

**“GOOD OLD WATSON!
YOU ARE THE ONE FIXED POINT IN A CHANGING AGE.”
- A Comparative Study of Two Finnish Translations of Sir Arthur
Conan Doyle’s *The Sign of the Four***

**Master’s thesis
Katja Länsimäki**

**University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
January 2012**

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Katja Länsimäki	
Työn nimi – Title “Good old Watson! You are the one fixed point in a changing age.” - A Comparative Study of Two Finnish Translations of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle’s <i>The Sign of the Four</i>	
Oppiaine – Subject Englanti	Työn laji – Level Pro Gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Tammikuu 2012	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 102 + 6 liitettä
<p>Tiivistelmä – Abstract</p> <p>Tämän tutkimuksen päämääränä oli vertailla Sir Arthur Conan Doylen toisesta kokopitkästä Sherlock Holmes romaanista <i>The Sign of the Four</i> poimittuja verbejä ja niiden kahta käännöstä, joista ensimmäinen oli Ida Wickstedtin kääntämä vuodelta 1894, ja toinen Jussi Korhosen käännös vuodelta 2009. Päämääränä oli tutkia, kuinka käännökset eroavat toisistaan, ja pohtia syitä erojen ja samankaltaisuuksien välillä. Tutkimus lähti siitä hypoteesista, että käännösten välillä on suuria eroja, sillä onhan niiden välillä kulunut aikaa yli sata vuotta, ja myös käännösteorioissa on tapahtunut merkittäviä näkökantamuutoksia.</p> <p>Analyysissä verbit jaettiin viiteen eri pääkategoriaan sen mukaan, miten ne vertautuivat toisiinsa käännöksissä: 1) sama verbi, sama rakenne, 2) sama verbi, eri rakenne, 3) eri verbi, sama rakenne, 4) eri verbi, eri rakenne, 5) muut. Verbien suuren määrän vuoksi kaikkia esiintymiä olisi ollut mahdotonta analysoida, joten analysoitaviksi valittiin kaikki ensimmäisen luvun verbit ja lisäksi verbit viidestä kohtauksesta, joissa oli enemmän pelkkää toimintaa ja kuvailua kuin ensimmäisessä luvussa. Käännöksiä vertailtiin etupäässä erilaisten ekvivalenssi-teorioiden pohjalta.</p> <p>Analyysin jälkeen alkuperäinen hypoteesi osoittautui jossain määrin vääräksi: suuria eroja kääntäjien suuntalinjoissa ei tullut esille, vaikka toki eroja oli erityisesti sanavalinnoissa, käännöksen tarkkuudessa ja käytetyissä rakenteissa. Analyysin pohjalta voidaan tehdä sellainen johtopäätös, että varsinaiset kääntämisen peruseriaatteet ja niihin liittyvät ongelmat eivät ole juurikaan muuttuneet ajan kuluessa ainakaan kaunokirjallisten tekstien suhteen, vaikka käännösteorioiden, kääntäjien työvälineet ja yleinen suhtautuminen kääntäjiin ja heidän työhönsä ovatkin muuttuneet.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords Translation, Verbs	
Säilytyspaikka – Depository Kielten laitos	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

Table of Contents

1 INTRODUCTION	7
2 TRANSLATION STUDIES	9
2.1. The recent history of Finnish translation	9
2.2. Translating in a situation	12
2.2.1. The translation and the translator	13
2.2.2. The reader	14
2.2.3. Re-translation	15
2.3. Aims of translation	16
2.3.1. Skopos	16
2.3.2. Loyalty	17
2.4. Equivalence	20
2.4.1. Formal vs. dynamic equivalence	22
2.4.2. Communicative vs. semantic translation	25
2.4.3. Overt vs. covert translation	28
3 VERBS	32
3.1. English verb forms	32
3.1.1. Verbs and the verb phrase	32
3.1.2. Tense	34
3.1.3. Voice	36
3.1.4. Aspect	37
3.1.5. Mood	38
3.1.6. Multi-word verbs	40
3.2. Finnish verb forms	41
3.2.1. General features	42
3.2.2. Finite verb forms	43
3.2.3. Non-finite verb forms	44
3.2.4. Aspect	45
3.2.5. Participial phrases	46
3.2.6. Compound forms and other multi-verb constructions	48
4 AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	50
5 SET-UP OF THE STUDY	51
5.1. Data	51
5.1.1. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle	51
5.1.2. The Sign of the Four	52
5.1.3. The Era of Sherlock Holmes	53
5.2. Methods of data gathering	56
5.3. Methods of data analysis	59
6 ANALYSIS	61
6.1. A general comparison of the two translations	61
6.2. Same verb, same structure	63
6.3. Same verb, different structure	67
6.4. Different verb, same structure	75
6.5. Different verb, different structure	84
6.6. Others	86
6.6.1. Omissions	87
6.6.2. Additions	88
6.6.3. Multi-word structures	90

6.6.4. Others	91
BIBLIOGRAPHY	99
Primary sources	99
Secondary sources	99
APPENDIX 1: Chapter titles	103
APPENDIX 2: Same verb, same structure.....	104
APPENDIX 3: Same verb, different structure	108
APPENDIX 4: Different verb, same structure.....	111
APPENDIX 5: Different verb, different structure	115
APPENDIX 6: Others	121

1 INTRODUCTION

Classics are novels that are read again and again by every new generation. Classics have been translated into foreign languages, and more often than not they have been translated several times as the generations change and demand a more up-to-date version of the beloved classic. Often this demand stems from change in the language: over centuries and even decades the language as it is used by common people can change so much that expressions and words become incomprehensible or laughable in their context. Indeed, some classics, like Shakespeare, are even translated within a language, as they become increasingly difficult even for the native readers to understand. However, it is not only the language that changes, but also the theories about how the language is used or should be used in translation.

The present study will concentrate on two translations of the same novel from different time periods. One of the aims of this study is to examine what kinds of differences there are between the translations. Sherlock Holmes is the world's best known private detective, and the novels and short stories about him and his loyal companion Dr. Watson, written by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, could well be considered classics since new readers still discover and enjoy the adventures of Holmes and his Watson, although many of them were written over a century ago. The characters and stories have also recently become known for the not-book-reading public thanks to the 2009 film adaptation by director Guy Ritchie, in which Robert Downey Jr. and Jude Law play the leading roles. As new audience is gained, new translations are required, and indeed many of the original stories have encountered several translations. The second full-length Sherlock Holmes novel, *The Sign of the Four*, was first translated into Finnish in 1894 (four years after its original publication) by Ida Wickstedt under the title *Neljän merkit*. The most recent of its Finnish translations was published in 2009, translated by Jussi Korhonen, and since the first translation even the title has gone through a small change, now being *Neljän merkki*. Because of the huge gap between the first and the most recent translation it presents interesting data to study, while being a good example of Doyle's writing.

Verbs were chosen as the focus of this study because of their indisputable role as the element around which clauses and sentences form. The aim is to see how the two translators from very different time periods had treated the source text and the verbs in

it: first of all, how the verbs had been translated, and then the differences and similarities in the translations. Additionally, verbs have such a great expressive power that the whole effect of a sentence can easily be altered by changing the main verb into a slightly different one.

Previous studies have been made on two or more translations of the same text, e.g. Oittinen (1997) on *Alice in Wonderland*. However, no previous studies on Finnish translations of Sherlock Holmes stories were found and also no previous studies on the differences in translating verbs. Consequently, this study gives fresh material to be examined, and will provide another angle to studies of different translations of one text.

In the chapters to follow, the history of Finnish translation is first discussed from the 19th century to the 21st century. After that, translation and situation will be examined from the translator's and reader's points of view, and some consideration is of course given to re-translation. Next, the study will proceed to the translation theories. First, the aims of translation will be discussed in the form of skopos-theory and the concept of loyalty. Second, different takes on equivalence will be explored. Then a chapter is dedicated to describing the verbs in English and in Finnish, their forms and uses. This will make explanations in the analysis clearer. Next, however, the aims and research questions are presented, after which a closer look at the data will be taken along with an explanation of methods of data gathering and analysis. Then the study proceeds to the analysis of the chosen data, and ends with a discussion of the results and concluding words.

2 TRANSLATION STUDIES

This section will deal with the recent history of translation in Finland, spanning approximately over the last 200 years, with the main focus in the last century. After that, several translation theories will be discussed: first, the close relationship between the situation in which a text is translated and the translation itself, with a look at the role of the reader and the need for re-translation. Second, the focus will shift on translation's aims: skopos-theory will explain the most important situational factor, the purpose, and the concept of loyalty addresses the issue from another viewpoint. Third, possibly the most disagreed on concept in translation studies, equivalence, will be explored through a few of the various binar systems that have been created to explain different kinds of equivalences. After these topics have been covered, the verb systems of English and Finnish, respectively, will be discussed.

2.1. The recent history of Finnish translation

To begin with, it is important to consider the history of Finnish translation, as the rise of Finnish into a civilized language coincides with the publication of the first Sherlock Holmes translation that is examined in this study.

In the 19th century, a struggle for language, culture and national identity was taking place in Finland, and translation into Finnish was an important means for spreading the language (Paloposki 2004: 366). Finland had been under the Swedish rule for 600 years, and the Russian Empire ruled Finland for a century before its declaration of independence in 1917. It is therefore no wonder that there were strong movements for improving the status of Finnish, the most important spokesmen for Finnish being Johan Vilhelm Snellman and Elias Lönnrot. (Oittinen 1997: 126, Paloposki 2000: 24.) In this phase, the translators were university teachers, priests, reporters and other men of nationalistic movement (Paloposki 2000: 30). Many early translators spoke Swedish as their first language, which complicated their work and resulted in Swedish-influenced expressions in the language of the translations (Hellemann 1970: 479). Towards the end of the 19th century, women entered the translation field, some of the most famous being Anni Swan and Helmi Krohn. At the turn of the century, most translators were also writers, e.g. Juhani Aho and Eino Leino. (Paloposki 2000: 30.)

Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura, founded in 1831, was an important milestone in the development of Finnish literature (Paloposki 2004: 366). Indeed, from 1830s onwards,

Finnish was determinedly transformed into a civilized language (Paloposki 2000: 20). In fact, Paloposki (2004: 366) names three main purposes that translation into Finnish had at the time:

- 1) to show that Finnish could be a language of literature, not solely a language spoken by the people,
- 2) to develop the language: translation was considered the fastest way to accomplish this, and
- 3) to give the people some “civilized” reading.

This was accomplished partly thanks to the translators who, according to Häkkinen (1994: 464), created a significant amount of standard Finnish by translating either written or spoken Swedish into Finnish. For instance, the word *sähkö* was coined by a translator called Samuel Roos (Häkkinen 1994: 422).

Consequently, more Finnish translations than original Finnish literature were published in the 19th century, and this was to change only in the beginning of the 20th century. A demand for prose was rising, and since the need could not be answered by Finnish authors, translations filled the void. (Kovala 1992: 28-29.) However, Kovala (1992: 31) points out that as the amount of books translated increased, so did the amount of the translations of less valued entertainment reading. (cf. Kovala 1992 for more detailed figures.)

The language field of the 19th century Finland was very different from today. Since the relationships with Sweden and Germany were well established, it was only natural that the first translations were from Swedish and German (Paloposki 2000: 25). However, the role of the English language was rather weak. In school, it was mandatory to learn Swedish and Russian before the actual foreign languages (German and French). Thus, it is understandable that not many had the opportunity to learn English, and it has to be remembered that very few even had the opportunity to go to school regularly, and, consequently, to learn any languages at all in the 19th century – it was not before 1921 that education became compulsory in Finland (Ruuhimäki). Indeed, many who did learn English, did so out of personal interest, or had to because of their occupation (Kovala 1992: 25). What is more, after the First World War, language politics in Finland favoured German. Therefore it is no surprise that in the end of the 19th century, it was generally rather difficult even to find translators who knew both Finnish and English. However, the status of English was better than average in all-girl schools and private

schools. (Kovala 1992: 24-26.) Additionally, English works were translated through the medium of other languages (Paloposki 2000: 28).

Other languages were the source for most translations at the time, but approximately 14 per cent of them were still translated from English. For instance, starting from 1879, Paavo Cajander's classic Shakespeare translations were published twice a year. However, translation from English into Finnish was mainly characterized by randomness and lack of devotion which resulted from a small audience and too few translators. (Kovala 1992: 33-34.) Ten most translated English language authors in 1890-1939 were (in order of most translations): Jack London, Arthur Conan Doyle, William Shakespeare, Zane Grey, James Oliver Curwood, Edgar Rice Burroughs, Berta Ruck, Edgar Wallace, Elinor Glyn and John Bunyan (Kovala 1992: 45).

It is curious that in the 19th century it was possible for a translation to get only the translator's name on its cover, especially if the translator was also a well-known writer. This happened with *Jänis Vemmelsäären seikkailut* which was actually translated by Anni Swan, but there was no mention of the original author when it was published. (Oittinen 1997: 121.) However, theories that advocate the translator's visibility instead of his or her invisibility, have risen only during the 20th century. (cf. 2.3.2.)

The extent of translation suffered a collapse in the 1920s and 1930s, but today over a half of all literature published in Finland is translations. (Paloposki 2000: 23.) In turn, over a half of the translations is translated from English, about 15 per cent from Swedish and less than a tenth from German. Using intermediary languages is now considered exceptional, whereas earlier it was quite normal. (Paloposki 2000: 28-29.)

In addition to the change in figures and status of languages over time, ideologies and theories of translation have also changed. It has been usual to domesticate a translation when a language is in its first phases of becoming a language of literature in all times worldwide. This was also the case in Finland in the beginning of the 20th century. Oittinen (1997: 126-127) describes how the first translation of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland* (translated in 1906 by Anni Swan) was placed in the Finnish countryside, how the names of the characters were changed into Finnish ones (Alice became Liisa, for instance), and units of measure were changed into their Finnish counterparts. The outside world was not as familiar to the contemporary public as it is today: therefore it was safer to Finnicize the world of *Alice* in order to not alienate the readers.

As recently as in the beginning of the 1980s, it was still natural to concentrate on the translator's invisibility in the most prominent translation theories in the world, whereas in the late 1990s the reasons for the particular choices and deviations from the original the translator has made were considered, and the exact sameness between the source text and the translation was not self-evident anymore. (Oittinen 1997: 120.) Indeed, in contrast to the first translation by Anni Swan, the most recent *Alice* translation by Alice Martin does not attempt to Finnicize the text, but reflects the modern world where the translator can trust that foreign languages and cultures are more familiar and better tolerated by the public: for example, Martin has maintained the British names of Alice's real world. (Oittinen 1997: 132.) It is important to note that there is no single or even a few established translation norms in the modern field of translation. Rather there are many parallel views that can be exploited to everyone's personal taste. Oittinen (1997: 130) further emphasizes that it is only natural for perceptions of translation to change over time, since they reflect the world and time in which they exist because translation, too, is a human action.

Having now discussed the changes that have taken place in a translator's work and in the translation studies relatively briefly, I will move on to the views about the situation in which a translator works. Certainly, this chapter has been a stepping stone in describing the change that has taken place between the two translations of *The Sign of the Four*.

2.2. Translating in a situation

Translation, like everything else, occurs in a certain situation, in a certain time and place. Moreover, a text is translated by someone who has his or her personal views about the purpose and aims of translation in general and about the particular translation task at hand. Translations made in different times reflect their own culture and perceptions about the world. It is necessary to consider these issues because the Sherlock Holmes translations that will be analysed in the course of this study have over a hundred years between them, and therefore the world and the situations in which they have been translated are very different. In the previous section I gave an overview of what translation and perceptions of it have been like for the past two centuries. In this section I will concentrate on particular views of a translator and a reader in a situation: what those situations and their different aspects are. I will touch on the subject of the translator as a reader, and finally, I will address the topic of re-translation.

2.2.1. The translation and the translator

“Translation does not take place in a vacuum”, states Vehmas-Lehto (2002: 114). Indeed, in Oittinen’s (1995: 44-45) view, the starting point of translation, in theory as well as in practice, is always the situation in which the act of translating occurs. There is always a situation in which and for which texts are translated, and that situation can be understood very widely: it includes time, place, culture and the whole textual context as well as the reader of the text who interprets the text in another situation. Oittinen (ibid.) emphasizes that every individual factor affects the text in its entirety and creates new interpretations and new meanings. In the present study, the concept of a situation is particularly important in that the Sherlock Holmes translations that will be analysed have more than a hundred years between them. Thus, it must be considered that the situations and the readers and translators in them are very different.

The most important aspects to consider when examining the situation are the translator’s personality, the community/communities in which the translator lives and participates in, and factors like his or her sex and age (Oittinen 1995: 45-46). As a consequence, the present study could be taken further by adding these issues in the analysis. It could be interesting to examine if their sex has made any difference in the translators’ choices: the translator of the 1894 version being female and the one of the 2009 version being male. This is, however, beyond the scope of this study, and also quite difficult, if not impossible, to study. Nevertheless, Hatim and Mason (1990: 38) have some additions to Oittinen’s list: the source of the text, its status, the client who has ordered the translation, and the actual purpose of the translation. In fact, Vehmas-Lehto (2002: 115) claims that the most significant situational factor is the purpose, or function, of the communicative act, i.e. translation in this case. (cf. 2.3.1. for more about the purpose, or *skopos*.)

The situation can be described from even a wider point of view, as Oittinen (1997: 13) so vividly does: “all texts reflect the situation in which they were born... All texts also reflect the thoughts of all the people who have interpreted them and given them their own perspective. Texts talk and listen, they are full of voices that make noise, argue and co-exist peacefully.” This observation leads to a conclusion that the reader also has a significant role in creating a text. Next, the reader’s role will be discussed.

2.2.2. The reader

It could be said that the reader is the final frontier of a text. “The reader takes the crown of interpretation from the translator who has taken it from the author, and then proceeds to read the text as he or she likes, disregarding the author’s and the translator’s intentions of how it should be read.” This is the colourful image Oittinen (1997: 128) paints from the carnivalistic perspective. Steiner (1975: 29) even reflects that there is no objective, literal history - and to take his thought a little farther with Oittinen’s perspective - because all history has been written by someone, and it is read by people in a different situation from the one in which it was written, which is a different situation from when it actually happened. Furthermore, a translator is also a reader - a transmitter as well as a receiver (Bassnett 2002: 43). In addition, Bassnett (ibid.) declares that if the relationship between the writer, the translator and the reader is understood correctly, a myth about translation as a secondary activity can be abolished.

Since the reader is an entity that cannot be controlled by the author or the translator, his or her expectations have to be considered. Vehmas-Lehto (2002: 116) remarks that the reader must be told if the translator has decided to not follow the prevailing conventions of translation, even though the deviations have been made because some structures of the source text do not work in the target language and culture. This is called the loyalty principle (cf. 2.3.2.). However, it is difficult to take into account every possible situation, i.e. the background and knowledge of every single reader, since their reading strategies cannot be predicted: every reader has a unique point of view and reads the text solely for himself (Oittinen 1995: 47).

Indeed, a reader’s responses to the text cannot be controlled - not by the translator nor even the author. This becomes particularly apparent when considering a text that has been written more than a hundred years ago, like the early works of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle. Although his readers at the time read Sherlock Holmes stories possibly in very different contexts, his readers today are certainly in a very different context from that of the late 19th and early 20th century, although their personal contexts may again vary considerably. (cf. 5.1.3. for historical background.) Thus, new translations of older texts are needed. The basis for re-translation will be considered in the next chapter.

2.2.3. Re-translation

As time goes by and people and situations change, there is a need to re-translate. The language of an earlier translation may be too old-fashioned to appeal to modern readers, or a translator might want to translate the text for a different audience. (Mäkinen 2004: 411, 415.) For instance, Alice Martin's 1995 Finnish translation of *Alice in Wonderland* is a translation of a classic, and aims to be an exact translation, therefore different from the previous ones, whereas the predecessors were clearly aimed at a child audience. Certainly one must note that precedent translations have an effect on the new translations. (Oittinen 1997: 133.) However, translation does not always take place between two languages: it may also occur inside a language. Steiner (1975: 28) even goes so far as to say that every reading act is a translation, whether one reads an ancient text from the Bible or the previous year's best-seller. A more concrete example of this could be any play, e.g. *Hamlet*, by Shakespeare: since the original plays were written in the 16th century, more or less, the English language has changed considerably, therefore requiring modernized versions and new editions with vast explanations as the texts become too difficult to comprehend even to native speakers (Mäkinen 2004: 419).

It is essential to have new translations made from old works, because they help to understand the contemporary world and people as well as the world of the past. The readers of the original text are also quite different now compared with a hundred years ago. Regardless, the old translations have significance and may have become a part of national literature, like Paavo Cajander's Shakespeare translations - they maintain their status although new translations have been made. (Oittinen 1997: 139.) However, the barrier of time between the texts is often more subtle and less easily recognized than that of linguistic difference - especially so when the gap inbetween is not a large one. A reader may err in his interpretation because the meaning of some words has altered, but they still look familiar. (Steiner 1975: 28.) The changes can also be more substantial: Bahtin (1979: 239) points out that parodical meanings are easily lost partially or entirely if the conditions are right. It is therefore an indisputable fact that some nuances of the original text are not anymore in the reach of the readers (Oittinen 1997: 22).

In this chapter, I have examined the role and situation of the translator as well as the reader, because they cannot truly be separated since a translator is initially also a reader of the text that is to be translated. The situation as a concept is particularly important in this study, because the two Finnish versions of *The Sign of the Four* to be analysed have

been translated in very different time periods, thus, in very different situations. Next, I will move on to discuss one of the most important situational factors of a translation: its aim and purpose.

2.3. Aims of translation

A translation may have several different aims. These have been approached, for instance, by Reiss and Vermeer with their skopos-theory, and Nord with her concept of loyalty.

2.3.1. Skopos

The skopos-theory was created by Reiss and Vermeer to describe the purpose, the objective of a target text which guides its translation. The basis of skopos-theory is thus the importance of the aims and goals of translation, its target audience and future context. (Koskinen 2004: 380.) Indeed, the Greek word *skopos* means a goal or an objective (Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 55).

According to Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 54), translation theory is a complex action theory. It differs from the general action theory in that it assumes that there always is a source text which is the primary action, whereas the starting point of general action theory is a given situation that is observed by a person, who then proceeds to act in a way that is justified by his observations of the surrounding situation. Therefore translation theory rather asks whether the action that has already started should be continued, that is, translated into another language, and exactly how it should be continued.

Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 57) also emphasize the purpose of the translation and achieving the purpose. The means to this end are only secondary. Indeed, Nord (1997: 124) paraphrases the main idea of skopos-theory in the following way: “the translation purpose justifies the translation procedures.” Nord’s idea of loyalty, which relates closely to skopos-theory, will be discussed in the next chapter. However, skopos-theory needs perhaps more explanation. Its basic principle is this: the purpose of translation is the most important factor in all translation. This means that whether a text is translated, what exactly is translated and how, and what translation strategies are used, depend on the purpose of the target text. (Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 55.) Even radical changes are allowed if, for instance, the text contains a culture-bound expression that cannot be

understood by an average target text reader. In any case, the translation is successful if the translator's and the reader's interpretation about it do not differ too much. (Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 57.)

Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 59-60) also argue that the *skopos* of the translation can differ from that of the source text for the following reasons:

- 1) preservation of source text features is not required, because the production of a translation is a different type of phenomenon compared to the production of the source text,
- 2) information is included only if the translator thinks it is new to the reader,
- 3) every unit in a language/culture system is defined by its position among the other units in the same system.

Because of these reasons, Reiss and Vermeer (*ibid.*) argue, one text is transformed to another in a translation process. Thus, it can only be required that the target text should stay as close to the source text as possible. Reiss and Vermeer (1986: 69) further insist that translation is not about whether languages are comparable with each other. They claim that the target text has its own *skopos*, independent from that of the source text.

The preliminary assumption of the *skopos* therefore is that every translation should be the most optimal manifestation of its purpose. Only then the content and the form are considered: they should follow the source text's content and form in all levels. What must be stressed, however, is that the primary task is fulfilling the purpose. Therefore the new fidelity rule, proposed by Reiss and Vermeer, is the following: translation strives for a coherent transfer of the source text, if *skopos* allows (and demands) it. (Reiss and Vermeer 1986: 65.)

Having now explained the main features of *skopos*-theory, I will concentrate on Nord's additional idea, loyalty, that focuses on not deceiving the reader by making unexplained changes to the text during the translation process.

2.3.2. Loyalty

As mentioned above, Nord (1997) presents an additional idea to Reiss and Vermeer's (1986) *skopos*-theory, the loyalty principle. She criticizes the *skopos*-theory because it gives too much freedom to the translator. Indeed, as was explained in the previous section, in *skopos*-theory the only important factor is the purpose of the target text.

According to the loyalty principle, however, the original author's intentions should be taken into account and the purpose of the translation should reflect the purpose of the source text. (Nord 1997: 125.) This way, the justifiable functions for one target text are reduced to a reasonable amount (Nord 1997: 126).

A translation process, however, includes more participants than merely the translator. The role of the reader was already considered at some length in 2.2.2, but there are several others. Nord (1997: 126) lists the translator, the author of the original text, the readers of the translation, and the initiator (e.g. a publishing house) of the translation. All the participants beside the translator also have their own legitimate interests in the translation, and the loyalty principle takes them into account. Firstly, initiators want a certain type of translation. Secondly, target readers expect to find a particular kind of relationship between the text and its translation. Thirdly, the original author has the right to demand respect for his text, and also expects a certain relationship between his text and the translation. In this network of participants, the translator is the one to mediate and negotiate if there is a conflict between the interests of the other parties involved. (Nord 1997: 126-128.)

In essence, loyalty is a moral responsibility, and should not be confused with fidelity or faithfulness, which are more tied with the wordings on a page and the equivalence between the source and the target text. (For more about equivalence, see 2.4.) Instead of referring to the relationship between the source and the target texts, loyalty is rather a social relationship between people – the participants of a translation process. This means that the author should be able to trust the translator's judgment, so that, for example, if any adaptations are needed to make the text work in the target culture, the author could consent to them and trust that the translator will not alter the original meaning. (Nord 1997: 125-126.)

If any significant changes are made in the translation, they should always be explained by the translator to the other participants. Of course, there are certain conventions of translation, e.g. that a translation is in the same genre as the source text (for example, a poem is translated as a poem and not prose), which determine the expectations of the other participants from a translated text. Indeed, a reader usually assumes that a translation follows the norms and conventions of a traditional translation. Therefore it is important to inform the reader, if these conventions have been violated in any way. If changes have been made, whether it has been done purposefully or not, and they have

not been explicitly explained, the reader will be deceived without even noticing it. This should never happen in light of the loyalty principle as the participants should always be informed of these adaptations in one way or the other. Nevertheless, a translator is not obliged to do what everyone else expects him to do. (Nord 1991: 94-95.) Being loyal may require ignoring certain conventions even when the author wishes certain features to remain unchanged (Nord 1997: 127). In the end, it is important to at least inform all participants of the reasons behind the changes (Nord 1991: 95).

Cultural references in a text often need some adaptation to make them work in the target culture. Loyalty ensures that the translation is coherent and comprehensible also to the members of the target culture. Authors, who often are not experts on translation, may insist on a faithful translation of the surface structures of the source text. Consequently, trust in the translator's loyalty is needed to make the author to consent to any changes needed to make the text coherent and comprehensible in the target culture. Moreover, the translator has to respect the author's communicative purpose. The loyalty principle also sets an obligation for him to take into account the different culture-bound translation concepts that prevail in the two cultures participating in the translation process. (Nord 1997: 25-126.)

In addition to Nord (1997), Chesterman (2000: 181) points out that the translator is not working alone, but he is a part of a network of senders and receivers of the text. Trust is essential in this network because a translator's trustworthiness enables him to continue working as a translator. It is important that this trust is maintained since trust can be lost rather than gained. To maintain the trust between all participants, the translator should try to make himself visible. This means that he should at least be mentioned. In a longer work, on the other hand, he could have e.g. a preface where he explains "the main principles underlying the translational approach that has been taken". The translator is responsible to give an explanation especially if the reader's expectations might somehow be challenged. (Chesterman 2000: 182.)

Another way for a translator to make himself visible is through footnotes, as is the case in the 2009 Finnish translation of *The Sign of the Four*. The translator, Jussi Korhonen, has decided to add several footnotes at the end of the book. They address issues like the use of cocaine in the 1880s, mistakes Doyle has made in his writing (e.g. Watson's wound from the Jezail-bullet: in *A Study in Scarlet* he is wounded in the shoulder, while in *The Sign of the Four* the bullet wound that bothers him is in his leg), and foreign,

especially Indian, words embedded in the story, that are not likely to be familiar to a 21st century Finnish reader. This kind of a use of footnotes does give more visibility and also credibility to the translator. Consequently, the text is not full of explanations, but the reader can check the footnotes or ignore them as he wishes.

In this chapter, I explored the skopos-theory which explains the issue that is considered by Oittinen to be the most significant situational feature of translation (see 2.2.), the purpose of the translation. However, since Reiss and Vermeer's view seems to be quite narrow in that they give so much power to the translator, I found it useful to take Nord's loyalty to the side to give the issue more perspective. Having now looked at translation's aims, I will move on to discuss the concept that has been defined in many ways through decades, and perceptions of which have also changed significantly, equivalence.

2.4. Equivalence

Equivalence is the most argued concept in translation theory (Chesterman 2000: 9). It is held self-evident by many, and even the concept of a good translator has been grounded on it (Oittinen 1995: 31). Although Oittinen (1995: 35) does suggest that equivalence as a concept begins to be outdated, she still agrees that it might be a useful tool in research, and therefore well worth studying. Martin (2001) confirms that equivalence is still a vital part of a translator's work, and suspects that Oittinen's (1995) theory is too far from practice and gives translators even too much liberty. Subsequently, this chapter aims to present different views of equivalence as it has been understood by researchers.

Generally, equivalence is defined as the "sameness" of the source text and its translation. However, this "sameness" opens up many debates. (Chesterman 2000: 9.) "Sameness" can be expected from e.g. linguistic elements, text form or communicative function (Koskinen 2004: 375). However, even the word equivalence is not used consistently in different languages: both Oittinen (1995: 35) and Koskinen (2004: 375) mention that the English word "equivalence" and the German word "Äquivalenz" refer to totally different things. Indeed, Snell-Hornby (1995: 17-18) points out that there are "subtle but crucial differences ... between the two terms, so that they should rather be considered as warning examples of the treacherous *illusion* of equivalence that typifies interlingual relationships". The two terms have a rather different historical development, and their positions within their respective language systems also differ somewhat. For instance, the English word *equivalence* has existed in common language from 1541, and

its adjectival form *equivalent* even longer, while the German *Äquivalenz* only emerged in 1876 with the definition “of equal value.” However, they both have been technical terms in e.g. mathematics, where they are semantically identical. In spite of that, equivalence was adopted into translation terminology as a general language term, whereas the German *Äquivalenz* was taken from either mathematics or formal logic. After that, they have been used slightly differently even within the same language. (For more discussion, cf. Snell-Hornby 1995.)

The pragmatic reality of equivalence theories is a disputed one. Martin (2001) surmises: “It may be just here that theory and practice meet – or clash uncomfortably.” Moreover, Chesterman (2000: 9-10) claims that the only real examples of equivalence are those in which an element X of the source text is always, in all contexts and situations, transmitted into the target language as Y. He proceeds to add that it is likely that in practice, this only occurs with a small set of items or syntactic structures that are separated from their context. Indeed, translation is more than replacing lexical and grammatical elements of one language with those of another (Bassnett 2002: 32). The problem in connecting equivalence with the practical side of translation is the implication that it is possible to achieve full equivalence, while there is no completely formal or dynamic target-language version of the source text (Hatim and Mason 1990: 8). Indeed, Venuti (1995: 18) stresses that by nature, translation is based on meanings, and cannot be assessed through mathematics-based concepts that emphasize one-to-one correspondence of elements and do not consider larger meaningful entities.

According to Chesterman (2000: 9), equivalence is usually divided into different subtypes. In these subtypes there are often two opposing main categories, although they do not necessarily exclude one another. In the next sections, I will present three examples of the binary equivalence model. First, Eugene A. Nida’s theory of formal and dynamic equivalence will be explored. Second, I will discuss Peter Newmark’s view of semantic and communicative translation. Third, and last, Juliane House’s model of overt and covert translation methods will be studied. By this I want to show what kinds of different approaches theorists have had towards equivalence, bearing in mind that these, too, are only a scratch on the surface.

2.4.1. Formal vs. dynamic equivalence

In Nida's (1964: 159) view, a translator should seek the closest possible equivalent in all translating. However, he divides equivalence into two fundamentally different types: formal and dynamic.

The focus of formal equivalence is the message of the text in form as well as in content. In formal equivalence, the elements (e.g. sentences, concepts) should match as closely as possible in the source and target languages. As an example of this, Nida gives "gloss translation" which is designed to "permit the reader to identify himself as fully as possible with a person in the source-language context, and to understand as much as he can of the customs, manner of thought, and means of expression." In gloss translation the form and content of the original are reproduced as literally and meaningfully as possible. E.g. a Medieval French text might be translated in this way for students of French literature. (Nida 1964: 159.)

According to Nida (1964: 165), a formal-equivalence translation is particularly designed to let the reader know as much of the original form and content as possible. Some of the possible features of formal-equivalence translation are "translating nouns by nouns, verbs by verbs" etc, "keeping all phrases and sentences intact (i.e. not splitting up and readjusting the units", and "preserving all formal indicators, e.g. marks of punctuation, paragraph breaks, and poetic indentation". Also concordance of terminology is important: a particular term in the original is always replaced by a corresponding term in the translation. This "may be pushed to an absurd extent." In the case of idioms, for instance, a formal-equivalence translation tries to make the structure and word choices of the original culture visible to the target reader. However, there are some elements, like puns, which cannot be rendered formally into another language. In these cases, Nida (ibid.) suggests the use of footnotes if the element requires an explanation – in rare cases an almost equivalent expression exists in the target language. In the end, Nida (1964: 166) points out that a formal-equivalence translation is often not useful for the average reader, although it still can be "a perfectly valid translation of certain type of a message for certain type of an audience", e.g. linguists.

Dynamic equivalence, in contrast, is more concerned with the effect the text has on the reader, that is, the effect of the target text on the target reader should be substantially the same as the effect of the original source text on the source text reader. "Complete naturalness of expression" is its aim, and it does not assume that complete knowledge of

the source culture's customs is required of the reader for him to understand the message. (Nida 1964: 159.) Of course, there are many levels on which dynamic equivalence can occur. Moreover, during the last decades, it has become more acceptable to emphasize the dynamic aspect of translating than emphasizing the formal one. (Nida 1964: 160.)

The target reader's response is the most important aspect of a dynamic-equivalence translation. Although a translation is still only a translation, and therefore has to reflect the purpose and meaning of the source text, a bicultural and bilingual reader's response to it should be the same as if the text was originally written in the target language. However, Nida states that a dynamic-equivalence translation is "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" (Nida 1964: 166.) Indeed, also Nida and Taber (1969: 12-13) advocate the use of natural equivalents, thus the avoidance of "translationese", i.e. strangeness and awkwardness in the grammar and style of the text.

A natural translation has to fit the receptor language and culture as a whole, the context of the particular message and the receptor-language audience (Nida 1964: 159). Consequently, the expressions that are out of context are the ones that throw the reader out of the story and make the translation less than successful. To achieve naturalness, some adaptations have to be made in grammar and lexicon. Lexical structures, whose adjustment has numerous alternative possibilities, are more difficult than grammatical changes which include, for instance, "shifting word order, using verbs in place of nouns" (Nida 1964: 167.) For example:

(1) Finally he thrust the sharp point home, pressed down the tiny piston, and sank back into the velvet-lined arm-chair with a long sigh of satisfaction. (Doyle 1890: 5)¹

Lopulta hän työnsi terävän piikin maaliinsa, painoi pienen männän alas ja vaipui samettipäällysteiseen nojatuoliinsa tyytyväisyydestä huokaisten. (Korhonen 2009: 7)

In this example, the words *with a long sigh* and *huokaisten* are to be considered. In the source text there is a noun phrase to indicate the action that is taking place. In the translation it has been replaced by a verb phrase.

In Nida's view, there are three lexical levels to be considered:

1) terms for which there are readily available parallels (e.g. *a dog* -> *koira*). These usually do not pose any great difficulties.

¹ Most examples in this study are from *The Sign of the Four* and its Finnish translations. In the parenthesis there will always be a reference to the author (Doyle) in case of the source text, or one of the translators (Wickstedt or Korhonen) in case of a target text. Underlinings in the examples are my additions.

2) terms which identify culturally different objects, but with somewhat similar functions. Regarding these, confusions are possible (e.g. sauna-going has different customs in different parts of the world).

3) terms which identify culturally different objects. With these, “foreign associations” cannot be avoided. If the cultures and languages in question are very different, there are bound to be themes, events and concepts which cannot be naturalized in the translation. Nida therefore suggests the use of footnotes to clarify these to the reader, for, in his own words, “all people recognize that other peoples behave differently from themselves.” (Nida 1964: 166-168.) Indeed, some translation theories seem to underestimate the reader’s capacity for own thought – everyone is able to deduce that some custom, like kissing cheeks, is perfectly normal in some cultures although it would be frowned upon if attempted in the reader’s own culture. Therefore there really is no need to naturalize everything, because people can think on their own.

Tensions in a binary system like this cannot be avoided. Nida (1964: 171-175) lists three areas of tension:

1) Formal and functional equivalents. The target culture may not have an object or an event that corresponds to the source culture referent, or there might be the same object but it symbolizes different functions.

2) Optional and obligatory equivalents. Languages have different elements that are obligatory in forming sentences. They are often grammatical, as in tense, aspect, voice, number, gender etc. For instance, gender is an optional element in a Finnish phrase. The sentence *Hän ei näyttänyt loukkaantuvan* (Korhonen 2009: 8) does not imply the gender of the subject in any way when taken out of context, whereas the English correspondent *He did not seem offended* (Doyle 1890: 7) makes it evident that the subject is male.

3) Rate of decodability. Nida states that it is important that the reader does not become tired, bored or confused while reading the text. The text should be possible to decode at a normal reading speed, thus it should not have too many foreign structures and words. Dynamic equivalence aims at a sensible decodability, whereas formal equivalence does not care at which rate the reader can decode the message.

However, Nida (1964: 176) sets a degree to which a translation can be dynamic.

Restrictions to dynamic equivalence are linguistic and cultural. Linguistic restrictions ensure that the form in which the original text exists stays the same, e.g. a song is a song even after translation. Cultural restrictions, however, are more concerned with faithfulness, and the expectations of the readers. (cf. 2.3.2. Loyalty.)

2.4.2. Communicative vs. semantic translation

Newmark (1989) approaches equivalence through communicative and semantic equivalence. In his view, the goal of communicative translation is to reproduce the effect experienced by the readers of the source text in the readers of the target text, whereas semantic translation aims to translate “the exact contextual meaning of the original”. The largest difference between them is that communicative translation is aimed only at the target-text reader, i.e. the foreign elements have been transferred completely into the target language, whereas semantic translation stays within the source culture and does not explain everything through the target culture. However, even in communicative translation the translator has to use only the source language text as his material basis. (Newmark 1989: 118.)

Communicative translation emphasizes rather the ‘force’ than the content of the message. Semantic translations, on the other hand, are often more informative than effective. (Newmark 1989: 118.)

... a communicative translation is likely to be smoother, simpler, clearer, more direct, more conventional, conforming to a particular register of language, tending to under-translate, i.e. to use more generic, hold-all terms in difficult passages. A semantic translation tends to be more complex, more awkward, more detailed, more concentrated, and pursues the thought-process rather than the intention of the transmitter. It tends to over-translate, to be more specific than the original, to include more meanings in its search for one nuance of meaning. A semantic translation is likely to be shorter than a communicative translation – it is devoid of redundancy, phatic language, stylistic aids and joins. (Newmark 1989: 118.)

Newmark (1989: 118-119) claims that if the effect of the source and the target text is the same, in both communicative and semantic translation literal translation is the best and the only valid translation method. He also argues that additional synonyms are unnecessary, and that paraphrasing is not translating. Indeed, he states that any paraphrase or version in the source language of the source text cannot be as close to the original than a translation.

Communicative and semantic translation may both be used within one text. Newmark (1989: 119) remarks that sometimes not only the content is important but also the manner in which it is communicated. This is especially so in the case of religious, philosophical, artistic and scientific texts. Also, a quotation from a speech can demand a semantic translation in an otherwise communicatively translated text (Newmark 1989: 120). Newmark (ibid.) further suggests that the two methods of translating are, in fact,

largely overlapping. In his opinion, the whole translation or a particular section of a translated text can be “more, or less, semantic - more, or less, communicative.”

The basis of Newmark’s approach is in cognitive translation, a pre-translation method in which a source language text is converted to plain clauses, and the meaning of every sentence element is clearly spelled out. This stage, although rarely required for a whole text, precedes the division to communicative and semantic translation which are its refined versions. Indeed, he points out that the text that results from cognitive translation is often repetitive and, overall, poorly written. The end result must therefore be clarified by communicative translation. (Newmark 1989: 120-121.) Newmark assumes that communicative translation might be better as a method than semantic translation. Although it loses some of the semantic content, it gains clarity and force that a semantic translation cannot convey. Curiously, he would even allow a translator to improve and correct structure, logic and word choices, and even mistakes of fact as long as everything is explained in a footnote. (Newmark 1989: 122.) However, he criticizes communicative translation as only fulfilling one purpose, one specific function (Newmark 1989: 129).

There is a curious detail in *The Sign of the Four* that can be examined in the light of Newmark’s communicative translation theory. It appears that Doyle has made a mistake that makes an attentive reader to wonder how the story moved from July to September only in a matter of few hours:

(2) ... This morning I received this letter, which you will perhaps read for yourself.”
”Thank you,” said Holmes. “The envelope too, please. Postmark, London, S. W. Date, July 7. ...”
(Doyle 1890: 20)

It was September evening, and not yet seven o’clock, but the day had been a dreary one, and a dense drizzly fog lay low upon the great city. (Doyle 1890: 28)

On one hand, Korhonen’s translation could not be said to be communicative, as he has not changed either month but has preserved the error as it exists in the original text. On the other hand, he has added a footnote in the end of the book to explain this fact:

Oli syyskuun ilta² eikä kello ollut vielä seitsemääkään, mutta päivä oli ollut synkkä ja kaupungin peitti paksu, tihkuinen sumu. (Korhonen 2009: 27)

2 Muutamaa tuntia aiemmin neiti Morstan on kertonut saaneensa “täna aamuna” heinäkuulle päivätyn kirjeen. Conan Doyle huomasi virheen vasta jätettyään käsikirjoituksen kustantajalle. Hän pyysi agenttiaan varmistamaan, että virhe poistetaan ennen kuin kirja menee painoon. Niin ei kuitenkaan tapahtunut. (Korhonen 2009: 154)

The following extract shows the earlier mistake, preserved in the translation:

“...Tänä aamuna sain kirjeen, jonka voitte varmasti lukea itse.”
”Kiitos”, sanoi Holmes. ”Saisinko nähdä myös kirjekuoren. Postileima on Luoteis-Lontoosta.
Päivämäärä seitsemäs heinäkuuta. ...” (Korhonen 2009: 20)

The following is Wickstedt’s translation of the erroneous passage:

Aamulla sain tämän kirjeen, jonka ehkä tahdotte itse lukea.»
»Kiitos,» sanoi Holmes. «Olkaa hyvä antakaa kuori myös. Leimattu Lontoossa. S. W. 7 p:nä
Syyskuuta. (Wickstedt 1894: 17)

Her translation could well be analysed as communicative, since she has corrected Doyle’s mistake. However, she has not offered an explanation in any form - possibly because that was not done in 1894, when translators were often to be invisible. This is a clear difference in the translators’ periods: today it would likely not be acceptable for a translator to make a change like this and not explain it - or even to preserve the mistake without an explanation that it is originally the author’s mistake, as Korhonen (2009) has done.

Newmark (1989: 124) admits that most texts need a communicative rather than semantic translation. Communicatively translated texts are more idiomatic and easier to read, for instance. These are the everyday texts, e.g. textbooks, reports, propaganda, publicity, popular fiction, and so on. In contrast, the texts that should be translated semantically are those in which the writer’s or speaker’s use of language is as important as the message: e.g. philosophical, religious and political texts (Newmark 1989: 125). Semantic translation keeps the translation closer to the source text with its figurative and formal elements (Newmark 1989: 124): it is therefore about preserving the author’s voice as faithfully as possible, giving it the same feeling that the source text has (Newmark 1989: 128).

The closer the source and target culture, Newmark (1989: 129) claims, the better the translation is likely to be. He also remarks that in some views, communicative translation should always be semantic as well, and vice versa, but considers this impossible, because “there is a contradiction, an opposition, at best an overlapping between meaning and message - when both are equally pursued” (Newmark 1989: 133).

Newmark makes it clear that he is against the view according to which the less a reader has to work, the better the translation. He thinks that a reader should be ready to e.g. look up a word in a dictionary: not everything should be offered without an effort from the reader. (Newmark 1989: 133-134.) In the end, Newmark (1989: 135-136) proposes

semantic translation as the translation method for “most linguistic activities”, and states that semantic translation is an art, whereas communicative is only a craft.

2.4.3. Overt vs. covert translation

Like Nida, Newmark and others before her, House (1981) has created her own binary equivalence model to be used in translation. The opposing elements of this model are overt and covert translation, the results of her empirical study in search for a means to evaluate translations.

In House’s (1997: 30-31) view, the concept of equivalence relates to the “preservation of ‘meaning’ across two different languages”, and there are three important translation-related aspects to that “meaning”. Those aspects are 1) semantic, 2) pragmatic and 3) textual. Next, before explaining overt and covert translation, I will go over these aspects since they are vital to the concept of equivalence as explained by House.

1) The semantic aspect means that there is a relationship between linguistic units and their referents “in some possible world”: this world can be either the real, contemporary world or an imaginary one from a fantasy book or a science fiction movie. E.g. a spoon has a certain referent, an object that is used for eating, in the real world.

2) The pragmatic aspect means that utterances, e.g. sentences, have a power of their own that is separate from that of its semantic contents. In actual real world interactional situations this power, or “illocutionary force” is clarified by the context in which the utterances occur, and it can also be seen from “e.g. word order, mood of the verb, stress, intonation or the presence of performative verbs.” (House 1997: 30-31.)

In this example from the data of this thesis, Watson reprimands Holmes for his habit of cocaine use. The two first verbs, *consider* and *count*, in his lines are in the imperative form, i.e. their mood expresses command and obligation. The imperative form has no subject and has a finite verb (Quirk and Greenbaum 1973: 200-201). Therefore, if we are to follow House’s reasoning, it is not the semantic content of those verbs that counts, but the mood in which they are expressed. Therefore the imperative mood would have to be retained also in the two translations:

(3) “But consider!” I said, earnestly. “Count the cost!” (Doyle 1890: 6)

«Mutta ajatelkaapa nyt,» sanoin vakavasti, «huomatkaa kuluja!» (Wickstedt 1894: 4)

”Mutta ajattele nyt!” sanoin vakavasti. ”Punnitse haittoja!” (Korhonen 2009: 8)

The mood of the second verb, *count*, has been preserved in both translations as *huomatkaa* and *punnitse*, although they are different verb and even different personal forms. In Korhonen’s translation the first verb, *consider*, has also been preserved in imperative, and therefore it could be said that his is a pragmatically equivalent translation. However, Wickstedt has decided to add the suffix *-pa* in the end of the verb form that would otherwise clearly be an imperative, *ajatelkaa*. The particle *-pa*, together with an imperative form, makes the verb rather a suggestion than a straightforward command, and also leaves some choice in the matter to the addressee (VISK § 835). This said, Wickstedt’s translation could be analysed as not quite pragmatically equivalent in the case of the first verb.

From this point of view, a translation can be seen as a “primarily pragmatic reconstruction of its original”, since in certain translation situations the semantic aspect can suffer on the expense of the pragmatic one.

3) The textual aspect requires the definition of a text. Consequently, House defines it as “any stretch of language in which the individual components relate to one another and form a cohesive whole”. The preservation of the connections within a text is necessary also in the target language, as the translation, too, has to be considered as a text, not a line of sentences that have nothing to do with each other. At the same time, however, the semantic meaning of the original must be maintained especially in overt translation. (House 1997: 30-31.)

From this, House (1997: 31) proceeds to give a (tentative) definition of translation as follows: “translation is the replacement of a text in the source language by a semantically and pragmatically equivalent text in the target language.” She also states that for her equivalence is the “fundamental criterion of translation quality.”

Now, we can proceed to look more in detail to the opposition between overt and covert translation. It must be pointed out, though, that House finds it possible that overt and covert translation are used within one text. She states that they do not exclude each other, but although one tends to lean towards the translation and the other to the source text, it is quite implicit in their relationship. (House 1997: 30.)

The readers of an overt translation have an access to the way the text functions in its original environment. The translation and the source text are not in the same discourse world, but the translation has its own, “second level” function alongside that of the source text. Thus a simple functional equivalence cannot be found in this type of a translation. (House 1997: 29.)

Overt translation is clearly a translation, since it is so strongly linked culturally and possibly historically to the original culture community, that it is immediately understood as a translation. To be of interest to the target text readers, the source text must also be “of potential general human interest.” (House 1997: 66.) Otherwise there would be no sense to translate it at all. These texts might also be considered valuable or have an important status in the source language (House 1997: 66).

In addition, overt translation is more straightforward because it leaves the source text’s semantic and pragmatic structures untouched if possible and only recodes the text into another language. Less cultural problems are apparent since one does not have to decide on using a cultural filter. (House 1981: 247.) Finally, any text may require an overt translation, since a text’s purpose and how to translate it is a very subjective matter. (House 1981: 248.)

An example, given by House (1981, 1997) and also analysed by her in the empirical study that determined the division to these two types of translation, is a political speech by Winston Churchill. It is tightly linked to the time and place in which it was given, but at the same time it has meaning and is of interest for the contemporary audience also in other countries.

A covert translation’s source text has not been directly addressed to a specific audience in that culture. Therefore the covert translation might as well have been written originally in the target language. Consequently, both of them are equally important for the source and target audience whose “equivalent needs” are met by both the source text and the covert translation’s purposes. (House 1997: 69.)

The requirements for covert translation are largely the opposite of an overt translation’s requirements. (House 1981: 246.) In covert translation it is important to find the equivalence in the target language for the exact function the source text has in its original setting. The new language is just a “vessel” for the text’s function. A cultural filter may have to be used to deliver the function properly, and to change “the pragmatic

parameters” slightly or more drastically to achieve the intended effect of the source text. (House 1997: 29.)

As examples of covert translation House (1997: 69) gives an excerpt from a coursebook in mathematics and a tourist information booklet, among a couple of others. Both of them are equally relevant to the source and target text readers, since the information they contain does not vary from place to place or from language to language.

Compared to overt translation, covert translation presents more and more subtle problems since the cultural aspects of the texts may be better hidden, and in any case they must be converted into the target language unlike in overt translation, where the cultural references must be left as they are. (House 1997: 70.) For instance:

(4) I glanced my eyes down it, catching a profusion of notes of admiration, with stray “magnifiques,” “coup-de-maitres,” and “tours-de-force,” all testifying to the ardent admiration of the Frenchman. (Doyle 1980: 9)

Erotin rivien seasta ylenpalttisen joukon magnifiqueita, coup-de-maitreja ja tour-de-forceja, jotka kertoivat kiihkeästä ihailusta. (Korhonen 2009: 10)

The example could be said to have been translated overtly, since the French words in the text have been maintained in French, and no explanations have been added although one could assume that French is a more familiar language to an average English reader than to a Finnish reader. If the sentence had been translated covertly, however, the translator might have had to look for another language that has approximately the same relationship with Finnish than French has with English, and transform the French expressions to that language (probably Swedish or English, or, if the late 19th century translation is considered, possibly German). At least from the modern perspective, therefore, overt translation seems to work better for works of fiction - it must not be forgotten that Finnicizing was not that unusual in the late 19th century (cf. 2.1. for historical details).

3 VERBS

In the previous section, I presented the theoretical framework of translation studies for this study. Now I will move on to a rather different topic that is more linguistic and includes various grammatical concepts, but without which a proper analysis of the verbs in *The Sign of the Four* and their translations into Finnish would not be possible. In this section, I will first concentrate on English verb forms, after which Finnish verb forms will be discussed.

3.1. English verb forms

This section will discuss verbs in the English language. This study assumes that the reader has a basic knowledge of English as well as Finnish grammar, thus it does not include a detailed description of every isolate verb form but concentrates on the use of said verb forms and related features. First, verbs in general and the verb phrase will be examined. After that I will go through tense, voice, aspect and mood, respectively. Finally, multi-word verbs will be discussed. After this view in the English verb system, the features of the Finnish counterpart will be explored in the next section.

3.1.1. Verbs and the verb phrase

The verb phrase is possibly the most crucial part of most clauses and even sentences, since there usually is a verb form of some sort in every clause, although exceptions do exist, e.g. exclamations and short answers like “*Right!*”, “*Not at all*” and “*Why, hardly*” (examples from Doyle 1890: 10). Other elements, e.g. objects, are also determined by the lexical verb in the verb phrase. (*Exploring Grammar I 2007-2008*: 29.) In this section, I will first give a short definition of a lexical verb and other types of verbs before moving on to examining finite and non-finite verb phrases in the English language.

Lexical verbs form an open class in contrast to the closed class of auxiliary verbs. This means that it is fairly easy to coin new lexical verbs and make them widely used. An example of a recent addition to the lexicon in the *Exploring Grammar* booklet is to *htmlize*. It could be said that regular lexical verbs have four forms: 1) base form, 2) -s form, 3) -ing form, and 4) -ed form. (*Exploring Grammar I 2007-2008*: 31.) However, Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 26) separate five forms for most verbs and state that regular lexical verbs have identical past and -ed participle forms, and the forms for irregular lexical verbs range from three (e.g. *put*) to eight (*be*).

Auxiliaries form a closed class, that is, new verbs cannot be coined and added there easily. They can also be divided into two categories: primary auxiliaries and modal auxiliaries. There are three primary auxiliaries: be, have and do. All of them can also be used as full verbs, without a lexical verb in the clause (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 31):

(5) “This is unworthy of you, Holmes,” I said. (Doyle 180: 13)

Another group is the modal auxiliaries. According to Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 26), they are the most lacking in their forms since they do not have an infinitive (*to may), -ing participle (*maying), -ed participle (*mayed) or imperative (*may!). In the *Exploring Grammar* booklet modal auxiliaries are listed as follows: *can, may, will, shall, must*. However, Quirk and Greenbaum (1973: 37) add *could, might, would* and *should* alongside the first four, and continue the list with *ought to, used to, need* and *dare*. The last four are also called marginal modal auxiliaries (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 39). Modal auxiliaries are used in a clause with a lexical verb:

(6) What sober man’s key could have scored those grooves? But you will never see a drunkard’s watch without them. (Doyle 1890: 14)

Modality will be discussed in more detail later on in section 3.1.6.

Now that verb types have been defined, I can proceed to discuss the construction of a verb phrase. There are only verb forms in a verb phrase, and it has the function of a predicator which is an obligatory element in a sentence. (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 29.)

As I already mentioned in the beginning of this section, verb phrases are either finite or non-finite. In a finite verb phrase, the verb expresses the number and the person of the subject of the clause. It can also express the past tense as well as the mood (indicative, imperative and subjunctive) which is the indicator of “the factual, nonfactual, or counterfactual status of the predication.” (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 41.) For more detail about mood, see section 3.1.5. In the next example,

(7) Sherlock Holmes still sat exactly as I had left him, save that he had laid aside his violin and was deep in a book. (Doyle 1890: 97)

there are three finite verb phrases. All of them express the past tense, and the last one, *was*, is clearly either the first or third person singular, even if taken out of context.

A non-finite verb phrase, on the other hand, has either the infinitive, the *-ing* form or the *-ed* form as its first or only word. These are the non-finite forms of a verb. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 41.) They can be the only element in the verb phrase, but a verb phrase can consist of several of them. (Quirk and Greenbaum 1973: 39.) For instance, the underlined words in the following examples from *The Sign of the Four* are non-finite verb phrases:

(8) “It was cleaned before being sent to me.” (Doyle 1890: 12)

(9) “Here is the old man,” said he, holding out a heap of white hair. (Doyle 1890: 108)

The verb phrase of an independent clause can be a finite verb phrase, but normally not a non-finite verb phrase (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 41).

3.1.2. Tense

Time and tense are not the same, although it may appear to be so on the surface. Certainly, tenses express time, but past tense is not restricted to events that occurred in the past, nor is present tense only used with events that are true in the present moment. Tense is rather a grammatical category that certain verb forms realize (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 47). In this section, the grammatical tenses of English, i.e. past and present, will be discussed. I will also look at other ways of expressing time, mainly the future. However, time is not the only feature that the tenses may express: they may have special uses, or can convey a speaker’s attitude (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 34). I will now proceed by presenting simple present first, then simple past, and the syntactic means of referring to future, following mainly the order in which they are presented in the *Exploring Grammar I* booklet. Before that, however, I will briefly define two important concepts that will be repeated in this section, *state* and *event*.

The major difference between *state* and *event* is that a state does not have strictly defined limits, whereas an event has a definite beginning and end. Leech compares that difference to the difference between countable and mass nouns. In any case, any verb can indicate either state, and is therefore stative, or event, and is dynamic, depending on the context. Indeed, they are rather semantic than grammatical terms. In spite of that, they are useful labels, though not the only ones. (Leech 1987: 8-9.)

Moving on to the description of the uses of simple present, it can refer to present or past events. Stative verbs in the simple present may express general truths or timeless

statements. States are expressed by e.g. *know*, *seem* and *belong*. Dynamic verbs, however, can describe an event or an action that is repeated or habitual. (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 34-35.) Moreover, it is easy to add a frequency adverbial (e.g. *often*, *every year*) in a sentence to specify the frequency with which the event takes place (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 49). For instance, the action of taking in the following example could be said to cover an unspecified time, during which it most likely occurs many times:

(10) It is very customary for pawnbrokers in England, when they take a watch, to scratch the number of the ticket with a pin-point upon the inside of the case. (Doyle 1890: 14)

Simple present can also refer to an instantaneous event in the present: it lasts for a short moment and occurs only once at that time, the time of speaking. The verb is dynamic, and the situations restricted to e.g. commentaries and self-commentaries. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 49.)

Additionally, simple present can refer to past events. This is usual in newspaper headlines, but also as a historic present, in which it is used to express the dramatic immediacy of the events. (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 35, Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 49.) This is illustrated by the following example that is an excerpt of Mrs. Smith telling about the events of the previous night:

(11) 'Show a leg, matey,' says he: 'time to turn out guard.' (Doyle 1890: 86)

Verbs of communication can also be used in simple present to imply that the information that was conveyed is still accurate at the present (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 35).

Moving on to the simple past, it expresses events that have taken place in the past, have been completed in the past and are separated from the present by a gap in time (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 35). Additionally, the event does not have to have little duration, like the one in example (12), but it can take place over a longer time period (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 50).

(12) "In this case it certainly is so," I replied, after a little thought. (Doyle 1890: 11)

Simple past can also express present events in polite requests and enquiries, as well as present or future time in hypothetical clauses (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 36). (cf. 3.1.5. for the use of *were* in the past subjunctive.) The habitual past refers to repetitive

events in the past, and the state past conveys a state of affairs that was true in the past for an unbroken period of time. Simple past also has its special uses: if a reporting verb of indirect speech is in simple past, the verb in the reported clause may change its tense to simple past, although the meaning is a present one (e.g. *I thought you were in Brussels*). Simple past can also reveal an attitude: politeness or tentativeness. A hypothetical past, on the other hand, is used particularly in *if*-clauses to express that what is said by the speaker is not his real expectation or belief, e.g. *If she asked me, I would help her* (implication: she will not ask me). (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 50-51.)

There are several constructions possible to refer to an event in the future. The modal auxiliary *will* precedes an infinitive in safe predictions. Programmed events are expressed by the present and an adverb that specifies the time. The *be going to* structure, or present progressive plus a time adverb, is used with an intended event. An imminent event can also be described by *be going to*, or alternatively *be about to*, structure. (*Exploring Grammar I 2007-2008*: 36.) Present tense can also express future time in conditional and temporal clauses (e.g. *He'll do it if you pay him*). This is more common than its use with time adverbials to indicate future time. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 50.)

3.1.3. Voice

Fundamentally, voice is the contrast between active and passive (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 43). Only a transitive verb can be changed from active to passive, and when it is done, it affects both the verb phrase and the clause in which it is embedded. The following changes take place when a change is made: “1) the active subject becomes the passive agent, 2) active object becomes the passive subject, 3) preposition *by* is added in front of the agent.” The agent, however, is not a necessary part of the clause and therefore is often left out. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 44-45.) In the following example a normally active clause has been given a passive voice:

(13) Active: “Holmes,” I said, in a whisper, “a child has done the horrid thing.” (Doyle 1890: 58)

Passive: “Holmes,” I said, in a whisper, “the horrid thing has been done by a child.”

Active, however, is the norm, as Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 45) point out, and can also be seen in the awkwardness of the example in passive above. Nevertheless there are several reasons why a speaker or a writer could choose to use passive instead of active. Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 45-46) list seven of them:

- 1) the identity of the agent is not known,
 - 2) the speaker/writer wants to avoid identifying the agent,
 - 3) the identity of the agent is not important or obvious from the context,
 - 4) acquiring an objective tone in scientific text by avoiding “I” as a subject,
 - 5) emphasising the agent of the action,
 - 6) avoiding a long active subject, or
 - 7) retaining the same subject throughout a long sentence.
- One or more of these reasons may apply in any occurrence.

3.1.4. Aspect

In English, aspect can be expressed in two ways: perfectly and progressively. The fundamental idea behind aspects is the way in which an action or a situation is viewed by the speaker/writer: whether it is completed or in progress. Additionally, these both can be expressed not only grammatically but also lexically. (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 37.) Additionally, Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 51) indicate that aspect is a grammatical category which “reflects the way in which the meaning of a verb is viewed with respect to time.” In this section, I will first look at the perfect aspect, second the progressive aspect, and finally I will take a brief glance at the combination of these two.

The main function of the perfect aspect is to point out that an action has ended. When the end of the action has exactly occurred depends on the moment of focus and the tense (cf. 3.1.2.). In general, actions that need to be told in the perfective have begun in the past and still go on in the present. They might also be completed in the past, but have some sort of a connection with the present. If the moment of focus is not the present, an event that has happened before the moment of focus can also be told in the perfective. (*Exploring Grammar I* 2007-2008: 37-38.) According to Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 51-53), the action described by the present perfect has begun in the past and leads up to the present within an indefinite time period, whereas the past perfect is set in the past of another past, e.g. the past simple. For instance:

(14) I had opened my mouth to reply to this tirade, when with a crisp knock our landlady entered, bearing a card upon the brass salver. (Doyle 1890: 15)

In this example, Watson’s act of opening his mouth happens before the landlady knocks on the door and enters. In this case *entered* is a past form that is usual in fiction (Leech 1987: 16), and past perfect has been used for *had opened* to indicate that it occurs in the past of the moment of focus which is the landlady entering.

The meaning of the present perfect can vary a little depending on the verb with which it occurs. For example, state verbs (cf. 3.1.2.) acquire a possibility of continuation in the future while used in the present perfect, while dynamic verbs might acquire a hint of repetition up to and including the present. Moreover, the present perfect does not accompany an adverbial that “indicates a specific point or period of time in the past”, unlike the simple past (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 51-52). According to Leech (1987: 6) simple present can also have an adverbial in the same sentence to “indicate a contrast with another period”.

The past perfect, however, can even be replaced by the simple past, if the relationship between it and another past form is clear. Past perfect can also be used in an attitudinal or hypothetical sense. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 53.)

3.1.5. Mood

The English language has three moods: indicative, imperative and subjunctive. Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 41) state that they “indicate the factual, nonfactual or counterfactual status of the predication.” In this section, I will mainly discuss imperative and subjunctive moods, how they can be recognized, and what are their uses, since there is not much to mention about indicative: it is the “unmarked” mood in which most verbs usually occur.

Imperative mood expresses a command or other directive speech acts. An imperative sentence usually does not have a subject, and the verb is in the base form. There is no tense distinction either, nor modal auxiliaries. It is rare to find an imperative in progressive or perfect, and it is only used with verbs with a dynamic meaning. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 241.) A couple of examples:

(15) “Fire if he raises his hand,” said Holmes, quietly. (Doyle 1890: 120)

(16) “My dear Watson, try a little analysis yourself,” said he, with a touch of impatience. (Doyle 1890: 59)

In the first example, Holmes tells Watson to fire his gun if the culprit makes a suspicious move. In the second one, he urges Watson to make an analysis by himself. Verbs *fire* and *try* do not have evident grammatical subjects, and they are both in the base form: therefore their mood is imperative.

There are some exceptions to this general rule, however. First person imperatives are possible with the verb “let”, as in e.g. *Let me do it* or *Let us do it*. Except for the “let me” structure (and the colloquial, shortened “let’s”), these tend to be rather archaic. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 242-243.)

Moving on to consider the subjunctive. The difference between them barely exists in present-day English grammar, but the distinction in meaning still applies (Leech 1987: 112). The subjunctive is used to express a wish or recommendation (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 41).

The subjunctive has a present and a past form. However, the distinction between them is more that of mood than tense. The present subjunctive is the base form of the verb: the verb *be* is therefore recognisable in all personal forms, whereas all the other verbs differ from the indicative only in the third person singular. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 43.) According to Leech (1987: 113), present subjunctive conveys theoretical meaning in conditional, concessive and noun clauses, i.e. it does not “imply the truth of the statement it contains.” For instance, in the following example:

(17) It’s laughable that Septimus should be in love. (Leech 1987: 118)

it is not evident whether Septimus is or is not in love, and it does not matter in the context. That is not the main idea in the sentence. (Leech 1987: 118.)

The past subjunctive (or *were*-subjunctive), on the other hand, is distinctive from the past indicative only in the first and the third person singular of the verb *be*. It is used after *wish* and *suppose*. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 44.) The meaning of a past subjunctive is hypothetical: the sentence contains “an assumption that the happening described did not, does not or will not take place” (Leech 1987: 118).

There are two main uses for the subjunctive: mandative and formulaic. The mandative subjunctive is “used in a that-clause after a demand, recommendation, proposal, intention.” It is also more characteristic of American English, but its use is increasing in British English, too. The formulaic subjunctive, on the other hand, is used in certain set expressions, e.g. *God save the Queen*, *Be that as it may*, *Heaven forbid that*, etc. (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 44.)

3.1.6. Multi-word verbs

In this section I will examine verbs that consist of two or more parts: usually the parts are a lexical verb and a particle or particles that seem to be an integral part of the verb and its meaning (*Exploring Grammar I 2007-2008: 32*). They can be divided into several subcategories, of which the most important are phrasal verbs and prepositional verbs, although the distinction between them is often not straightforward. Other subcategories are e.g. phrasal-prepositional verbs. These will be discussed in more detail further on in this section, but first I will examine phrasal and prepositional verbs. Some grammars may define phrasal and prepositional verbs somewhat differently, but for the purposes of this study I will mainly follow Greenbaum and Quirk's (1990) categorisation.

The meaning of a phrasal verb cannot necessarily be foreseen from the meanings of its verb form and particles. The particle in a phrasal verb is an adverb by definition, and can be preceded by an object in the clause. (*Exploring Grammar I 2007-2008: 32-33*.)

For example:

(18) I handed him over the watch with some slight feeling of amusement in my heart, for the test was, as I thought, an impossible one, and I intended it as a lesson against the somewhat dogmatic tone which he occasionally assumed. (Doyle 1890: 11-12)

The phrasal verb *hand sth over (to sb)* has the meaning "to give something officially or formally to another person" (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary 2005*). It is therefore evident that the verb *hand* and the adverb *over* mean something else when they are put together than when separated.

Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 337-338) divide phrasal verbs into two subcategories: intransitive and transitive phrasal verbs. The difference between the two is that transitive phrasal verbs can take a direct object which frequently finds its place before the adverb, and it is only the object that can separate the adverb particle from the verb if the combination is fully idiomatic. Intransitive verbs, on the other hand, do not allow this separation. However, some phrasal verbs can belong to both categories. For this reason, some combinations of a verb and an adverb can have two different meanings.

The other prominent category of multi-word verbs is prepositional verbs. The particle in this case is a preposition, the meaning of which is tightly connected with the verb's meaning. Moreover, the object only comes after the preposition particle, never before it. (*Exploring Grammar I 2007-2008: 33*.) As with phrasal verbs, Greenbaum and Quirk

(1990: 338-341) make a division of prepositional verbs into two groups: these are simply called “type I prepositional verbs” and “type II prepositional verbs.” Both groups include lexical verbs that are followed by a preposition. The only major difference between them is that type II verbs are ditransitive, i.e. they are followed by two noun phrases, of which the second one is a prepositional object. To continue with the description of prepositional verbs in general, there is a semantic or syntactic connection between the verb and the preposition. A prepositional verb may also be in a passive form (see more about passive in 3.1.3.), and the verb can be separated from the preposition by an adverbial. The prepositional phrase can also be inserted in front of the whole clause.

(19) He was left with good prospects, but he threw away his chances, lived for some time in poverty with occasional short intervals of prosperity, and finally, taking to drink, he died. (Doyle 1890: 13)

In the previous example, the underlined verb is a prepositional verb, for which could be given various possible meanings that all fit the context: *to conceive a liking for* (*Merriam-Webster Online*), *to begin to do sth as a habit* (*Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary 2005*).

Finally, there are phrasal-prepositional verbs and other multi-word verb constructions. The particles of a phrasal-prepositional verb are an adverb and a preposition. Greenbaum and Quirk (1990: 341-342) list two types for these, too: the first type has only a prepositional object, whereas the second type is ditransitive, requiring two objects as a result. The other multi-word verb constructions include verb-adjective combinations (similar to phrasal verbs), verb-verb combinations (idiomatic, second verb nonfinite) and verbs with two prepositions (a further variant on prepositional verbs, either one or both of the resulting prepositional phrases can be left out). (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 341-343.) It must be noted that verbs like these pose a veritable challenge to translation into a language that does not make use of similar constructions. For instance, Finnish does not have prepositions. This challenge will be addressed in the analysis.

3.2. Finnish verb forms

Having discussed English verb forms in the previous section, I will now move on to the other party of the language pair under study, Finnish. However, I will only mention in passing most of the features that are similar between English and Finnish, and concentrate on the differences between them. I will begin by discussing the main

features of Finnish verb system, then I will continue with the explanation of the finite and non-finite forms, after which I will explore how the aspect works in Finnish, and finally, I will describe the various Finnish multi-verb constructions.

3.2.1. General features

In this section, I will briefly describe the basic features of the Finnish verb system. These are the contrast between active and passive forms and the stative and dynamic nature of all verbs. These have already been discussed at some length in the section about English verb forms, but here I will briefly discuss them from Finnish grammars' point of view to give the matter more perspective. In the sections after that, I will move on to defining finite and non-finite Finnish verb forms.

Passive and active are the main classes which all verb forms belong to. A known person is the actor in an active clause, whereas in a passive clause the actor is unknown. What is significant, though, is that the Finnish passive is not impersonal - rather there may be an undefinable human operator present. For instance, in the sentence *Vene irrotettiin laiturista*, it is evident that there was someone who did the detaching. Compare *Vene irtosi laiturista*: it is possible that there was no person present: the boat was detached without anyone intervening. (Leino 1989: 76.) All in all, the Finnish passive, like its English counterpart, highlights the result and the object, not the subject of the action. (Kotus.)

Like English verbs, Finnish verbs can be divided into stative and dynamic ones. (cf. 3.1.2.) Dynamic verbs describe a situation in which a certain element of change is included, e.g. *juosta*, *muuttaa*, *kirjoittaa*. In addition, there is a difference whether the action has duration or a natural ending point, i.e. by their aspect (cf. 3.2.4.). (ISK 2004: 437.)²

Although no clear boundaries can be assigned to the meanings of verbs, they can be roughly divided into concrete, mental and abstract. Observable actions and states are described by concrete verbs, while mental verbs describe states and actions that occur inside one's mind. Abstract verbs, on the other hand, do not describe actions or states, but rather define certain relationships between them (e.g. *aiheuttaa* and *johtua*). However, verbs can shift their meaning from one group to another especially in a metaphorical sense. (ISK 2004: 437-438.)

² In this study, I mainly refer to *Iso suomen kielioppi* as ISK and its online version as VISK.

3.2.2. Finite verb forms

Like English, the Finnish language also has finite and non-finite verb forms. In this section, I will first concentrate on the finite and in the next section, on the non-finite forms. The categorisation I follow is mainly based on that of Leino (1989). To begin with, Finnish has many more verb forms than English: it is possible to draw 136 different forms from a single verb. Of these, Leino (1989: 77-92) divides finite forms into three categories: personal forms, tenses and moods. Next, these will be explored in more detail.

There are seven personal forms for every verb: three in singular, three in plural and one passive form. Unlike in English, the negation word in Finnish, *ei*, is a verb that has only partial conjugation. Personal forms include one, two or three words, e.g. *kirjoitamme*, *olemme kirjoittaneet* or *emme ole kirjoittaneet*. The last two are compound forms (liittomuoto). (Leino 1989: 77-78.)

However, there is one feature that is very different from that in English: in Finnish it is possible to use the second person plural *te* for one person in order to be polite. Plus, usually in this case in a compound form the main verb is in singular when there is only one person to address. (Leino 1989: 80.) This is illustrated in the following example from Wickstedt's translation, where the first speaker is Sherlock Holmes and the second Doctor Watson, they address only each other, and what is more, there is no one else in the room at the moment:

(20) «Olette nukkunut hyvin,» sanoi hän. «Pelkäsini että keskustelumme herättäisi teidät.»
«En ole mitään kuullut.» vastasin minä. «Oletteko saanut tuoreita tietoja?» (Wickstedt 1894: 89)

Finnish has four tenses: present (preesens), imperfect (imperfekti), perfect (perfekti) and pluperfect (pluskvamperfekti). The imperfect corresponds more or less to the English simple past, and the pluperfect corresponds to the past perfect. The present tense can always indicate either the present time or the future time. (Leino 1989: 79.) For instance, in the first example the present tense indicates present time, whereas in the second one the time of waiting is in the future:

(21) ”Aineistoa ei ole juuri lainkaan”, hän totesi. (Korhonen 2009: 13)

(22) Odotamme paluutanne täällä. (Korhonen 2009: 51)

In addition to the present tense, *tulla tekemään* verb union (verbiliitto) is one possibility of expressing the future time (ISK 2004: 443).

According to Leino (1989: 80), there are four moods in Finnish: indicative, conditional, potential and imperative. Indicative mood is found in all languages: it is possible in all tenses and is the basic form without any specific tone for all verbs. Besides implying an order, the Finnish imperative can also imply a wish. Nevertheless, the potential is a mood that does not appear in English. The action it indicates is considered by the speaker to be unsure but likely. Potential mood has one of the few exceptional conjugations in Finnish: *lienee* for the verb *olla*. (Leino 1989: 80-81.)

3.2.3. Non-finite verb forms

The non-finite, i.e. nominal, forms of a verb are infinitives and participes. They may acquire an object or a possessive suffix, but they do not have personal endings (persoonapäätte). Infinitives are like nouns, and participes behave like adjectives. (Leino 1989: 83-84.) It is typical for an infinitive phrase to not contain a subject, although a genitive subject or a possessive suffix can occur in some constructions. (VISK § 492.) In this section I will firstly examine the different infinitives in Finnish, and secondly the use of the participes.

Leino (1989), whose categories I have mainly followed throughout this section, divides infinitives into five groups. On the other hand, ISK (2004) has divided them in only three categories. I will present both categorisations here, but in the analysis of this study I will take advantage of the more recent version, that of ISK (2004).

Infinitives conjugate in all singular forms and in one plural form. Most frequently they are found in active, but two of them can also be found in passive. Leino's infinitives have been numbered from I to V:

- I. only active, the base form and the translative case (*valvoa*, *valvoaksesi*)
- II. inessive and instructive case, active and passive (*valvoessa*, *valvottaessa*, *valvoen*)
- III. many cases, all of them in active, instructive also in passive (e.g. *valvomassa*, *valvomasta*)
- IV. only active, nominative and partitive case (*valvominen*, *valvomista*)
- V. not in all grammars (may be III's subcategory), only active, only the plural of adessive case. (*valvomaisillaan*) (Leino 1989: 84-87.)

ISK (2004: 489), on the other hand, has excluded the traditional numbered division to five infinitives, and lists some of the forms above as something else than an infinitive form of a verb. For example, *istuminen* could be categorised as a noun. ISK (*ibid.*)

divides infinitives to three categories which are called A-, E- and MA-infinitives according to their marker. Only the inessive case of E-infinitive and the little used instructive case of the MA-infinitive occur in passive. Infinitives are therefore divided as follows:

A-infinitive. Basic form (*istua*) and translative case (*istua^{akseen}*).

E-infinitive. Inessive (*istuessa*; Pass: *istuttaessa*) and instructive case (*istuen*).

MA-infinitive. Inessive case (*istumassa*), elative case (*istumasta*), illative case (*istumaan*), adessive case (*istumalla*), abessive case (*istumatta*), instructive case (*istuman*; Pass: *istuttaman*).

As can be seen above, Leino's first infinitive and ISK's (2004) A-infinitive are the same, as are Leino's second infinitive and ISK's (2004) E-infinitive. However, ISK has put all the three other categories of Leino under a single heading, MA-infinitive. Regardless, Leino mentions some forms that do not appear in ISK, for instance the partitive case in the fourth infinitive.

On the subject of participes, Leino and ISK agree more: they are divided into two basic categories which will be called VA- and NUT-participes from now on (VISK § 521). Generally, the conjugation of participes is most like that of nouns, but they are used like adjectives. The participes can occur in both active and passive form: the passive form of NUT-participle is actually called TU-participle. In addition to the already mentioned ones, there is an agent participle and a negative participle. Leino (1989: 92-93) states that in general, VA-participes describe an unended action and can acquire an object. NUT-participes, on the other hand, describe an action that has ended. It is used as part of a compound tense and in negations.

In this section I have defined the various non-finite verb forms in the Finnish language. In the next section I will move on to aspect and how it is expressed in Finnish.

3.2.4. Aspect

Aspect in Finnish can be expressed through verbs, adverbials and the case endings in a noun. A sentence always has its own aspect, too. This chapter, however, concentrates on the aspect of verbs. VISK (§ 1498) defines aspect as the features that embody the duration of an event in a sentence. Unlike in English, in Finnish the aspect is often evident in the object (e.g. *miestä ammuttiin/mies ammuttiin* vs. *a man was shot/a man was shot to death*), but can also be included in the verb. Thus, the variety of situations which can be described by a verb are depended on its aspect (VISK § 1508).

There is also an aspect on the sentence level. It is either defined (*rajattu*) or undefined (*rajaamaton*). A defined aspect means that the sentence includes one entity of a situation that has a beginning and an end. There is a certain result or change taking place. An undefined aspect, on the other hand, focuses the attention on a certain part of an action, that can be in progress or without a result. (VISK § 1498.)

VISK (§ 1509, 1511, 1513) classifies verbs in three groups according to their aspect:

1) limit-fleeing (*rajapakoinen*): describes being, movement, emotion and weather. E.g. *asua, sataa, tanssia, heilua*. Occur in undefined sentences.

2) limiting (*rajaava*): a change that leads to a certain point, after which the situation does not continue. Describes moving in/out, communication, giving, getting and taking. E.g. *syntyä, havaita, luvata, lainata, varastaa*. Some of them can be used to describe an event with duration, e.g. *Avasin oven hitaasti*.

3) limit-seeking (*rajahakuinen*): the exact meaning depends on the other clause members. The result of the situation is or is not evident.

3.2.5. Participial phrases

This chapter covers the most common participial phrases in the Finnish language. Leino (1989: 144) indicates that as a general rule, a participial phrase can always be substituted with a subordinate clause, and it does not contain a verb in a personal form. However, there often is a nominal form of a verb in a participial phrase, and that is the main reason why they are discussed in this study. There are different kinds of participial phrases and related concepts, and they have been defined differently by various linguists. In this chapter, however, I will present the main features of participial phrases.

Participial phrases can be divided into numerous categories, of which the most important ones will be discussed. They have been defined in various different ways and debated to the extent that ISK (2004: 837) sees the concept of *lauseenvastike* (participial phrase/construction) as more problematic than useful. Consequently, ISK does not use it as a collective term, although it does explain the non-finite phrases that have been traditionally gathered under this label. In this study, I will use the concept of participial phrase to refer to the general idea for clarity's sake. Next, I will discuss some of the most important features of participial constructions.

ISK's (2004) *referatiivirakenne* and Leino's (1989) and Karlsson's (1999) participial construction (*partisiippirakenne*) are basically the same. It is a participle based form

with an ending -vAn, -neen, or -nUt, and can occur both in active and passive. In active form a participial construction has a genitive subject. The whole phrase is often the object of a clause. (ISK 2004: 531.) Leino (1989: 145) states that a participial construction always corresponds to a *that*-clause. For instance:

(23) Ojensin kellon huvittuneena sisimmässäni [sic!] sillä ajattelin tehtävän olevan mahdoton - tarkoitukseni oli näpdyttää häntä toisinaan omaksumansa koulumestari-maisen äänensä-vyn vuoksi. (Korhonen 2009: 13)

Olevan here is a participial construction with the marker -vAn. A corresponding *että* clause would be *että tehtävä oli mahdoton*.

The temporal construction is mentioned by all three grammars. It is always represented by an -essA or -tUA marker: -essA indicates an event that occurs at least partly at the same time as the event of the main clause, whereas -tUA describes an event that occurred or began before the main event. A temporal construction also has a genitive subject, a corresponding possessive suffix or no subject at all. (ISK 2004: 536.) Additionally, it substitutes a clause beginning with *when* (Leino 1989: 148).

A finite form substitutes a (*so*) *that* -clause that indicates purpose (Leino 1989: 152). It is expressed by the translative case of A-infinitive, the illative case of MA-infinitive, or the translative case of the VA-participle in passive (ISK 2004: 541). Example (24) clarifies this:

(24) Olin juuri auaissut suuni vastatakseni, kun lyhyen naputuksen perästä emäntämme tuli sisään, tuoden käyntikorttia tarjottimella. (Wickstedt 1894: 13)

In this example, Watson's purpose is to reply to Holmes, and for this he has opened his mouth. A possible paraphrase is *jotta voisin vastata*. Therefore there is a purpose indicated by the finite form, the translative case of A-infinitive in this case, that is accomplished by the main event of the clause.

The kvantum construction (kvantumrakenne) is used mostly in metatextual expressions, i.e. when expressing a position about the form or content of one's message, e.g. *mainitakseni* or *luonnehtiakseni* (ISK 2004: 508). Leino (1989: 152) claims that it substitutes a *sikäli kuin* clause. However, a *sikäli kuin* clause is clearly more awkward in most of the cases.

3.2.6. Compound forms and other multi-verb constructions

In this section I will cover the most important multi-verb constructions in the Finnish language. This includes compound form, verb union and verb chain that have a finite auxiliary and a non-finite main verb in common. The valency, i.e. how many other elements a verb requires around it, of the main verb dictates the construction of the clause, while the auxiliary does not have specifications of its own. The auxiliary expresses both the number and the person, while the main verb expresses only the number. (ISK 2004: 442.)

In a compound form, the auxiliary *olla* or *ei* determines negation, tense or both together with the main verb. They occur mostly in finite form, but non-finite forms are possible in affirmative clauses with the main modal verbs (*voida*, *pitää*, *täytyä*) and the verbs *alkaa* and *haluta*. (ISK 2004: 442.) For example:

(25) Kyseessä oli äkillinen päähänpisto, josta en ole maininnut kenellekään. (Korhonen 2009: 12)

A verb union, on the other hand, includes the auxiliary *olla*, or *tulla* or another verb in some cases. In a verb union, only the auxiliary agrees with the subject. Additionally, it works like a simple predicate verb. It can also occur in a compound form, and in a non-finite construction when the meaning allows it. Depending on the context the meaning may vary. (ISK 2004: 443.) The following is an example of a verb union:

(26) Kasvot olivat niin yhdennäköiset pienen ystävämmen kanssa, että minun oli käännyttävä ja varmistettava hänen olevan yhä seurassamme. (Korhonen 2009: 49)

Another form of a multi-verb construction is a verb chain. In this case, a non-finite verb that is not viewed as a phrase that is the complement of a verb is connected with a modal or an abstract verb. Therefore the predicate includes two or more verbs. (ISK 2004: 443, 493.) For instance:

(27) Suoraan minua kohti tuijottivat kasvot, jotka näyttivät riippuvan ilmassa, koska kaikki niiden alla peittyi varjoihin. (Korhonen 2009: 48–49)

Verb idioms and idiomatic phrases (*idiomaattinen sanaliitto*) as described by ISK (2004: 447) resemble in many ways English phrasal and prepositional verbs. Verb idioms consist of a verb and its extension, and idiomatic phrases consist of a verb and a particle. In the latter case, a verb and a particle can form a compound verb, although the forming of a compound word is more usual in the case of infinitive forms and noun derivatives (e.g. *takaa-ajettu*) (ISK 2004: 448). The most usual verbs form a lot of

different idioms, since several verbs can occur with the same particle or idiomatic complement. In addition, the case of the complement may vary with the accompanying verb (e.g. *olla käytössä* vs. *ottaa käyttöön*). (ISK 2004: 447.) However, all the verbs that occur with a particle occur also without one (ISK 2004: 448).

4 AIMS AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

From time to time, there is a need to re-translate Sherlock Holmes's adventures, since theories of translation have changed significantly from the time the stories were first written. Therefore new translations meet better the needs of a contemporary audience who might feel the language of the end of the 19th century to be too old-fashioned for them. These translations provide an interesting material to study, because the gap between the first translation and the most recent one is more than a hundred years – this means that not only the different preferences of the two translators have to be taken into account, but also the change in everyday language that has surely occurred during this time. In addition, Finnish translations of Sherlock Holmes's adventures have not been compared and studied before. Therefore they provide fresh and interesting data for this study.

This study is mainly interested in how verb forms have been translated in the two Finnish versions of Sir Arthur Conan Doyle's *The Sign of the Four* (aka *The Sign of Four*), and the differences between the two. The main research questions in this study are:

- 1) how the verbs have been translated in the two translations, and
- 2) where the greatest differences and similarities between the two are.

This study does not aim to discover which is the better translation of the two, because that would be a rather subjective viewpoint, and also because what was a good translation a hundred years ago might not seem so for the modern audience. Instead, this study aims to compare and contrast the translators' decisions and to reflect on the different contexts, separated by more than a hundred years, in which they have made those decisions. This study therefore aims to be comparative and descriptive.

5 SET-UP OF THE STUDY

5.1. Data

5.1.1. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle

Arthur Conan Doyle was born May 22 in 1859 in Edinburgh. He began his medical studies in Edinburgh at the age of seventeen. One of his extra-curricular teachers was Dr Joseph Bell who is said to be the real life model for the character of Sherlock Holmes. (Redmond 2009: 97-99.) Doyle was married twice: first to Louise Hawkins in 1885, and after her death, to Jean Leckie in 1907. He abandoned his medical career and settled for writing in 1891. (Redmond 2009: 100-101.) Although he is best known as the creator of Sherlock Holmes, the most famous private detective in literature, his other works consist of fiction, plays and poetry. These include Napoleonic works, historical novels, science fiction, drama and poetry - not to mention some peripheral works about Holmes, including some breakfast table discussion parodies (Redmond 2009: 102-113).

Doyle was a man with many interests. He participated in the Society of Authors as well as sports: he played cricket and football among others, and was an admirer of boxing. Additionally, he worked as a doctor in the Boer War in South Africa, and published his observations as *The Great Boer War* in 1900. Another pamphlet, *The War in South Africa - Its Cause and Conduct*, basically propaganda, had a great success in England and was translated into several languages. This pamphlet earned him a knighthood, although the publication of *The Hound of the Baskervilles* only eleven weeks after might have also had a part in there. (Redmond 2009: 115-123.) Later in life, his conversion to spiritualism was made public, followed by letters, articles and even books on the topic. (Redmond 2009: 128.) Sir Arthur Conan Doyle died in 1930 (Redmond 2009: 101).

73 editions of Arthur Conan Doyle's work were translated into Finnish and published before the year 1939. Part of them includes same stories under different titles. His books were published by 24 publishers, which shows that especially small publishers were eager to publish mostly his Sherlock Holmes stories. Doyle got admirers rather early even in Finland, although detective novels were under suspicion at the time. (Kovalala 1992: 51.) After *The Hound of the Baskervilles* was translated into Finnish in 1904,

Arvosteleva kirjaluettelo gave some positive publicity to the Sherlock Holmes stories (Ekholm 1985: 25).

5.1.2. The Sign of the Four

The Sign of the Four, second of the four novel-length stories featuring the famous private detective, Sherlock Holmes, and his faithful companion, Dr John Watson, first appeared in both British and American editions of the *Lippincott's Magazine* in February 1890. Afterwards it was published also in book form. Notably the story has been published under two different titles, *The Sign of the Four* and the slightly shorter *The Sign of Four*. According to Redmond (2009: 14), there were no copyrights for foreign authors in the US at that time, which resulted in widespread copying at low cost and fast rate. Consequently, spelling errors and missing words were not unusual, and even extended to the title, dropping the definite article in front of the word four. At present, *The Sign of Four* is more used as a title. However, the longer version being the original one, it is used throughout this study. (Redmond 2009: 14-15.)

The Sign of the Four is said to be more mature than *A Study in Scarlet*, and indeed it is a thoroughly recognisable detective story even in modern terms although it shifts quite frequently between the actual detective work and Dr Watson and Mary Morstan's love affair (Redmond 2009: 15). The story begins with a puzzle presented to Holmes by Miss Mary Morstan: someone has been sending her a valuable pearl every year since her father disappeared six years ago. She has now received a letter in which she is asked to meet the sender.

Holmes and Watson accompany her to the meeting in which the sender is revealed to be the son of a friend of Miss Morstan's father, called Thaddeus Sholto. Sholto's father had, on his deathbed, told his sons that he and Miss Morstan's father had found a treasure in India. However, he died before he could tell where the treasure was. He had urged his sons to give half of the treasure to Miss Morstan.

The plot proceeds to the discovery of the murdered Bartholomew Sholto, Thaddeus Sholto's twin brother. On his desk was a paper with the words "the sign of the four" written on it - a similar paper had been found after the death of the Sholtos' father. From various clues Holmes deduces that the murder had been committed by a man with a wooden leg and another who had very small feet. With the help of Toby the dog, Holmes and Watson follow a scented trail through the streets of London which leads

them to the harbour where they learn that a steam boat called the Aurora had been hired by two men that fit the description of the murderers given by Holmes.

Holmes convinces Athelney Jones of the police to give a boat to their use, and after a heated chase, they catch the man with the wooden leg, Jonathan Small, whose companion Tonga is shot and falls into Thames. Small confesses his crimes and tells the story of how he and his three original companions (these were “the four”) came to know of the treasure found by Morstan and Sholto. The treasure now lies in the bottom of Thames. Small is arrested, and Watson tells Holmes of his engagement to Mary Morstan.

5.1.3. The Era of Sherlock Holmes

Among other issues, it is important to consider the setting of the Holmes stories, the late Victorian and early Edwardian period, especially because Doyle was such an accurate depicter of all the aspects of his time: justice, general concerns and everyday details (Redmond 2009: 139). In this section, I will give an overview of the contemporary politics, class issues, daily life and the British Empire, India in particular, as it plays a significant role in t storyline of *The Sign of the Four*.

Victoria was queen of England from 1837 until her death in 1901, and was succeeded by her son Edward VII. Britain being a constitutional monarchy, however, the Parliament was the real wielder of power. Nevertheless, politics was of less interest to ordinary people than today, and it was even less of interest since, for instance, direct taxation was also at a low level before the introduction of income tax in 1842 – thus politics did not have a visible effect on their lives. (Redmond 2009: 150, Briggs 1983: 226.)

The largest political parties in the period were the Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. However, their structure and principles were not like their modern counterparts, but they did have general philosophies: the Liberals were for “social reform and meritocratic institutions”, and the Conservatives for “extolling benefits of tradition for the squires and landowners.” These two alternated in power during the period. In Holmes’s time, the Labour Party was quite unimaginable. (Redmond 2009: 152.)

A status that was received through birth, ancestry and education was valued more by the whole of society that one acquired by means of money, for instance (Briggs 1983: 226,

Redmond 2009: 156). Royalty was, of course, on top of the society and after them came nobility (members of the House of Lords, or “peers”), and aristocracy (e.g. knights and baronets). The distinctions between them were very important for those who held them or aspired to them. Some social mobility was possible, but mainly through marriage. Fathers and husbands largely defined women’s class save for the few that could provide for themselves independently. Doyle depicts some of them in his stories, e.g. Irene Adler and Mrs Hudson, the housekeeper at Baker Street. Class was further complicated by issues like race, ethnicity, religion and national origin: even Scots and Welsh were looked down on by Englishmen. (Redmond 2009: 156-160.)

Domestic service was common at the time. Indeed, every respectable household had at least one maid, and great households may have had a complex hierarchy of servants. Consequently, more women than men were in the field. Their treatment could vary significantly from one house to the other: some were hardly better than slaves, while others were practically treated as members of the family. (Briggs 1983: 242, Redmond 2009: 161.) Doyle’s description of the era includes even these aspects: in *The Sign of the Four*, Mary Morstan is a governess in Mrs Cecil Forrester’s household, and is witnessed several times by Dr Watson to be a well-treated friend of the lady of the house rather than a paid employee.

Victorian life gave more liberties to men than to women. However, although well-off women governed their households, those from lower classes had to work like men to earn their living. Often this work was in factories or as prostitutes. Indeed, Redmond (2009: 163) states that the sexual repression of which Victorians are almost stereotypically known of is not a feature of the 1890s, but rather of a couple of generations earlier. Certain places allowed men and women to get acquainted and meet each other, although Redmond (ibid.) stresses that not everyone did so despite the existence of the possibility. Indeed, in the last decades of Queen Victoria’s reign, the old cornerstones of “Victorianism”, i.e. “self-help”, “character” and “respectability” were doubted by the people, and “earnestness” was “completely out of fashion during the early 1890s” (Briggs 1983: 231).

Doyle’s writing treats death casually, and it indeed was a normal part of life. Childbirth was a common cause of death for women, and in the age before modern medicine many children did not survive their childhood illnesses. (Redmond 2009: 164.) Indeed,

women may have been constantly pregnant, and the arrival of a new child was a yearly event in many Victorian families (Briggs 1983: 243-245).

Means of entertainment were rather different in the era before television, radio and the Internet. Common pastimes were parlour games, conversations, writing letters and excursions to see the sights of London. Royalty's doings were also a matter of interest. Newspapers were read, of course. There were national morning papers like *The Times*, and more local evening papers that have now ceased to exist. As a means of communication, the telegraph, introduced in the 1840s, was revolutionary because it made the distance between the sender and the receiver insignificant. The telegram was written by the sender, transmitted over wires and delivered by a messenger to the recipient at the other end. On the other hand, postal service was also fast. In London, there were several deliveries a day. (Redmond 2009: 164, 166.)

What is characteristic for the period is, of course, the existence of the British Empire. London was its heart as the capital of England and the United Kingdom. The territories of the Empire were Canada, India, Ceylon (Sri Lanka), Hong Kong, Natal and the Cape Colony, the Gold Coast (Ghana), many Caribbean Islands, the Australian territories and New Zealand. (Redmond 2009: 172.) Since India plays a significant part in the story of *The Sign of the Four*, the ending of this chapter is devoted to a brief description of its role in the Empire.

India was probably most well known for tea, its most familiar export and the essential part of the daily life of the British even today. The British presence in India was commercial in the beginning, but became military and governmental in the 18th century. By Holmes's era, there were about 288 million people in India, and the country was ruled by the Viceroy and Governor-General in Calcutta, and by the officials of the Indian Office in London. *The Sign of the Four* makes reference to the 1857 Mutiny by some of the native soldiers: there were religious passions involved, and in addition, dissatisfaction with how the British treated the Indian customs and traditions. In 1877, Queen Victoria was proclaimed Empress of India. In addition to tea, India was a source of wheat, cotton, rice and opium. (Redmond 2009: 179-180.)

This chapter provided a relatively brief overview of some of the features of the late Victorian and early Edwardian era, including mainly those points that feature in the

Sherlock Holmes novel *The Sign of the Four*. Next, the methods that were used to gather and analyse the data from said novel will be discussed.

5.2. Methods of data gathering

The data for this study was gathered from *The Sign of the Four* by Sir Arthur Conan Doyle, and its two Finnish translations, *Neljän merkit* (translated by Ida Wickstedt in 1894) and *Neljän merkki* (translated by Jussi Korhonen in 2009). *The Sign of the Four* was chosen for this study because it is a good example of Doyle's writing, a classical detective story. In addition, there were two translations of the novel from very different time periods readily available. Moreover, Finnish translations of Doyle's writing have not been compared before, and therefore the data is fresh - academic studies tend to focus on works that are considered classics, and not detective stories, that are regarded as popular fiction, therefore not generally as valuable as e.g. Shakespeare's plays. However, since detective stories continue to be popular, as they are read by most common people, their language is the one that makes an influence on people's use of language. Therefore it is not pointless to study such a text, and finally, as it is the quality of linguistic elements that is under consideration in this study, not, for instance, a deep analysis of metaphors, a detective story serves well its purpose as analysable data for a study of this kind.

Since the translation of verbs is the focus of the study, they were collected manually from the three versions of the novel. However, because the number of verbs is vast already in one page, all the verbs of the novel were not gathered, but they were limited to those of the first chapter and a selected number of scenes further in the novel that contain more verbs of action. I will now explain the selection of these scenes, five in total.

Most of the narration in *The Sign of the Four* relies on dialogue between the characters. Because the first chapter of the novel is an introductory one where Holmes and Watson are introduced and discuss Holmes' methods, and in the end of which a new case appears, it has a certain lack of verbs of action. If I had chosen to analyse only the verbs from the first chapter, the data would not have been exhaustive enough. Therefore I chose to search the novel for scenes that present more action, e.g. scenes where characters are moving from one place to another. These scenes include less dialogue than the first chapter, and they will be described next.

- 1) The first action scene is from the fifth chapter, and describes how Holmes, Watson and Thaddeus Sholto move to the second floor of Bartholomew Sholto's house and find his body in his room.
- 2) The second action scene shows Holmes and Watson examining Bartholomew Sholto's chamber and the secret room in the attic above it in the sixth chapter.
- 3) In the third scene that was chosen, Holmes and Watson are accompanied by Toby the dog whom they follow through the streets of London in order to find Sholto's murderer. Their lead is a handkerchief that smells of creasote. This scene is in the seventh chapter as well as the next one.
- 4) This scene is the first end of the trip that was guided by Toby's nose. Holmes and Watson traverse several streets and end up with a trolley smelling of creasote - not the culprit.
- 5) The fifth and last scene includes quite a lot of dialogue, but also a lot of movement. This is in the ninth chapter, where an aged sailor comes to the Bakerstreet to see Holmes when Watson is home alone with Athelney Jones, claims to know all about the case and refuses to speak to anyone else but Holmes, finally trying to leave the house.

The scenes are on average two pages long. They were chosen because they were the longest action scenes in the novel that had the least dialogue, excluding the chase scene on Thames where the culprits are caught. The chase was excluded from the study because it was too long, as the other five scenes already presented enough data to study. In addition, the five selected scenes, since they are from different parts of the book, give more varied data than one longer scene. Other scenes that included action verbs were often no longer than one paragraph, and therefore would not have made full entities to analyse.

The words that were gathered from the original English novel include only verb forms and particles that may occur with them and are inseparable from the verb because otherwise the meaning would not rest the same. The Finnish counterparts, however, may include other word classes, e.g. nouns and adjectives, if the meaning of the original verb is present in a corresponding noun. For example, *to pass through* can have been translated as *miehenmentävä* which is best categorised as an adjective.

In addition, participles that are clearly used as adjectives or nouns in clauses were excluded from the data, since my study concentrates on verbs. Sometimes, on the other hand, the translated verb might be a mixture of a verb and a noun in the original: for instance *show* and *a light* are often translated as the verb *valaista*, and the noun *lamppu* is left out because it is already included in the meaning of the verb.

After the verbs had been gathered, they were divided into five main categories according to the way they had been translated in the two translations. The categories and the principles that have guided the division of verbs into these categories are the following:

1) Same verb, same construction

This category comprises of the verbs that have been translated precisely in the same manner in both translations. As is possible in Finnish, there might be other clause members between the different parts of the verb phrase in different places, but as long as the verb itself has the exact same parts, it belongs into this category. For instance:

(28) For some little time his eyes rested thoughtfully upon the sinewy forearm and wrist all dotted and scarred with innumerable puncture-marks. (Doyle 1890: 5)

Hetken katseli hän mieltivänä jäntevää kyynärvarttansa ja käsirannetta, jotka olivat ihan täynnä merkkiä ja arpia lukemattomien ruiskutusten jälkeen. (Wickstedt 1894: 3)

Hän katseli hetken jäntevää kyynärvarttaan ja rannettaan, jotka olivat lukemattomien pistojälkien täplittämät ja arpeuttamat. (Korhonen 2009: 7)

2) Same verb, different structure

I decided that the verb according to which a verb phrase is categorised as either the same or a different verb is the main verb of the verb phrase. This means that the verbs in this category have in common the main verb, but the other verb forms in it might be different or the same. However, what is most important is that the construction of the verb phrase is different in the translations: they may differ by their personal form, tense, mood, aspect, or by having a particle alongside. E.g.

(29) Your father has, if I remember right, been dead many years. (Doyle 1890: 12)

Muistaakseni on isänne ollut kuolleena jo useampia vuosia ... (Wickstedt 1894: 10)

Mikäli muistan oikein, isäsi kuoli monta vuotta sitten. (Korhonen 2009: 14)

3) Different verb, same structure

In this category, a verb in the original novel has been translated differently in the translations, but the construction, e.g. personal form, tense, mood etc. are the same.

(30) "He speaks as a pupil to his master," said I. (Doyle 1890: 9)

"Hän puhuu kuin oppilas mestarilleen," sanoin. (Wickstedt 1894: 7)

"Hän puhuu kuin oppilas mestarilleen", huomautin. (Korhonen 2009: 10)

4) Different verb, different structure

This category includes the cases where a verb has been used in both translations, but the verb that has been used is different as well as the structure.

(31) The only point in the case that which deserved mention was the curious analytical reasoning from effects to causes by which I succeeded in unraveling it. (Doyle 1890: 8)

Ainoa kohta jutussa, joka kannattaisi mainitsemista, oli tuo omituinen erittelevä johtopäätös vaikutuksista syihin, jonka kautta onnistuin saamaan valoa asiaan. (Wickstedt 1894: 6)

Tapauksessa oli huomionarvoista vain erikoislaatuinen analyttinen päättely, jota sovelsin jutun ratkaisemisessa. (Korhonen 2009: 9-10)

5) Other

This category contains everything that did not fit into the previous categories, and because of its nature it has several sub-categories: 1) left out from one of the translations, 2) left out from both translations, 3) either one has translated by a noun instead of a verb construction, 4) only an orthographic/register difference, 5) differ only by having different particles, 6) complex multi-verb constructions that have both same and different verbs.

5.3. Methods of data analysis

The data of this study was analysed qualitatively, although some quantitative information is given on the side. Indeed, qualitative and quantitative methods can be combined (Strauss and Corbin 1990: 18), and in this case additional quantitative data is used to produce a clearer picture of how the number of occurrences in each category relates to the number of occurrences in other categories. The importance of this becomes clear when considering the amount of occurrences that was analysed, which ended up rather large. However, the qualitative method was chosen as the main method simply because the quality of a translation is a rather subjective issue, plus it depends on the theoretical framework from which the translation is viewed. In the case of this

study, qualitative method also means that additional factors such as the time and place in which the source text was translated in both cases are considered.

The conduction of the analysis itself will be explained next. The data was grouped into the five main categories that were discussed in more detail in the previous chapter. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990: 65), categorizing is “grouping concepts that seem to pertain to the same phenomena.” In the case of this study, the phenomena in question were verbs and structures in Wickstedt’s (1894) and Korhonen’s (2009) translations. Those phenomena then were grouped according to how they appeared in relation to one another. Depending on the data and the type of categorization, it is possible for categories to overlap, but in this study the categories are fairly unambiguous. The categories were discovered by reading the source text and the two translations, picking out the verb forms and then simply by examining their translations and finding clear, straightforward categories into which all the occurrences could be fit into. Then every verb occurrence from the source text was put into a table with the first and the last translation, respectively, according to the category. The tables are found in the appendices of this study. Next, each of the categories was examined separately, the most prominent features were found, described and analysed with examples to illustrate the points better. In this stage several of the less important and less prominent features were not taken into account because there were so few occurrences to exemplify them that including them would not have made any significant effect on the final results. The analysis, of course, contains my own subjective viewpoints on the meanings of certain verbs, but also references to dictionaries where needed. Indeed, as the translators were translating in a specific situation, place and time, so am I in a specific situation, place and time, and I can only make my analysis from this point of view – I cannot say indisputably what impact Wickstedt’s (1894) translation might have had on her contemporaries, while I can judge Korhonen’s (2009) translation fairly well since it was published only a couple of years before the writing of the present study. Therefore it is inevitable that my interpretations stem from this time and age.

6 ANALYSIS

The analysis begins with a general overview of the two translations which will present other aspects in addition to the verbs that will be discussed in more detail in the subsequent chapters. As was explained in the methods of data gathering, the data for this study was divided into five main categories. The analysis that follows the general comparison of translations will advance through each category and describe the data in them through examples and, in the case of the last chapter, several sub-categories.

6.1. A general comparison of the two translations

In this chapter, before moving on to the actual analysis of verbs, I will present a brief overview of Wickstedt's (1894) and Korhonen's (2009) translations in general. This is meant to illuminate some differences or similarities which do not come up when considering verbs. First of all, it has to be noted that the translator Wickstedt's name is not even mentioned on the title page of the original novel from 1894. While some translators back then got their translation entirely under their own name (Oittinen 1997: 121), it is evident that some did not get any recognition at all.

The first differences arose in the titles of chapters (Appendix 1). Wickstedt (1894) had taken more liberties with them, while Korhonen (2009) had mostly translated them quite literally. Korhonen (2009) also tended to use words that were clearly of foreign origin, like *tragedia* and *deduktio* that were derived from the English *tragedy* and *deduction*, while Wickstedt (1894) had come up with Finnish equivalents: *murhenäytelmä* and, more curious, *ajatusopillinen johtamistaito*. Today, influences from other languages are better tolerated than in the first phases of Finnish becoming a language of literature. This may be the reason why Wickstedt (1894) chose to find proper Finnish counterparts for words that could have been left almost untouched, and why Korhonen (2009) was able to leave them in a more foreign form. The largest differences in Wickstedt's (1894) translation were in the titles of chapters 2 and 10. Her translations were of course derived from what happens in those chapters, as in chapter 2 there is Miss Morstan who tells Holmes about her case, and in chapter 10 there is a chase, but the original titles were entirely different.

It must be noted that neither of the translators had censored Holmes's use of cocaine. It is worthwhile to note is that its use was restricted to a doctor's order only in 1916, and its ill effects were not known as well as today (Redmond 2009: 43). Up until the late

1920s, Finland's drug control was next to non-existent, and even cocaine could be acquired legally from pharmacies with a doctor's order (Ylikangas 2009: 70). Korhonen (2009) had even made a footnote about its legality at the time, while for Wickstedt (1894) the use of cocaine as it was back then was probably a well-known fact, not to be hidden from the readers. However, the footnotes made by Korhonen (2009) also show the difference in the attitude towards translations: in the late 19th century, it would not have been usual for a translator to explain herself in any way or make notes in the translation to clarify some aspects to the reader, while it may even be expected in some instances today. This is why the existence of one such footnote in Wickstedt's (1894) translation is particularly interesting. It is explained on page 28 in a footnote that a *hookah* is *Itämaalainen piippu*.

Interestingly, although it is often thought that first, early translations are more domesticating than re-translations – this is the re-translation hypothesis (Paloposki and Koskinen 2004: 27) – Wickstedt's (1894) translation had maintained most of the names of places and people as they were. One of the few exceptions to this was that of Bartholomew Sholto whose first name had been changed to a more Finnish-sounding one, *Bartholomeus* (Wickstedt 1894: 31). It can be assumed that this was an easy solution, since Bartholomew is a biblical name that had its Finnish counterpart already. The river Thames had also been altered to a form that more resembles its actual pronunciation, *Thems* (Wickstedt 1894: 26). Wickstedt (1894) had also added some vowels to end of names that end in a consonant, e.g. *Norwood* (Doyle 1890: 105) became *Norwoodi* (Wickstedt 1894: 96). On the other hand, she had maintained some English words where Korhonen (2009) had translated, as in *Wauxhall Bridge* (or *Vauchall Bridge Road* (Wickstedt 1894: 25) – she writes several names in a slightly different ways, which might indicate something about the typography that was not as fixed back then as it is now – or might be plain errors in typing) (Wickstedt 1894: 117) – *Vauxhallin silta* (Korhonen 2009: 118), although she had translated some of the more readily translatable parts of place names, e.g. *Yli Norwood* (Wickstedt 1894: 96) for *Upper Norwood* (Doyle 1890: 104). Additionally, Wickstedt (1894) had not translated the courtesy titles of Mister/Mr, Missis/Mrs and Miss/Ms, whereas Korhonen (2009) had done so, replacing the English titles with *herra*, *rouva* and *neiti*.

There were also some animal species that the two translators had translated differently. For instance, Korhonen (2009: 67) translated *badger* as *mäyrä*, which is the more common word for the animal, while Wickstedt (1894: 64) had used *metsäsika*.

According to *Suomisanakirja*, however, *mäyrä* and *metsäsika* are synonymous terms for the same animal. Another animal was *slowworm* (Doyle 1890: 70), which is *vaskitsa* in Finnish. Korhonen (2009: 68) translated it correctly, but for some reason Wickstedt (1894: 64) had opted for *kyykäärme*, which is not even the same kind of an animal, as *vaskitsa* is not a snake but a lizard that has no legs (Sammakkolampi).

In general, when reading and comparing, Korhonen's (2009) translation seemed to have preserved the atmosphere of the source text rather well even though they have more than a century between them. This is because of his word choices, that were not common modern Finnish in all cases. Wickstedt's (1894) translation, on the other hand, did have a dated feeling because so many word choices and phrase constructions just are not used anymore. Indeed, it is impossible for me to say what a contemporary of Wickstedt has thought about her translation. It is clear, however, already on the basis of this short general comparison, that new translations of older works are needed. In the following chapters I will proceed to analyse the main subject of this study, i.e. verbs, more thoroughly.

6.2. Same verb, same structure

This group of same verb and same structure consisted of 191 occurrences of a verb and its two translations. This is approximately a fourth of the total amount of verbs to be analysed. In this group, the translators had arrived at the same solution of a Finnish counterpart for an English verb. In the text, there may have been other clause members between different parts of the verb form, but they did not affect the classification and are indicated with three dots in the tables. As long as the verb itself and its structure were the same in both translations, the verb belongs in this category.

Be occurred 46 times in this category in different forms, most often *is* or *was*. *Olla* was the translators' chosen Finnish counterpart with two exceptions: *käsitellä* and *koskea*.

(32) They are all upon technical subjects. (Doyle 1890: 9)

Kaikki ne käsittelevät teknillisiä kysymyksiä. (Wickstedt 1894: 7)

Ne kaikki käsittelevät teknisiä aiheita. (Korhonen 2009: 11)

Another very common verb was *say* with 20 occurrences. It had been translated into Finnish as *sanoa* with only two exceptions that were *kuiskata* and *kysyä*. *Kuiskata* as a solution is more readily evident from the context:

(33) "Holmes," I said, in a whisper, "a child has done the horrid thing." (Doyle 1890: 58)

«Holmes,» kuiskasin, «lapsi on tehnyt tämän hirvittävän teon.» (Wickstedt 1894: 53)

"Holmes", minä kuiskasin, "tämän kauhean teon on suorittanut lapsi." (Korhonen 2009: 56)

Although *to whisper* is also a verb, Doyle has used it as a noun, whereas both translators have resolved to merge the noun into the verb, therefore arriving at *kuiskata*. A more formal solution could be *sanoin kuiskaten*, or *sanoin kuiskaamalla*, but the latter word is still a verb form - a completely formal solution in Finnish, that would not sound awkward, seems unlikely to exist - *sanoin kuiskauksena*, for example, is not at all common usage.

Kysyä had been used as a translation for a reporting verb, *say* (Doyle 1890: 106), after a question. In this case, it is not the translators' choice that was curious, but rather the author's - why use *say* as the reporting verb after a clear question? Both Wickstedt (1894: 98) and Korhonen (2009: 99) had therefore arrived at a more dynamic solution: *kysyä* fits the context better than *sanoa* (which would be the literal, therefore formal, translation - indeed, *to say* has most often been translated as *sanoa*). Moreover, *kysyä* would be a natural equivalent (Nida and Taber 1969: 12-13) which avoids a word choice that would sound strange to a Finnish speaker.

Example (34) shows how *to screen* has been translated as *kasvaa*. However, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2005) indicates that a precise meaning for *to screen*, in this context, would be "to hide sth/sb by placing sth in front of or around them." *Kasvaa* does not seem to fulfil this meaning entirely, although it is true that when something grows in a corner, it does hide it. On the other hand, Wickstedt (1894) had added the adjective *tuuhea* (thick-growing, dense) as a complement for the beech (which she had translated erroneously as *koivu*). This adds to the meaning of the verb by emphasizing the covering nature of the tree in question.

(34) On reaching the boundary wall Toby ran along, whining eagerly, underneath its shadow, and stopped finally in a corner screened by a young beech. (Doyle 1890: 75)

Tullessamme ulkomuurille, juoksi Toby kovasti vinkuen sitä pitkin, pysähtyen lopuksi erääseen kulmaan, jossa kasvoi tuuhea koivu. (Wickstedt 1894: 68)

Päästyämme muurille Toby juoksi sen viertä innokkaasti vinkuen ja pysähtyi viimein nurkkaan, jossa kasvoi nuori pyökki. (Korhonen 2009: 71)

Languages have different amounts of synonyms for the same concept, and words that have several meanings depending on the context (homonyms). Consequently, some verbs have been translated in a couple of different ways, as in the following examples:

(35) But I confess that I don't see how you arrived at it. (Doyle 1890: 10)

Mutta minun täytyy tunnustaa ett'en ymmärrä mistä sen tiedätte. (Wickstedt 1894: 8)

Mutta tunnustan, etten ymmärrä kuinka pystyit päättämään sen. (Korhonen 2009: 12)

(36) I see also in your open desk there that you have a sheet of stamps and a thick bundle of post-cards. (Doyle 1890: 11)

Näen myöskin avoimessa laatikossanne tuossa, että teillä on arkki postimerkkiä ja kimppu postikorttia. (Wickstedt 1894: 9)

Näen myös, että sinulla on kirjoituspöydälläsi arkki postimerkkejä ja paksu nippu postikortteja. (Korhonen 2009: 12)

To see in English means actual seeing or, alternatively, understanding. In Finnish, *nähdä* or *ymmärtää* do not have the same double meaning. Therefore it has to be translated differently in these two contexts.

Additionally, the same verb can be used as a translation for several different verbs on the condition that their meanings are close to each other. For instance, *to answer* (Doyle 1890: 6) and *to reply* (Doyle 1890: 11) were both translated as *vastata* (Wickstedt 1894: 4, 9 ; Korhonen 2009: 8, 12). However, since *vastata* means also *to correspond*, it was used also in that sense in both translations. *To ask* (Doyle 1890: 106, 15) was translated as *kysyä* (Wickstedt 1890: 98 ; Korhonen 2009: 99) and *pyytää* (Wickstedt 1890: 13 ; Korhonen 2009: 16), and, of course, *to have, be* and *possess* (Doyle 1890: 9, 7, 9) were translated as *olla* (Wickstedt 1894: 7, 5, 7 ; Korhonen 2009: 10, 9, 10), since in Finnish it is the case ending of the subject that makes the difference between being something and having/possessing something (cf. Leino 1989: 112). However, *must be* was translated merely as *olla* in one occasion, as is shown in example (37):

(37) Surely it is no great feat to assume that a man who treats a fifty-guinea watch so cavalierly must be a careless man. (Doyle 1890: 14)

Eihän ole mikään urotyö otaksua, että henkilö, joka pitelee viidenkymmenen guineen kelloa niin huolimattomasti on huikenteleva. (Wickstedt 1894: 11-12)

Ei varmaankaan tarvita suuria älynlahjoja sen päättämiseen, että ihminen, joka käsittelee viidenkymmenen guinean arvoista kelloa näin piittaamattomasti, on tavoiltaan huolimaton. (Korhonen 2009: 15)

Must has a meaning of logical necessity, i.e. the speaker considers the clause or sentence to be necessarily or very likely true (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990: 61). The most common Finnish counterpart of *must* is *täytyä*, which is a necessive verb with which one has to use an A-infinitive and a genitive case of the subject (ISK 2004: 500-501). Therefore a translation with *täytyä* would be: *...että ihmisen, joka käsittelee ... , täytyy olla ... huolimaton*. The translations by Wickstedt and Korhonen lack this aspect of necessity, making Holmes state as a certain truth that Watson's brother was a careless man. It must to be noted, though, that the difference in meaning is extremely small.

In this data, there were also some verb forms that could be considered more colloquial. In example (38), *knows* has been used in first person singular, which would be *know* in standard English. The standard third person singular ending *-s* occurs in all present tense personal forms in e.g. parts of northern England, and particularly the south-west and south Wales (Hughes and Trudgill 1987: 17).

(38) "Yes. I knows well where it is. An' I knows where the men he is after are. An' I knows where the treasure is. I knows all about it." (Doyle 1890: 107)

«Kyllä; minäpä tiedän, missä se on, minä. Ja minä tiedän, missä ne ovat nuo, joita hän ajaa takaa. Ja minä tiedän, missä aarre on. Minä tiedän koko asian.» (Wickstedt 1894: 98)

"Juu. Tiedän oikein hyvin, missä se on. Tiedän myös missä ne hänen etsimänsä miehet on. Ja mä tiedän senkin, missä aarre on. Mä tiedän kaiken koko jutusta." (Korhonen 2009: 100)

In the example above, both translators decided to translate *knows* as *tiedän*, which is quite formal usage in Finnish. *Tiiän* would be a colloquial form often heard in speech - another would be *tiän*, and there may be others, depending on the dialect spoken. However, they used several other means to convey the different register of the old sailor (actually, Holmes in disguise): Wickstedt (1894) doubled some of the pronouns (*minä; ne, nuo*) while Korhonen (2009) has used words like *juu, mä* and *juttu*, and his verb usage in the third sentence of the example is a colloquial one: *miehet on* (vs. a formal *miehet ovat*). Wickstedt's (1894) translation is a more interesting one, because the double-pronouns remind of French usage, where it is common to emphasize something in a similar way. For instance, in the following sentence: *Moi, je m'appelle Jean* (My name is Jean), *moi* and *je* both mean *I*. Since this is not at all common in Finnish, nor was a hundred years ago concluding from the way the translation was otherwise conducted, it is curious how Wickstedt's (1894) translation made the old sailor sound like a Frenchman. It can therefore be concluded, that it was not the translators' verb usage that made the sailor's speech stand out from the speech of other characters, but

they nevertheless made him sound different through other choices of structure and words. The result was, however, not similar in the translations.

Another colloquial verb usage in the data was *ain't* (Doyle 1890: 107). It is a negation form that is very common in speech but not found throughout Britain, and it corresponds to the negative forms of the present tense forms of *be*, or the negative present tense of the auxiliary *have* (Hughes and Trudgill 1987: 14). In this case, it corresponds to *is not*. It was translated as *ei ole* by Wickstedt (1894: 99) and *ellei ... ole* by Korhonen (2009: 100). *Ellei* is merely a combination of *jos* and *ei*, therefore the verb itself is the same and it belongs in this category. A spoken Finnish form of *ole* would be *oo*, but it has not been used by either of the translators.

For the most part, the verbs in this category have been translated quite formally, which is reflected in that both Wickstedt (1894) and Korhonen (2009) have arrived at the same solution.

6.3. Same verb, different structure

The main verb of the verb forms in this category was always the same in both translations, but the structure that was used is different - sometimes with very minor differences, sometimes with major ones. There were 101 occurrences of a verb in this category.

The contrast between *sinä* and *te* occurred throughout the data. Even when the verb itself was the same, the person was always a second person singular in Korhonen's (2009) translation and a second person plural in Wickstedt's (1894) translation when Holmes and Watson address each other. (cf. 3.2.2.) This difference in politeness does not exist in English, since second person singular and plural are identical in the English language. The following example illustrates this point:

(39) "Perhaps you are right, Watson," he said. (Doyle 1890: 6)

«Ehkä olette oikeassa, Watson,» sanoi hän. (Wickstedt 1894: 4)

“Ehkä olet oikeassa, Watson”, hän sanoi. (Korhonen 2009: 8)

This was a fine indicator of the time gap between the two translations. Today, it is not customary in Finland to address friends with *te* - especially someone one has known and lived with for years, like Holmes and Watson have in *The Sign of the Four*. However,

norms of politeness were different at the time Wickstedt (1894) translated the novel. This also illustrates the difficulty of formal equivalence: if a concept or word usage does not exist in the source language, while it does exist in the target language, what is the formal way to approach the translation? This is rather an opposite of the case of *hän* vs. *she/he* (cf. 2.4.1.) In Finnish, it must be indicated whether a person is addressed politely as *te* or familiarly as *sinä* - this is therefore an obligatory element in contrast to that of the optional element of gender in Finnish. The message has to be fluent and not disturb the reader with a word choice that does not fit into the context (Nida 1964: 174). Indeed, Korhonen's (2009) translation was directed at the readers of 21st century who consider it normal to address close friends with *sinä*. Wickstedt's (1894) translation, however, followed the politeness norms of her time, which was also temporally significantly closer to that of Doyle's. If Korhonen (2009) had wanted to convey the manners of the late 19th century, he could have decided for Holmes and Watson to address each other as *te*. The tension between obligatory and optional elements between the two languages is therefore evident.

In one occurrence Wickstedt's (1894) use of second person plural as a politeness form differed grammatically from normal modern usage. In *ettekö ... tietäneet* (Wickstedt 1894: 7) the main verb was also in plural. Since in this case, too, it is Holmes speaking to Watson, the main verb should be in singular although the auxiliary verb is in plural, resulting in *ettekö ... tiennyt* (Leino 1989: 80). It is possible that the grammatical rules concerning the form of politeness were not yet established in Wickstedt's (1894) time, or they may have changed during the last century.

Generally, Wickstedt (1894) had the tendency to use more suffixes than Korhonen (2009). In example (40), the suffix used by Wickstedt (1894) is *-hän*. *-han/-hän* as a suffix implies that the fact that is expressed by the clause is mutual, self-evident knowledge for the speaker and the receiver (ISK 2004: 797). Holmes is the speaker in the example, and Wickstedt's (1894) translation therefore implied that it was already known to Watson, to whom Holmes is speaking, that Holmes glanced over the brochure in question. Korhonen's (2009) translation lacked this element: it can be deduced from the context that it was very likely that Watson already knew the fact, since it is he who wrote the brochure, but the word choices did not make it evident. However, Doyle's original did not have this implication:

(40) "I glanced over it," said he. (Doyle 1890: 7)

«Niin silmäilinhän minäkin sitä,» sanoi hän. (Wickstedt 1894: 5)

“Silmäilin sitä”, hän sanoi. (Korhonen 2009: 9)

It is therefore an additional element from Wickstedt’s (1894) part. Other suffixes, or enclitic particles that are commonly used in Finnish with finite as well as non-finite verb forms to convey additional information, used by Wickstedt (1894: 10, 99) in this category were *-kaan/-kään*, the meaning of which is ‘(not ...) either’ and *-pa* (1894: 4) which also occurs as *-pä*, that is used for emphasis (Karlsson 1999: 20). *-hän* was used twice by Wickstedt (1894: 4, 5). In contrast, Korhonen (2009: 56, 100) only used *-pa* twice. It must be noted that enclitic particles often have two forms because of the Finnish vowel harmony that does not allow front and back vowels to occur within one word - it is therefore the particle that agrees with the rest of the word.

One consistent phenomenon was that of *voida* and *kyetä*. In this category at least, Korhonen (2009) used *kyetä* invariably as a translation for *can/could*, whereas Wickstedt (1894) always used *voida* in the corresponding occasions. For instance:

(41) Secondary inference,--that he had occasional bursts of prosperity, or he could not have redeemed the pledge. (Doyle 1890: 14)

Toinen loppupäätös - että hän oli väliin paremmissakin varoissa, muuten hän ei olisi voinut lunastaa, kelloansa takaisin. (Wickstedt 1894: 12)

Seuraava päätelmä: hänellä oli ajoittaisia vaurauden kausia, muuten hän ei olisi kyennyt lunastamaan panttia takaisin. (Korhonen 2009: 15)

As can be seen, this also resulted in a different form for the verb that follows: *voida* requires the main verb to be in A-infinitive, whereas *kyetä* requires the MA-infinitive in illative case. Virtually, they are synonymous in meaning: *kyetä* signifies that somebody can do something, i.e. has the ability or opportunity, and *voida* contains the meaning that something is possible (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K, S-Ö* 2001). *Voida* was also used by both translators as a translation for something else than *can/could*, but *kyetä* was not used by Wickstedt (1894) even once in this category.

There were some occasions where the particular word choice in the case of the subject of the clause by the translator has transformed the verb from singular to plural. Example (42) illustrates this:

(42) Looking straight at me, and suspended, as it were, in the air, for all beneath was in shadow, there hung a face,--the very face of our companion Thaddeus. (Doyle 1890: 51)

Huoneesta tuijotti minua vastaan naama, joka näytti suorastaan riippuvan ilmassa, sillä kaikki muu alapuolella oli varjossa ja tämä naama oli ystävämme Thaddeuksen. (Wickstedt 1894: 46)

Suoraan minua kohti tuijottivat kasvot, jotka näyttivät riippuvan ilmassa, koska kaikki niiden alla peittyi varjoihin. Ne olivat kumppanimme Thaddeuksen kasvot: ... (Korhonen 2009: 48–49)

Naama and *kasvot* are practically synonymous, although in modern usage *naama* is more colloquial, or even used of an animal's face (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja L-R* 2001). The time gap can therefore perhaps be seen here, too. However, *naama* is a singular noun, whereas *kasvot* is a plural noun, which results in different verb forms in the occurrences of the example (42). Additionally, it must be noted that the two verb forms of the original, *suspended* and *hung*, were merged by both translators: *to suspend* is *ripustaa; riippua, roikkua; kellua, leijua, leijaila*. *To hang*, as it were, is *ripustaa; riippua, roikkua*. (*Englanti-suomi suursanakirja* 1990.) *Näyttää*, on the other hand, seems to be an addition because there is no counterpart in meaning for it in the source text - which is curious since it has been added both by Wickstedt (1894) and by Korhonen (2009).

There were also other differences in the chosen person for some verb forms, and thus their subjects. For instance, in example (43), Watson remarks that he had lived with Holmes in Baker Street. In her translation, Wickstedt (1894) had made Watson and Holmes a compound subject, i.e. used *we* as subject rather than stating in singular that it is Watson who has lived with Holmes, which Korhonen (2009) did:

(43) More than once during the years that I had lived with him in Baker Street I had observed that a small vanity underlay my companion's quiet and didactic manner. (Doyle 1890: 8)

Enemmän kuin kerran niiden vuosien kuluessa, joina olimme asuneet yhdessä Baker Streetillä, olin huomannut, että vähän turhamaisuutta piili toverini tyyneessä, opettavassa käytöksessä. (Wickstedt 1894: 6)

Sinä aikana, jolloin olin asunut Holmesin kanssa Baker Streetillä, olin enemmän kuin kerran havainnut ystäväni hillityn opettajamaisen käytöksen taustalla hienoista turhamaisuutta. (Korhonen 2009: 10)

Indeed, the difference in the essential meaning is a minor one. However, Wickstedt (1894) deviated from the subject indicated by the source text, hence her translation was not a literal, i.e. formal, one. The first Sherlock Holmes story, *A Study in Scarlet*, indicates that Holmes and Watson moved together to Baker Street (Doyle 1887). Indeed, on the basis of Korhonen's (2009) translation, one could get the assumption that Holmes already lived there when Watson moved in, which was not the case.

In some cases, there was a difference in the tense used by the translators. In example (44), Wickstedt's (1894) translation gives an impression that Holmes makes his remark while Watson is climbing up the wall, whereas Korhonen's (2009) translation implies that Holmes makes the remark only after Watson has climbed on the wall:

(44) "There's the print of wooden-leg's hand," he remarked, as I mounted up beside him. (Doyle 1890: 75)

«Tässä näkyy jälki puujalkamiehen kädestä,» huomautti hän, kiivetessään hänen viereensä. (Wickstedt 1894: 68)

“Tässä on Puujalan kädenjälki”, Holmes huomautti kiivettyäni muurille hänen vierelleen. (Korhonen 2009: 72)

In the source text, *mounted* is in simple past. This implies a single, finished action (cf. 3.1.2.). However, it is accompanied by the conjunction *as*, in this occurrence meaning “while sth else is happening” (*Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* 2005). Thus, Wickstedt (1894) was closer to the source text's meaning in her translation, although like Korhonen (2009), she arrived at a temporal construction to replace a subordinate clause that would have begun with *kun* (or *samalla kun*). As a sidenote, *mount up* is also a phrasal verb that is translated as “nousta (korkeaksi), kohota (suureksi), lisääntyä” (*Englanti-suomi suursanakirja* 1990). Since this meaning does not fit the context in this case, the verb that was analysed is *to mount*, and *up* was treated as a separate adverb.

Given the hundred year time gap, it is only natural that some of the constructions used by Wickstedt (1894) would now be considered old-fashioned, and have fallen out of common usage. However, these little used expressions may contain the source text's meaning more accurately than Korhonen's (2009) more modern structures. An example of this is the following:

(45) "It was to him I was to tell it," he repeated, with the petulant obstinacy of a very old man. (Doyle 1890: 107)

«Hänelle itselle minun piti se kertoman,» toisti hän vanhan ukon oikullisella itsepintaisuudella. (Wickstedt 1894: 98)

“Hänelle mä sen tulin kertomaan”, hän toisti vanhan miehen marisevalla itsepäisyydellä. (Korhonen 2009: 100)

Kertoman was the instructive case of MA-infinitive, a little used verb form that occurs as a verb union with the necessary verb *pitää* (ISK 2004: 444). On the other hand, Korhonen's (2009) solution *tulin kertomaan* had a different implication from Doyle's *I was to tell*: according to *Collins English Dictionary* (2003), the auxiliary *be* that takes

an infinitive “expresses intention, expectation, supposition, or obligation.” In addition, *olla määrä, pitää* is the given translation for *be to* plus an infinitive in *Englanti-suomi suursanakirja* (1990). Therefore there was no reference in the source text to the sailor coming to tell it to Holmes, which is the way Korhonen (2009) has translated it. *Piti ... kertoman*, although rarely used today, contains precisely the reference to intention, expectation, supposition and obligation of the source text. Other old-fashioned expressions used by Wickstedt (1894: 53) were *menkäämme* and *katsokaamme*. As a contrast, it must be noted that for his part, Korhonen (2009) used some expressions that are probably not likely to be found in a text from the late 19th century. These included e.g. *ratkettuaan juomaan* (Korhonen 2009: 14).

Wickstedt (1894) had the general tendency to use longer structures than Korhonen (2009). In most cases this means that what Korhonen (2009) translated as simple present or past tense, Wickstedt (1894) may have translated as a compound tense. Consequently, some of Wickstedt’s (1894) solutions cannot be deemed correct because of the nature of the tenses in question. Example (46) illustrates this point:

(46) “Subject to your correction, I should judge that the watch belonged to your elder brother, who inherited it from your father.” (Doyle 1890: 12)

«Edellyttämällä oikaisuanne, luulin että kello on kuulunut vanhemmalle veljellenne, joka on perinyt sen isältänsä.» (Wickstedt 1894: 10)

”Korjaa jos olen väärässä, mutta luulen kellon kuuluneen vanhemmalle veljellesi, joka peri sen isältäsi.” (Korhonen 2009: 13)

Both *belonged* and *inherited* were simple past forms. Wickstedt’s (1894) *on kuulunut* and *on perinyt* were both in perfect, while Korhonen’s (2009) *kuuluneen* was a past participial construction that replaced the *että* clause that was present in Wickstedt’s (1894) translation, and *peri* was an imperfect form. Because the Finnish perfect has the implication that the action that has been committed in the past still has an influence in the present, just like in English, Wickstedt’s (1894) usage of this form in this context was not correct: both actions were begun and finished in the past, and Watson’s brother who is in question is dead. Therefore the only option is that he inherited the watch in the past and possessed it in the past, which was evident from the source text as well as from Korhonen’s (2009) translation. Another similar instance from this category was the following:

(47) Your father has, if I remember right, been dead many years. (Doyle 1890: 12)

Muistaakseni on isänne ollut kuolleet jo useampia vuosia ... (Wickstedt 1894: 10)

Mikäli muistan oikein, isäsi kuoli monta vuotta sitten. (Korhonen 2009: 14)

In this case, however, Wickstedt (1894) was closer to the source text in regard to formal equivalence. The Finnish and English perfect, although the former is generally considered a tense and the latter a mood, correspond in meaning: the fact that Watson's father is dead has been true in the past since he died and continues to be true in the present. Korhonen (2009), on the other hand, treated the death of Watson's father as a single incident that took place in the past.

There was also a difference in the usage of participial phrases. Wickstedt (1894) seemed to have used participial phrases more of the type *nojautuen*, *mitaten*, and *pysähtyen* (Wickstedt 1894: 8, 54, 68), while Korhonen's (2009) translation contained those as well as others, as in example (48):

(48) He pushed the creosote handkerchief under the dog's nose, while the creature stood with its fluffy legs separated, and with a most comical cock to its head, like a connoisseur sniffing the bouquet of a famous vintage. (Doyle 1890: 74)

Ja hän asetti kreosottiin kastetun nenäliinan koiran kuonon alle; se seisoi siinä hajasäärin ja koomillisella, tärkeällä muodolla, tuntijan tavoin, joka hengittää sisäänsä harvinaisen viinin tuoksua. (Wickstedt 1894: 67)

Hän työnsi kreosottiin kastetun nenäliinan koiran kuonon alle eläimen seistessä paikoillaan pörröiset tassut harallaan, pää naurettavan näköisesti kenossa kuin viinintuntijalla, joka arvioi kuuluisaa vuosikertaa. (Korhonen 2009: 71)

Seistessä was a temporal construction that replaced a clause beginning with *when*. A *when* clause would have been a more formal translation of the source text's *while* clause. However, participial phrases are more natural in Finnish, especially to avoid a string of subordinate clauses. Korhonen's (2009) solution is therefore rather a dynamic one. Despite that, it must be considered how Finnish and English have different constructions that can substitute each other perfectly inside the language, but how only one of them would fit the requirement for formal equivalence regarding syntax and replacing one word in the source text by one word in the target text. A suggestion for formal-equivalence translation is thus "... kun eläin seisoi pörröiset jalat harallaan ...". However, *kun eläin seisoi* is perfectly substitutable with *eläimen seistessä*. No meaning is lost, but it sounds more natural in Finnish.

On the other hand, Wickstedt (1894) had also found a way to avoid an awkward subordinate clause by using a semicolon instead of the conjunction *when*. However, her solution lacked the word level idea of Toby standing at the same time as Holmes pushes the handkerchief under the dog's nose. Certainly Toby is standing at that time, which

also came forward from Wickstedt's (1894) translation, but there it was more to be deduced from the context. Indeed, the semicolon often unites two sentences that are closely related: it is stronger than a comma, but weaker than a full stop (Itkonen 2000: 20). Therefore the connection between the two actions existed, but on a different level from that of the source text or Korhonen's (2009) translation.

The data contained many occurrences where one of the translators had used a negative construction, and the other a positive construction. In these cases the actual meaning did not change drastically, as one would think at first, but it was the co-text and especially the word forms that contributed to the meaning in the way that even though the verb forms of the two translations could be seen as opposites, the meaning of the whole clause was similar enough, as in example (49):

(49) "There is something devilish in this, Watson," said he, more moved than I had ever before seen him. (Doyle 1890: 51)

«Tässä on jotakin selittämätöntä, Watson,» sanoi hän niin liikuttettuna, jommoisena en koskaan ollut nähnyt häntä. (Wickstedt 1894: 46)

"Tässä on jotain pirullista, Watson", hän sanoi järkyttyneempänä kuin olin häntä milloinkaan nähnyt. (Korhonen 2009: 48)

The past perfect in the source text indicates that the action of never seeing Holmes in that state of mind was in the past of that moment in which Watson saw him like that, which also is in the past of the moment he was telling about it. The words *ever before* indicate that Watson has never seen Holmes like that: *ever* can be used in comparisons (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English 1987). In Wickstedt's (1894) translation, *koskaan* corresponds to the *ever* in the source text. Because of the word *jommoisena* (a dated/colloquial spelling of *jollaisena*), *koskaan* requires the negation word *ei* which is also a verb in Finnish, although its conjugation is only partial. Therefore it can be concluded that there is no direct correspondent for *ever* in Finnish. Indeed, Korhonen (2009) translated the clause very differently from Wickstedt (1894). *Milloinkaan* was there to indicate the meaning of *ever before*. Additionally, the structure used by Korhonen (2009) was a simple comparative of which one part was a clause: *järkyttyneempänä kuin olin häntä milloinkaan nähnyt*. It can be concluded that the entire structure that is chosen is a vital part of how the verb is to be translated. Structurally, therefore, Korhonen (2009) was closer to the source text because he translated the comparative structure of the source text with a Finnish comparative structure.

6.4. Different verb, same structure

This category contained verbs whose structure, i.e. tense, mood, person, and so forth, was the same in both translations. The verb itself, however, could be a completely different one, or had only a minor difference in nuance. This category consisted of 154 occurrences.

In this category, one noticed how a verb with a very general meaning can be translated by a verb that has a more specific meaning, or vice versa. The verbs with a general meaning will be called umbrella terms or verbs from now on. A significant amount of the occurrences included an umbrella term in one translation and a more specific verb in the other. It is clearly Wickstedt (1894) who used umbrella terms more often, whereas Korhonen's (2009) verbs often denote more specific meaning or have a certain nuance. However, it must be noted that there were contrary occurrences, too. Example (50) illustrates this point about umbrella terms:

(50) Holmes glanced at it, and then handed it to me. (Doyle 1890: 52)

Holmes katsoi sitä ja ojensi sen sitte minulle. (Wickstedt 1894: 47)

Holmes vilkaisti paperia ja ojensi sen minulle. (Korhonen 2009: 50)

Wickstedt's (1894) *katsoa* was a very general term since one can *katsoa* in several different ways. *Vilkaista*, on the other hand, is to “luoda nopea silmäys, katsahtaa, silmätä” (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja S-Ö* 2001). Before making any conclusions, the verb in the source text must be considered: *to glance* is to “look at something quickly” (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* 1987, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* 2005). In this case, Korhonen (2009) was closer to the source text's meaning, and it was the case most often as Wickstedt's (1894) “umbrella verbs” did not necessarily convey the nuances of Doyle's original verbs. However, the following exemplifies the fact that in some cases it was the opposite way:

(51) By the table, in a wooden arm-chair, the master of the house was seated all in a heap, with his head sunk upon his left shoulder, and that ghastly, inscrutable smile upon his face. (Doyle 1890: 52)

Nojatuolissa pöydän ääressä istui talon haltija, kokoonkyyristyneenä, pää painuneena vasenta olkapäätä vasten ja kasvoissa tuo kauhistava, selittämätön hymyily. (Wickstedt 1894: 47)

Talon isäntä retkotti pöydän ääressä puisessa nojatuolissa pää vasemman olkapään varaan painuneena kasvoillaan kaamea, tutkimaton hymynsä. (Korhonen 2009: 49)

Was seated was accompanied by *all in a heap* in the source text. This was translated by Korhonen (2009) as a single verb, *retkottaa* which is to “maata t. riippua hervottomana” (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja L-R* 2001). Wickstedt’s (1894) *Sholto*, on the other hand, *istui ... kokoonkyristyneenä*. This consisted of two parts, as did the original expression, of which the first one was “an umbrella verb” and was more in line with the idea that *Sholto*’s body has become cold and stiff and his limbs have twisted because of the poison. *Retkottaa*, however, rather gave the impression that he was limp and hanging on the chair. As a conclusion, a colourful expression does not always add the right nuances of meaning.

To explore further, it is also important to consider the effect a certain verb in the text has, or rather the effect that results if the verb is changed into one that has the same general meaning, but also some nuances that imply e.g. a different attitude. There were a number of occurrences in the data that had this difference in effect. For instance, movement can be perceived very differently depending on the expressive verb. In fact, this point can perhaps be most clearly seen through verbs of movement, as in example (52):

(52) He shuffled towards the door, but Athelney Jones got in front of him. (Doyle 1890: 107)

Hän meni ovea kohden, mutta Athelney Jones asettui hänen eteensä. (Wickstedt 1894: 99)

Hän laahusti kohti ovea, mutta Athelney Jones puikahti hänen eteensä. (Korhonen 2009: 100)

In the example above, Wickstedt (1894) translated *shuffle* as *mennä*, while Korhonen (2009) used the verb *laahustaa*. *Mennä* describes movement from one place to another, and is indeed a verb with a very general meaning, while *laahustaa* describes a movement of a specific kind: it describes walking slowly, by dragging one’s feet along (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja L-R* 2001). This is also the definition of *to shuffle* in *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1987), and *Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* (2005) gives a similar definition. Therefore in this case Korhonen (2009) got the meaning of the source text right, while Wickstedt’s (1894) translation lacked this nuanced meaning, although the general idea is the same.

Example (52) above presents another similar case of verbs: *got* that was translated as *asettui* (Wickstedt 1894) and *puikahti* (Korhonen 2009). This verb described the movement of Athelney Jones as he moves between the old sailor and the door as the sailor is trying to escape. *Suomen kielen perussanakirja L-R* (2001) gives *pujahtaa* and

luikahtaa as synonyms for *puikahtaa*, and the image that is transmitted to me by those verbs is one of a small person or animal that quickly moves through a small opening. However, Athelney Jones was described as having “broad face and heavy shoulders” (Doyle 1890: 125), which does not fit the image given by the verb *puikahtaa*. Additionally, the source text’s verb was simply *got*, the past tense form of *to get* that has several meanings, e.g. to receive, to bring, to buy, and to arrive which is the meaning in this example. It is also one of the most common English verbs (*Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* 2005). It does not describe a specific kind of a movement, therefore it can be concluded that Wickstedt’s (1894) *asettui* was a more formal translation, since it is also a verb with a general meaning which possibly, in my opinion, also has a nuance of a steady and confident movement.

Another group of occurrences was that of verbs translated as almost the same, but with a slight difference in e.g. tone or form (for instance, a transitive vs. intransitive verb) that did not affect the essential meaning. Pairs like this were, to mention a few, *huomautti* (Wickstedt 1894: 10) and *totesi* (Korhonen 2009: 13), *töhritty* (Wickstedt 1894: 47) and *töherretty* (Korhonen 2009: 50), *hämmennyin* (Wickstedt 1894: 53) and *häkellyin* (Korhonen 2009: 56), *tuki* (Wickstedt 1894: 5) and *nojasi* (Korhonen 2009: 8). These could be labeled as synonyms. Example (53) illustrates this point with a pair of translations that have a different nuance to give to the action described:

(53) “Pretty sort o’ treatment this!” he cried, stamping his stick. (Doyle 1890: 108.)

«Joo, tämäpä on kohteliasta vastaanottamista, tämä!» huudahti hän lyöden kepillään lattiaan. (Wickstedt 1894: 99)

“On tääkin kohtelua!”, mies huusi keppiään lattiaan jyskyttäen. (Korhonen 2009: 100.)

Here, *to cry* is to “shout loudly” (*Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* 2005), or “to make loud sounds expressing fear, anger, surprise, or some other feeling” (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* 1987). The difference in meaning between *huutaa* and *huudahtaa* is a minor one, but it does exist: *huudahtaa* is to give a short, rather faint shout that expresses surprise, joy etc., while *huutaa* is to express oneself with a voice louder than normal speech to e.g. draw attention or give a warning (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K* 2001). My opinion of the essential difference between the two is that if the shout is a short one, it should be *huudahtaa*, and if the shouting continues for a longer period of time, it is *huutaa*. *Huutaa* could also be more aggressive than *huudahtaa* which has a more pleasant tone. In the case of example (53), however, both

seemed almost equally correct. The exclamation of the old sailor was not very short, but neither was it a full sentence – it even lacked a verb. Of course, this might be an error on Doyle’s part, but the phrase is a believable exclamation even without the verb. The difference in meaning is, indeed, a minor one, and it rather depends on the point of view which would have been preferable in this case. In addition, what must be taken into account, if the length of the exclamation is the defining factor in deciding the correct translation, is the length of the translated exclamation. Korhonen’s (2009) translation was somewhat shorter than the original, only containing three words instead of the five in the source text. The exclamation in Wickstedt’s (1894) translation, however, was even longer than in the source text, containing six words. This does not fit the idea on the usage of *huutaa/huudahtaa* that was presented earlier: the translators have probably had their own interpretations on their usage. As can be seen from this example, there is yet another factor to be considered in addition to the three listed by Nida (1964: 166-168, cf. 2.4.1.): sometimes there are two or more suitable alternatives for a translation of an element, and these do not have a large difference in meaning, or it can depend on the translator’s viewpoint which one she or he prefers. Additionally, to make the translation coherent and flowing one must take into account the elements of the co-text that came before and will come after. Every element has an effect on all the other elements of the co-text.

In some occasions, there was a contrast between a rather strong expression and a milder one in the translations. Example (54) illustrates this:

(54) I was annoyed at this criticism of a work which had been specially designed to please him.
(Doyle 1890: 8)

Minua suututti kuulla arvosteltavan tuolla tapaa työtä, joka oli erittäin tarkoitettu hänelle mielihyväksi. (Wickstedt 1894: 6)

Hänen kritiikkinsä harmitti minua, sillä olin kirjoittanut teoksen varta vasten häntä miellyttääkseni.
(Korhonen 2009: 10)

To annoy is to ”make (someone) a little angry or impatient” (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* 1987) or ”to make sb slightly angry” (*Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* 2005). *A little* and *slightly* are the crucial words here. Synonyms for *harmittaa* are ”kismittää, kiukuttaa, sapettaa, ärsyttää, närkästyttää” (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K* 2001) which all express a slight irritation, not a strong emotion. Even though *harmittaa* is given as a synonym for *suututtaa* in *Suomen kielen*

perussanakirja S-Ö (2001), in my opinion it expresses a stronger emotion than *harmittaa*.

In some instances synonymical expressions may have included words from other word classes than verbs. In example (55), *vannoa* and *luvata juhlallisesti* are virtually synonymous:

(55) Again and again I had registered a vow that I should deliver my soul upon the subject, but there was that in the cool, nonchalant air of my companion which made him the last man with whom anyone would care to take anything approaching to a liberty. (Doyle 1890: 5)

Monta monituista kertaa olin juhlallisesti luvannut lausua julki kaikki, mikä sydäntäni painoi tässä aineessa, mutta toverini kylmässä huolettomuudessa oli jotakin, joka esti kellenkään päähän juolahtamasta kohdella häntä edes vähänkään vapaasti. (Wickstedt 1894: 3)

Olin kerta toisensa jälkeen mielessäni vannonut puuttuvani asiaan mutta ystäväni viileän välinpitämätön olemus teki hänestä vihoviimeisen ihmisen, jonka käytöstä teki mieli arvostella. (Korhonen 2009: 7)

Luvata has more weight with the adverbial *juhlallisesti* than alone, as its basic meaning is *to promise*. *Juhlallinen* expresses seriousness in the accompanying action (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K* 2001). *Vannoa*, however, already contains the idea of the act being more serious than *luvata*: there is a sincere vow included in the promise. If the source text is considered, however, *had registered* cannot be considered alone, either, because *a vow* was contained in both *vannoa* and *luvata* in Finnish. Indeed, “I registered a vow” is found in *Englanti-suomi suursanakirja* (1990) with the translation “päätin mielessäni, että...” Korhonen’s (2009) translation was an intermediary form of this and *vannoa*, since it did contain the word *mielessäni*. In my opinion, both were equally good translations. Again, this highlights the fact that in many cases there is no single correct translation that would always be the only one that can be used, and that literal translation can also lose some parts of the meaning, although Newmark (1989: 135-136) is of the opinion that it would be the best translation method in most cases: *rekisteröidä vala* does not have any real significance in Finnish.

It was also possible that a verb and a noun from the source text were blended, in a way, in the translation, so that the translation did not contain a verb and a noun but only a verb in which both meanings were more or less included. Two instances of this were *valaista* and *syllistyä* (Korhonen 2009: 10). Here, I will examine *valaista* as presented in example (56):

(56) He held down the lamp to the floor, and as he did so I saw for the second time that night a startled, surprised look come over his face. (Doyle 1890: 58)

Hän valaisi lattiaa, ja sitä tehdessään näin toisen kerran samana yönä hämmästyksen ilmeen hänen kasvoillaan. (Wickstedt 1894: 53)

Hän piteli lampun lähellä lattiaa ja niin tehdessään erotin toista kertaa samana yönä häkeltyneen, yllättyneen ilmeen hänen kasvoillaan. (Korhonen 2009: 56)

In the example above, Wickstedt (1894) used *valaista* as the action verb of the first clause. Consequently, the overall meaning of the clause stayed the same: Holmes is holding the lamp near the floor to see more clearly. *Suomen kielen perussanakirja S-Ö* (2001) states that *valaista* means “tehdä valoisaksi.” Since *valaisin* is “valaisuun käytettävä (sähkö)laite, lamppu” (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja S-Ö* 2001), it could be added that this is accomplished by means of a lamp of some sort. Indeed, what Wickstedt (1894) altered in her translation was rather the action of focus: *valaista* draws attention to the fact that more light was directed to the floor, whereas Korhonen’s (2009) more formal translation that also contained the actual noun “lamp” highlighted the fact that the lamp was held close to the floor. In fact, Wickstedt’s (1894) translation only implies that Holmes holds the lamp down and close to the floor, which is clear from the source text, but Korhonen (2009) made it as explicit as it is in the source text.

In one occurrence, there was an essential difference in the meaning of the verb. This can be seen in example (57):

(57) I stooped to the hole, and recoiled in horror. (Doyle 1890: 51)

Kumarruin katsomaan avaimenreijästä ja kauhistuin. (Wickstedt 1894: 46)

Kurkistin reiästä ja kavahtin taaksepäin kauhun vallassa. (Korhonen 2009: 48)

Practically, or at least partially, Wickstedt’s (1894) *kauhistua* and Korhonen’s (2009) *kavahtaa* contain the same meaning, but the essential difference was that *kauhistua* is used to describe an emotional response (“joutua kauhun valtaan, pelästyä, järkyttyä, tyrmistyä” in *Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K* 2001) whereas *kavahtaa* is used to describe a movement caused by that emotional reaction (“hypähtää, ponnahtaa pelosta, säikähdyksestä tms.; pelästyä, säikähtää” in *Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K* 2001). *Kavahtaa*, however, also seems to contain the emotional response while *kauhistua* described only the emotional side. Nevertheless, the source text must be considered. The meaning of *to recoil* is “to move back suddenly in fear or dislike” (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* 1987). In Korhonen’s (2009) translation there was also a reference to *kauhu*, horror, as a noun, as in the source text. Wickstedt’s (1894) translation, however, lacked this: she may have concluded that there is enough horror in

kauhistua so that it needed no further elaboration. Formally speaking, Korhonen (2009) seemed to be closer to the source text.

In the scene where Holmes and Watson knock down the door of Bartholomew Sholto's chamber, an abundance of onomatopoeic verbs for the same kind of a noise could be observed. *Rytistä* had been used by both translators, the other verb used by Wickstedt (1894: 46) being *ratista* and by Korhonen (2009: 49) *natista* – *creak* and *groan* (Doyle 1890: 52) being the verbs in the source text. However, *creak* was *rytistä* for Wickstedt (1894: 46) and *natista* for Korhonen (2009: 49), whereas Korhonen (2009: 49) used *rytistä* as a translation for *groan* while Wickstedt (1894: 46) used *ratista*. When considering phonetic symbolism, certain vowels denote different types of sound, e.g. the vowel /I/ denotes high pitch as in *hiss* or *clink* (*New words in English* 2011). This is why it is interesting that the translators had used verbs with the same vowels, /y/ and /a/, but exactly the other way around as regards the verbs in the source text. This provokes the question of whether people perceive sounds differently – personally, I would say that /y/ in Finnish expresses a loud, voluminous sound whereas /a/ would denote possibly a quieter, creaky sound.

In the same scene, there were two interesting occurrences of two verbs, *heittäytyä* and *rynnätä*. Both translators had used them, but in opposite cases, shown in examples (58) and (59):

(58) "The door must come down," he answered, and, springing against it, he put all his weight upon the lock. (Doyle 1890: 52)

«Meidän täytyy särkeä ovi,» vastasi hän ja heittäytyi kaikin voimin sitä vastaan. (Wickstedt 1894: 46)

"Ovi täytyy murtaa", hän vastasi ja ryntäsi päin lukkoa koko painollaan. (Korhonen 2009: 49)

Evidently, Wickstedt (1894) had decided to translate *to spring* as *heittäytyä* and *to fling (yourself)* as *rynnätä*, whereas Korhonen (2009) had made the decisions the other way around.

(59) Together we flung ourselves upon it once more, and this time it gave way with a sudden snap, and we found ourselves within Bartholomew Sholto's chamber. (Doyle 1890: 52)

Yhdistetyin voimin ryntäsimme sitä vastaan vielä kerran; se lensi äkkiä auki, ja me olimme Bartholomeus Sholton huoneessa. (Wickstedt 1894: 46)

Heittäydyimme sitä vasten yhdessä, ja tällä kertaa se antoi periksi äkisti rasahtaen. (Korhonen 2009: 49)

Moving on to consider the meanings of the verbs, in Finnish *heittäytyä* is to “heittää itsensä, paiskautua, viskautua, syöksyä” (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K* 2001), and *rynnätä* is to ”syöksyä, hyökätä, säännätä” (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja L-R* 2001). On the other hand, *to spring* is ”to move quickly and suddenly upwards or forwards as if by jumping”, and *to fling* is ”to move (oneself or part of one’s body) quickly or with force” (*Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* 1987). In my opinion, *rynnätä* is not as sudden a movement, as is implied by *Suomen kielen perussanakirja L-R* (2001), too, as to spring or to fling oneself. Rather, *rynnätä* contains an implication of a longer movement towards a person or an object – like running, for instance. *Heittäytyä*, on the other hand, is more sudden. The problem here is that *heittäytyä* probably would have been the best solution as a translation in both cases, but since the occurrences are so close to each other in the source text, the translators were likely to want to avoid repetition of the same verb. This was made clear even by the fact that *heittäytyä* and *rynnätä* were used in opposite instances by Wickstedt (1894) and Korhonen (2009).

There seemed to be two verbs that were often preferred by Wickstedt (1894) to any other verb that might have had a more specific meaning. These were *kulkea* (example 60) and *jatkaa* (example 61).

(60) He walked slowly from step to step, holding the lamp, and shooting keen glances to right and left. (Doyle 1890: 50)

Hän kulki hitaasti askel askeleelta valaisten eteensä lyhdyllä ja katsellen tuimasti oikealle ja vasemmalle. (Wickstedt 1894: 45)

Hän käveli hitaasti askel kerrallaan lamppua matalalla riiputtaen ja innokkaita katseita oikealle ja vasemmalle luoden. (Korhonen 2009: 48)

Kulkea is a verb with a very general meaning that covers a wide range of different ways of moving forward, from tiptoeing to running, or even by a vehicle. However, it seemed that Wickstedt (1894) had often used it to mean walking. This might be a case of a shift in the meaning of a word, which is very possible given that her translation dates over a hundred years back.

In several occurrences, Wickstedt (1894) had used *jatkaa*, to continue, as a translation for a reporting verb. In example (61), *to observe* could be translated as *huomauttaa* or *kommentoida* (*Englanti-suomi suursanakirja* 1990), as Korhonen (2009) has done: in the example Holmes is indeed observing the fact that his examining Watson’s watch has had some results, although not as many as he had hoped for.

(61) "Though unsatisfactory, my research has not been entirely barren," he observed, staring up at the ceiling with dreamy, lack-lustre eyes. (Doyle 1890: 12)

«Mutta vaikk'ei tyydyttävä, niin ei tutkimiseni kuitenkaan ole ollut aivan turha,» jatkoi hän tuijottaen kattoon veltolla, haaveksivalla katseella. (Wickstedt 1890: 10)

"Vaikkakin tutkimukseni oli epätydyttävä, se ei ollut täysin tulokseton", hän huomautti katsellen kattoa unelmoivin, utuisin silmin. (Korhonen 2009: 13)

At a first glance, *jatkaa* as a reporting verb does not make sense from the formal perspective. If one is to look at it from a more dynamic point of view, the co-text has to be taken into account. If there had only been Watson's inner thoughts and observations between that and Holmes's previous remark, *jatkaa* would have been a good continuation. However, it is Watson who has spoken before that. On the other hand, the previous reporting verb used by Wickstedt (1894) to report Holmes's speech is *huomautti* (Wickstedt 1894: 10). It was *remarked* in the source text, which is in most cases translated as *huomauttaa*, too. It is very much possible that Wickstedt (1894) did not want to use the same verb twice one after the other for the same character. It must also be noted that before the age of computers, which is certainly when Wickstedt (1894) wrote her translation, corrections and changes would have been much more troublesome than today. Also, if the previous verb used to report Holmes's speech was *to remark*, it could be argued that the observation of example (61) was only a continuation of that remark – therefore *jatkaa* is a dynamic translation, since it avoids the repetition of *huomauttaa*.

In this category there was one clear error made by a translator. In example (62), Wickstedt (1894) used *pureskella* as a translation for *to tug*. However, according to *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (2005), the actual meaning of "to tug (at/on) sth" is "to pull hard, often several times". *Englanti-suomi suursanakirja* (1990) translates "to tug at" as "kiskoa jtk."

(62) The scent appeared to be much hotter than before, for he had not even to put his nose on the ground, but tugged at his leash and tried to break into a run. (Doyle 1890: 81)

Kreosootihaju näytti tulleen voimakkaammaksi kuin ennen, sillä Tobyn ei tarvinnut laskea kuonoansa maahankaan, vaan pureskeli nuuraa ja koetti lähteä täyttä vauhtia. (Wickstedt 1894: 74)

Jälki vaikutti olevan entistä voimakkaampi, koska koira ei laskenut kuonoaan maahan vaan rimpuili hihnassaan kuin olisi halunnut karata juoksemaan. (Korhonen 2009: 77)

Korhonen's (2009) *rimpuilla*, although not a most formally equivalent translation, is therefore significantly closer to the source text's verb and its meaning. There had quite

clearly been a misunderstanding of the verb's meaning on Wickstedt's (1894) part, since her translation is the equivalent of "to bite several times continuously".

6.5. Different verb, different structure

In this category, the translations of a verb structure in the source text contained a different verb and also a different structure. This was the largest category with 219 occurrences. This was also the most difficult category to analyse, since the number of combinations of different verbs and structures used by the translators rose so high, and many of the instances were unique or appeared only a couple of times. Therefore it is not practical to go through all the possible sub-categories that this category could contain. I will proceed with the analysis of only the most prominent cases that have the most occurrences in the data. This will lead to neglecting many single occurrences, but for the purposes of this study their analysis is not very relevant.

One of the most prominent features in Wickstedt's (1894) translation when compared with that of Korhonen (2009) was wordiness. Often Korhonen (2009) had managed to express the same idea in fewer words and in a more concise manner. For instance:

(63) "They surely would not take a cab, or go off in a balloon." (Doyle 1890: 81)

«He eivät ole mahtaneet lähteä roskissa tahi nousseet ilmapallossa?» (Wickstedt 1894: 74)

”Tuskinpa he vaunuilla tai ilmapallollakaan ovat poistuneet.” (Korhonen 2009: 77)

Korhonen's (2009) translation had only two words, whereas Wickstedt (1894) had used four. Additionally, to take a brief look at the other verb occurrence in the source text, i.e. *go off*, Korhonen (2009) had combined them to make the translation even more concise. The idea of negation and condition is included as *tuskinpa*, not as *eivät ... mahtaneet* as Wickstedt (1894) had done. Indeed, *olla* is the only verb that the translations had in common, and even it was in a different form. *Lähteä* and *poistua*, however, are virtually synonymous.

Another feature of this category was that one translation could contain phrases that include other words, often nouns, beside verbs, and the other translation had a single verb in the corresponding sentence or clause. *Ole/olkaa hyvä* and *anna/antakaa anteeksi* are examples of these phrases. They may have had *kehottaa* or *katua* as their counterpart in the other translation. Example (64) illustrates this:

(64) "My dear doctor," said he, kindly, "pray accept my apologies. ..." (Doyle 1890: 13)

«Rakas tohtorini,» sanoi hän sydämmellisesti, «pyydän, suokaa minulle anteeksi. ...» (Wickstedt 1894: 11)

”Tohtori kiltti”, hän sanoi ystävällisesti, ”olkaa niin hyvä ja hyväksykää anteeksipyyntöni. ...” (Korhonen 2009: 14)

Pray, in precisely that form, is old use, meant to mean please when asking a question or telling someone to do something (*Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary* 2005). It could also be used ironically, but not in this context. This is, indeed, quite an interesting occurrence, since *rukoilla*, which would be the most common translation for *pray*, does not fit the context, and there is no real equivalent of *please* in Finnish. Both translators have made a good solution, although in different ways: Wickstedt (1894) had used *pyytää* in first person singular, and Korhonen (2009) had translated *pray* as *olkaa niin hyvä* – a fixed phrase that always has the verb *olla* and the adjective *hyvä*. However, even though there were some occurrences like this in the data, nothing certain can be said about which translator prefers which method: both had used both. What must be further noted, however, is that Korhonen’s (2009) Holmes uses the polite second person plural here to address Watson, whereas normally they address each other in second person singular (cf. 6.3.). In my opinion, this emphasizes the sincerity in Holmes’s apology.

In this category, there was one curious occurrence that needs to be looked at in more detail. Example (65) shows the occurrence where the verbs in the translations described a different action. To stoop was translated as *kumartua* by Wickstedt (1894) and as *kurkistaa* by Korhonen (2009).

(65) I stooped to the hole, and recoiled in horror. (Doyle 1890: 51)

Kumarruin katsomaan avaimenreijästä ja kauhistuin. (Wickstedt 1894: 46)

Kurkistin reiästä ja kavahdin taaksepäin kauhun vallassa. (Korhonen 2009: 48)

To stoop, according to *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English* (1987), is to bend the upper body forwards and down. Indeed, the act of looking through the keyhole was only implied in the source text, but both translators had made it evident in their translations. Korhonen (2009) had in a way done his translation the other way around: the act of stooping, bending the upper body, was implied in his translation: an average sized person would naturally have to stoop to see through a keyhole that is placed in the usual spot. *Kurkistaa* is to “katsoa jtkä kaula pitkällä, vaivihkaa, sivumennen, tirkistää, vilkaista (*Suomen kielen perussanakirja A-K* 2001). Wickstedt (1894), on the other

hand, had made both acts visible in her translation with *kumartua* and *katsoa*. This method also agrees with her more wordy translations.

Mostly, this category consisted of mixtures of the previous categories. There were occurrences in which one translation had a more colourful expression than the other, e.g. *lähteä juoksemaan* (Wickstedt 1894: 74) vs. *singahtaa* (Korhonen 2009: 77) different personal forms were used, differences between the effect given by the translations – a contrast between a stronger and a gentler effect, e.g. *ettekä ... saa mennä matkaanne* (Wickstedt 1894: 99) and *älkää toki menkö* (Korhonen 2009: 100) or between a slow and a fast movement. There were only slight differences in the meaning of some verbs, e.g. *verrata* (Wickstedt 1894: 53) and *vertailla* (Korhonen 2009: 56). These different aspects give such a vast number of sub-categories that it is of no use to go through them all, especially because they have already been examined in the earlier chapters of this study.

6.6. Others

The last category consists of several different sub-categories. This category includes all the occurrences that did not fit into the four previous categories. As it follows, it is a collection of very different translation strategies. Accordingly, I decided to make use of sub-categories, because the different types of occurrences that fall under this category may have nothing in common, whereas in the previous categories there was always a certain common feature that made them belong in the same group of occurrences.

As in the previous categories, only the most prominent features that had the most occurrences will be analysed. I will begin the analysis with omissions, first those that have only been made by one of the translators, then by both translators. Then I will examine the cases where one or both translators have made additions that did not exist in the source text. Then I will proceed to examine more complex multi-word constructions, e.g. cases where both translators have used two verbs and the same structure, but the first verb used, often an auxiliary, is different. The last category consists of other types of expressions, e.g. noun and adjectives that have been used to replace a verb clause or a part of the meaning of the verb clause.

6.6.1. Omissions

The vast majority of occurrences, 66 in total (over a half of all the occurrences in the fifth main category), in this category were omissions of verbs by one or both translators. 33 of these omissions were made solely by Korhonen (2009), while those made only by Wickstedt (1894) comprised of 16 occurrences and those left out by both numbered 17. *Be* was evidently the most omitted verb. In the next example can be seen how Korhonen (2009) made the sentence more compact, even though Finnish words tend to be longer than English words. Thus, there was an omission of *was*, since phrases like *there was that* are not typical for Finnish - a noun phrase has therefore replaced it. However, Wickstedt (1894) maintained the *was* in the Finnish sentence, and the result does not sound unusual even to a modern reader:

(66) Again and again I had registered a vow that I should deliver my soul upon the subject, but there was that in the cool, nonchalant air of my companion which made him the last man with whom one would care to take anything approaching to a liberty. (Doyle 1890: 5)

Monta monituista kertaa olin juhlallisesti luvannut lausua julki kaikki, mikä sydäntäni painoi tässä aineessa, mutta toverini kylmässä huolettomuudessa oli jotakin, joka esti kellenkään päähän juolahtamasta kohdella häntä edes vähänkään vapaasti. (Wickstedt 1894: 3)

Olin kerta toisensa jälkeen mielessäni vannonut puuttuvani asiaan mutta ystäväni viileän välinpitämätön olemus teki hänestä vihoviimeisen ihmisen, jonka käytöstä teki mieli arvostella. (Korhonen 2009: 7)

Rather, Wickstedt (1894) seemed to have maintained the idea that there was *something* in Holmes's cool manner that made it unthinkable to reproach him, whereas Korhonen (2009) gave the impression that it was precisely the *cool, nonchalant air* of Holmes that denied taking liberties with him. The difference was minimal, but it was there.

Korhonen's (2009) omissions clearly outnumbered the omissions made by Wickstedt (1894). However, the following is an example of Wickstedt's (1894) omissions:

(67) There are no less than four such numbers visible to my lens on the inside of this case. (Doyle 1890: 14)

Neljä sellaista merkkiä huomasin suurennuslasin avulla kellon kuoressa. (Wickstedt 1894: 12)

Minun linssini mukaan kellokopan sisällä ei ole vähempää kuin neljä tällaista numeroa. (Korhonen 2009: 15)

The idea that is missing from Wickstedt's (1894) translation is that there is, indeed, four pawnbroker's numbers, and no less: Watson's brother has therefore taken his watch four times to a pawnbroker, which suggests that he was often short of money. However, in

the context this becomes evident a little later and is therefore only an emphasis for the fact.

In about a quarter of the occasions both translators omitted the verb *be*. Example (68) illustrates this point:

(68) Here, for example, is one ‘Upon the Distinction between the Ashes of the Various Tobaccos.’ (Doyle 1890: 9)

Tämä esimerkiksi erotuksesta eri tupakkalajien tuhan välillä, ... (Wickstedt 1894: 7)

Tässä esimerkiksi yksi: ‘Kuinka tunnistaa eri tupakkalaatujen tuhkat’. (Korhonen 2009: 11)

In both cases, the sentence would gain only a little with the verb added. However, a whole sentence should always have a predicate, i.e. a verb in a personal form (Leino 1989: 105). Therefore one may suggest that the translators have not written grammatically correct Finnish since they completely omitted the verb from a sentence. Of course, there are also short sentences, i.e. exclamations, which do not have a predicate, but perfectly constructed sentences do have one (Leino 1989: 104).

It is possible for a verb in Finnish to embed more meaning than its English counterpart, and vice versa. Consequently, *valaista* has a more specific meaning than *set* which is a more general verb that can be used in many contexts, whereas *valaista* can only be used when there is a lamp of some sort involved (cf. also 6.4. example 56).

(69) It was locked on the inside, however, and by a broad and powerful bolt, as we could see when we set our lamp up against it. (Doyle 1890: 51)

Mutta se oli sisäpuolelta lukittu leveällä, vahvalla salvalla, jonka näimme valaistuame avainreikää lyhdyllä. (Wickstedt 1894: 46)

Ovi oli kuitenkin lukittu sisäpuolelta leveällä ja lujalla salvalla, jonka erotimme ovenraosta lampun valossa. (Korhonen 2009: 48)

Korhonen (2009), however, chose to leave out a corresponding verb and has again made the sentence more compact.

6.6.2. Additions

Additions in a translation can sometimes be more difficult to notice than omissions. It is often unclear whether there has been an addition or not because of the different ways in which expressions are made in the two languages. For instance:

(70) You can tell me any message you have for him. (Doyle 1890: 107)

Voitte ilmoittaa minulle kaikki tiedot, mitä aiotte hänelle sanoa. (Wickstedt 1894: 98)

In the example above, one could argue that since the source text only has one verb form, Wickstedt (1894) had added another because there were two of them in her translation. On the other hand, *aikoa sanoa* is not a literal translation of *have*, so although there were more words in the translation than in the English counterpart, an actual addition had not been made but the verb had been translated by a verb expression that is more natural in the target language as regards the way the earlier part of the sentence had been translated. In this study, these kinds of “additions” are therefore not considered additions, but are rather categorised into other groups. Indeed, this sub-category deals with those occurrences that clearly had something additional that did not appear in the source text, and additions are such an often mentioned translation strategy (cf. e.g. Ruokonen 2006) that I feel they have to be addressed here, too.

Already earlier in this study (cf. 6.4.), Wickstedt (1894) appeared more wordy in her translation than Korhonen (2009). This is particularly evident in the following example:

(71) “No, no; I ain't goin' to lose a whole day to please no one. ...” (Doyle 1890: 107)

«Ee-en; minäpä en aiokkaan istua täällä ja turhaan kuluttaa kokonaista päivää ilmaiseksi. ... »
(Wickstedt 1894: 98)

”Ehei, mä en tuhlaa koko päivääni tän takia. ...” (Korhonen 2009: 100)

A counterpart for *en aiokkaan istua täällä* is nowhere to be found in the source text. *Turhaan kuluttaa* is the counterpart for *ain't goin' to lose*, but the verb phrase before it was clearly an addition. Korhonen (2009), however, kept it simple with *en tuhlaa*: the translation of this verb was therefore practically the same with both translators, only Korhonen (2009) used a negation form while Wickstedt (1894) translated with an adverb and a verb. However, the reasons behind Wickstedt's (1894) additional phrase remain unclear, except for the fact that she evidently wanted to stress the old man's frustration. Still, her word choices and especially choices of suffixes give an impression of someone who is being mischievous. Furthermore, they make one wonder about Wickstedt's (1894) Finnish skills in that area, since the image that I personally get only from that piece of dialogue is not a frustrated old man, but a mischievous child who first said he is going to stay and sit down, but then decided not to do so. The addition therefore seems rather pointless.

6.6.3. Multi-word structures

There were a few cases which did not fit clearly into any of the categories of the previous main sections, hence they are grouped with others: they comprise of two verbs of which the latter is often the same in both translations, and the first one is a different verb, but the structure in both is the same. The next example illustrates this:

(72) May I ask whether you have any professional inquiry on foot at present? (Doyle 1890: 14)

Uskallanko kysyä, onko teillä nykyään mitään ammattitutkimusta käsillä? (Wickstedt 1894: 12)

Saanko kysyä, onko sinulla tutkimuksia kesken tällä hetkellä? (Korhonen 2009: 16)

Kysyä was the same for both, while Wickstedt (1894) translated *may* as *uskaltaa* and Korhonen (2009) translated it as *saada*. Both were however in the first person singular and had the suffix *-ko* added to demonstrate that it was a question phrase. Other cases like these was, for instance, *would prevent from taking* (Doyle 1890: 11) that had been translated as *estäisi ... ottamasta* by Wickstedt (1894: 9) and *hillitsisi ... ottamasta* by Korhonen (2009: 13).

Multi-word construction could also be ones where the verb in the expression was the same in both translations, but a significant part of the original verb's meaning was expressed by another word that had been translated differently by Wickstedt (1894) and Korhonen (2009). This other word or these other words may have been from a different word class altogether. For example:

(73) He had recovered his self-possession in an instant. (Doyle 1890: 59)

Silmänräpäyksessä oli hän taas herra ylitsensä. (Wickstedt 1894: 53)

Hänen mielenmalttinsa oli palautunut hetkessä. (Korhonen 2009: 56)

Oli is the same in both translations, but the rest of the phrase is completely different. While Korhonen (2009) used a full verb form, pluperfect, Wickstedt (1894) had created something more interesting. In fact, it is difficult to assess where one part ends and another begins with regard to the relationship between the source text and the translation: *olla herra ylitsensä* seems like an idiom, although an old-fashioned one, that includes the meaning of self-possession. However, *recover* is present in the form of *taas*. Since *herra ylitsensä* does not exactly have any meaning without the *olla* verb, it should be included in the analysis of the verb, even though *olla taas* does have the

meaning of *recover*. Korhonen's (2009) translation was therefore more formal, although he, too, changed the word order.

6.6.4. Others

In three occurrences, Korhonen (2009) has replaced a short exclamation-like sentence that includes the verb *be* by an exclamation in Finnish that does not include a verb. *No niin* had been used twice (Korhonen 2009: 56, 71) and *Se siitä* once (Korhonen 2009: 77). To exemplify further:

(74) Here you are, doggy! Good old Toby! (Doyle 1890: 74)

No niin, poika! Vanha kunnan Toby! (Korhonen 2009: 71)

The translation was therefore dynamic rather than formal, since the elements had not been translated one by one. That would have resulted in *Siinä sinä olet*, which is not really colloquial Finnish. Wickstedt (1894) also had not translated the example above completely formally, although she had used an *olla* structure in the other two cases:

Tule tänne, poikani! Vanha kelpo Toby! (Wickstedt 1894: 67)

She has maintained *here* as *tänne*, but the verb in question is *tulla* instead of *olla*. The meaning has therefore been altered, even though it still fits the context, as Holmes (the speaker) is offering a handkerchief for Toby to smell.

Clear errors in translation were quite few in the end. However, there were some instances that make one suspect that there might be more like that elsewhere in the text. For instance, once Korhonen (2009) had left out a whole sentence with no trace of it in the translation. It even stands out in the translation, because the omitted sentence was Watson's line between the old sailor's two lines:

(75) "Hänelle mä sen tulin kertomaan", hän toisti vanhan miehen marisevalla itsepäisyydellä.

"Ehei, mä en tuhlaa koko päivääni tän takia. Ellei herra Holmes ole täällä, sitten herra Holmes selvittää jutun itsekseni. Teihin minä en luota enkä aio suutani teille avata." (Korhonen 2009: 100)

The omission was clear, because the text does not flow – the reader gets the feeling that something is missing. This must have been mere carelessness, which proves that translators are in the end only human beings.

To conclude the analysis, I will present one more example that shows how difficult it was at times to put verbs into categories according to their translations:

(76) Give me problems, give me work, give me the most abstruse cryptogram or the most intricate analysis, and I am in my own atmosphere. (Doyle 1890: 7)

«Antakaa minulle tehtäviä ratkaistavaksi, antakaa minulle mitä selittämättömpiä merkkikirjoituksia tahi mitä sekavin erityis – silloin olen minä mieli työssä, silloin voin olla ilman tekoihoituskeinoja. (Wickstedt 1894: 5)

Olen oikeassa elementissäni ratkoessani ongelmia, kamppaillessani vaikeatajuisen salakirjoituksen tai mutkikkaiden tutkimusten kanssa. (Korhonen 2009: 8)

In this case, it was even difficult to decide what element had actually been translated by what element. Wickstedt (1894) had maintained the repetition with the verb *give* at least partially, while Korhonen (2009) had adopted a completely different line of approach. Wickstedt's (1894) translation was indeed formally closer to the source text, although Korhonen (2009), too, maintained the prevalent idea.

7 DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

The amount of different aspects to consider in translation is vast. This can be seen in the range of theories that have been constructed in this field. It seems that no single theory is completely satisfactory when it comes to the actual translation process. The skopos theory emphasizes the purpose of translation. The concept of loyalty highlights the relationship between the translator and the readers. Different equivalence theories quite often juxtapose two different methods of translation, although it seems that the actual translation usually requires using both methods within one text.

When considering translations, what must always be born in mind is the situation in which a text is translated, and, on the other hand, read after it is published. This is particularly interesting in comparing two translations of the same book, because not only the original author and the translator are in different places geographically and temporally, but also the two translators are so, even though both might have lived in the same country.

The purpose of this study was to compare two Finnish translations of the same novel to see how two different translators from a different time and place, although from the same country, had treated the source text. The data had to be restricted to not make the study too vast, so I decided to concentrate on the translation of verbs. This was because the verb is a crucial element in every sentence, and it can give the reader a completely different picture of what happens in a certain scene in a novel. The task was made even more interesting by choosing a novel from the end of the 19th century that had been translated into Finnish quite soon after its original publication, as well as quite recently, making the time gap between the translations larger than a century. I wanted to see if the change in translation theories, which was described in the beginning of the theoretical part of this study, could also be seen in the translations. My hypothesis was that there would be a visible difference in the strategies used by the two translators, Ida Wickstedt (1894) and Jussi Korhonen (2009), because there have been significant changes in the prevalent translation theories, in the ways in which people react to translations, and certainly in what readers expect from translations (cf. 2.1.).

In the first category of the verb analysis, those occurrences in which both translations had the same verb in the same form were analysed. This was the case of concluding which were the most prominent phenomena in the category – in what cases had the

translators arrived at the same solutions. Firstly, it seemed to be the case most often with common verbs like *be* and *say*. There is a readily available translation for them, which makes them fairly easy to translate. Some exceptions to the rule existed, however, since besides the most common translation *olla*, *be* had also been translated as *käsitellä* and *koskea*. It can be concluded that sometimes the context requires a different verb to be used instead of the one that would be the translation if the verb was taken out of context. Secondly, in connection to the previous point, there are homonyms that can be translated in several ways, e.g. *see*. Depending on the context, it can mean either *katsoa* or *ymmärtää*, and was translated accordingly by both translators. If there are several different meanings to one word that depend entirely on the context in which it is used, strictly literal translation, as promoted by Newmark (1989) as the best method in any translation, is difficult to be justified. In contrast, the same verb was also used as a translation for different verbs, e.g. *answer* and *reply* were both translated as *vastata*. This shows that the amount of synonyms and homonyms differ from language to language, therefore giving very different ranges of options to choose from for different words when translating a text.

The second category included the occurrences where both translators had decided to use the same verb, but in a different form. The compound verb forms were put into this category even if the first verb of the verb structure was different, but the main verb was the same in the translations. Subsequently, the analysis was about figuring out the reasons behind the choice of a different structure by either of the translators. Of course, it is not possible to know what the translators have actually been thinking, but it can often be deduced from linguistic clues. Most often this had something to do with the other clause elements that required another verb form, e.g. second person singular versus second person plural. This fact also emphasizes the need for considering the context, the time and place in which the text has been translated: for instance, using the polite second person plural in Finnish when talking to one's friend is not usual in the 21st century. Oittinen (1995: 44-45) says that the situation is actually the starting point of translation. It is therefore curious why Korhonen (2009) had used the second person singular for Holmes and Watson when they are addressing each other, although he has opted for the polite form when they are talking to other characters. Perhaps the choice illustrates the close relationship between the detective and his companion. On the other hand it can be assumed that Wickstedt (1894) knew how her contemporaries addressed each other, and thus the polite form she used reflects the time and age better than

Korhonen's (2009) more modern approach. Another finding in this category was that Wickstedt (1894) seemed to favour longer structures, i.e. compound tenses where Korhonen (2009) used a simple tense. It seems like Wickstedt (1894) had a different view of how to use the tenses, although it is also possible even if rather unlikely that the tenses were not used as consistently in written language a hundred years ago. However, what must be noted is Wickstedt's highly possible Swedish-speaking background. It is possible that it affected some of her Finnish, and it is not improbable that her background was Swedish, as many translators of that time in Finland spoke Swedish as their first language (Hellemann 1970: 479). This is, however, only a speculation on the basis of her Swedish name - nothing certain is to be found about her background.

The occurrences which had the same structure, but a different main verb, were put into the third category. There emerged the issue of "umbrella terms" versus verbs with a more specific meaning. Both translators had used both types of verbs, but Wickstedt's (1894) translation had more of the "umbrella terms", i.e. verbs with a very general meaning. Although I already considered her potential Swedish-speaking background as the source for some of her solutions, it did not necessarily mean that if the translator had used a more descriptive verb, it corresponded better to the meaning of the verb in the source text. Sometimes the effect of the chosen descriptive verb may have been very different from the original. It was also often the case that both translators had used a verb with some degree of descriptiveness, but with a different effect. In any case, descriptiveness is difficult to describe, and the effect is a highly personal viewpoint, which further emphasizes the fact that the reading experience is unique to every reader – the translators also being readers (Bassnett 2002: 43).

In some cases, there was a possibility of translating the English phrase completely formally in relation to the structure, but there was a more natural Finnish equivalent available that had been used. For instance, participial phrases are often more natural in Finnish than subordinate clauses. It must be considered how Finnish and English have different constructions that can substitute each other perfectly inside the language, but how only one of them would fit the requirement for formal equivalence regarding syntax and replacing one word in the source text by one word in the target text. If the non-formal option is more natural in the target language, and the meaning is the same, I argue that it is the one that should be used, as Korhonen (2009) did in example (48), even though Newmark (1989: 135-136) proposes semantic translation as the translation method for "most linguistic activities", and states that semantic translation is an art,

whereas communicative is only a craft. Indeed, Nida (1964: 163) is also for natural translation, as it is the most important factor in producing a similar response in the readers of the translation as in the readers of the original text. Additionally, in some cases it had been necessary for a translator to use a verb that is not the most optimal translation, if the co-text required it, and there was no other verb that had the most optimal meaning in the target language. As example (59) shows, in these cases the structure may well have been the same.

The fourth category consisted of different types of occurrences that were mainly blendings and mixtures of the types of occurrences presented in the previous four categories. In this category, both the verb and the structure used by the translators were different. Although most of the issues had already been addressed in the previous categories, there were some to be found here, too. For example, English and Finnish employ different means to achieve an effect: while in English it is most convenient to use prepositions and the like, Finnish uses adverbials and other clause elements. Also, some of the examples in this category showed how Wickstedt's (1894) translation was often more wordy when compared with Korhonen (2009) who had in many cases translated in a very compact way. Perhaps this again shows the different language background of the two translators: when one is speaking or writing in a language that is not his or her native tongue, often some terms have to be explained in a roundabout fashion if one's vocabulary does not contain the specific word in that language.

All the verb occurrences that did not fit into the four main categories were put into the fifth one. Thus it created a rather mixed group of occurrences that had to be divided into four sub-categories. The most important feature that consisted of over a half of all the occurrences in the main category was omissions. Interestingly, Korhonen (2009) had omitted twice as many verbs as Wickstedt (1894), although both had made omissions. *Be* was the most omitted verb, and I think this might be because many English expressions are based on the verb *be* whereas Finnish often offers the possibility of using a different kind of a construction instead.

The most significant challenge in conducting this study was the amount of verbs that grew rather large. After collecting the verbs from the first chapter of *The Sign of the Four*, the amount was already large, but not exhaustive enough because there is no real action. If I had settled for those verbs, the study would have had a serious lack of verbs of movement and other types of action. However, because of taking into account several

“action scenes”, the data became quite large since there is hardly a sentence without a verb and most of the sentences have several of them. Although the data is quite massive, it is, however, certainly exhaustive enough precisely because of that amount, so that conclusions can be drawn even about the whole novel and its translations.

Another challenge was defining what exactly a verb is. Words from other word classes, although they seemed to affect the meaning of the verb, too, had to be cruelly left out especially from the occurrences in the source text – this was of course impossible in the case of the translations, since not always had a verb been translated with merely a verb, but Finnish nouns and adjectives could carry some, if not all, of the English verb’s meaning. In the end, it was fairly difficult to separate the verb from all the other surrounding material, and especially the counterpart of each verb from the target texts. Additionally, because of the large amount of verbs that were finally collected, every single occurrence could not be analysed since that would have gone beyond the scope of this study. However, I chose to examine some of the most interesting single occurrences as well. The interest rose in some cases from the obvious difference between expressing ideas in English and in Finnish, and in some cases from a significant difference between the two translations. What is most interesting is of course very much a matter of personal opinion: another researcher might have left out the single occurrences I chose to analyse, and analysed other occurrences instead which I have left out.

On the other hand it must be noted that since this study concentrated on verbs, other word classes were left almost completely untouched. However, their influence on the chosen translations for verbs has been addressed where relevant. In the end, this was only a study of one novel and its two translations. Therefore the strategies of only two individual translators were examined, and since all the translators are also individuals who have their own experiences and translate from their own personal situation, the results of this study cannot be generalised. However, the results do tell us something about the actual work of translators as it was and is today. Although theories and views about translation have changed significantly over a century, it seems, based on my results, that what translators actually do when translating has not changed that much. Of course, there are those that want to experiment, but they are quite few in the end. An average translator, which I assume both Wickstedt (1894) and Korhonen (2009) to have been, tries to make the text sound good and be understandable to an average reader in the target language, and does not stick too much to, for example, an ideal of formality. Wickstedt’s (1894) translation has evidently become outdated language-wise, but is

however an example of written Finnish as it was decades ago. Indeed, this is the reason why Korhonen's (2009) translation even exists: as the language changes, new translations are needed of old works, classics, that are read from generation to generation (Mäkinen 2004: 411). Additionally, Paloposki and Koskinen's (2004) results are similar. They came to the conclusion that there is no linear historical development of translations as such: this would require a presumption that first translations are not as good as those that came after them, that there is a certain movement towards better translations. Indeed, in some cases it might be the opposite, as translators have to work in a hurry and do not get paid adequately.

A study like the present one has its weaknesses, of course. For instance, it is highly likely that some other word class than verbs might have been more revealing in some aspects. Also, skopos theory is rather difficult to apply to a study of such a limited data, and loyalty is best seen in features outside the actual translated text (e.g. footnotes and forewords). In addition, my way of limiting the amount of data is only one of many possibilities, and some other way might well have been more efficient in collecting a data that contains all of the most important features of both translations but does not have too much of repetition.

Accordingly, *The Sign of the Four* could be studied further by taking other features besides verbs and comparing their translations. For instance, a study of culture- and time-bound expressions could be interesting. Also a further study could be done by taking all the Finnish translations of a single Sherlock Holmes novel, and to see whether there is any that differs significantly from the others in some aspect, and what would be the reasons for that. It could also be interesting to investigate the readers' responses to new translations: is there a translation that is *the* translation for Sherlock Holmes enthusiasts? Or do they consider a translation always inferior, and the only right way to read a novel is in the original language? What could also be considered more thoroughly is the translators' background, i.e. Wickstedt's (1894) very possible Swedish-speaking background – does her translation have visible traces of that? Indeed, many other ends could also be pursued when comparing two translations of a novel from different time periods. This study will hopefully give some guidelines as to how such a study can be carried out most efficiently, and serve as a stepping stone for further study in the field.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary sources

Doyle, A. C. 1894. *Neljän merkit*. Translated by Ida Wickstedt. Pori: Porilaisen kirjapaino.

Doyle, A. C. 2007 (1890). *The sign of the four*. Minneapolis: Filiquarian publishing, LLC.

Doyle, A. C. 2009. *Neljän merkki*. Translated by Jussi Korhonen. Helsinki: Basam Books.

Secondary sources

Bahtin, M. 1979. *Kirjallisuuden ja estetiikan ongelmia*. Translated by Kerttu Kyhälä-Juntunen and Veikko Airola. Moscow: Kustannusliike Progress.

Bassnett, S. 2002. *Translation studies*. London and New York: Routledge.

Briggs, A. 1983. *A social history of England*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Chesterman, A. 2000. *Memes of translation*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Collins English Dictionary. 2003. Glasgow: HarperCollins Publishers.

Doyle, A. C. 1887. *A study in scarlet*. (27 Nov 2011)
http://www.gutenberg.org/catalog/world/readfile?fk_files=1998496&pageno=1

Ekholm, K. 1985. Oidipuksesta Sherlock Holmesiin. In Ekholm, K. and J. Parkkinen (eds.), *Pidättekö dekkareista*. Helsinki: Kirjastopalvelu Oy, 9–33.

Englanti-suomi suursanakirja. 1990. Juva: WSOY.

Exploring Grammar I. 2007-2008. Course material for EKIP204 Exploring Grammar I. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.

Greenbaum, S. and R. Quirk. 1990. *A student's grammar of the English language*. Hong Kong: Longman.

Hatim, B. and I. Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the translator*. London and New York: Longman.

Hellemann, J. 1970. Suomensuomen kirjallisuus. In Tarkka, P. (ed.), *Suomen kirjallisuus VIII. Kirjallisuuden lajeja*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura ja Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otava, 418–484.

House, J. 1981. *A model for translation quality assessment*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.

- House, J. 1997. *Translation quality assessment. A model revisited*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
- Hughes, A. and P. Trudgill. 1987. *English accents and dialects. An introduction to social and regional varieties of British English. Second edition*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Häkkinen, K. 1994. *Agricolasta nykykieleen. Suomen kirjakielen historia*. Juva: WSOY.
- ISK. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. 2004. Hämeenlinna: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Itkonen, T. 2000. *Uusi kieliopas*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Karlsson, F. 1999. *Finnish. An essential grammar*. Translated by Andrew Chesterman. London and New York: Routledge.
- Koskinen, K. 2004. Ekvivalenssista erojen leikkiin – käännöstiede ja kääntäjän etiikka. In Oittinen, R. and P. Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käännös*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 374–387.
- Kotus. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. 2005. Sananselityksiä: Ison suomen kieliopin termejä. (4 Aug 2011) http://kaino.kotus.fi/cgi-bin/julk1/termit.cgi?h_id=pCACBIFJF
- Kovala, U. 1992. *Väliin lankeaa varjo. Angloamerikkalaisen kaunokirjallisuuden välittyminen Suomeen 1890–1939*. Jyväskylä: Nykykulttuurin tutkimusyksikkö.
- Leech, G. N. 1987. *Meaning and the English verb. Second edition*. London and New York: Longman.
- Leino, P. 1989. *Suomen kielioppi*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. New edition*. 1987. Harlow: Longman dictionaries.
- Martin, A. 2001. A translator's view on translation norms. (5 Aug 2011) <http://blogs.helsinki.fi/hes-eng/volumes/volume-1-special-issue-on-translation-studies/a-translators-view-of-translation-norms-alice-martin/>
- Merriam Webster Online. (1 Dec 2011) <http://www.merriam-webster.com/>
- Mäkinen, P. 2004. Ikinuori lähdeteksti, ikääntyvä kohdeteksti? In Oittinen, R. and P. Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käännös*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 407–425.
- New words in English. Comments on phonetic symbolism, ablaut combinations and rime combinations*. 2011. Course material for EKIS210 New words in English. University of Jyväskylä, Department of Languages.
- Newmark, P. 1989 (1977). Communicative and semantic translation. In Chesterman, A. (ed.) *Readings in translation theory*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura, 116–140.
- Nida, E. A. 1964. *Toward a science of translating*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

- Nida, E. A. and C.R. Taber. 1969. *The theory and practice of translation*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Nord, C. 1991. Scopos, loyalty, and translational conventions. *Target* 3 (1), 91–109.
- Nord, C. 1997. *Translating as a purposeful activity. Functionalist approaches explained*. Manchester, UK & Northampton, MA: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Oittinen, R. 1995. *Kääntäjän karnevaali*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Oittinen, R. 1997. *Liisa, Liisa ja Alice. Matkakirja*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. 2005. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Paloposki, O. 2000. "Nerontuotteita maailmankirjallisuudesta" - Suomennosten historia 1800-luvulta nykypäivään. In Paloposki, O. and H. Makkonen-Craig (eds.), *Käännöskirjallisuus ja sen kritiikki*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 20–33.
- Paloposki, O. 2004. Kääntäminen historiassa. In Oittinen, R. and P. Mäkinen (eds.), *Alussa oli käänös*. Tampere: Tampere University Press, 349–373.
- Paloposki, O. and K. Koskinen. 2004. A thousand and one translations. In Hansen, G., K. Malmkjær and D. Gile (eds.), *Claims, changes and challenges in translation studies*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 27–38.
- Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum. 1973. *A university grammar of English*. Hong Kong: Longman.
- Redmond, C. 2009. *Sherlock Holmes handbook. 2nd edition*. Toronto: Dundurn press.
- Reiss, K. and H. J. Vermeer. 1986. *Mitä kääntäminen on. Teoriaa ja käytäntöä*. Translated by Pauli Roinila. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Ruokonen, M. 2006. Intertekstuaalisuus ja kaunokirjallisuuden kääntäminen. In Tommola, J. (ed.), *Kieli ja kulttuuri kääntäjän työvälineinä*. Turku: PAINOSALAMA OY, 57–82.
- Ruuhimäki. (14 Dec 2011) <http://www.ruuhimaki.fi/?id=5954A3A9-4240418D9E3B-008A370CBCF1>
- Sammakkolampi. (30 Nov 2011) <http://www.sammakkolampi.fi/lajit/vaskitsa.html>
- Snell-Hornby, M. 1995. *Translation studies. An integrated approach. Revised edition*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Steiner, G. 1975. *After Babel. Aspects of language and translation*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Strauss, A. and J. Corbin. 1990. *Basics of qualitative research. Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, Inc.

Suomen kielen perussanakirja. A-K. 2001. Helsinki: Edita.

Suomen kielen perussanakirja. L-R. 2001. Helsinki: Edita.

Suomen kielen perussanakirja. S-Ö. 2001. Helsinki: Edita.

Suomisanakirja. (30 Nov 2011) <http://suomisanakirja.fi/mets%C3%A4sika>

Vehmas-Lehto, I. 2002. *Kopiointia vai kommunikointia? Johdatus käännteoriaan.* Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Venuti, L. 1995. *Translator's invisibility. A history of translation.* London: Routledge.

VISK: Ison suomen kieliopin verkkoversio. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>

Ylikangas, M. 2009. *Unileipää, kuolonvettä, spiidiä. Huumeet Suomessa 1800-1950.* Jyväskylä: Atena.

APPENDIX 1: Chapter titles

Doyle (1890)

Wicktedt (1894)

Korhonen (2009)

I. The Science of Deduction	Luento ajatusopillisessa johtamistaidossa	Deduktion tiede
II. The Statement of the Case	Miss Morstanin asia	Uusi tapaus
III. In Quest of a Solution	Etsimismatkalla	Ratkaisua etsimässä
IV. The Story of the Bald-Headed Man	Pienen kaljupää-miehen historia	Kaljupäisen miehen tarina
V. The Tragedy of Pondicherry Lodge	Murhenäytelmä Pondicherry Lodgessa	Pondicherry Lodgen tragedia
VI. Sherlock Holmes Gives a Demonstration	Sherlock Holmes mielityössään	Sherlock Holmes järjestää näytöksen
VII. The Episode of the Barrel	Kreosooti-tyunnyri	Tynnyri
VIII. The Baker Street Irregulars	Apulaisjoukkomme	Baker Streetin palkkasoturit
IX. A Break in the Chain	Odottamaton viivytys	Katkennut ketju
X. The End of the Islander	Takaa-ajaminen	Saaristolaisen kuolema
XI. The Great Agra Treasure	Suuri Agra-aarre	Agran aarre
XII. The Strange Story of Jonathan Small	Jonathan Smallin elämäkerta	Jonathan Smallin ihmeellinen tarina

APPENDIX 2: Same verb, same structure

Doyle	page	Wickstedt	page	Korhonen	page
took	5	otti	3	otti	7
adjusted		asetti		asetti	
rested		katseli		katseli	
pressed		painoi		painoi	
sank		vaipui		vaipui	
answered	6	vastasin	4	vastasin	8
smiled		hymyili		hymyili	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
is		on		on	
said		sanoin		sanoin	
is		on		on	
speak not		ett'en ... puhu		etten puhu	
put	7	asetti	5	asetti	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
am		olen		olen	
have chosen		olen valinnut		olen valinnut	9
created		luonut		luonut	
am		olen		olen	
answered		vastasi		vastasi	
am		olen		olen	
are		ovat		ovat	
is		on		on	
shook		pudisti		pudisti	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
cannot		en voi onnitella		en voi onnitella	
congratulate					
is ... ought to be		on ... pitäisi olla		on ... pitäisi olla	
was	8	oli	6	oli	
confess		tunnustan		tunnustan	10
was irritated		kiusasi		kiusasi	
had ... through		oli ... lävistänyt		oli ... lävistänyt	
filling up		täyttäessään		täyttäessään	
has come		on saavuttanut		on ... saavuttanut	
has		on		on	
was		koski		koski	
concerned					
tossed over	9	viskasi	7	viskasi	
speaks		puhuu		puhuu	
has		on		on	
possesses		on		on	
is ... wanting		puuttuu		puuttuu	
is ... translating		kääntää		kääntää	
laughing		nauraen		nauraen	
are		käsittelevät		käsittelevät	
enumerate		luettelen		luettelen	
remarked		huomautin	8	huomautin	
is	10	on		on	
is		on		on	
answered		vastasin		vastasin	12
is		on		on	
answered		vastasi		vastasi	

shows		osoittaa		osoittaa	
don't see		ett'en ymmärrä		etten ymmärrä	
was		oli		oli	
adhering		on tarttunut	9	on tarttunut	
is	11	on		on	
is		on		on	
know		tietääkseni		tietääkseni	
is		on		on	
is		on		on	
knew		tiesin		tiesin	
see		näen		näen	
have		on		on	
send		lähettämään		lähettämään	
replied		vastasin		vastasin	
is		on		on	
answered		vastasi		vastasi	13
is		on		on	
were to put ... to		panisin		panisin	
have		on		on	
has ... come into		olen saanut haltuuni		olen ... saanut haltuuni	
handed ... over		ojensin		ojensin	
balanced	12	punnitsi	10	punnitsi	
handed ... back		ojensi ... takaisin		ojensi ... takaisin	
has been ... cleaned		on ... puhdistettu		on puhdistettu	
answered		vastasin		vastasin	
was cleaned		puhdistettiin		puhdistettiin	
accused		syytin		syytin	
suggests		viittaa		viittaa	14
is		on		on	
are		ovat		ovat	
is ... to have		on		on	
has ... been		on ... ollut		on ... ollut	
said		sanoin		sanoin	
was	13	oli		oli	
lived		eli	11	eli	
died		kuoli		kuoli	
said		sanoin		sanoin	
speak		sanoen		sanoen	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
assure		vakuutan		vakuutan	
knew		etten ... tiennyt		etten tiennyt	
had		olevan		olevan	
is		on		on	15
was	14	oli		oli	
must be		on	12	on	
inherits		perii		perii	
followed		seurasin		seurasin	
was		oli		oli	
had		oli		oli	
is		on		on	
is		on		on	16
answered		vastasin		vastasin	

have		onko		onko	
cannot live	15	en voi elää		en voi elää	
is		on		on	
is		on	13	on	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
read		luki		luki	
ask		pyytäkää		pyytäkää	
took	50	otti	45	otti	48
were chattering		kalisivat		kalisivat	
examined		tutki		tutki	
knocked	51	koputti		koputti	
receiving		saamatta		saamatta	
was locked		oli ... lukittu	46	oli ... lukittu	
is		on		on	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
had mentioned		maininneen		maininneen	49
were		olivat		olivat	
is		on		on	
said		sanoin		sanoin	
answered	52	vastasi		vastasi	
was littered over		oli täynnä	47	oli täynnä	
was		oli		oli	
sunk		painuneena		painuneena	
was		oli		oli	
was		oli		oli	50
handed		ojensi		ojensi	
was	58	oli	53	oli	55
was		ei ollut		ei ollut	
lay ... upon		peitti		peitti	
said		sanoi		sanoi	56
is		on		on	
did		tehdessään		tehdessään	
followed		seuratessani		seuratessani	
said		kuiskasin		kuiskasin	
said	59	sanoi		sanoi	
failed		petti		petti	
is		on		on	
asked		kysyin		kysyin	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
answered		vastasin		vastasin	
could not (but) think		ett'en voinut olla ajattelematta	54	enkä voinut olla ajattelematta	57
had ... turned		olisi suunnannut		olisi suunnannut	
kept muttering		mutisi		mutisi	
smell	74	haista	67	haista	71
threw		heitti		heitti	
fastened		kiinnitti		kiinnitti	
towered up		kohosi	68	kohosi	
had		näytti		näytti	
whining	75	vinkuen		vinkuen	
screened		kasvoi		kasvoi	
were worn down ... rounded		olivat kuluneet ... pyöristyneet		olivat kuluneet ... pyöristyneet	72

had ... been used		olisi käytetty		olisi ... käytetty	
remarked		huomautti		huomautti	
have had		ettei ole satanut		ei ole satanut	
confess		tunnustan		tunnustan	
reflected		ajattelin		ajattelin	
swerved		ei ... poikennut		(ei) ... poikennut	
rubbing	80	pyyhkivät	73	pyyhkivät	76
is	81	vaivaa	74	vaivaa	77
said		sanoi		sanoi	
made up his mind		teki ... päätöksensä		teki päätöksen	
cold [sic!] see		huomasin		huomasin	
were		olivat		olivat	
was		oli		oli	78
burst		purskahdimme		purskahdimme	
was heard	106	kuului	97	kuului	99
stopped		pysähtyi		pysähtyi	
corresponded to		vastasi		vastasi	
was		oli	98	oli	
was		oli		oli	
asked		kysyin		kysyin	
is		onko		onko	
said		kysyi		kysyi	
was	107	koskeeko		koskeeko	
knows		tiedän		tiedän	100
is		on		on	
knows		tiedän		tiedän	
knows		tiedän		tiedän	
is		on		on	
knows		tiedän		tiedän	
tell		kertokaa		kertokaa	
repeated		toisti		toisti	
ain't		ei ole	99	ellei ... ole	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
have		on		on	
recognized		huomasi		huomasi	
to see	108	tapaamaan		tapaamaan	
said		sanoin		sanoin	
said		sanoi		sanoi	
sitting		istui		istui	

APPENDIX 3: Same verb, different structure

Doyle	page	Wickstedt	page	Korhonen	page
could hold out	6	ett'en ... voinut hillitä	4	en kyennyt hillitsemään	7
are		olette		olet	8
is		on		ei ole	
consider		ajatelkaapa		ajattele	
say		sanotte		sanot	
know		tiedättehän		tiedät	
remember		muistakaa		muista	
is		on		olen	
did not seem offended	7	ei näyttänyt loukkaantuneelta	5	ei näyttänyt loukkaantuvan	
said		kysäsin		kysyin	9
finding		löydän		olen löytänyt	
glanced over		Silmäilinhän		Silmäilin	
remonstrated	8	vastustin	6	vastustelin	
should be observed in treating		olisi ... pitänyt käsitellä		käsiteltäessä on käytettävä	
should be devoted to		olisi omistettu		olisi pitänyt olla omistettu	10
had lived		olimme asuneet		olin asunut	
was consulted		kysyi ... neuvoa		tuli ... kysymään neuvoa	
had	9	sain	7	saamani	
didn't ... know		ettekö ... tietäneet		etkö tiennyt	
can say		voi sanoa		kykenee ... sanomaan	
was smoking		polttaa		polttava	
have		olette	8	on	
leaning	10	nojautuen		nojasi	12
dispatched		olitte ... lähettämässä		lähetit	
confess		täytyy tunnustaa		tunnustan	
had not written	11	ett'ette ollut kirjoittanut	9	ettet ole kirjoittanut	
sat		olin istunut		istuin	
could ... go ... for		menitte		menisit ... ellet	
remains		jää jälelle		jäljelle jäävän	
to avoid treading in		päästä astumatta		mentäessä ... olla astumatta	
must be		täytyy olla		on oltava	
say		sanotte		sanoit	
would ... think		pitäisittekö		pitäisitkö	13
leaving		jättämättä		olla jättämättä	
would ... have		olkaa		olisitko	
was		oli		olevan	
could ... keep from smiling at	12	voin olla hymyilemättä	10	oli vaikea olla hymyilemättä	
are		on		olet	
could ... expect		odottikaan löytävänsä		odottaisi löytävänsä	
has not been		ei ... ole ollut		ei ollut	
should judge		luulisin		luulen	
belonged		on kuulunut		kuuluneen	

inherited		on perinyt		peri	
has ... been dead		on ... ollut kuolleena		kuoli	14
remember		muistaakseni		muistan	
taking to drink	13	rupesi ... juomaan	11	ratkettuaan juomaan	
is		on		ei ole	
is		ei ole		on	
might be		on		täytyy ... olla	
did ... get		saitte		sait	
was not		eikö ... olleet		ei ollut	15
never guess		en koskaan arvaa		en arvaile koskaan	
do not follow		ett'ette seuraa		ettet seuraa	
notice	14	homaatte [sic!]		huomaat	
is		ei ... ole	12	ei liene	
could not have redeemed		ei olisi voinut lunastaa		ei olisi kyennyt lunastamaan	
winds		vetää		vetävät	
see	15	katsokaa		katso	16
is		on	13	ovat	
to reply		vastatakseni		vastaamassa	
have (no recollection of)		en voi muistaa kuulleen		en muista kuulleen	
remain		jääte		jäisit	
tried to turn	51	koetti ... vääntää	45	koetti ... vääntäen	48
bent down to		kumartui alas	46	kumartui ... puoleen	
rose		nousi pystyyn		nousi	
had ... seen		en ... ollut nähnyt		olin ... nähnyt	
looking		tuijotti		tuijottivat	
suspended		näytti riippuvan		näyttivät riippuvan	
was		oli		olivat	49
was		oli		olevan	
is to be done		on tehtävä		voimme tehdä	
had ... been dead		oli ... ollut kuolleena	47	ollut ... kuolleena	
walking	58	käveli	52	kävellessä	55
let us see		katsokaamme	53	katsotaanpa	56
can find		löydämme		löydämmekö	
was covered		oli täynnä		oli ... peitossa	
is	59	on		ei ... ole	
let us go		menkäämme		mennään	
will be		tulee olemaan		voi olla	
is		löytyvän		löytyy	
will look		katson		katsotaan	
measuring		mitaten	54	mittasi	
examining		tutkien		tutki	
would have made		olisi tullut		olisi voinut tulla	57
stood	74	seisoi	67	seistessä	71
ran along	75	juoksi ... pitkin	68	juoksi ... viertä	
stopped		pysähtyen		pysähtyi	
mounted up		kiivetessäni		kiivettyäni	72
had not ... to put	81	ei tarvinnut laskea	74	ei laskenut	77
had heard	106	olimme ...	97	kuulemiamme	99

		kuulleet	- 98	
clad		puettuna		pukeutunut
leaned upon		nojatessaan		nojasi
overhung		varjosti		varjostivat
are	107	ovat		on 100
was to tell		piti ... kertoman		tulin kertomaan
wait		odottakaa	99	odottakaapa
saw	108	en ole nähytkään		en ole ... nähnyt
treat		kohtelette		kohtelee
will not have ... to wait		ei ... tarvitse ... odottaa		ette joudu odottamaan
resting		tuettuna		tukien
might offer		voisitte tarjota		tarjotkaa

APPENDIX 4: Different verb, same structure

Doyle	page	Wickstedt	page	Korhonen	page
rolled	5	taittoi syrjään	3	kääri	7
thrust		pisti		työnsi	
had become		kiusasi		vaivasi	
to protest		väittää vastaan		esittää vastalauseita	
had registered a vow		olin juhlallisesti luvannut		vannonut	
asked	6	kysäsin	4	kysyin	8
raised		katsahti		nosti	
said		vastasi		sanoi	
has not got over		ei vielä ole voittanut		ei ole vielä palautunut	
cannot afford to throw		eikä ... ole varaa ... ponnistaa voimiani		ei ole varaa kuormittaa	
leaned	7	tuki	5	nojasi	
rebels at		nousee ... vastaan		kapinoi ... vastaan	
crave for		tarvitsen		kaipaam	9
said		vastasin		sain	
should be treated		pitäisi ... kohdella	6	tulisi suhtautua	
have attempted to tinge		olette koettanut antaa		olet koettanut sekoittaa	
produces		tekee		on	
was annoyed at	8	suututti		harmitti	10
seemed to demand		näkyi vaativan		näytti vaativan	
had observed		olin huomannut		olin ... havainnut	
made		En ... sanonut		En ... huomauttanut	
did not prevent ... from walking		vaikk'ei ... estänyt ... käymästä		ei estänyt ... kävelemästä	
said		jatkoi		sanoi	
possessed		tarjosi	7	liittyi	
have suggested to		johtivat		johdattivat	
testifying	9	todistaen		kertoivat	
said		sain		huomautin	
said		vastasi		sanoi	
cried		sanoi		huudahti	
have been (guilty of)		olen kirjoittanut		olen syyllistynyt	
is		näkee		on	
weary	10	väsyttän	8	uuvutan	
lets ... know		ilmoittaa		kertoo	12
said		huudahdin		sain	
remarked		vastasi		huomautti	
chuckling		hymyillen		hykerrellen	
is		on	9	jää	
have taken up		on purettu		on tehty	
thrown up		viskattu		lapioitu	
is found	11	ei ole		ei esiinny	

have heard ...		olen kuullut ...		olen kuullut ...	
say		sanovan		mainitsevan	
intended		oli antaa		oli näpäyttää	
gazed	12	katsoi	10	tuijotti	
opened		aukaisi		avasi	
examined		tarkasti		tutki	
snapped		sulki		napsautti	
remarked		huomautti		totesi	
observed		jatko		huomautti	
staring up		tuijottaen		katsellen	
sprang	13	hypähdin	11	ponnahdin	14
limped		kuljin		onnuin	
has		on		haiskahtaa	
accept		suokaa		hyväksyää	
could ... say		sanoin		arvioin	15
is		tuntuu		on	
(by) stating	14	sanomalla		mainitsemalla	
did		tein		epäilin	
treats		pitelee		käsittelee	
should have had		olisi pitänyt olla		olisi pitänyt luottaa	16
is ... to live for	15	elää		on	
swirls		vierii		leijuu	
entered		tuli sisään	13	astui sisään	
to step up		käymää [sic!] sisään		tulemaan ylös	
led	50	meni	45	johdatti	48
went up		menessämme		kiivetessämme	
walked		kulki		käveli	
holding		valaisten		riiputtaen	
shooting		katsellen		luoden	
ended	51	päätyi		loppui	
force		töytystä		pakottaa	
could see		näimme		erotimme	
intaking		hengittäen	46	henkäisten	
recoiled		kauhistu		kavahdin	
was streaming		virtasi		kylpi	
was		oli		peittyi	49
were set		olivat kangistuneet		olivat vääntyneet	
must come down	52	täytyy särkeä		täytyy murtaa	
springing		heittäytyi		ryntäsi	
creaked		rytisi		natisi	
groaned		ratisi		rytisi	
flung		ryntäsimme		heittäydyimme	
gave way		lensi ... auki		antoi myöten	
found		olimme		löysimme	
was drawn up		oli sijoitettu		oli asetettu	
stood		oli	47	seisoi	
had trickled		juoksi		valui	
was seated		istui		retkotti	
seemed		tuntui		näytti	
lay		oli		lepäsi	50
lashed on		kääritty		kiinnitetty	
scrawled		töhritty		töherretty	
glanced at		katsoi		vilkaisi	
mounted	58	kiipesi	52	nousi	55

found		olimme		seisoimme	
ran up		oli		myötäili	
putting		pidellen	53	koskettaen	56
entered		tuli sisään		pääsi sisään	
held		valaisi		piteli	
saw		näin		erotin	
has done		on tehnyt		on suorittanut	
was staggered	59	hämmennyin		häkellyin	
said		vastasi		sanoi	
think		en luule		en usko	
gleaming		kimeltäen	54	kiiluen	57
broke out		huudahti		kiljahti	
pushed	74	asetti	67	työnsi	71
led		vei		johdatti	
sniffing		hengittää		arvioi	
pattered off		lähti	68	lähti ...	
		juoksemaan		seuraamaan	
led		kulki		mutkitteli	
clambered	75	kiipesi		kapusi	72
dropped		päästi		tiputti	
's		näkyä		on	
had passed		oli vallinnut		oli ... kulkenut	
hesitated		ei epäillyt		ei epäröinyt	
rose		voitti	69	erottui	
lead	80	vieviä	73	johtavia	76
were taking down		aukasivat		laskivat	
brushing		lakasivat		harjasivat	
stared		tuijottivat		katsoivat	
trotted		kulki		raahusti	
found ourselves		olimme	74	saavuimme	77
had edged away		olivat ...		olivat kääntyneet	
		kääntäneet			
growled	81	mutisi		murahti	
suggested		ehdottelin		ehdotin	
sniffing		haistettuaan		nuuskittuaan	
appeared to be		näytti tulleen		vaikutti olevan	
tugged		pureskeli		rimpuili	
thought		luuli		ajatteli	
were nearing		lähestyvän	75	lähenevän	
came to		tulimme		päädyimme	
turned		kääntyi		säntäsi	
sprang		juoksi		hypähti	78
looking		katsoi		katseli	
looked		tuijotimme		katsoimme	
was	106	todisti	98	oli	99
heaved		kohosivat		kohoilivat	
had		peitti		oli	
gave		muistutti		vaikutti	
looked		katsoi		katseli	
can tell	107	voitte ilmoittaa		voitte jättää	
said		jatkoi		vastasi	
shall let ... know		sanon		välitän	100
don't care		en pidä	99	en luota	
shuffled		meni		laahusti	
got		asettui		puikahti	
cried	108	huudahti		huusi	
stamping		lyöden		jyskyttäen	

shall recompense	palkitsemme	hyvitämme
sit	istukaa	istahtakaa
came	meni	perääntyi
seated	istui	istuutui
broke in	keskeytti	kajahti
started	hämmästyimme	säpsähdimme

APPENDIX 5: Different verb, different structure

Doyle	page	Wickstedt	page	Korhonen	page
dotted	5	olivat ihan täynnä merkkiä	3	täplittämät	7
scarred		ja arpia		arpeuttamat	
had witnessed		olin ... nähnyt		oli toistunut	
had not reconciled		ei ollut voinut sovittaa minua		ei kyennyt tottumaan	
swelled		tunsin		soimasi	
had lacked the courage		ett'ei minulla ollut rohkeutta		etten rohjennut	
should deliver my soul upon the subject		lausua julki		puuttuvani asiaan	
would care to take a liberty		kohdella ... vapaasti		teki mieli arvostella	
made		minut	4	saivat	
crossing		vastustamaan		asettumaan poikkiteloin	
was	6	oliko		johtuipa	
had taken		olin juonut		nauttimastani	
is		käytätte		on	8
had opened		selaili		oli ... avannut	
stimulating		vilkastuttaa		virikistävänä	
clarifying		voimistuttaa		mieltä puhdistavana	
count		huomatkaa		punnitse	
may be roused and excited		ehkä vilkastuvat ja vahvistuvat		saattaa virkistää ja kiihottaa	
involves increased		josta seuraa enentyvä		kiihdyttää	
may leave		viimein jättää jälkeensä		voi ... aiheuttaa	
comes upon		muututte kun vastavaikutus sitte tapahtuu		vaivut	
is		ei ... kannata		on	
should ... risk		uskaltaisitte		otat ... riskin, joka voi vaarantaa	
made	5	esti ... juolahtamasta	3	teki	7
would ... care to try	6	haluatteko koettaa	4	haluatko kokeilla	8
has (a relish)	7	näyttäen	5	joka valmistautuu	
can dispense		voin olla		en tarvitse	
is		tekevätkin		on	9
is laid		jätetään		tullaan kysymään	
examine		tarkastelen		tutkin	!!!!
pronounce		lausun		annan lausunnon	
claim		en etsi		en havittele	
figures		ei mainita		ei esiinny	
have ... had		olettehan ... tullut tuntemaan		sait tutustua	
was		en ole		ei ole ... tehnyt	
embodied		Olenpa kertonutkin		kuvailin	
worked	8	sovittaisitte	6	yrittäisit vääntää	

could not tamper	En muuttanut		En halunnut vääristellä	
should be suppressed	olisi pitänyt poistaa		on syytä jättää pimentoon	
deserved mention	kannattaisi manitsemista [sic!]		oli huomionarvoista	
succeeded in unraveling	onnistuin saamaan valoa		sovelsin jutun ratkaisemisessa	...10
had been ... designed to please	oli ... tarkoitettu ... mielihyväksi		olin kirjoittanut ... miellyttääkseni	
sat nursing	istuin hieroen		tyydyin huoltamaan	
ached	pakotti		vaikuttivat ... kivuliaasti	
has extended	on ... ulottunut		olen ... laajentanut	
know	tiedätte		olet kuullut	
was able to refer ... to	olin tilaisuudessa kertomaan	7	Pystyin esittämään	
testifying	9 todistaen		kertoivat	
rates	arvostelee		antaa ... arvoa	
may come	voi ... tuoda mukanaan		kertyy	
illustrating	osottavat		esitetään	
is	voi olla		tarjoaa	
has been done	on tehnyt		on	
narrows	rajoittaaahan		pienentyy	
appreciate	10 pidän	8	ovat	
unclaimed	ei kukaan tule vaatimaan		tunnistettaessa	
discovering	saada selvää		selvitettäessä	
have had ... observing	olen tullut huomaamaan		saatuani tilaisuuden tarkkailla	12
spoke	puhuitte		mainitsit	
implies	sisälly		eivätkö ... ole	
sending up	puhalleten ilmaan		tuprutellen	
have been to	olitte		olet ... käynyt	
arrived at	tiedätte		pystyit päätelemään	
have mentioned	enkä ole ... virkannut sanaakaan		en ole maininnut	
may serve to define	voi ... määrätä	9	saattaa olla hyötyä	
tells	huomaan		kertoo	
did ... deduce	11 johti ... ajattellemaan		dedusoi	
Eliminate	Karkoittakaa		Eliminoin	
is	on		pitää paikkansa	
to have ... in ... use	käyttää		käsittelmäänsä	13
might submit to	mielitte asettaa		haluat ... esittää	
might read	voi huomata		pystyy lukemaan	
to let ... have	sanokaa		kertoisit	
thought	katsoen		ajattelin	
assumed	12 käytti	10	omaksumansa	

are		on ... sanottavaa	ei ole	
robs		riistää	on menetetty	
being sent		lähetettiin	sain ... käsiini	
putting forward ... to cover		koetti peittää ... puolustuksella	turvautumisesta ... naamioimiseksi	
gather		päätätte	päätelit	14
was made for		on ... tehty	on ... kuulunut	
descends		joutuvat	perii	
was left with	13	astui ulos maailmaan	oli	
threw away		turmeli	11 heitti ... menemään	
can gather		olen voinut huomata	sain selville	
could not have believed		enpä olisi luullut	en olisi uskonut	
would have descended		alentaisitte	voisit vajota	
have made inquires		olette tiedustellut	olet kysellyt	
pretend to deduce		väitätte, (että) olette tulleet tähän tietoon	teeskentelet ... dedusoineesi	
cannot expect ... to believe		ettehän voi pyytää ... uskomaan	et voi olettaa ... uskovan	
have read		olette lukenut	päätelit	
pray		pyydän	olkaa niin hyvä	
viewing		pitäessäni	suhtauduin	
had forgotten		unohdin	enkä ottanut huomioon	
handed		annoitte	ojensit	
are		ovat	pitää paikkansa	
did not ... expect to be		en luullut olleeni	en odottanut ... pitäisi paikkansa	15
seems		näyttää	on	
observe		ettekä huomaa	etkå pane merkille	
may depend	14	voi tehdä	riippuvat	
observe		tarkastatte	tarkastellessasi	
keeping		on pidetty	on ollut tapana säilyttää	
to assume		otaksua	12 päättelämiseen	
is no		eihän ole	ei ... tarvita	
nodded		taivutin päätäni	nyökkäsin	
to scratch		piirtävät	raaputtaa	
ask		olkaa hyvä	kehotan	
to look at		katsokaa	tarkastelemaan	
look at		tarkastakaa	katso	
has slipped		on luistanut	lipsumisesta	
could have scored		olisiko ... riipustanut	saisi aikaan	
will ... see		ette koskaan tapaa	löytyy	
regret		kadun	pyydän anteeksi	16
stand	15	asettukaa	tulepa	
drifts		käärii itseensä	leijuu	
has no		ei ole	ellei	

to exert		harjoittelisi		voi käyttää	
have		voi käyttää	13	ole sijaa	
had opened		olin ... auaissut		olin	
don't go		elkää menkö		älä suotta lähde	
shaken was	50	oli pelästyksissään	45	oli ... järkyttynyt	48
had to pass		tuin		veti	
were trembling		horjuivat		tutinalta	
whipped out		otti ... esiin		vetäisi	
appeared ... to be served		näyttivät peitti		näyttivät olevan päälystävällä	
had remained		oli jäänyt		pysytteli	
advanced	51	meni eteenpäin		eteni	
kept streaming		seurasimme levitessä		pysytellessämme huojuen	
was not ... closed		ei ... ollut ... tukittu	46	ei ollut ... ummessa	
moved stooped		liikutettuna kumarruin katsomaan		järkyttyneempänä kurkistin	
do ... make of		selitätte		mieltä ... olet	
looked round ... to make sure		katsoin ... tullakseni vakuutetuksi		oli käännättävä ja varmistettava	49
recalled		muistin		mieleeni juolahti	
did not yield	52	ei auennut		ei antanut myöten	
appeared to have been fitted up		näytti olevan varustettuna		näytti	
was (heavy with)		levittäen	47	löyhkäsi	
stood		olivat nojautuneena		erottuivat	
was thrown		oli ... viskattuna		oli ... kokoon keritty	
were twisted		olivat väännetyt		olivat taipuneet	50
turned		vääristetyt		vääntyneet	
seizing	58	tarttuen	52	otti ... tukea	55
swung		heitäytyi		heilautti itsensä	
reached		otti vastaan		kurotti	
followed		voin seurata		kiivetessäni	
was formed		muodostivat		muodostui	
had to step		täytyi hypätä		oli astuttava	
can press		voin avata	53	avautuu	56
was		valtasi		tunsin	
should have been able to foretell	59	olisin voinut sanoa ... edeltäpäin		olisi pitänyt osata aavistaa	
is ... to be learned		emme ... saa ... tietää		ei ole ... nähtävää	
try		koettakaa		yritäpä	
know		tunnette		tiedät	
apply		seuratkaa		sovella	
to compare		verrata		vertailemme	
cannot conceive		en voi ajatella		en kykene kuvittelemaan	
will cover		voisi täydentää ja yhdistää		sopisi yhteen ... kanssa	
will be		on ... oleva		kirkastuu	
whipped out		otti esiin	54	nappasi	

comparing		verraten		vertaili	
were		olivat		liikkui	57
picking out		haistaa		vainua hakeva	
exerting		käytti		ratkaisemisen	
hunted about		nuuskien		metsästäessään	
broke into	74	rupesi ... haukkumaan	68	päästi	71
had been ... whitening		oli ... ruvennut valkenemaan		oli ... kirkastumassa	
could ... see		voimme ... erottaa		oli (mahdollista) nähdä	
harmonized with	75	soveltuikin ... yhteen		sopi yhteen	
hung over		esitettiin		varjosti	
reaching		tullessamme		päästyämme	
taking		ottaessaan		ojennettuani	72
see		näette		näkyä	
will lie upon		ei katoa		pysyy	
had		epäilin		oli	
were ... appeased		haihtui		osoittautuivat ... turhiksi	
waddled		meni tallusteli	68 - 69	hoippui	
had ... been following	80	oli ... johtanut	73	olimme ... seuranneet	76
were beginning to come		tulimme		olimme ... saavuttaneet	
emerging		kulki		astelivat	
sauntered up		tuli juosten		kipittivät	
passed		kulkiessamme		kävelimme	
looked		ei katsonut		vilkuilematta	
had traversed		olimme kulkeneet ... läpi	74	olimme ohittaneet	77
seemed to have taken		näyttivät valinneen		olivat kulkenee [sic!]	
escaping		ett'eivät kiinnittäisi		välttääkseen herättämästä	
had never kept		eivät milloinkaan olleet seuranneet		eivät olleet pysyneet	
would serve		voivat kulkea		oli tarjolla	
turns		yhtyy		muututtua	
ceased to advance		pysähtyi		ei ... jatkanut	
waddled		pyöri		alkoi taapertaa	
looking		katsahti		nostaen katseensa	
to ask for		vetoutuen		olisi ... hakenut	
would not take	81	eivät ole mahtaneet lähteä		ovat poistuneet	
stood		seisahtivat		ovat seisoskelleet	
's off		on vauhdissaan		lähti	
darted away		lähti juoksemaan		singahti	
tried to break into		koetti lähteä		olisi halunnut karata juoksemaan	
ran down		johti ... pitkin		jatkui	

raced		mentiin		tempoi	
were	106	tuntui	97	olisi ollut	99
made his way		oli		pääsi	
entered		astui sisään		avasi	
to draw		vetäessään	98	yritti haukkoa	
had fallen into		oli joutunut		oli joutunut kärsimään	
is		haette		koskee	
was to tell	107	piti ilmoittamaan		olisin kertonut	
tell		sanonhan		kerroinhan	
am acting for		olen ... sijassaan		edustan	
is after		ajaa takaa		etsimänsä	100
must find ... out		saa ... ottaa selkoa	99	selvittää	
won't tell		enkä aio sanoa		enkä aio suutani avata	
must not walk off		ettekä ... saa mennä matkaanne		älkää toki menkö	
shall keep		aiomme pidättää		pidämme	
like		tahdotte		oli ... mieleen	
put		asetti		oli painanut	
seize	108	valloitate		pidättää	
will be		ette tule kärsimään		ei käy kuinkaan	

APPENDIX 6: Others

Doyle	page	Wickstedt	page	Korhonen	page
was	5	oli	3	-	7
had had		-		-	
produced	6	herätti	4	-	
felt		tunsin		-	
is		on		-	8
suppose		luulen		luultavasti	
find		minusta		pidän	
you have been endowed		luonto on antanut teille		-	
Give me ... give me ... give me	7	Antakaa minulle ... antakaa minulle ... antakaa minulle	5	ratkoessani ... kamppaillessani	
I abhor		kammoon		kammoan	
raising		-		kohottaen	9
was	8	oli	6	-	
is deficient		puuttuu		[mutta myös]	10
is		ovat		-	
is		-	7	on	
spoke	9	puhuessaan		-	
glanced		silmäilin		-	
was smoking		polttaa		polttava	
has		on		-	
is		-		-	
is		on		-	
is ... turning up		tulee esiin		tulee ... vastaan	
is		on		-	
is	10	-	8	-	
is		on		-	12
have		-	9	-	
lies	11	-		-	
would prevent ... from taking		estäisi ... ottamasta		hillitsisi ... ottamasta	13
should be (delighted) to look into		(suurimmalla ilolla) tarkastan		(minulle) tuottaisi (suurta iloa) tarkastella	
is	13	-	11	-	14
is		-		-	
is		oli		-	15
was		oli		(kallistuu)	
began	14	alotin		aloitin	
is not ... dinted		ettei ... ole ... lomessa		ettei ... ole ... lommoilla	
is cut and marked		kulunut ja täynnä riipaleita		naarmuinen ja rispaantunut	
is ... well provided for to show		on ... hyvin varustettu osoittaakseni	12	on ... ollut hyväosainen sen merkiksi	
is		-		on	
take		ottavat		-	
is		-		on	

is	-		ei ole	
being lost or transposed	-		häviämisestä	
are	-		ei ole	
contains	sijaitsee		-	
leaves	jättää		-	
did	tein		epäilin	16
may ... ask	uskallanko kysyä		saanko kysyä	
was ever	15 onkohan ... löytynyt		-	
could be	voiko löytyä mitään		-	
are	-	13	-	
bearing	tuoden		kädessään	
addressing	kääntyen ... puoleen		osoittaen sanansa	
should prefer	katson paremmaksi		olisi parempi	
ascended	50 -	45	nousumme	48
was	51 -		osoittautui	
were seeking	etseimme		-	
set	valaistuumme	46	lampun valossa	
being turned	-		oli käännetty	
was	-		-	
were	-		-	
was	oli		-	49
was ... jarring	teki hirveän vaikutuksen		oli ... kauheamman näköistä	
put	52 -		-	
appeared to leak	näkyi vuotavan	47	näytti vuotavan	
to have been broken	oli ... rikottu		-	
to pass through	mahtui ... sisään		miehenmentävä	
lying	58 laskeutui	52	-	55
held	-		kannatteli	
was	oli		-	
are	on	53	no niin	56
leads	johtaa		johtava	
see	-		katsohan	
is	on		-	
sloping	muodostaa		loivassa kulmassa	
is	on		-	
come over	-		-	
defined	paineluita		rajattujen	
formed	- : -		muotoisten	
had recovered	59 oli taas herra ylitsensä		oli palautunut	
had regained	tultuamme		olimme taas	
hurried about	ryömi nopeasti	54	laskeutui polvilleen kiireen vilkkaa	
are	74 tule	67	no niin	71
smell	-		haista	
strained	-	68	piti ... kireällä	
kept	pani ... juoksemaan		- (piti)	

were scarred ... intersected		löytyikin (runsaasti)		risteilivät ... kuin arvet	
joined	75	yhtyivät		risteyskohdassa	
had been loosened		oli ... lohennut		oli ...irrallaan	72
left		muodostuneet		-	
is		-		-	
were ... astir	80	oli liikkeellä	73	liikkui	76
was ... beginning		oli ... alkanut		avatun	
spoke		todisti		-	
having borne away		-	74	olimme ajautuneet	77
pursued		seurasimme		etsimämme	
go off	81	nousseet		- : -	
's		ei ole		se siitä	
was ... off		olikin ... täydessä menossa		liikkui	
had not ... shown		nopeammin kuin ennen		ennennäkemättömän	
stood		oli	75	asetetun	78
had been brought		oli ... kuljetettu		-	
stood		-		seisoi	
were smeared		olivat taharatut		olivat ... peitossa	
ascending	106	-	97	-	99
was ... put to		-		-	
buttoned		oli kiinni	98	oli napitettu	
were		-		-	
could see		voinut ... nähdä		-	
am acting for	107	olen ... sijassaan		olen ... edusmiehensä	
have		aiotte ... sanoa		-	
was		-		-	
was		-		-	100
must wait		saatte luvan odottaa		- (puuttuu koko lause)	
ain't goin' to lose		en aiokkaan istua täällä ja turhaan kuluttaa		en tuhlaa	
to please		ilmaiseksi		tän takia	
returns		tulee kotiin	99	paluuseen	
made a little run		lähti vauhdilla		pyrähti	
come	108	tulen		tuun	
resumed		sytytimme ... jatkoimme		jatkoimme	
think		pidän		-	