/corpus/index.xml>).

Corpora which include translated texts are sometimes called **translation corpora** (Kenny, 2004, 61), and there are different terms for different types of translation corpora. A **parallel corpus** consists of original texts in one language and translations of those texts into one or more languages (Olohan, 2004, 24). For example, the Chemnitz English-German Translation Corpus (<https://www.tu-chemnitz.de/phil/english/sections/linguist/real/independent/transcorpus/index.htm>) has English source texts and German translations. A **comparable corpus** consists of comparable texts originally created in the language and translations into the language in question (Olohan, 2004, 35). Comparable corpora usually consist of several sub-corpora and they can be used separately. For example, the Translational English Corpus (TEC) includes texts translated into English, and it is usually used in comparison with a sub-corpus of the BNC, which provides original English comparable texts (Olohan 2004, 36-37).

Modern corpora are electronically compiled according to the specification of the researcher and can consist of any number of whole texts or excerpts of texts. The language, genre, use, age, authors or other status of the collected texts entirely depends on the reason the corpus is being created (Kenny, 2004, 59).

3 Translation universals

This chapter will discuss the theoretical framework of Translation Universals, which is where the research topic, the unique item hypothesis, comes from. The history and research into Translation Universals will be explored first and relevant individual universals and relevant research will be discussed later on.

The theory of Translation Universals includes the concept of unique items and how they behave in translations. Translation universals are a collection of universal features, or laws, of translation. In other words, it is a roadmap of what features to expect in a translated text. The theory originates in the early 90's, when the focus of Translation Studies moved from analysing individual translations to being able to analyse larger text samples with the use of corpora. The first corner stones of the theory were laid by Baker (1993) and Toury (1995), when they started to map out the laws and probabilities of translations.

Baker (1993) describes the possibilities which corpus research opened for Translation Studies and describes some early translation universals which she called the Universal features of translation. She collected six features found in several different studies (Baker, 1993: 12-13). These include the first building blocks of the unique item hypothesis. Curiously enough, one of Baker's universal features assumes that translations exaggerate target language features, but this was only found in one study on Hebrew-English translations. Another contradictory universal feature reports abnormal frequencies of target language words, which is one of the main descriptions of the unique item hypothesis. According to Baker (1993), corpora were the way forward for translation studies, which had previously only been able to make small scale studies on the potentially universal features, because analysing texts manually is time consuming and difficult. History has showed her to be right, and corpus studies have gained popularity ever since.

The second study often mentioned as the starting point of the translation universals is Toury (1995). In the last section of his book, Toury describes his attempts to create some laws of translations. Unlike Baker, he created only two main laws, namely the law of growing standardisation (Toury, 1995: 303) and the law on interference (*ibid.* 310). These ideas were also included in Baker's list,

but Toury takes the formation process to a more philosophical level instead of only focusing on the studies on these topics, and he shows his thought process by writing out several different forms of the laws. All versions of the laws are not necessary in this context, so I will only present the ones that explain the main idea in the most tangible way. Toury's law of growing standardisation in its second form is as follows:

[I]n translation, textual relations obtaining in the original are often modified, sometimes to the point of being totally ignored, in favour of (more) habitual options offered by the target repertoire. (Toury, 1995:304)

Repertoire here means the selection of codified or institutionalised (generally well-known) expressions in the target language and textual relations are unique or newly invented utterances.

The law of interference is largely what one would expect. The law is based on the observation that the source text has an impact on more than just the message of the translation. Toury's law of interference in its first incarnation is as follows: "in translation, phenomena pertaining to the make-up of the source text tend to force themselves on the translators and be transferred to the target text" (Toury, 1995: 312). Toury differentiates two kinds of interference, *negative transfer* and *positive transfer*. Negative transfer deviates from the target language's norms and conventions whereas positive transfer increases existing target language features. Toury continues refining his law and in its third form he says, that accomplished translators are less likely to be affected by the source text (Toury, 1995: 313).

After Baker's and Toury's initial laws and features of translation, several other researchers took these ideas and developed them further. Andrew Chesterman (2010), while criticising Translation Universals themselves, collected a helpful listing of them. It consists of 11 different universals that are divided into two categories. Chesterman explains the categories: "An S-universal formulates a generalization about a difference between translations and source texts, and a T-universal claims something about typical differences between translations and non-translations in the target language." (Chesterman, 2010: 40). The S-universals are *lengthening*, *interference*, *standardisation*, *dialect normalisation*, *reduction of complex narrative voices*, *explicitation*, *the retranslation hypothesis* and *reduction of repetition*. In practice these universals signify that translations tend to stay closer to the standard of the target language, they are longer than the source text and that even

though there is some interference, translations tend to facilitate the reader more as translators avoid repetition and add explanations to aid readability. T-universals are *simplification*, *conventionalisation*, *untypical lexical patterning* and *underrepresentation of target-culture-specific items* e.g. the unique item hypothesis (Chesterman, 2010: 41-42). From these universals it can be understood that translations utilise simpler language, tend to err on the side of conventionalism and have a tendency to have different and untypical usages of the target language.

As can be inferred from the previous list by Chesterman and studies by Toury and Baker, translation universals at this point are not concrete or even fully formed hypothesis in most cases, and are supported and opposed by a loose collection of evidence. As Baker suggested (Baker, 1993), this could be due to the idea of translation universals being born before proper methods for analysing large text masses quantitatively were created and became more accessible in the 1990's (Kenny, 2004), but as corpus-based translation studies gathers steam, more and more new studies are being published. Some of these studies will be presented in the following sections. Oftentimes as corpus-based methods are applied to study any given translation universal, they produce evidence for other universals than the original research topic, which will be discussed further in later chapters after presenting the topic of this study, i.e. the unique items hypothesis.

4 Unique item hypothesis

This study's research question follows from the unique item hypothesis, suggested by Tirkkonen-Condit (2002). Section 4.1 will present the basic premises of the unique item hypothesis. Section 4.2 will introduce the theory, research and criticism regarding the hypothesis and section 4.3 will present research into how unique items are triggered to appear in translation.

4.1 Basic premises

First and foremost, this section focuses on the premises of the unique item hypothesis. The idea of unique items and their role in translations is based on Reiss' idea of missing words (Reiss, 1971) and a continuation of Tirkkonen-Condit's previous research on uniquely Finnish clitic particle –kin (Tirkkonen-Condit 1993), where the particle was used to test translator's ability to create relations in text that are in Finnish created with one small clitic particle but need to be written out in English. More on this study in section 4.2.

Amongst previously proposed translation universals, the unique item hypothesis was suggested as a new addition by Tirkkonen-Condit (2002, 209). She proposed that "translated texts would manifest lower frequencies of linguistic elements that lack linguistic counterparts in the source languages such that these could also be used as translation equivalents." This is the nucleus of the hypothesis. As to the unique item itself, Tirkkonen-Condit offers the following explanation:

The unique elements are not untranslatable, and they may be frequent, typical and entirely normal phenomena in the language; they are unique only in respect of their translation potential, as they are not similarly manifested in other languages, or at least not similarly manifested in the source languages of the translations. (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2002, 209)

Tirkkonen-Condit (2002) also mentions what is considered to be the other half of the unique item hypothesis. Tirkkonen-Condit writes that "Translators may ignore these items, as they do not tend

to suggest themselves readily, certainly not as one-to-one equivalents to any particular item in the source text.” This of course follows naturally from the idea of uniqueness, whether as a universal or a language pair –related issue.

Another definition touching upon the unique item hypothesis comes from Eskola (2002, 264) and it incorporates the idea of another translation universal, the idea that translations tend to manifest untypical lexical frequencies in general, and it also includes the suspected cause of the underrepresentation. Eskola gives the following definition:

Translations tend to underrepresent unique linguistic items and overrepresent such items which have a clear, unambiguous and frequent equivalent which functions in a way as a stimulus in the source text (translation by author).

As can be seen, here the stimulus and lack thereof is in the actual definition. Here in the first occurrences of the unique item hypothesis we can already see three parts of the hypothesis. Uniqueness of the items, underrepresentation in translation and a lack of stimulus in the original text. As can be seen, these parts all affect each other, as uniqueness of the unique items in the target language causes there to be no stimulus for them in the original text which leads to underrepresentation of the unique items in translations. A fourth aspect could be added when we consider that this is proposed as a translation universal, so the aspect of universal applicability comes into play as well.

Chesterman (2004) takes a very close look at the way Tirkkonen-Condit uses “unique” as a key element of the hypothesis without actually providing any criteria for deciding what is and is not a “unique” item. Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 177) sums up her term “unique item” as “linguistic elements that are unique in the sense that they lack straightforward linguistic counterparts in other languages” and she describes the items as “lexical, phrasal, syntactic or textual, and they need not be in any sense untranslatable; they are simply not similarly manifested (e.g. lexicalized) in other languages”. Chesterman (2004) tackles this ambiguity and states that in its current form it would be difficult if not impossible to test the claim to see if a word or grammatical form is in fact unique. Regarding uniqueness in relation to other languages, Chesterman also points out something Tirkkonen-Condit has mentioned in passing, which is that intuitively fairly unique items can lack a counterpart in other language and have perfectly compatible counterpart in another. Tirkkonen-

Condit mentions “jaksaa (Sw. orka); mahtua (Sw. rymmas); ehtiä (Sw. hinna); riittää (Sw. räcka); viitsiä (Sw. idas)” (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2002, 209) as examples of unique items in relation to English but not in Swedish.

Based on private correspondence and published works, Chesterman concludes that uniqueness in this case could be considered to mean “present in the target language but not presented in a similar way in a given source text” (Chesterman, 2004, 5). This would seem to be a more tangible formulation of the idea. However, in the context of this study it can be questioned whether it should be applicable in both translation directions, as for example in a study by Tirkkonen-Condit (1993) where she tested the clitic particle –kin in translations from Finnish to English and found translators had issues translating –kin to English, where there is no “target” to land on.

Chesterman also asks if some items are more unique than others and how uniqueness can be measured. In his example, there are two ways to express “So här ringer du till nödnumret 112” in Finnish, and both Finnish options are such that they have no similarly manifested counterpart in Swedish. In Chesterman’s view, having to understand uniqueness in a relative sense weakens the term.

Regarding the issue of defining uniqueness, Chesterman points out that Tirkkonen-Condit’s previous description is far too loose and goes on to say that “If we identify a unique items in terms of the non-existence of a straightforward, one-to-one equivalent in some other language(s), this depends in turn on what we mean by equivalence, and by this particular kind of equivalence” (Chesterman, 2004, 7). As a solution to this loose definition, Chesterman suggests that unique items could be defined as items that require a unit shift in order to be translated, and notes that most Tirkkonen-Condit’s examples seem to require a shift from word to group or morpheme to group. Chesterman points out that all unit shifts do not seem to qualify as unique. He suggests that “an item counts as unique if it cannot readily be translated back into a given source language without a unit shift” (Chesterman 2004, 7). He admits that readily is not the most concrete of wordings but notes that neither is the hypothesis in general.

Chesterman (2004, 10) further notes that the unique item hypothesis seems to be concerned with linguistic uniqueness as opposed to perceived uniqueness and this linguistic uniqueness may not be best observed through questionnaires or translation identity tasks, because they bring out what translators or readers perceive as unique instead of actually linguistically unique items. Chesterman argues that linguistic uniqueness can better be observed by using grammars, dictionaries and other such analysis. He suggests that before going deeper into the mechanics of underrepresentation, more emphasis should be placed on finding out what exactly constitutes a unique item (Chesterman 2004, 11). He proposes a methodology which he argues could be used to flesh out the definition of unique item more accurately. This seems like a good starting point but this study lacks the data and technology to carry it out so this study shall continue to put the cart before the horse, as Chesterman puts it.

Out of the three aspects of the unique item hypothesis separated earlier in this study (uniqueness, underrepresentation in translations, and lack of stimulus in the original text) Chesterman has thoroughly critiqued uniqueness. Another aspect, underrepresentation, has been tested and proven in previous research by Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, see section 4.2), but the third aspect, underrepresentation happening due to lack of stimulus, has only been speculated. The idea that unique items do not have stimulus has been partially supported, although it can and will still be argued that some unique items do have stimulus in other languages for some uses and meanings. What has not been studied at all is how much the lack of stimulus actually affects the number of unique items in the translation. That is the question this study will be focusing on.

4.2 Research on the unique item hypothesis

This section presents studies conducted on the unique item hypothesis thus far. Until now, research on the unique item hypothesis has focused mostly on the aspect of underrepresentation, although the lack of stimulus in the original text is often mentioned and offered as a possible explanation. The underrepresentation part of the hypothesis has been tested in a number of studies and the findings suggest that the unique items are consistently underrepresented in translations when compared to their frequency in original texts of the target language (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2004, 2005).

Tirkkonen-Condit (2004) tests the hypothesis by comparing the frequencies of sufficiency verbs and the particles *-kin* and *-han* in translated and original Finnish corpora consisting of academic and fictional texts using the Corpus of Translated Finnish. The verbs chosen as unique items stemmed from Flint (1980) who studied the semantic field of Finnish verbs of sufficiency using a larger selection of verbs. In Flint (1980) the aim is to describe the morphological field of Finnish verbs of sufficiency and as a by-product, the study produced a list of unique Finnish verbs. The clitic particle *-kin* is continuation from Tirkkonen-Condit (2004). Tirkkonen-Condit found that the unique items were underrepresented in fictional and academic translation corpora, severely more so in the academic one. In addition, she found that the verbs behaved differently in translated texts. They had more varied collocates and different syntactic and semantic functions in the original texts and far less variety in the translations, for example the verb *malittaa* (has enough patience), had three collocates in original fiction (*malittoi mielensä, malittaa olla tekemättä, malittaa odottaa*) and only one in translated fiction (*tuskin malittoi idottaa*) (ibid. 179-180). Tirkkonen-Condit offers the unique item hypothesis as an explanation, and mentions that perhaps the translation process proceeds somewhat literally and from word to word and thus the source language can interfere with the process (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2004: 183).

Tirkkonen-Condit (2005) analyzes the same material as Tirkkonen-Condit (2004) by comparing the frequencies of the particle *-kin* in the Corpus of Translated Finnish. She found the particle to be underrepresented in the majority of the sub-corpora, and, most notably, the original Finnish texts had far more varied frequency of the particle than any of the translations (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2005: 125-126).

Kujamäki (2004) also found similar results in his study on translation students and unique items. The students translated a German text regarding weather to Finnish. The text was set up to have weather words that could be translated with Finnish unique items. The results showed that the unique weather words were underrepresented in the students' translations and the students tended to produce translations close to the original German form. Similarly to Tirkkonen-Condit suggested that translation progresses from word to word, as presented earlier in this section, Kujamäki attributes this to the students having a narrow, word-to-word philosophy of translation as well as a fear of dwelling into the context and letting go of the text level (Kujamäki, 2004: 198-199).

As mentioned in section 4, additional to testing the unique item hypothesis itself, Tirkkonen-Condit (2002) has also tested the identifiability of translations, which reveals an interesting feature of the unique item. Tirkkonen-Condit (2002) points out that the frequency of unique items, along with idiomatic or colloquial language, is one of the features that people used to decide if a text was a translation or an original (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2002).

Another interesting work on unique items comes from a Finnish translator Kersti Juva. Juva (2019, 7-8), while not a scientific study, compiled interesting translation equivalents and unique items in her own translations over a 50-year period. The collection focuses on the Finnish side of the translation equation and most focus is placed on translations that are not the ones that first come to mind when reading the original text. Juva offers some insights into how a translator solves many different types of translation problems, and she covers most of the verbs in this study as well, with examples and sometimes explanations as to the translation process. In the example below the first part is the original text, indented middle part is a draft translation and the last part is the finished translation. For example:

ST: My Lady alights so quickly and walks so quickly that Sir Leicester, for all his scrupulous politeness, **is unable** to assist her, and is left **behind**.

TT1: Lady laskeutuu niin nopeasti, että sir Leicester huolimatta kaikesta tunnollisesta kohteliaisuudestaan, **ei pysty** auttamaan häntä ja jätetään vaunuihin.

TT2: Armollinen rouva laskeutuu niin nopeasti, että huolimatta kaikesta tunnollisesta kohteliaisuudestaan sir Leicester **ei ennätä** auttamaan häntä ja jää jälkeen.

Juva (2019, 210) does not comment on this particular example, but the process of producing unique items is somewhat visible, as the draft version includes the non-unique *ei pysty* which changes to the unique *ei ennätä* in the finished translation.

Juva (2019, 9-10) states that in the examples she has bolded the part of the original text that the translation touches upon, but this should not be taken to mean that the equivalence is on the word-level or even on the textual level at all.

There are some exceptions to the principle of underrepresentation, such as the translated sub-corpus of popular fiction in the aforementioned Tirkkonen-Condit (2005) study had more instances of –kin-particle than its original Finnish counterpart. Although this sub-corpus only consisted of a few novels and the findings can thus not be considered conclusive, it indicates that there is something left to study in this corner of the translation studies. Another example of an uncharacteristic finding is reported by Tirkkonen-Condit and Mäkisalo (2007), in a study on TV-subtitles found the language to be more in line with original Finnish text than the frequencies of translated texts. In their study, they compared the frequencies of clitic particles and other cohesive devices in original, translated (Corpus of Original and Translated Finnish, CTF) and subtitled Finnish corpora (The Finnish Broadcasting Company Corpus of Subtitles, FBC). For example, previously Tirkkonen-Condit (2002) found the same unique clitic particle -kin to be underrepresented in the Corpus of Translated Finnish compared to original Finnish texts. Mäkisalo and Tirkkonen-Condit found that many devices, such as the unique clitic particle -kin, were far more common in subtitles than in translated or even original Finnish. They suggest that this is due to the constrictive nature of TV subtitling which forces the translators to use short forms with a large range of expressions, and often those happen to be unique items. (Tirkkonen-Condit and Mäkisalo, 2007:228-229).

Mauranen (2000) came across evidence of unique items were underrepresented in translations, as she found out that *toisaalta* is a very common metatextual lexeme and appears in a multitude of word combinations in original Finnish but is considerably less frequent in translations. In translations, *toisaalta* also appears in less varying word strings (ibid. 2000, 126-127, 137), while testing for the possibility that translations “exhibit unusual word combinations compared to similar texts written originally in the same language” (ibid. 2000, 136) by looking at metatextual word combinations in academic texts and other genres.

Eskola (2004) touches upon the unique item hypothesis by stating her hypothesis as “translations tend to show untypical syntactic, lexical and textual frequencies as compared to non-translated texts”. The data consists of Finnish non-finite forms, some of which she describes as uniquely Finnish, gathered from a sub-corpus of Corpus of Translated Finnish, The Finnish Corpus of Translational and Non-Translational Narrative Prose (Eskola, 2004, 88-89). She looks at three forms, referative, temporal and final. Although Eskola does not mention specifically looking for uniqueness, it does appear, when she defines the different constructions in her study:

- a. “The structure is unique and language specific; there is no straightforward equivalent in English and Russian that could be productively paraphrased by a finite verb form (relative construction).
- b. Despite certain restrictions, the structure has an equivalent in English and Russian that can be productively paraphrased by a finite verb form (temporal construction).
- c. The structure has clear straightforward equivalent in English and Russian that has no productive finite alternative (final construction).” (Eskola, 2004, 88-89).

Eskola states that the Finnish relative construct is unique compared to English and Russian and that it is usually translated as a subordinate clause (Eskola and Jantunen, 2002, 189). In a. above, uniqueness is also mentioned. In her findings Eskola mentions that relative constructs are underrepresented due to being unique in Finnish compared to the other source languages (ibid. 194). Her findings also showed evidence for simplification, untypical patterning as well as unique item hypothesis. The most unique, referative form, is the most underrepresented and the other two, temporal and final forms are overrepresented, the most equivalent one, final, being twice as frequent in translations as it is in original Finnish. Eskola points out that the origin of this untypical frequency seems to be in the source language (Eskola, 2004, 96), as readily available equivalents seem to be a key difference.

4.3 Research on the stimulus in the original text

As for the stimulus in the original text, or triggers, as they are sometimes called, the linguistic elements triggering unique items in the source language have not been a prominent topic of research. As Chesterman describes, the different translation universals can be divided between source- and target language universals and have largely been largely studied in either in the target language or the source language without contrasting and comparing the two.

The unique item hypothesis has almost exclusively been studied in texts translated to Finnish, the only exception being an article by Tirkkonen-Condit (1993), which pre-dates the actual unique item

hypothesis. Tirkkonen-Condit examined how three translation teachers process the clitic particle – kin in a Finnish-English translation. In the article, she points out that all translators overtly signaled some of the instances while some went unnoticed by most. Tirkkonen-Condit suggests that “logical and pragmatically obvious relations ‘take care of themselves’ in translation even if the translator ignores them, while more remote, global and pragmatically less obvious relations call for signaling” (Tirkkonen-Condit, 1993: 208). This could mean that the grammatical function of the unique item might affect the translation process and act as a kind of a trigger.

Tirkkonen-Condit (1993) also points out that the translator’s awareness of the item’s function is a key point in producing an acceptable translation, which might be the case in L2 translations as well. However, Denver (2009) studied this in Spanish-Danish translation test with MA students and professional translators using key-logging to collect data on the translation process in order to see how translators react to the argumentative structures including unique items in the texts. She found that unique items were rarely produced in the translation even in instances they would have been ideal, and the keylogging procedure gave no indication that the translators paid any attention to the argumentative structures of the text and there were no difference in the log between producing a unique item and producing a synonym (Denver, 2009:144-146).

Eskola (2002, 138, 154, 168-169, 193) studies Finnish non-finite verb forms in translations from English and Russian and her findings also point to the stimulus and lack thereof in the original text being relevant to the frequencies of more unique verb forms. Out of the three forms she studied, referative, temporal and final (see also Eskola 2004), the one that has no stimulus in the original text was significantly underrepresented whereas two forms that had stimulus in English and Russian were greatly overrepresented compared to original Finnish.

As for the term for the source language words that give rise to unique items, Chesterman (2004: 4) uses the term ‘triggering’ in his analysis of the definition of unique items. “And this is the point: the claim is, that verbs like this [verbs of sufficiency] are under-used in translations into Finnish, precisely because there is not a similar lexicalized verb in the source text which would ‘trigger’ them in the translator’s mind (Chesterman, 2004: 4).” Juva (2019, 208) uses the term impulse in her text to describe the structure in the original text that gave rise to the unique item in the translation.

This study uses the term “stimulus” to refer to the original text phenomena that gives rise to unique items in translations.

5 Research data

This chapter will introduce the data used and the process for collecting it. Section 5.1 will present the verbs of sufficiency chosen to be the examples of unique items in this study. Section 5.2 will introduce the corpus from which the data was collected and section 5.3 will be moving on to presenting the data itself using tables and examples. Finally, section 5.4 will go over some problems and difficulties of the corpus, data collection process and the data itself.

5.1 Verbs of sufficiency

For the purposes of this study a choice had to be made about which unique items to focus on. As previously discussed in section 4.1, the definition of unique items is somewhat open so it is best to choose a word or a grammatical form that has previously been used in unique item research instead of trying to choose a new example of an unique item. That would have been interesting but grappling with the definition is beyond the scope of this study.

There are a handful of options of “confirmed” unique items in previous research, as presented in section 4.2. These include the clitic particles *-kin/han* that have been the topic of multiple early studies of the topic by Tirkkonen-Condit (2004). Kujamäki (2004) tested the hypothesis with unique Finnish weather words.

The unique items chosen for this study are verbs of sufficiency, as Tirkkonen-Condit (2004) calls them in her research. Tirkkonen-Condit used the verbs *ehtii*, *jaksaa*, *riittää*, *uskaltaa*, *kelvata*, *mahtua*, *viitsiä*, *kehdata*, *viihtyä*, *maltaa*, *rohjeta* and *joutaa*. By her definition, all these verbs convey the meaning of having enough or being enough. She gives the following meanings (Tirkkonen-Condit 2004, 180):

“ehtii	“has enough time”, is early/quick enough
jaksaa	“is strong enough”, “has enough energy”
riittää	“is enough”

uskaltaa	“has enough courage” “has enough nerve to” “is brave enough” “is daring enough”
kelpaa	“is good enough”
mahtuu	“is small enough”
viitsii	“has enough initiative or interest”
kehtaa	“is bold enough”
viihtyy	“is comfortable enough”
maltaa	“is patient enough”
rohkenee	“is brave enough” “has enough courage”
joutaa	“is idle enough”

As mentioned in section 4.2 Flint (1980, 3-4) used a larger sample of verbs to study the semantic field they create and in her study she provided a glossary of the verbs from which a table (table 1) in combined to illustrate the meanings she gave for these verbs. Note that Flint is the first to present the verbs in this grammatical form.

Table 1 Meanings of the verbs

Verb	Meaning according to Flint
Ehtii	has time, is in time, gets (somewhere) intime
Mahtuu	fits (into), can fit
Maltaa	has the patience to, has control over (oneself)
Jaksaa	has energy to, has strengt to
Uskaltaa	dares, has the courage to, ventures, risks,
Viitsii	cares to, bothers to, feels like bothering
Kehtaa	is not embarressed to, is not ashamed to
Viihtyy	feels comfortable, feels at home
Rohkenee	is bold enough, ventures
Joutaa	has time, is at leisure, is despensable
Riittää	is enough to, suffices, is adequate
Kelpaa	is good enough, qualifies

A more detailed glossary and deconstruction of the multiple uses and meanings of each verb will be presented in chapter 6 when the method is discussed in more detail. At this point it suffices to say

that all these verbs are a part of the same semantic field of sufficiency and possibility (Flint, 1980, 60) and it is assumed that they lack straight forward counterparts in English (Flint, 1980, 2.). In addition, they have previously been found to be underrepresented in translations (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2004: 177-178). These features together mark the verbs as candidates for unique items. This study uses the same group of verbs because they yield a suitable sample size for the study and Tirkkonen-Condit's previous research provides invaluable reference data for the future findings.

5.2. The corpus

For the purposes of this study, the data is collected from a sub-corpus of the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (1999-2008) (OMC), the En-Fi-sub-corpus. This sub-corpus originates from The Finnish-English Contrastive Corpus Studies (FECCS) Project at the Department of English in the University of Jyväskylä. The corpus created during that process reportedly consists of both English to Finnish translations as well as Finnish to English translations (Marin, 1999), and consists of both fiction and non-fiction texts (Mauranen, 2000). The current OMC En-Fi-sub-corpus used in this study only has English-Finnish translations of fiction novels. The English-Finnish sub-corpus that is a part of OMC was created in collaboration with the Universities of Lund and Oslo (Marin, 1999) after parts of the FECCS corpus were given to the University of Oslo.

The OMC's En-Fi-sub-corpus is a parallel corpus, meaning it has original works and their translations into another language, in this case English originals and Finnish translations. The corpus consists of excerpts from 21 English fiction novels and their translations into Finnish. Each excerpt is approximately 10 000 – 15 000 words in length. The English original texts contain altogether 298,554 words and the Finnish translated texts contain 216,221 words (Signe Oksefjell Ebeling, personal communication, September 2018). The corpus is annotated with information of the original text or translation, the running number of the sentence and if the sentence is in the beginning, middle or end of a paragraph or a chapter. It has also been aligned so that SL sentences are matched with their TL equivalents.

The OMC and its sub-corpora are accessible online using the project's own corpus tool PerlTCE, created by Lars Wilhelmsen. This tool allows word-search using search strings of multiple words that can be left open-ended by using an asterisk, filtering out words in the source language in the same sentence or within a span of words in a sentence or filtering in words that must appear in the same sentence or within a span of words in a sentence. There is also a possibility to show the previous and following sentences to the occurrences as context.

The OMC En-Fi-sub-corpus was chosen for this study because it allows for the relevant search, e.g. word-search, and it produces both the SL and the TL sentence in the results. This particular sub-corpus has not been widely used, which results in errors in the tagging and code not having been corrected. More on this in chapter 5.4.

5.3 Data collection

The research data was collected from the OMC using the word search –function. All twelve verbs were searched using different search strings but same settings otherwise for the basic searches. For the basic searches, the settings were as follows: the searches were made from the En-Fi-corpus, searching from the translations and the chosen search language was Finnish. No context was chosen and tags were hidden as the exact position and source of the occurrences is not the focus of this study. The search strings were formed using the Finnish verb's body and conjugations, often using an asterisk to function as the wild card. The search strings as well as the numbers of occurrences are presented in Table 2.

Table 2 Search strings

Verb	Search string	Cluttered	Clean
Ehtii	ehti* ehdi ehdi* ehdi	63	60
Mahtuu	mahtu* mahdu* mahdu	17	17
Malttaa	malt*	11	6
Jaksaa	Jaksa* jaksa	24	24
Uskaltaa	uskal*	24	22
Viitsii	viitsi viitsi*	20	20
Kehtaa	kehd* keht*, NOT lullaby	9	9
Viihtyy	viih* NOT amused entertained comfort* cozy cosy thrivers	8	8
Rohkenee	rohke* rohje* NOT bold cour*	12	4
Joutaa	joud* jouta* jouti	47	2
Riittää	riitä* riitä* riite* NOT quarrel rites squabble	9	9
Kelpaa	kelvata kelpa* kelva*	8	8
		252	189

As shown in Table 2, the initial searches yielded 252 occurrences. 63 of those occurrences were so-called clutter, i.e. words that match the search string but are not actually the verbs the study is looking for. For example, there were several occurrences of *joutua* (*have to, end up in* and several other meanings) in the search for *joutaa*, and after removing all clutter the data amounts to 189 occurrences of 12 verbs. The table also includes the numbers of each separate word from both before and after removing all clutter. This illustrates the difficulties in forming search strings in this manner. Some of the searches were much clearer than others, but for example when searching for the verb *kehdata* the word *kehtolaulu* had to be excluded because without excluding it, the search also finds all occurrences of *kehtolaulu*. More on this in section 5.4. later.

The actual search results in the PerITCE software with the settings chosen come out as two matching sentences, the first one being the Finnish translation and the second being the original English counterpart. Both sentences have identifying codes attached, which marks the sentences origin, the language and work. The search word is bolded and the entire sentence is presented, as can be seen from example A.

Example A

Tai ainakin sen verran, mitä kymmenessä päivässä **ehditään**.
(PDJ3TF)

Well, as much of the country as we can in ten days.
(PDJ3)

In this example, “ehdi” is bolded, as it is one of the search words (the entire search string being ehti*|ehdi|ehdi*|ehdi). PDJ3 under the English sentence is the code for the original work and PDJ3TF for the Finnish translation.

For the purposes of this report and ease of reading, in the following chapters examples are presented without the identifiers and the original English is presented first with the Finnish translation below with the whole unique item and the source language stimulus, when it can be found, bolded, as can be seen in example B below. As can be seen from the example, errors in the material are left as is. The errors in the material are discussed further in section 5.4.

Example B

How else could she have **borne** all those interminable speeches of welcome, in languages she did n't understand, knowing that she must sit through the translation into English.

Kuinka hän muuten olisi **jaksanut** kaikki ne loputtomat tervetuliaispuheet kielillä joita hän ei ymmärtänyt tietäen koko ajan että joutuisi istumaan vielä englanninkielisen tulkkauksenkin ajan.

All occurrences of all forms of the verbs researched in this study are gathered into Table 3 below. This is the short representation of the research data, in order illustrate the scope and scale of it and the type of occurrences it includes.

Table 3 All occurrences

Verb	Occurances
Ehtii	ehtiäkseen : 1, ehti : 14, ehdit : 3, ehtimättä : 1, ehditään : 1, ehdittyään : 1, ehdinkö : 1, ehtiny : 1, ehtiäkseni : 1, ehtii : 4, ehdittävä : 1, ehtisi : 7, ehdin : 1, ehtis : 1, ehtiihän : 1, ehtivät : 2, ehtinyt : 11, ehtineet : 2, ehtiä : 5, ehditty : 1
Mahtuu	mahtua : 1, mahtunut : 2, mahtuisivat : 2, mahtuneet : 1, mahtuu : 2, mahdutte : 1, mahdu : 3, mahtumaan : 1, mahtui : 3, mahtuivat : 1
Malttaa	malttanut : 1, malttoi : 3, maltetaanpa : 1, malttamaan : 1
Jaksaa	jaksaisikaan : 1, jaksakin : 1, jaksaa : 3, jaksaisiko : 1, jaksanut : 8, jaksa : 7, jaksamme : 1, jaksaisi : 1, jaksaneet : 1
Uskaltaa	uskalsin : 1, uskaltaisi : 1, uskaltaisin : 1, uskallettava : 1, uskaltaneet : 3, uskallus : 1, uskaltamatta : 2, uskaltanut : 3, uskalla : 2, uskallan : 1, uskallakin : 1, uskallat : 1, uskalsi : 1, uskallanpa : 1, uskaliaasti : 1, uskaltaen : 1
Viitsii	viitsinyt : 8, viitsitte : 2, viitsisikö : 1, viitsimättä : 1, viitsitkö : 1, viitsisittekö : 1, viitsi : 5, viitsikö : 1
Kehtaa	kehtaavat : 2, kehtaatkin : 2, kehtaa : 3, kehdannut : 2
Viihtyy	viihtyvät : 1, viihdyt : 3, viihdyttekö : 1, viihtyy : 1, viihdyn : 2
Rohkenee	rohjennut : 1, rohkenenko : 1, rohjettava : 1, rohkenee : 1
Joutaa	jouda : 1, joudeta : 1
Riittää	riitä : 9
Kelpaa	kelvannutkaan : 1, kelpaisi : 1, kelvata : 1, kelpaa : 4, kelpaako : 1

As can be seen from the tables, the numbers of instances for different verbs vary from a couple instances of *joutaa* to tens of cases of *ehtii*. It would be interesting to calculate the frequencies for each word, but with limited information of the corpus the calculations would not be accurate.

5.4 Issues

This chapter discusses some of the issues with the data collection process, the corpus and the data itself. The issues are separated in different sections although they are of course related in many cases.

5.4.1 Technical difficulties

The PerlTCE software used to operate the corpus definitely did pose some restrictions to the searches, not in a small part due to English-Finnish language pair. Finnish as a synthetic language relies heavily on conjugation and since this corpus is not able to exclude any Finnish word bodies or any forms that looked similar to the ones being searching for, the only option to form search strings was to include the target Finnish word forms and exclude English ones that might interfere. This often meant that the searches had to be performed multiple times and English word that kept cropping up in the results had to be added to the list of excluded words to reduce the amount of clutter. This still left some clutter to be manually cleared out the results, as shown in Table 4 further down.

Marin (1999) explains in her Pro Gradu thesis that the annotation system TCL, which also appears in the software's name, was created for this particular project, as not many suitable options were available at the time. This unfortunately also means that the corpus cannot be used in any other environment as no other software is able to read the tagging.

5.4.2 Issues with the data

Other minor issues while using the corpus relate to it not being widely used. There are 11 errors in text recognition and tagging within the data, but fortunately these errors are minor and do not seem to affect the data in any meaningful way. Most of the erroneous occurrences had the TL also visible in the SL part of the result. Sometimes there were tags visible in the text and in a few cases the text recognition software, proof-readers or some other part of the process had left a mistake in the text

where a character had turned into another one. In some cases the SL segment showed an extra sentence.

All the erroneous segments in the research data are included in the analysis, as none of the errors affect the actual words analysed in it, but it does show that there could be issues with the data where some technical error might have eliminated some results, for example an additional space in the middle of a word would prevent it from being found with the search string, but this is unlikely to happen in large enough amounts to change the results. Most erroneous cases have not been chosen as examples in the study, but some examples will have additional spaces in the middle of words and those have been left as they were.

6 Research method

This chapter presents the research method used in this study. First, some background information is given to explain the origins of the method, then the categorization used in analysis is presented with examples.

The primary objective of this study is to find out whether the unique items that are present in translations tend to have mostly clear stimuli in the original text. The unique item hypothesis states that the target language unique items are underrepresented due to lack of straightforward stimulus in the original text. Tirkkonen-Condit (2002, 209) suggests that “translated texts would manifest lower frequencies of linguistic elements that lack linguistic counterparts in the source languages such that these could also be used as translation equivalents.” In this light, it would also mean that the unique items that do appear in translations are expected to have clear translation equivalents as stimuli in the original texts.

This study set out to explore this by identifying all occasions of the 12 Finnish verbs of sufficiency presented in chapter 5.1 and analysing their potential stimuli. To find out if these unique verbs tend to mostly occur with clear stimuli in the original text, this study attempts to classify unique items in relation to their stimulus e.g. whether the stimulus clear or not.

In order to accomplish this, a definition for “a clear stimulus” is needed. Tirkkonen-Condit and other researchers do not offer a concrete definition for it. Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 178) states that verbs of sufficiency “constitute a lexical domain with no straightforward lexicalized translation equivalents in many Indo-European languages”, which ignores the many very close equivalents in the English-Finnish language pair. To be able to differentiate between clear and not clear stimulus, this study resorts to using printed dictionaries dating back to the time of the translations in the OMC En-Fi-sub-corpus. Most dictionaries list single word equivalents and idiomatic phrases, which is interesting as Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 179) noted that in translations, verbs such as *viitsii* more often appear in idiomatic phrases such as *Älä viitsi*. This is explored further in the analysis, but it is telling that dictionaries list translation equivalents for idioms and they include unique items.

The categories of analysis are as follows:

Category 1: Clear, literal stimulus

Category 2: Idioms and phrases

Category 3: No clear stimulus

Category 1 consists of the occurrences where the unique item has a clear and straightforward stimulus in the original text. This is the category that the unique item hypothesis suggests would have most, if not all, occurrences. As Eskola (2002) states, “Translations tend to underrepresent unique linguistic items and overrepresent such items which have a clear, unambiguous and frequent equivalent which functions in a way as a stimulus in the source text”. Although the point of unique items is that they do not have readily available translation equivalents, they often include aspects that have a fairly straightforward translation.

This is visible in Example 1, where the English word *dare* has been translated with the proposed unique Finnish item *uskaltaa*.

Example 1.

Sam never mentioned it, and no one **dared** ask.

Sam ei asiasta puhua pukahtanut eikä kukaan **uskaltanut** kysyä.

Uskaltaa is found in multiple dictionaries as an equivalent for *dare*. The words are similar in definition, as Flint gives *uskaltaa* the meaning of being brave enough.

Category 2 includes examples of phrases or phrasal expressions that are used as equivalents commonly enough to be found in dictionaries.

The unique item hypothesis does not mention phrasal uses specifically, but it became clear early on in the research process that there are enough idiomatic usages of the verbs of sufficiency, such as

älä viitsi, that it would warrant a separate category for idioms and set phrases, so I have devised a category for these occurrences.

Flint (1980, 26) gives an example of an emphatic affirmative utterance that use the unique item *kehdata* for emphasis in an exclamation:

Että KEHTAAKIN aina myöhästyä! (That) he should have the nerve to be late all the time!

Example 2. below shows the type of idiomatic use in the data. The exclamation *don't you dare* has been translated as *uskallakin*.

Example 2.

"Hamish, **don't you dare**.

"**Uskallakin!**

Category 3 differs most from the previous two, as these are the cases that do not have any simple word or structure that can be determined to be the stimulus for the unique items that appeared in the translation. The sense and meaning do exist in the original text and these are by no means errors, but functional translations. Instead of a readily available stimulus, the unique items in this category appear even though the original text could have been correctly and idiomatically translated literally and without any unique items at all. There is no clear stimulus for the unique item. The part of the original text that corresponds to the unique item in the translation can sometimes be easily identified, but does not offer a clear and obvious stimulus the translator to produce a unique item, as shown in example 3 below.

Example 3.

The lettering generally ran out of space before the message was completed, but it was so familiar, from pictures and reports of what was happening in the schools of real blacks that it could be read, anyway.

Kirjaimet eivät tahtoneet **mahtua** pahville — mutta teksti oli niin tuttua lehtikuvista ja uutisraporteista, jotka kertoivat tapahtumista mustien kouluissa, että sen pystyi hyvin lukemaan.

Here in example 3 the original English structure could have been translated literally without any issues, for example – *tila loppui yleensä ennen kuin viesti oli valmis* --, and yet a unique item is produced.

Another type of category 3 cases that rose were the ones where the original text had spelled out the semantic meaning of the unique item in a way that can be translated literally without even coming close to breaking target language grammar, as we can see from example 4 below, where the original text has the stimulus words *have enough time* and the translator has chosen the unique item *ehtii* instead of the literal translation *tarpeeksi aikaa* or some iteration of the same.

Example 4.

She had just **enough time** to rush in, pick him up, see if he was wet or marked in some way, and then go back to work.

Hän **ehtii** juuri ja juuri ottaa sen syliinsä, tarkistaa että se oli kuiva ja ettei siinä ollut naarmuja ja sitten hänen oli lähdettävä takaisin.

Besides the cases like the one in example 4, where the trigger is the spelled out meaning of the unique item, other difficult cases in category 3 are intuitive and “good” translations, where at first glance it seems that there must be a clear stimulus as the translation so aptly conveys the original text’s meaning. After breaking down the original text, it becomes clear that the unique item does not correspond to any specific word or a structure, but rather something else conveyed between the lines, as can be seen from example 5.

Example 5.

She waited for the flicker of surprise to widen his eyes slightly and then continued, "To cut the cane with — of course."

Odotettuaan että Butchin silmät **ehtivät** laajeta hiukan hämmästyksestä hän lisäsi: "Sen ruo'on leikkaamista varten tietysti."

In example 5 the translation includes the unique item *ehsiä* but there is no explicit implication of the meaning of having enough time or being on time, which Tirkkonen-Condit (2002) and Flint (1980) give as the primary meaning and use of the item. The idea of small amount of time passing and then acting at the nick of time is present in the translation and the translator has chosen to express it using the Finnish unique item.

Category 3 is also where the uniqueness aspect of the unique item comes to play. As Tirkkonen-Condit (2002) says,

The unique elements are not untranslatable, and they may be frequent, typical and entirely normal phenomena in the language; they are unique only in respect of their translation potential, as they are not similarly manifested in other languages, or at least not similarly manifested in the source languages of the translations.

All instances where there is no discernible stimulus word or word string are placed in category 3 and there is considerable variation in this category, but all occurrences fall under the same criteria. The variation will be further explored in the analysis, section 7.1.

7 Analysis and results

This chapter presents the analysis and results of this study. Section 7.1 will investigate if the research questions set as the hypothesis in chapter 1 are supported by the data using qualitative analysis. In section 7.2 each verb will be presented separately and examples of different types of original items and how they seem to behave in translations will be given, using qualitative analysis.

7.1 Quantitative analysis

This section will refer to the research question set for this study in section 1 to see if the hypothesis is supported by the results or not. The research question was formulated as follows: “Do unique items that are present in translations have mostly clear stimulus in the original text? How do unique items function in translations and what are they used for?” As such, the hypothesis was that most unique items in translations have clear stimuli in the original text, as Tirkkonen-Condit (2005, 177-178) suggests.

In the data, 189 instances of the 11 unique Finnish verbs were identified and they are presented in table 2 in section 5.3. As explained in section 5.3, the instances were then divided into three categories that are presented in Table 5 below. Category 1: clear stimulus amounted to 36 instances out of 189; category 2, which includes idiomatic and phrasal uses amounted to 20 out of 189 instances and category 3, instances with no clear stimulus, amounted to the overwhelmingly largest group, 133 out of the total 189 cases.

Table 5 Categories

Category	Defenition	Total
1	Clear, literal stimulus	36
2	Idioms and phrases	20
3	No clear stimulus	133
Total		189

The results clearly do not support the hypothesis that most unique items in translated texts have clear stimuli in the original text. Actually, the findings point to the complete opposite, i.e. that most unique items do not have clear stimulus in the original text at all. The first and second categories are small compared to the majority of cases that fall under category 3. The distribution of unique items across all three categories and 12 verbs is presented in Table 6.

Table 6 Verbs in categories

Verb	Category 1	Category 2	Category 3	All
ehtii	6	0	54	60
mahtuu	5	0	12	17
malttaa	1	4	1	6
jaksaa	1	0	23	24
uskaltaa	18	2	2	22
viitsii	3	3	14	20
kehtaa	0	5	4	9
viihtyy	0	0	8	8
rohkenee	2	0	2	4
joutaa	0	2	0	2
riittää	0	0	9	9
kelpaa	0	4	4	8
Total	36	20	133	189

As can be seen from Table 6, different verbs have different ratios between categories. *Ehtii* (60 cases) appears six times with clear stimulus, zero times with phrasal use and 54 times without apparent stimulus at all. This pattern seems to be somewhat typical of these verbs, most of them mainly fall into the third category and may not have any cases of the first or second category. *Mahtuu* (17 cases) similarly has five cases of clear stimulus, zero cases of phrasal use and the remaining 12 out of 17 are without stimulus. *Malttaa* (6 cases) has one clear case, four phrasal cases and one case without stimulus, making it one of only three verbs with mostly phrasal use, although the sample size is rather small. *Jaksaa* (24 cases) has one case of clear stimulus, no phrasal use and 23 without stimulus, whereas *uskaltaa* seems to function in an opposite manner, with 18 cases of clear stimulus and two cases of phrasal use and two of no stimulus. *Viitsii* (20 cases) falls to the more typical pattern, three clear stimulus, three phrasal uses and 14 without stimulus. *Kehtaa* (9 cases) has zero clear stimulus cases but has five phrasal uses, which is slightly more than the cases

of no stimulus, of which it has four. In the case of *viihytyä*, (8 cases) all eight cases have no stimulus. *Rohkenee* (4 cases) has two clear stimulus cases and two no stimulus cases but zero phrasal uses. *Joutaa* (2 cases) is the only case where all found uses were phrasal. *Riittää* (9 cases) is similar to *viihyy* as all nine cases have no stimulus. *Kelpaa* (8 cases) as zero clear stimulus, four cases of phrasal use and four cases of no stimulus.

Table 5 previously presented the categories and total cases in them, and in the light of these individual numbers, it could be said that the trend for no clear stimulus is rather clear throughout the data. Six verbs (*ehtii, mahtuu, jaksaa, viitsii, viihyy, riittää*;) out of twelve are distributed mostly to category 3 and only one verb (*uskaltaa*) has significantly more cases of clear stimulus than any other. Three verbs (*maltaa, kehtaa, joutaa*) have most cases distributed to category 2, but here the overall numbers are very small and category 2 is the smallest overall category. It should be noted that seven verbs (*maltaa, kehtaa, viihyy, rohkenee, joutaa, riittää, kelpaa*) have under ten cases in total, and it is quite possible that with a different material their ratios could have been different, but even in that case the changes in ratios would need to be considerably large to the effect the overall results.

To sum up this quantitative analysis, the hypothesis that most unique items that do appear in translations have clear and literal stimuli in the original text is not supported at all by this data. The answer to the first research question “Do unique items that are present in translations have mostly clear stimulus in the original text?” with this data is clearly no. In the light of the numbers presented in this chapter, most unique items do not have clear and literal stimulus in the original text at all. The second research question “How do unique items function in translations and what are they used for?” will be answered in the qualitative section of this analysis.

7.2 Qualitative analysis

The following analysis endeavors to find explanations for these results by looking at each verb and their ratios of different categories with examples. The aim is to find tendencies and trends in how unique items behave and how they are used in order to explain why the hypothesis was not supported and to answer the other research question: “How do unique items function in translations

and what are they used for?" The analysis will go over all verbs and all three categories of unique items, but special interest is paid to category 3, as it has the most variation in how the unique items are used.

6.2.1 *Ehtii*

Ehtii is the largest in quantity. As stated in chapter 5, *ehtii* holds the meaning of having enough time (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2004, 180), being on time or getting somewhere on time (Flint, 1980, 3-4).

In category 1, clear stimulus, *ehtii* has only six cases, most of which have *catch* (example 6) as the stimulus word and one of which has *making it* (example 7) in reference to making it on time.

Example 6

I 've got a plane to **catch**."

Minun täytyy **ehsiä** koneeseeni."

Example 7

I said gratefully that I could, and reckoned that I 'd have to leave soon after two-thirty to be sure of **making it**.

Sanoin kiitollisena että voisin ja arvelin että minun olisi lähdeävä pian puoli kolmen jälkeen **ehsiäkseni** varmasti ajoissa.

Ehtii had no cases of phrasal use, so I will move on to category 3, no clear stimulus in the original text. *Ehtii* has 54 cases in total in this category. Some of these are the cases mentioned in section 6, where the original text has the stimulus words *have enough time* and the translator has chosen the unique item *ehtii* instead of the literal translation *tarpeeksi aikaa* or some iteration of the same, as can be seen in example 8.

Example 8

She had just **enough time** to rush in, pick him up, see if he was wet or marked in some way, and then go back to work.

Hän **ehiti** juuri ja juuri ottaa sen syliinsä, tarkistaa että se oli kuiva ja ettei siinä ollut naarmuja ja sitten hänen oli lähdettävä takaisin.

Interestingly, only three cases out of 54 follow this pattern of not producing a literal translation by using a unique item. The remaining 51 unique items have something else in the original text or more specifically, in the original meaning, that gives rise to the unique item.

One prominent trend with *ehtii* appears to be stylistic choices. Unique items are used to mark the dialect a character speaks or to convey a style of narration the author uses. The aspect of having enough time or being able to do something in the constraints of time are present, but not necessarily on word-level.

Example 9

"Goody, goody, on you, Mister," Miss Eva went after him with the spoon, "I ai n't forgot you broke my china poodle this morning."

"Luuletsä että mä oon unohtanu miten sä tänä aamuna **ehdit** jo rikkoa yhden posliinikoiran."

In example 9 there is no actual word to note having enough time, but that is not what *ehtii* is used for here, instead it is used to create an idea of a dialect.

Example 10

"E 's a **spry ole thing**, but he 's as soft as butter, ent you, ole boy?" and he knelt down and ruffled his fur.

"Se **ehtii** joka paikkaan, mutta se on lauhkea kun lammas, etkö vaan, Sammy?"

Similarly, in example 10 above, *ehtii* is used to create a dialectal way of speaking. The dialectic *spry ole thing* is translated with the unique and informal *ehtii* to imply a dialect instead of using a more formal description.

Example 11

By the time she was three, Matilda had taught herself to read by studying newspapers and magazines that lay around the house.

Kolmen vuoden ikään **ehdittyään** Matilda oli opetellut omin päin lukemaan tutkimalla talossa ajalehtivia sanoma- ja aikakauslehtiä.

In example 11 above, *ehtii* appears as a flavorsome way to describe Matilda's fast learning.

A second trend identified with *ehtii* appears to be that it often appears in sentences that in the original English use auxiliary verbs to express their meaning. English has a large and varied list of auxiliary verbs and they are used in a variety of ways and styles. *Ehtii* often appears in the translations in conjunction with auxiliary verbs, such as *have* or *can*, in the original text. *Have* of course already made an appearance in the first trend with *having enough time* but the trend continues beyond just the obvious uses with references to time and *have* being more of a coincidence by grammar.

For example, in example 12 below, a group is travelling or performing a search and they have ten days to do whatever they are doing. Time restriction (ten days) is apparent in the text but the verb is the auxiliary *can* and the translator has decided to make the idea of *having enough time* explicit by using *ehtii* in the translation. A literal but also correct translation would have been *Tai ainakin sen verran, mitä kymmenessä päivässä voimme/pystymme*, as *can* is most often used in similar situations as the Finnish *voida* (to be able to). *Ehtii* highlights the time restriction affecting the group's ability to perform the task.

Example 12

Well, as much of the country as we **can** in ten days.

Tai ainakin sen verran, mitä kymmenessä päivässä **ehditään**.

Similarly, in example 12, stopping the car on time gets an added sense of emergency by having *ehtii* in the sentence. Being able to stop in time can be expressed in different ways but the unique item here is functional.

Example 13

Sometimes he throws up into paper bags, or beside the road if my father **can** stop the car in time.

Joskus hän oksentaa paperipussiin tai tienvierelle, jos isä **ehtii** pysäyttää ajoissa.

As an example of a different auxiliary verb (can) which has been translated by the verb *ehtii* as a functional equivalent, in example 13 would be the auxiliary verb and reach is the primary one, and the translator has packed both into *ehtii*, along with the idea of not having enough time to travel and the conditional form.

Example 13

This time it was a conscious decision: I would no longer reach Avignon that night.

Tällä kertaa se oli harkittu päätös: minä en **ehtisi** enää Avignoniin sinä iltana.

There also were a handful of examples where there was a *before + auxiliary verb* -sentence that was translated as *ennen kuin ehti*. As can be seen in example 14, there is no grammatical need to have a word that corresponds to *could*, but the unique item is used in its place.

Example 14

Geertge died **before she could** collect a stuiver, which is the twentieth part of a guilder.

Geertge kuoli **ennen kuin ehti** periä stuiveriakaan, joka on guldenin kahdeskymmenesosa.

Third trend found within the uses of *ehtii* in translations is to reconstruct English sentences that differ structurally from Finnish, and could result in unidiomatic Finnish the translation. In example

15, it would be grammatically possible to build a similar structure in Finnish as in the original English, but it would be untypical.

Example 15

As soon as the words were out, she regretted them.

Hän katui sanojaan jo ennen kuin **eh**ti sanoa lausettaan loppuun.

In example 16 something similar seems to have happened as *ehtii* is not grammatically needed but makes both the structure and meaning clearer and smoother.

Example 16

And bulky parcels crammed with books keep on arriving in the mail (often intercepted by his father, until Paul arranges with a friend to use a different address).

Ja muhkeita kirjapaketteja lappaa jatkuvasti postitse (jotka isä usein **eh**tii takavarikoida, kunnes Paul sopii ystävänsä kanssa, että ne lähetetään tämän osoitteeseen).

In summary, multiple ways to use *ehtii* to create different effects in the translation were found in the analysis. Only very few cases utilize *ehtii* in its most literally translatable meaning of making it on time but multiple other more uniquely Finnish uses have found their way into these translations, both as a stylistic choice to emulate the original style or a utilitarian choice to make the translation more readable.

6.2.2 *Mahtuu*

Mahtuu is a verb that describes having enough space and it can be used both literally and figuratively. Flint (1980, 3-4) defines it as being able to fit into something and Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 180) as being small enough.

For *mahtuu*, there are 5 cases of category 1 verbs with clear stimuli, four of which have *fit* (as in example 17) as the stimulus and one which has *having enough room* (example 17) as the stimulus in the original text.

Example 17

The rest of you and the pushchair can **fit** into the back."

Te muut ja rattaat **mahdutte** taakse."

Example 17 above presents a typical category 1 case where the unique item comes directly from the original text and the context directly has to do with arranging people and things in a vehicle.

Example 18 below is the other way category 1 is presented with *mahtuu*. There is no context as to what kind of a leg or an arm would fit under a microscope, but at least it is clear that there would not be much room in any case.

Example 18

We pick them off - there is n't **room** for a whole arm or leg under the microscope - and turn the magnification up as high as it will go.

Me revimme ne irti — käsi tai jalka kun ei **mahdu** kokonaan mikroskoopin alle — ja kierrämme suurennuksen niin isoksi kuin se menee.

As with many of the verbs in this analysis, *mahtuu* also does not have any cases in category 2 so next will be category 3.

In category 3 there are 12 cases of *mahtuu*, and three of them seem to follow the trend that unique items can be stimulated by auxiliary verbs, in this case *have*, *would* and *could*, a trend that is prevalent with *ehtii* as well. In example 19, the original stimulus of *would slip into* is constructed as *mahtuisivat*, where the idea of sliding items into a small pocket and the space restrictions (the subsequently mentioned tiara being too big) are condensed into one unique Finnish verb.

Example 19

The pendant and earrings **would** slip into his trouser pockets, but the tiara was wider and higher than he had thought.

Riipus ja korvarenkaat **mahtuisivat** hänen housuntaskuihinsa, mutta tiara oli ympärysmitaltaan suurempi ja myös korkeampi kuin hän oli kuullut.

The last word being *kuullut* might be a choice or a spelling error, as *thought* literally translates to *luulla/luullut*.

The rest of the cases in category 3 fall under the trend of solving English structures, as can be seen in example 20.

Example 20

I listened to the urgency in his voice and wondered whether Dozen Roses was more than just another trot-up, **of which season by season** he had many.

Kuuntelin hänen kiihkeää ääntään ja aprikoin, mahtoiko Dozen Rosesin tapaukseen liittyä muutakin kuin pelkkä taivaan merkkien näyttäminen, joita hänellä **mahtui** useita joka sesonkiin.

In the original text, the latter clause is perfectly functional in English, but structurally impossible in Finnish and *mahtuu* is a compact solution.

In example 21, the intangible energy in the original text is not contained by the elevator, but the translation shifts the focus from the elevator being unable to contain it to the energy being too large to fit in the elevator. By using a unique Finnish verb, this is possible and avoids complicated literal translation such as “niin väkevän energian, että hissi ei voinut pitää sitä seiänsä sisällä” [author]. The translation keeps most parts of the sentence, the energy, the elevator’s four walls and the energy not fitting in by switching up the verb.

Example 21

As always he seemed to whirl in a vortex of almost oppressive energy, too powerful to be **contained** by the lift's four walls.

Kuten aina hän näytti rimpuilevan miltei ahdistavan tarmon kurimuksessa, niin väkevän energian, ettei se **mahtunut** hissin neljän seinän sisään.

In summary, *mahtuu* to also follow the trend of being in part triggered by auxiliary verbs in the original text as well as cases where the idea of spatial limitations are apparent in the original text, often coinciding with a complex English structure, that the unique item solves.

06.2.3 *Malttaa*

Malttaa describes having enough patience or willpower to withstand temptation or impulse. Flint (1980, 3-4) defines it as having enough self-control or patience and Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 180) as being patient enough.

Malttaa has six cases in total, one in category 1. *Malttaa* is one of the few verbs to feature cases in category 2 (three cases), and there is only one case of category 3.

The only case of *malttaa* in category 1 is presented in example 22 below. *Forbear* has been translated as *malttaa*.

Example 22

Before they left I could not **forbear** to draw Gillian closer and impart to her the glittering counsel that wearing 501s with trainers was frankly un d sastre and that I was amazed she had walked the streets to my apartment in broad daylight and escaped pillory.

Ennen heidän lähtöään en **malttanut** olla vetämättä Gilliania lähemmäs ja kuiskaamatta hänelle kullanarvoista neuvoa: että harmaiden farkkujen ja lenkkitosujen yhdistelmä oli suoranainen disastre, ja että oli ihme kuinka hän oli onnistunut kävelemään asunnolleni kirkaassa päivänvalossa joutumatta yleisen pilkan kohteeksi.

Malttaa is one of the rare verbs which have cases in category 2, three cases in total. Interestingly all three cases have similar stimulus and also follow the trend where these unique Finnish verbs often

occur in structures that have auxiliary verbs in English. Example 23 presents one of these cases, where the phrase *could hardly wait* is translated as *malttoi tuskin odottaa*. The unique item seems to fit as some sort of an indirect translation equivalent for the auxiliary verb *can*.

Example 23

He **could** hardly wait, his tongue itched.

Hän **malttoi** tuskin odottaa, hänen kieltään aivan kutkutti.

Malttaa is also an exception in category 3, as there is only one case, in example 24 below.

Example 24

She wanted to break into a run but managed to **resist**.

Hän halusi pistää juoksuksi, mutta onnistui **malttamaan** mielensä.

Here the stimulus is in the idea that the person had enough willpower to not to run, e.g. she resisted, and this translator has resisted the literal translation with the Finnish phrase *malttaa mielensä*. Another, more literal option could have been *vastustaa kiusausta*, depending on the context of course, among other literal translations such as *Hän halusi juosta, mutta onnistui vastustamaan haluaan*.

To summarize, *malttaa* is one of the unique items that on its own seems to support the hypothesis that a clear stimulus gives rise to more unique items, but the sample size is very small. *Malttaa* sees more phrasal use in translations than some other verbs and possibly also in original Finnish, but that is a topic for a different study. It would be interesting to see if the uses of *malttaa* are more varied in original Finnish and how this possibly effects translations.

6.2.4 *Jaksaa*

Jaksaa means having enough energy or spirit to do something. Flint (1980, 3-4) describes it as having energy or strength to do something.

Jaksaa has 24 cases in total, with cases in all three categories. In category 1 there is only one case, in example 25 below, where the stimulus is *to bear*.

Example 25

How else could she have **borne** all those interminable speeches of welcome, in languages she did n't understand, knowing that she must sit through the translation into English.

Kuinka hän muuten olisi **jaksanut** kaikki ne loputtomat tervetuliaispuheet kielillä joita hän ei ymmärtänyt tietäen koko ajan että joutuisi istumaan vielä englanninkielisen tulkkauksenkin ajan.

In category 3 there are 23 cases of *jaksaa*. There is again evidence for a few trends, such as auxiliary verb being present and using the unique item to convey a slang or a style in dialogue. Most of the cases fall under auxiliary verbs, with a few to do with style and some with other uses.

Most *jaksaa*-cases that have an auxiliary verb in the original text seem to come from the verb *can*, with one exception where the original text has *would* in it. In example 26, the first sentence contains the idea of being able to (*can*) and the latter part conveys the ideas of negativity and low energy, and the translation utilizes *jaksaa* in the first part to highlight the lack of energy.

Example 26

He **could n't** imagine it; he could n't think of any period bleaker than this in all his life, but he 'd noticed how time had a way of coloring things.

Hän ei **jaksanut** uskoa sitä; hän ei pystynyt kuvittelemaan elämäänsä tätä synkempää jaksoa, mutta hän oli huomannut, että ajalla oli taipumus värittää asioita.

In example 26 on the other hand, *jaksaa* is used to convey the happy dedication of the characters. The literal translation of *can* would most often be *voida* in Finnish, and that could have been used here

too, but the unique item *jaksaa* amplifies the aspect that the characters actually want to sit and look at microscopes.

Example 27

We 've seen microscopes before, but not at such length; we **can** spend a lot of time with them before getting tired of them.

Olemme nähneet mikroskooppeja ennenkin, mutta emme niin monta yhdellä kertaa; me **jaksamme** istua niiden ääressä pitkät rupeamat ennen kuin kyllästymme.

The second trend, stylistic choices in dialogue, is present in a few cases. In example 28 it is very clear, and it also very clearly does not have a simple and clear stimulus in the original text.

Example 28

Amy never smacked him but would jerk him on to her hip and dump him on her bed saying: "Bloody awful noise."

Amy ei koskaan läpsäissyt poikaa, vaan sieppasi hänet lonkalleen ja tälläsi hänet sängylleen sanoen: "Jumalauta, että **jaksaakin** möykätä."

The original *bloody awful noise* could have been translated literally, but the translator chose to add informal *että jaksakaan* to amplify the effect. Interestingly here the original English has no verb at all, but the translation does, and not the other way around.

Again, the same trends appear with *jaksaa* as with the other verbs, they seem to inhabit the same slot as auxiliary verbs but with meanings taken from elsewhere in the text. *Jaksaa* most often appears with *can*, and rarely with any other auxiliary verb. The other prevalent trend, stylistic choice, is also present.

6.2.5 *Uskaltaa*

Uskaltaa means having enough courage to do something, and Flint (1980, 3-4) gives it the meanings of daring, having enough courage to do something, to venture or to risk.

Uskaltaa has 22 cases. It is also exceptional because it has 18 cases in category 1, more than any other verb, and it is also the only one in which category 1 is the largest category.

In category 1 there are 18 cases of clear stimulus that can be translated literally. Majority of these have the word *dare* in the source language, as can be seen in example 29 below.

Example 29

She said things they 'd never **dare**, she made them turn pale.

Hän sanoi sellaista mitä he eivät olisi ikinä **uskaltaneet**, hän sai heidät kalpenemaan.

The third stimulus to appear in category 1 is *nerve*, in example 30 below shows.

Example 30

Oh, I had a **nerve**, in those days, Kate would sigh, looking back.

Voi miten minä **uskalsin** niihin aikoihin, Katella oli tapana huokaista muistellessaan aikaa.

The stimulus *nerve* and other cases like it will be further discussed in chapter 8 later on.

Uskaltaa also has cases in category 2. Category 2 consists of stimulus that is phrasal and common enough to have equivalents in dictionaries, but in the case of *uskaltaa* the equivalents are single words. Both cases are dare-related, first in example 31 we have *I dare you* which has been translated as *jos uskallat*.

Example 31

Spitting that Maid's blue flame right in the face and saying: "Come on, I **dare** you!"

Sylkeä sen Neidon sininen liekki päin silmiä ja sanoa: Käy päälle jos *uskallat!*"

In the other case in example 32, the phrase *don't you dare* has been translated as *uskallakin*, which despite being only a single word, counts as a phrase in Finnish.

Example 32

"Hamish, do n't you **dare**.

"**Uskallakin!**

Uskaltaa is similarly exceptional in category 3 as there are only two cases, but interestingly both of these cases follow trends that are prominent with other verbs as well. First trend is using unique items to add to the style and atmosphere of the text, as can be seen from example 33 below.

Example 33

Willie stayed motionless, **hardly** breathing.

Willie pysyi liikkumattomana **uskaltaen** tuskin hengittää.

The context is not abundantly clear, but the translator has chosen to forgo the literal translation of *Willie pysyi liikkumattomana, tuskin hengittäen* to add *uskaltaen* in the sentence.

The other case, presented in example 34 below, falls under the trend of unique items appearing in place of auxiliary verbs and the trend of using unique items to stylize dialogue. It could also be said that using a unique item here also smooths out the structure.

Example 34

I **would n't really wish to trust** these proofs to the post.

En oikein **uskaltaisi** lähettää tätä korrehtuuria postissa.

In summary, *uskaltaa* is an exception in the findings with only two cases in category 3 and nearly twenty in category 1. The two cases in category 3 still follow similar trends as other cases in the category.

6.2.6 *Viitsii*

Viitsii has the meaning of having enough initiative or interest to do something. Flint (1980, 3-4) says it means “cares to do something, bother to do or feel like bothering to do something”.

There are 20 cases of *viitsii* in the data across all three categories, three in category 1, three in category 2 and 14 in category 3.

In category 1, all three cases stem from the same stimulus word, *bother*. All three are rather straightforward. Here is one of the cases in example 35:

Example 35

They gawped at the removal van, not **bothering** to disguise their curiosity.

He töllistelivät muuttoautoa **viitsimättä** yrittääkään peittää uteliaisuuttaan.

Category 2 similarly has three cases in it. All three have different stimuli phrases but they follow a similar logic. The English phrase has been replaced by a Finnish phrase even though the literal meanings might not be very close, because the usage is the same. One case is presented in example 36 below.

Example 36

She tried again, "C '**mon now**, Mrs Windsor, open the door and we 'll have a nice chat.

Hän yritti uudestaan: "Älkää **viitsikö**, rouva Windsor, avatkaa vain ovi, niin voimme vähän rupertella.

As can be seen from the example, nothing in the literal meaning of *come on now* would translate into anything to do with having enough initiative to do something, but as tags, the actual use is not related to the meaning and thus the translation.

The largest category is again category 3 with 14 cases. The stimuli for these are varied and there are fewer cases that fall under clear trends than with many other verbs. There are some cases where the stimulus is the auxiliary verb *would/will* in these cases, and a few where stylistic choices in descriptions or dialogue but approximately half the cases are miscellaneous where the stimulus is a word like *lazy* or *try* or *please*. One case in example 37 below.

Example 37

Please don't use language like that around me.

"**Älä viitsi** käyttää tuollaista kieltä.

The other case, in example 38 below, there really was only the idea of not doing something as the stimulus.

Example 38

I have a six-foot convertible sofa that I usually **sleep on as is**, a desk, a chair, an endtable, and plump pillows that serve as additional seating if anyone comes over to sit.

Huonekaluja on vain nimeksi, parimetrinen vuodesohva jota en yleensä **viitsi** taitella auki, tuoli ja pöytä ja pari isoa tyynyä jotka toimivat lisäjakkaroina jos joku tulee käymään.

Here the translation changes the focus from sleeping on an unturned sofa to not bothering to open it, leaving sleeping to be implied, and making the lack of initiative explicit with the unique item.

To summarize the unique item *viitsii*, it seems to behave similarly to many of the other verbs in this study, having far fewer cases in the first two categories and exhibiting similar trends in category 3, mostly appearing in place of an auxiliary verb, a style choice and in many miscellaneous cases.

6.2.7 *Kehtaa*

Flint (1980, 3-4) says that *kehtaa* means not being embarrassed to do, or not being ashamed to do something, and Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 180) says *kehtaa* means being bold enough to do something.

In the research data, there are nine cases of *kehtaa*, none in category 1, five in category 2 and four in category 3.

In category 2 the five cases stem from three different stimulus phrases, different permutations of *how dare you*, *got a nerve* and *got cheek*, some of which have also given rise to different unique item verbs in this study. In example 39 stimulus *dare* is translated as *kehtaa*.

Example 39

How dare they! he shouted, as he slapped the medal onto the table.

Miten he kehtaavat! hän huusi samalla kun paiskasi mitalin pöytään.

Previously *dare* has appeared as stimulus in category 1, as a single word instead of a phrase and has been translated as *uskaltaa*, but in a phrase the corresponding exclamation is done with *kehtaa* in Finnish. Similarly, *nerve* has previously in this study been translated as *uskaltaa* when it appears without being in a phrase. In example 40 below *nerve* is in a phrase and translated with a Finnish phrase with *kehtaa*.

Example 40

And to Matilda she said, "You 've **got a nerve** talking to your father like that.

Ja Matildalle hän sanoi: "**Ettäs kehtaatkin** puhua isällesi tuolla tavoin.

The same word in a different context can produce different unique items, and possibly also different solutions without unique items, depending on the use and context. Phrases also could be seen as style choices in dialectal uses.

In category 3 there are four cases, and two of them are identical and from the same source text. Two other cases are miscellaneous and somewhat style-related. Example 41 presents one of the identical cases.

Example 41

I **do n't like** to say that you 're living in a caravan with no proper job."

Enkä **kehtaa** sanoa, että hän asuu asuntovaunussa ilman kunnon työtä."

There is a regional variation in the use of *kehtaa* in Finnish and in this case the translation evokes the meaning of not daring, or even being ashamed to do something.

Interestingly enough there are no cases where *kehtaa* appears in the place of an auxiliary verb. *Kehtaa* is also not used to smooth out difficult source language structures. The sample size is also very small, so it cannot be said that these cases would not exist.

6.2.8 *Viihtyy*

Viihtyy has the meaning of being comfortable enough (Tirkkonen-Condit 2004, 180) or feeling at home (Flint 1980, 3-4).

In the material there are eight cases of *viihtyy* and they are all in category 3. In approximately half of the cases, the stimulus word seems to be the adjective *like*, which literally translates into *pitää*, which is often an acceptable translation, grammatically and idiomatically. One such cases is presented in example 42 below.

Example 42

We do n't really use the showroom a great deal, only for new customers mostly, but I **like being** in here.

Me emme oikeastaan käytä tätä huonetta usein - lähinnä vain silloin kun saamme uusia asiakkaita - mutta minä **viihdyn** täällä.

As can be seen from the example, where the original text uses an adjective to describe how the person feels about the place, the translator has found a single, unique Finnish verb to do the job.

There is a verb in English that is closer to *viihtyy* in meaning, but it has other uses and broader meanings as well. In example 43 below the translator has used *viihtyy* to convey the needed meaning.

Example 43

She **enjoys** it up in Yorkshire.

Hän **viihtyy** Yorkshiressä.

Here any literal translations such as *nauttii* or *pitää* would not be correct due to *it up in* structure in the sentence that makes it so that the person enjoys the act of being in Yorkshire, and *viihtyy* encapsulates that meaning well.

In summary, *viihtyy* seems to deviate from the trends in category 3 that have been present in many other verbs in this study. No cases of auxiliary verbs in the original text, no dialect or style choices and not much in the way of complex structures, but instead more cases to do with the aspect of enjoyment in *viihtyy*.

6.2.8 Rohkenee

According to Tirkkonen-Condit (2004, 180) *rohkenee* means being brave enough or having enough courage and Flint (1980, 3-4) gives it the meaning of being bold enough or ventures.

In the material there are four cases of *rohkenee*, so not much can be said about it. Two cases are in category 1 and the other two are in category 3. This follows the way other verbs in this study have been distributed.

In category 1, one of the two cases have *venture* in as the stimulus and the other again has *dare*, in example 44 below.

Example 44

in which Rembrandt stood upright in his working tunic with his hands on his hips and appears defiant and invincible today to any onlooker who **dares** meet his eyes in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna.

jossa hän seisoo ryhdikkäänä työtakissaan kädet puuskassa ja näyttää uhmakkaalta ja voittamattomalta, ken vain nykyään **rohkenee** katsoa häntä silmiin Wienin Kunsthistorisches Museumissa.

Different unique items that have same stimulus is discussed more later in chapter 8.

In category 3 there are two miscellaneous cases, neither falling under any of the trends observed elsewhere in this study. All that can be said is that there are creative ways to use language, for example in example 45 below.

Example 45

Whether it 's people or nations, we have to **find the faith** to open our hearts and hands and say, Look, I 've nothing.

Niin yksilöiden kuin kansakuntienkin on **rohjettava** avata sydämensä ja kätensä ja sanoa: Katsokaa, minulla ei ole mitään.

There seems to be no grammatical or other convention forcing to not translate this more literally with something such as *usko* or *luottamus*, but the unique item was chosen.

6.2.9 *Joutaa*

Joutaa means to be idle enough (Tirkkonen-Condit 2004, 180) or to have enough time, to be at leisure or to be dispensable (Flint, 1980, 3-4). In the material there are only two cases of *joutaa*, both in category 2 and both stemming from the same phrase: *haven't got all day*. In both of these cases the phrase is also written in a dialect, which is more often the case with category 3 cases but has been seen in other categories as well. One of the cases in example 46 below.

Example 46

"Go on," said Tom, "I told you before, I **ent got all day**."

"Enkö minä sanonut ettei tässä **joudeta koko päivää** seisomaan."

Both of the cases are from the same source text and as the sample size is very small, nothing much can be said about *joutaa*.

6.2.10 *Riittää*

Riittää, according to Flint (1980, 3-4) means being enough to or adequate, or that something suffices. There are nine cases of *riittää* on the material, all cases of category 3.

There are no clear trends in these nine cases, except for a few that might be considered style choices in dialogue, as in example 47 below.

Example 47

I 'm here now, **OK?**"

Nyt olen täällä, eikö se **riitä**?"

These texts were published in the 80's and 90's, when translating OK as okei or ok was not as common as it is now days. In this case the difficult OK is translated as *eikö se riitä* that adds an air of impatience or irritation that this type of colloquial tag question often marks. The stimulus here of course is far from clear.

6.2.11 *Kelpaa*

Flint (1980, 3-4) defines *kelpaa* as being good enough or qualifying. There are eight cases of *kelpaa* in the material, four in category 2 and four in category 3.

In category 2 the cases stem mostly from *nothing but the best* type of phrases, as in example 48 below.

Example 48

— **Nothing but the best** for the Swanwicks, said my da when my ma told him that she 'd seen Missis Swanwick buying margarine instead of butter in the shop.

"Swanwickeille **kelpaa vain paras**", isä sanoi, kun äiti kertoi nähneensä kaupassa että Swanwickin täti osti voin sijasta margariinia.

In category 3 most cases are to do fit style and dialogue and some occur in the place of an auxiliary verb, as in example 49 below.

Example 49

That **do** you?"

Kelpaako se?"

Kelpaa is the only unique item verb found in the material that directly corresponds to the auxiliary verb *do*.

There are no cases of solving a complex structure, but again as the sample size is small, there is little to be said about *kelpaa* beyond noting that these cases exist.

In summary, in this analysis all categories of all verbs were looked at cases to find out if there are any overarching uses for these unique items. In category 1 and category 2 the unique items seem to be utilized in similar manner as the source language equivalents. In category 3 the analysis revealed three prominent trends in usage: stylistic choices in order to create dialects, solving complicated English sentence structure and in place of English auxiliary verbs. All three trends were present in verbs with larger sample sizes, but cases of at least one trend can be found in all verbs, even the ones with very few cases.

8 Discussion

This chapter discusses the results of this study and compares them with previous research and observations. The method and its application in this kind of research will be discussed in the latter half of this chapter.

8.1 Discussion on results

The hypothesis tested in this study is: Do most unique items that are present in translations have clear stimulus in the original text? As discussed in section 7.1, the qualitative analysis did not support the hypothesis. 133 out of 189 cases had no clear stimulus, 20 had a phrase a stimulus and 36 had clear stimulus. This also seems to imply that underrepresentation on unique items is perhaps not solely due to them not having clear stimulus, as they appear in translations mostly despite not having clear stimulus, rather than because of having clear stimulus.

The second research question in this study is: How do unique items function in translations and what are they used for? This is analyzed in 7.2 with qualitative analysis. In category 1 (clear stimulus) and category 2 (phrasal use) the unique items seem to be utilized in similar manner as the source language equivalents, but the prominence of category 3 (unique items with no clear stimulus) is very interesting and the qualitative analysis revealed some fascinating usage trends within the category. Unique items seem to be inspired by English auxiliary verbs, style in dialogue and narration, and in correspondence to complicated English sentence-structures. Based on the findings it would appear that these unique items that get their meaning from the field of sufficiency, are in many cases used not only to convey the core meaning, but also to solve other translation issues, such as presenting a regional or social dialect in dialogue. These verbs are not exactly markedly dialectic in Finnish, but they might be perceived to be of a lower register and less formal than other expressions. This together with dialectal personal pronouns and other markers can produce an illusion of the dialect in the original text.

It is also interesting to note that unique items often correspond to English auxiliary verbs, as those do not have translation equivalents in Finnish, with the exception of *be*. Furthermore, it is curious to see how consistently certain unique items appear in conjunction with the same auxiliary verbs. *Ehtii*, *jaksaa* and *maltaa* appear with *can*, *mahtuu*, *viitsii* and *uskaltaa* appear with *would*, and they do not break this pattern except with *be* and *do*, but those have multiple grammatical uses in English so that would be expected. This can be due to the limited data but there could be a grammatical reason behind it. As for Translation Studies, it would seem that the lack of translation equivalents for auxiliary verbs might give opportunities to use unique items. Similarly, complex English structures that lack similar Finnish structures seem to open a window to use unique items. Seemingly this is the case in longer sentences that have the inkling of time restrictions for example, and sentences that have a lot going on semantically, written out in a way that Finnish grammar does not support.

Another interesting example of how unique items behave can be seen in example 50 below, where the original English has two sentences with *can* in them and the translation has translated the first as *voinut* and the second as *jaksanut*.

Example 50

But she could n't admit it; nor **could** she understand the phenomenon of her sexual reluctance.

Mutta hän ei voinut myöntää sitä; hän ei myöskään **jaksanut** ymmärtää tätä ilmiötä, että hän oli seksuaalisesti vastahakoinen.

Clearly it is something else in the sentence or context that drives the translator towards unique items, as it would have been possible to translate both literally. Perhaps they wish to avoid repetition or something else in the original text called for a different solution.

Juva (2019, 161-162) made similar observations about her own translations, and presents examples from most of the verbs researched in this study, and often makes similar observations about how unique items are used in translations. Similarly to the findings of this study, she notes that auxiliary verbs such as *can* (ibid. 2019, 208-209, 211, 213) often act as an impulse for translators to use unique items. She also states that she often uses unique items to add color and style to the translation (ibid. 2019, 217), another trend that was prominent in this study as well. Juva (ibid. 221) also uses unique items to create clearer structures in the translation.

Juva (ibid. 2019, 8) noticed early in her career that producing verbs such as *viihytyä* and *viitsiä* need extra effort from the translator because English does not have any one way to express them. Juva states that translators often are tempted to follow the original structure as closely as possible even if a better option exists, and thus translators have to go beyond the first option that comes to mind in order to produce diverse language. She also included some draft translations in her material and it opens an interesting window into the translation process. For example, with the Finnish verb *mahtua* below. First line is the original text, second is a draft translation and the last line is the final translation.

ST: The tunnel used to seem so vast to me, like a cave all us kids **could** live in

TT1: Tunneli tuntui minusta ennen valtavalta, se oli kuin luola jossa me lapset **olisi voitu** asua

TT2: Ennen tunneli tuntui minusta valtavalta, kuin luola johon me lapset **olisimme mahtuneet** asumaan

Juva (2019, 213)

Interestingly the draft translation does not have a unique item, so apparently it was not readily suggested by the original text, but later revisions brought it up regardless of the stimulus, so it would seem that something in the translation process can produce unique items somewhat independently of stimulus.

Kujamäki (2004: 198-199) made similar observations in a study conducted on translation students. According to Kujamäki, students tended to follow the original structure closely even when more unique options were available.

The lack of category 1 and 2 cases could be due to the stimulus word themselves being rare as well. This research did not focus on frequencies so there is no data on how common the determined English stimulus words are in prose, so this cannot be confirmed in this study. On the other hand, it is also possible that not all cases of the stimulus words were translated as unique items, as it would be possible to translate them differently. For example, *dare* was translated with three different unique items, *uskaltaa*, *rohkenee* and *kehtaa*. Finnish has multiple verbs that can be used to describe different

aspects of daring where English seems to be using one. Dictionaries give both as acceptable equivalents depending on context. What should this say about how original items are stimulated in the original text?

8.2 Discussion on approach and methodology

The jumping off point of this study is a quote from Tirkkonen-Condit (2002): “Translators may ignore these items, as they do not tend to suggest themselves readily, certainly not as one-to-one equivalents to any particular item in the source text.” Tirkkonen-Condit also proposes that translating may proceed somewhat chronologically and literally and thus the original language can interfere with the translation (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2004: 183). As presented in section 4.2 with the examples of Juva’s collection (Juva 2019), this is not necessarily true, as the draft version and final translation may differ greatly and unique items are often added in editing. The data for this study does not include this kind of information, so revisions and their impact on unique items remains unknown.

The method used in this study is devised based on the idea that *one-to-one equivalents* in the context of stimulus for unique items would mean *literal or perfect translation equivalence*, which is not necessarily the case. The unique item hypothesis does not make it clear what “lack of stimulus” means, or what “stimulus” means for that matter. That being the case, this research took the stand that it must be examined in the strictest possible form and this study based the definition of clear stimulus on dictionary entries. This is of course somewhat arbitrary as the results heavily depend on the dictionaries used. The chosen dictionaries are printed ones that were widely available at the time the books that form the corpus were published. Modern online dictionaries would possibly have given different results, as they have much more space to go into exceptions and rarer uses. Even the printed dictionaries sometimes have interesting entries, for example Hurme et al. (1973, 845) gives *uskaltaa* as an equivalent of *to risk it*. This is a large and thorough dictionary and it lists more translations than most others used as reference.

"Someone has to take **risks** if it 's to improve a bad situation.

— Jonkun on **uskallettava**, jos sillä tavoin saadaan parannusta aikaan.

Due to this, the example above has been placed in category 1 instead of category 3, even though the original text could have been translated more literally without breaking Finnish grammar.

There is a case of *jaksaa* where the stimulus appears phrasal, but that was not confirmed by any of the references and it was placed in category 3. The translation is phrase-like as well, but not established enough to appear in dictionaries.

Example 52

He is **ever** hopeful!

Hän **jaksaa** toivoa!

In example 53, again an interesting stimulus that could have been put in category 3 if not for one reference dictionary giving *uskaltaa* as an equivalent.

Example 53

Oh, I had a **nerve**, in those days, Kate would sigh, looking back.

Voi miten minä **uskalsin** niihin aikoihin, Katella oli tapana huokaista muistellessaan aikaa.

Example 54 below is in category 3, not phrasal use even though it may look like it at first. This case is interesting because it uses a phrase in the translation, but the stimulus is not very phrasal, and the translation can also be seen as a style choice, but the stimulus is not clear in any case.

Example 54

Please don't use language like that around me.

"**Älä viitsi** käyttää tuollaista kieltä.

It is also interesting to consider that in order for a word to be included in a dictionary as an equivalent, it first needs to be established as such in practice, perhaps in translation. This would mean that unique items that are underrepresented in translations would also be underrepresented in dictionaries. Another way unique items are added in dictionaries could be that the makers just happened to have them in mind and there was enough space to include them. In a way, the method used in this study touches upon how much the unique items appear in bilingual dictionaries as well as how they come about in translations.

9 Conclusion

This study set out to explore what could be learned about unique items in translations and their stimulus in the original texts by extracting a set of unique items in a corpus and identifying the corresponding stimulus. The study further classifies the found stimuli into three categories based on the how clear the stimuli is.

The data comprises of 12 unique Finnish verbs of sufficiency; *ehtii, mahtuu, maltaa, jaksaa, uskaltaa, viitsii, kehtaa, viihtyy, rohkenee, joutaa, riittää* and *kelpaa* retrieved from the English-Finnish-sub-corpus of the Oslo Multilingual Corpus (OMC). The corpus is a parallel corpus containing original English fiction and the corresponding Finnish translations. In total 189 cases of the verbs were found. The cases were then divided into three categories by the type of stimulus involved, which are Category 1: clear stimulus, Category 2: phrasal use and Category 3: no clear stimulus.

Results show that out of the 189 cases analyzed, the vast majority represent Category 3: no clear stimulus. The results are as follows: Category 1: 35 cases, Category 2: 21 cases, Category 3: 133 cases. Further analysis of Category 3 found that these unique items seem to be used as a solution to a variety of translation problems, mainly in three prominent trends: style in dialogue and narration, in correspondence to complicated English sentence-structure and in correspondence to English auxiliary verbs.

This result sheds some light on how unique items behave in translations. The unique item hypothesis (Tirkkonen-Condit, 2002) suggests that unique items are features of a language that do not manifest similarly in other languages and due to this lack of stimulus, they are underrepresented in translations. This study found that 133 out of 189 cases of unique items did not have clear stimulus in the original text. This study also shows that these Finnish verbs of sufficiency that have been suggested to be unique items, do have similarly manifested features in English and those can and are being used as translation equivalents. This is an interesting find in the light of uniqueness and warrants further research into uniqueness and the different ways unique items are defined.

As for other future research, it could be fruitful to study how the translators' awareness of unique items affects their frequency in translations. Analyzing process data of how translators arrive to unique items could also shed more light to why they are underrepresented. Juva (2019) offers some interesting examples of her own processes that often show a lack of unique items in the first draft, but they are present in the final version. It could be beneficial to focus the study of stimulus on the black box of translation. The unique item hypothesis in general could also benefit from further refining the definition of uniqueness.

References

- Baker, M. (1993). Corpus Linguistics and Translation Studies — Implications and Applications. In Baker, M., Francis, G., and Toginini-Bonelli, E. *Text and Technology: In Honour of John Sinclair*. (233-250). Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Kenny, D. (2009). Corpora. In Baker, M., & Saldanha, G. (2009). *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Chesterman, A. (2004). Hypotheses about translation universals. In Hansen, G., Malmkjaer, K., and Gile, D. (eds) *Claims, Changes and Challenges in Translation Studies* (1-14). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chesterman, A. (2004). What is a unique item? In Gambier, Y., Shlesinger, M., Stoltze, R., (eds) *Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies* (3-13). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Chesterman, A. (2010). Why study translation universals? In Hartama-Heinonen, R. and Kukkonen, P., (eds) *Kiasm. Acta Translatologica Helsingiensia*, Vol 1, 38–48.
- Denver, L. (2009). Unique items in translations. In Göpfeich, S., Jakobsen A. L., Mees, M. I., (eds) *Behind the Mind. Methods, models and results in translation process research. Copenhagen Studies in Language*, No. 37, 125-147.
- Eskola, S. (2002). Syntetisoivat rakenteet käännessuomessa: suomennetun kauno- kirjallisuuden ominaispiirteiden tarkastelua korpusmenetelmällä. Joensuun yliopisto, Joensuu.
- Jantunen, J. H., & Eskola, S. (2002). Käännessuomi kielivarianttina: syntaktisia ja leksikaalisia erityispiirteitä. *Virittäjä*, 106(2), 184. Retrieved from <https://journal.fi/virittaja/article/view/40170>
- Eskola, S. (2004). Untypical frequencies in translated language: A corpus-based study on a litetrart corpus of translated and non-translated Finnish. In Mauranen, A. and Kujamäki, P., (eds) *Translation Universals, Do they exist?* (83-100). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Flint, A. (1980). Semantic structure in the Finnish lexicon: verbs of possibility and sufficiency. Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, Helsinki.
- Hurme, R., Pesonen, M. (1973). *Englantilais-suomalainen suursanakirja*. Helsinki: Werner Söderström osakeyhtiö.

- Juva, K. (2019). *Löytöretki Suomeen*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Kujamäki, P. (2004). What happens to “unique items” in learners’ translations? “Theories” and “concepts” as a challenge for novices’ views on “good translation”. In Mauranen, A., and Kujamäki, P., (eds) *Translation Universals, Do they exist?* (187- 204). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Mauranen, A. (2000) Strange strings in Translated Language. A Study on Corpora. In Olohan, M. (ed.) *Intercultural Faultlines* (73-91). Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Olohan, M. (2004). *Introducing corpora in translation studies*. London: Routledge.
- The Oslo Multilingual Corpus (1999-2008), the Faculty of Humanities, University of Oslo. The Oslo Multilingual Corpus is a product of the interdisciplinary research project Languages in Contrast (SPRIK), directed by Stig Johansson and Cathrine Fabricius-Hansen, and compiled by the OMC corpus team.
<http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/services/omc/> Oslo Multilingual Corpus – Background and use. (2010, July 6). Retrieved from
<http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/services/omc/>
- Rekiaro, I., (1991). *Englanti-suomi sanakirja*. Helsinki: Gummerus
- Riikonen, E., Tammelin, M., Sirkka A. (1979). *Englantilais-suomalainen sanakirja*. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otava
- SPRIK (completed). (2012, October 4). Retrieved from
<http://www.hf.uio.no/ilos/english/research/projects/sprik/index.html>
- Särkkä, H. (1992). *Englanti-Suomi-Englanti sanakirja*. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otava
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1993). What happens to a uniquely Finnish particle in the processes and products of translation? In Gambier, Y., and Tommola J., (eds) *Translation and Knowledge* (273-284). Turku: Grafia Oy.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2002). Translationese – a Myth or an Empirical Fact? *Target* Vol 14, No 2, 207-220.
- Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2004). Unique items – over- or under-represented in translated language? In Mauranen, A. and Kujamäki, P. (eds), *Translation Universals, Do they exist?* (177-184). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (2005). Häviävätkö uniikkiaineokset käännöskielestä? In Mauranen, A. and Jantunen J. H. (eds), *Käännössuomeksi* (123-138). Tampere University Press.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S., and Mäkisalo, J., (2007). Cohesion in subtitles: A corpus-based study. *Across Languages and Cultures*, Vol 8, No 2, 221-230.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive Translation Studies – and beyond*. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamin