

**Translation of the 3rd Person Singular Pronouns in English and
Finnish**

Paula Suoniemi
University of Tampere
School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies
English Philology
MA Thesis
May 2006

Tampereen yliopisto
Englantilainen filologia
Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos

SUONIEMI, PAULA: Translation of the 3rd Person Singular Pronouns in English and Finnish

Pro gradu –tutkielma, 76 sivua + liitteet (14 sivua)
Toukokuu 2006

Tässä pro gradu –tutkielmassa tarkastellaan yksikön kolmannen persoonan pronomien kääntämistä englannista suomeen ja suomesta englantiin. Mielenkiinto kohdistuu erityisesti suomen yksikön kolmannen persoonan pronomien aiheuttamien monimerkityksisyyksien ratkaisemiseen käännöksissä. Käännöksen tapahtuessa englannista suomeen on kääntäjän tarkkailtava tilanteita, joissa *he:n* tai *she:n* kääntäminen *hän*-pronomilla aiheuttaa epäselvän viittaussuhteen muodostumisen. Suomesta englantiin käännettäessä epäselvyyksiä ei aiheudu aivan yhtä helposti.

Tutkielmassa käytetään kaksikielistä korpusta tarkastelemaan tekstejä, jotka on alun perin kirjoitettu englanniksi ja suomeksi sekä niiden käännöksiä. *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* koostuu sekä fiktiivisestä että ei-fiktiivisestä materiaalista.

Tutkielma osoittaa, että yleisin tapa kääntää yksikön kolmannen persoonan pronomini englannista suomeen ja suomesta englantiin on vastaavan pronominin käyttö. Strategiat monimerkityksisyyksien välttämiseksi ovat samankaltaisia sekä englannissa että suomessa. Ellipsiä käytetään myös toiston välttämiseen. Tehokkain keino torjua monimerkityksisyys on kääntää pronomini substantiivilla tai erisnimellä, jolloin viittaussuhde harvoin on epäselvä. Korpukselta löytyi myös joukko strategioita, joita ei voitu liittää päästrategioihin.

Tutkielmassa tarkastellaan myös topiikin jatkuvuutta tekstissä eli kuinka esimerkiksi henkilöihin viitataan tekstin kuluessa. Jatkovuutta suomessa ja englannissa vertaillaan keskenään, jolloin saadaan laajempi kuva koheesiosta kyseisissä kielissä.

Avainsanat: pronomini, kääntäminen, koheesio, referenssi, kontrastiivinen lingvistiikka, korpuslingvistiikka

Translation of the 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish

Contents

1. Introduction.....	1
1.1 Cohesion.....	4
1.2 Reference.....	6
1.2.1 Textual reference.....	7
1.2.2 Pronoun reference within a text.....	8
1.3 Third person singular pronouns.....	10
1.3.1 <i>he</i> and <i>she</i>	11
1.3.2 <i>hän</i>	13
2. Presentation of data.....	17
2.1 Translation of the masculine 3 rd person singular pronoun into Finnish.....	18
2.2 Translation of the feminine 3 rd person singular pronoun into Finnish.....	20
2.3 Translation of the Finnish 3 rd person singular pronoun into English.....	22
3. Discussion.....	24
3.1 Translation of the English 3 rd person singular pronouns into Finnish.....	24
3.1.1 Pronoun.....	25
3.1.2 Ellipsis.....	28
3.1.3 Noun.....	36
3.1.4 Other strategies.....	41
3.2 Contrastive analysis: <i>he</i> and <i>she</i>	43
3.3 Translation of the Finnish 3 rd person singular pronoun into English.....	45
3.3.1 Pronoun.....	45
3.3.2 Ellipsis.....	47
3.3.3 Noun.....	51
3.3.4 Other strategies.....	55
3.4 Contrastive analysis: English and Finnish.....	57
3.5 Translations as regards genre.....	60
3.6 Topic continuity.....	62
4. Conclusion.....	74
Bibliography	
Appendices	

1. Introduction

Cohesion is an essential part of any language. Cohesive devices tie together pieces of language to form a meaningful and understandable text. There are various cohesive devices available, reference being among the most important ones. The reoccurrence of elements in text, even if in some other form, creates powerful connections between sentences and larger units of text. Reference itself employs more than one method, of which the use of pronouns, especially 3rd person pronouns is well-known. Third person pronouns are used effectively and economically to refer to entities mentioned elsewhere in the text. When translating text from one language to another, one has to be careful to maintain the cohesion within the translated text, as well. With 3rd person pronouns, the problem arises from the fact that while English, for instance, has two 3rd person singular pronouns to distinguish between the two genders, some other language may only have one 3rd person singular pronoun. Finnish, for instance, is a language that employs only one 3rd person singular pronoun, which is used for both genders. Problems of ambiguity may easily arise when translating from English into Finnish, since in situations in which English uses the two 3rd person singular pronouns to distinguish between participants, Finnish has to resort to some other strategy to resolve any possible ambiguities. The problem of ambiguity is possibly not as essential when translating from Finnish into English, but may, nevertheless, need attention from the translator. (See chapters 1.1, 1.2 and 1.3 below for information on cohesion, reference and personal pronouns.)

Thus the topic of this study is the translation of the 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish, particularly from the point of view of problems of ambiguity. The 3rd person pronouns are essential in this matter, since they are clearly cohesive and affect the coherence of the text they are used in, and secondly because of the interesting fact that in English, there are two 3rd person singular pronouns which distinguish the two genders, while Finnish has only one corresponding pronoun. In addition to translation of pronouns, I will also

discuss topic continuity, which is closely connected to the use of pronouns in discourse. The discussion on topic continuity will contrast both English and Finnish, but also an earlier study on topic continuity in written English narratives. The aim of this study is descriptive rather than prescriptive.

The research questions for this study can be stated as follows:

1. How are the English 3rd person singular pronouns *he* and *she* translated into Finnish? Are there any differences between the translation strategies found for the masculine and feminine pronouns?
2. How is the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän* translated into English?
3. What are the similarities and differences in the translation strategies found in the two languages?

To answer the research questions, texts written originally in Finnish or English with their translations in English or Finnish, respectively, will be needed. These are found and most easily handled in a bilingual corpus of the two languages. The material used in this study comes from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* compiled by Robert Cooper at the Department of English at the University of Tampere. (See chapter 2 below.) In the following, I will discuss each of the research questions and present some ways to answer the question.

The three research questions include similar research tasks: finding out the strategies for translating each of the pronouns, and analysing them in terms of similarities and differences. Thus, first of all, a search for the 3rd person singular pronouns *he* and *she* including their inflected forms should be made in a collection of texts originally written in English. This should give an answer to the question of how the English pronouns are translated into Finnish, and similarly a search for *hän* in a collection of texts originally written in Finnish should answer the second research question. When these data have been analysed it should be

possible to compare the strategies found in English and Finnish by looking at the distribution of the strategies.

The issue of translating 3rd person singular pronouns has not, to my knowledge, been researched to any great extent. Research associated with the topic deals with cohesion, reference, and the use of personal pronouns, but translational studies, for instance, often have a larger scope than merely 3rd person singular pronouns. I myself have written two essays on the topic; the first one on the translation of the English 3rd person singular pronouns in Finnish, and the second one on the translation of the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun into English. However, a pro gradu dissertation by Tiina Nilsson in the year 1999 from the Translation Department at the University of Tampere deals with the problems of translating pronominal expressions in English and Finnish. The scope of the dissertation is, nevertheless, rather different from the one at hand, since it focuses largely on the different methods of translation itself and the influence of genre on the translation of pronouns. Thus it could be said that significant inquiries into the translation of 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish have not been made. However, the topic is relevant due to the fact that more and more texts are translated between the two languages, for instance, because of the European Union of which both countries are members. It is important that translations are accurate and unambiguous as regards pronominal reference. Although the aim of this study is purely descriptive, the results might be of assistance to translators of these two languages.

The structure of the study is as follows. Chapter 1 introduces the topic, and discusses relevant issues, such as cohesion, reference and personal pronouns. Chapter 2 offers information on the material and methods of the study, as well as presents the results. In chapter 3, the results are discussed with the help of extracts from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*. Chapter 3.1 deals with the English 3rd person singular pronoun, and chapter 3.2 with the differences found in the translation strategies for the

masculine and feminine pronouns. Chapter 3.3 discusses the strategies found for translating the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun into English, and chapter 3.4 deals with the differences found between the two languages. Chapter 3.5 discusses translation strategies found in the two separate genres, fiction and non-fiction. Finally, chapter 3.6 addresses the question of topic continuity. Chapter 4 concludes the discussion.

In the following, some of the most important linguistic factors connected to the study will be discussed.

1.1 Cohesion

Any piece of language that a reader or hearer judges to be understandable and indeed a text, potentially contains elements that relate to other elements within that same piece of language. In order to fully understand one element the reader or hearer must refer to another element which is semantically related to the first one. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976: 4), these relations within a text actualise the concept of cohesion. Cohesion occurs when there is a relation of presupposition between two or more elements within a text. The meaning of one element is only decodable through reference to another element (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 4). Halliday & Hasan's example [1:14] on page 11 illustrates cohesion in a simple way:

(1.1) He said so.

Although the sentence is grammatical, its interpretation is impossible since the identity of 'he' and what he said is unknown. To solve these problems the reader or hearer must refer to the context. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976: 14) cohesion at its simplest only requires that "the presupposed element is verbally explicit and is found in the immediately preceding sentence." They give an example [1:23]:

(1.2) Did the gardener water my hydrangeas?
-He said so.

In the example, 'he' refers to the gardener and 'so' to 'I watered the hydrangeas.'

Cohesion functions not only as a text-forming device, but also as a tool to simplify the text in order to make it easier for the reader or hearer to keep track of its content (Beaugrande & Dressler 1981: 60). The use of pro-forms – words the content of which is manifested by the word or entity they refer to – may, however, lead to loss of determinacy in that the reference may become unclear. The possible difficulties caused by this fact are, nevertheless, smaller than the benefits gained by the use of pro-forms. The notion of continuity is also of importance. As the same entity or individual is referred to a second time within the same text, there is a sense of stability. This, in turn, strengthens the image of the piece of language as a coherent text.

Halliday & Hasan (1976: 13) state that cohesion is a part of the system of language, and that it operates through resources in the language itself. These resources can be categorised into reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, and lexical cohesion. Bloor & Bloor (1995: 95-101) give good accounts of each of the categories. Reference occurs when the entity referred to, on second mention, is indicated by means other than simply naming it again. These means include the use of a pronoun, a demonstrative or a comparative. Substitution takes place when the entity in question is not repeated, but replaced by another word or group of words, as in the following example (Bloor & Bloor 1995: 96):

(1.3) Would you like *this cake*? Or do you prefer the other *one*?

Quite similar to substitution is ellipsis, which could be thought of as substitution by zero.

Both substitution and ellipsis have three different types – nominal, verbal and clausal. Fourth type of cohesive ties is conjunction, in which conjunctive adjuncts (*then, on the other hand, etc.*) are used to express meaningful relationships between clauses or larger chapters of text.

Finally, lexical cohesion makes use of 'lexical items in discourse where the choice of an item relates to the choices that have gone before' (Bloor & Bloor 1995: 100). Lexical cohesion

may take place through repetition, synonymy, antonymy, collocation or the use of general nouns. Since reference is of importance to this study, it will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

1.2 Reference

As Halliday & Hasan (1976: 31) point out, what makes reference cohesive is continuity - the fact that the same entity appears repeatedly in the same discourse, even if in some other form. Reference sets up a relationship between the current sentence and the previous one if it indeed contains the same referent as the current one (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 281). Cornish (1986: 1) points out that reference is economical since it avoids repetition and redundancy. The properties of referential meaning – the identity of the thing referred to – have raised different opinions. Brown & Yule (1983: 28) quote Strawson's (1950) idea that 'reference' as such can not do anything, but that an expression may be used to set up a reference. Brown & Yule state further that reference can be thought of as an action performed by the writer or speaker. Brown & Yule (1983: 200) also criticise Halliday & Hasan's approach to reference as links between words and maintain that the link can actually be found between a reference and a mental representation of the discourse that the processors have established in their mind. However, Halliday & Hasan (1976: 31) do take a similar approach to reference by saying:

In the case of reference the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to...

Beaugrande & Dressler (1981: 109) also take a more psychological viewpoint by saying that "expressions activate knowledge." Cornish (1986: 134), on the other hand, consider reference "a communicative function", in which both speakers or writers and their addressees participate.

1.2.1 Textual reference

Reference may be situational or textual; in other words, exophoric or endophoric, respectively. However, only endophoric reference is cohesive since exophoric reference does not help integrate passages into a coherent piece of text (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 37).

Exophoric reference, nevertheless, does affect the creation of text by creating a link between the language and the situation. Endophoric reference may be further divided into anaphoric and cataphoric reference depending on the direction of the reference. According to Beaugrande & Dressler (1981: 61), in cataphoric reference, the pro-form occurs before the expression co-referring with it, so that the direction of the reference is forwards. Halliday & Hasan (1976: 75) point out that there are limitations to cataphora; only the demonstratives *this*, *these* and *here* can be said to be clearly cataphoric cohesive. Personals, for instance, are cataphoric normally in situations in which the reference is determined by the structure of the sentence itself, and because of the lack of textual link, are not cohesive. See example (1.4):

(1.4) He who hesitates is lost.

in which *he* refers forward to *who hesitates* (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 56). The pronoun *it* may be used cataphorically cohesively if it is text-referring, as in (1.5):

(1.5) I would never have believed *it*. They've accepted the whale scheme.

Quirk et al. (1985: 351) mention that when cataphoric reference is possible, so is anaphoric reference, as well. Thus, a sentence with cataphoric reference may be rephrased as a sentence with anaphoric reference and vice versa. However, cataphoric reference is often associated with formal written English, such as in (1.6) below:

(1.6) Before *he* joined the Navy, Gerard made peace with his family.

In anaphoric reference, the pro-form occurs after the co-referring element, so that the direction of the reference is backwards. According to Beaugrande & Dressler (1981: 60),

anaphora is the most typical direction of reference. While cataphoric reference should take place within reasonable limits, a sentence for instance, anaphoric reference may occur over larger distances. The presupposed element may be in the immediately preceding sentence, but also in some earlier one (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 14). Anaphoric reference chains, i.e. sequences of links between an anaphor and its antecedent, have great effect on the continuity and thus cohesion of a text (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 1457). See (1.7) below:

(1.7) *My daughter* tells me that *her* car has been giving *her* a lot of trouble recently. *She* thinks *she* may have to start cycling to work.

In (1.7), each of the italicised nouns functions as both an anaphor and an antecedent. For instance, the pronoun *she* in the beginning of the second sentence, functions as an antecedent to the following *she*, and as an anaphor to the preceding *her*. And since all of these anaphors refer to the same person as their antecedents, all of them have the same reference and form an anaphoric reference chain. *Iso suomen kielioppi* (2004: 1382) points out that a reference chain may include also, for instance, ellipsis, proper noun or a generic noun (e.g. *man*, *girl*). The elements affecting the choice of anaphor or some other cohesive device will be discussed in more detail in chapter 1.2.2 below.

Anaphoric and cataphoric reference can both be manifested by the use of personals (through the category of person), demonstratives (by means of location and proximity) or comparatives (by identity or similarity). Personals will be discussed in more detail in chapter 1.3 below.

1.2.2 Pronoun reference within a text

In this chapter, the ways context affects the choice of pronoun or some other cohesive device will be briefly discussed.

By a basic rule, the introduction of a new character is made by nominal reference, i.e. a common noun or a proper noun, and any following references to the same person are made

with a pronoun (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997: 98). This rule may be broken only when there is confusion of 'who is who'. It may be assumed that this happens fairly often in English-Finnish translation because of the lack of gender distinction in Finnish. The English version is acceptable even when there are only pronouns, but the Finnish translation needs to separate the two sexes by using nominal reference. A problem in English, as well, is encountered when two persons of the same sex are closely involved. Fox (1987a: 171) says that in such cases "a full nominal reference seems to be the norm for the character who becomes the grammatical subject of a clause". One more point to be made about basic rules of pronoun choice, is the centrality of the character. The protagonist is usually referred to pronominally, and all secondary characters nominally (Georgakopoulou and Goutsos 1997, 99). Additionally, all characters may be nominalised despite their context.

Georgakopoulou and Goutsos (1997: 98) make an interesting remark about a change that occurs in the function of pronouns and other reference forms. They state that reference forms are no longer just "links between successive clauses", but more importantly, they function as "signals of discourse units". This suggests that a choice between a pronoun and a common noun or proper noun represents change in the discourse structure. For instance, changes in narrative action or attention can be highlighted with nominal use where pronominal use would otherwise be the norm (id.: 99). Similarly, nominal reference can be used to emphasise disagreement or cooperation between characters (id.: 100).

Fox has studied discourse structure and the use of pronouns extensively (see e.g. Fox 1987a and 1987b). In Fox's view, the choice of pronoun is to large extent affected by what the characters are involved in. For instance, a full noun phrase reference is used if a character begins planning and performing an action (1987b: 162). Full noun phrases are also used when two characters do not interact directly with each other (Fox 1987b: 165). Pronouns, on the other hand, may be used when characters are involved in a fight, for instance, or some other

fast-paced interaction. However, if the characters are of the same sex, the other must be referred to with a full NP (Fox 1987b: 171). According to Fox (1987b: 163-4) pronouns are also used when two references to the same character are interrupted by, for instance, describing the scenery, or an introduction of another character as long as that character remains passive.

Fox (1987b: 168) further argues that the hierarchical structure of the text also has an effect on the choice of pronoun. For instance, a full NP where one would have expected a pronoun may signal a change in the structure of the text. In short, full NPs are found in the beginning of a new discourse unit, and pronouns in other, non-initial positions.

1.3 Third person singular pronouns

Personals are referents which, in a speech situation, specify the role or function of the element that they refer to (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 44.) Figure 1 below shows how the category of person may be divided into speech roles and other roles. The speech roles can further be divided into speaker (*I, we*) and addressee (*you*), which are not cohesive since they refer to the situation outside of text (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 48). The other roles of the category of person include specific reference in the singular and plural (*they*), and the generalised reference to human beings (*one*). The specific singular use can further be divided into human and non-human reference – the human male referent being *he*, the human female referent being *she*, and the non-human referent being *it*. According to Halliday & Hasan (1976: 49), third person reference is typically textual and therefore it is also cohesive.

Person	Speech roles	Speaker	Speaker only <i>I</i>			
			Speaker plus <i>we</i>			
		Addressee(s) <i>you</i>				
	Other roles	Specific	Singular	Human	Male <i>he</i>	
				Non-human <i>it</i>	Female <i>she</i>	
			Plural <i>they</i>			
Generalised human <i>one</i>						

Figure 1. Person

Quirk et al. (1985: 340) say that 3rd person pronouns refer to third parties, that is participants other than speaker/writer and addressee (similar to Halliday and Hasan's 'other roles' above). Participants referred to with 3rd person pronouns are not 'involved in the origination or reception of the utterance' in which they are being referred to.

Halliday & Hasan (1976: 54) point out that the syntactic function of the personal or its referent makes no difference to the relation between them. Thus, the three categories of personals – personal pronouns, possessive pronouns and possessive determiners – function similarly. Quirk et al. (1985: 335) define pronouns as a set of closed-class words with nominal function. In other words, there is a fixed number of pronouns, which function like a noun phrase.

In the following chapters, the usage of the 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish will be discussed.

1.3.1 *he* and *she*

According to the *Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*, the 3rd person singular pronouns *he* and *she* refer to male and female persons already mentioned or otherwise known. Quirk et al. (1985: 342) point out that the connection between sex and gender in English is

very close, so that the sex of the person referred to affects to the choice of masculine or feminine pronoun:

(1.8) Fred looked at *himself* in the mirror.

(1.9) Freda looked at *herself* in the mirror.

However, in literary English the masculine pronoun may be used generically, to refer to both sexes when the sex is not determined (Quirk et al. 1985:342):

(1.10) Everyone thinks *he* has a right to be here.

Quirk et al. (1985: 342) mention further that the use of this generic *he* may be avoided by the use of the plural 3rd person pronoun *they* in informal language.

The personal gender (*he/she*) is used to refer to ‘a being felt to possess characteristics associated with a member of the human race’ (Quirk et al. 1985: 341), otherwise the nonpersonal gender (*it*) is used. The definition of ‘person’ may also include supernatural beings (gods, fairies, etc.) and higher animals. In addition, Christophersen and Sandved (1969: 55) mention that certain specific animals are often referred to as *he* or as *she*, irrespective of their sex. Thus a dog is often referred to as *he*, and a cat as *she*. Miller and Swift (1982: 58), on the other hand, prefer the use of *it* in such cases, since it is ‘not offensive to animals’ and simultaneously gives no misinformation about the sex of the animal. It should also be noted that persons may be referred to with nonpersonal reference. According to Quirk et al. (1985: 316), a baby or a child may be referred to as *it* when there is no personal relationship to the child, or there is a need to ignore sex distinctions, for instance, in scientific context:

(1.11) A child learns to speak the language of *its* environment.

The nonpersonal pronoun *it* may be replaced by *she* to show affection or familiarity. Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 488) state that this use of *she* is found especially with reference to ships:

(1.12) The Titanic sank on *her* / *its* maiden voyage.

Another case where *it* may be replaced by *he* or *she* is that of personification, which is common in informal use. Quirk et al (1985: 341) state that personification is found commonly especially in poetry and fiction, where nearly any object may be referred to with personal reference. For instance, a computer may be referred to as *he*, or a car as *she*. It should also be noted that countries, when they are considered as political units, may be referred to with *she* (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 488):

(1.13) This country / England has no sense of *her* / *its* place in the world.

There are two sets of possessive pronouns in English; the first set for a determinative function, and the second set functions independently as noun phrases (Quirk et al. 1985: 361). The possessive pronouns for the masculine 3rd person singular are *his* and *his*, and for the feminine *her* and *hers*:

(1.14) *her* book vs. This book is *hers*.

1.3.2 *hän*

In Finnish, the use of the 3rd person singular pronoun is somewhat simpler than in English. There is no distinction of gender, the only form being *hän*:

(1.15) *Hän* on näyttelijä. → *He/she* is an actor.

However, in colloquial language the 3rd person singular pronoun is often replaced by the demonstrative pronoun *se* (White 1997: 122):

(1.16) Tämä on kaverini Kalle. *Se* asuu Vantaalla.

The following example from a novel by Eeva Joenpelto shows that in Finnish, *se* may also be used of babies, even if their sex is known, unlike in English (see 1.3.1 above). The effect of this in the extract is to emphasize Helmi's hesitant feelings towards the baby – the baby is merely an object for her:

- (1.17) Helmi teki parhaansa, hölskytti vanhaa kylmää maitoa pullossa ja tökötti sitä suuhun, mitä *hän* muuta voi. Kun poika yhä vain kuopi ilmaa pisti Helmi pullanpalan *sen* kuivien ikenien väliin ja piteli siinä, lapsi imi sitä silmänympärystä ponnistuksesta turvoten. (*Neito kulkee vetten päällä*: 1955)

In Finnish, animals are nearly always referred to using *se* (White 1997: 121):

- (1.18) Minulla on pieni kissa. *Sen* nimi on Misse.

Sometimes when the speaker feels very strong affection, an animal may be referred to as *hän*. However, no examples of this were found in the material, and thus on-line sources were consulted:

- (1.19) Kake on avustajakoira ja *hänen* omistajansa on pyörätuolissa. (www.kotiposti.net)

In the case of inanimate objects and personification the most obvious pronoun choice would be *se*:

- (1.20) Auto ja *sen* anastajat löytyivät Turusta.

However, *Nyky-suomen sanakirja* (1980) does list *hän* as a possibility:

- (1.21) Kavahtakoot *häntä*, kuningas Humalaa!

In Finnish, the names of countries are always referred to using *se*:

- (1.22) Iso-Britannia ja *sen* siirtomaat eivät julkaisseet häiden kunniaksi postimerkkejä lainkaan. (www.uta.fi)

A further remark should be made on the Finnish possessive suffix, which is used together with a possessive pronoun on certain occasions:

- (1.23) *minun* kissani

Iso suomen kielioppi (2004: 1238) points out that in colloquial and newspaper language, the possessive pronoun may be omitted if there is an element mentioned earlier in the text with which the possessive suffix correlates. This is common with reference to relatives:

(1.24) Ei *sillä* juuri nuottikorvaa ole, vaikka isäläns on ollu hyä.

In (1.24), the possessive pronoun modifying the noun *isä* has been omitted, since the pronoun *sillä* in the beginning of the sentence refers to the same person and thus correlates with the possessive suffix *-ns*.

Another instance in which 3rd person singular pronouns are commonly omitted, is recurring reference to the same presupposed element (*Iso suomen kielioppi* 2004: 1370). In other words, when the same, especially animate, element is being referred to continuously, the recurring pronouns may be omitted. See (1.25) below:

(1.25) *Kauko* tuli tenderistä halko käsissä. *Hän* polkaisi luukun auki ja Ø nakkasi puun pesään.

In (1.25), *Kauko* is first referred to with the 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*, but the following reference is with ellipsis. In *Iso suomen kielioppi* (2004: 1371) it is pointed out that the omission of the pronoun is possible only if the pronoun is in subject position and the reference is unambiguous. It is also common that the following sentence begins with a verb phrase, as in (1.25) above.

The differences between the English and Finnish 3rd person singular pronouns are illustrated in table 1 below:

Table 1. 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish

Referent	English pronoun	Finnish pronoun
Male person	<i>he</i>	<i>hän/se*</i>
Female person	<i>she</i>	
Male animal	<i>he/it</i>	<i>se/hän</i>
Female animal	<i>she/it</i>	
Inanimate objects	<i>it/he/she</i>	<i>se/hän</i>
Personification	<i>he/she</i>	<i>se/hän</i>
Names of countries	<i>she/it</i>	<i>se</i>

*colloquial

It is clear from the table above that English with its three-way division between masculine, feminine and neuter makes far more distinctions than Finnish, both with human and non-human referents. This in turn means that the 3rd person singular pronouns in Finnish (*hän, se*) are potentially far more ambiguous than their English equivalents.

2. Presentation of data

In this chapter, the material and methods used in this research will be presented. In addition, the findings of the research will be stated.

The material used in this study comes from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* compiled by Robert Cooper at the Department of English at the University of Tampere. *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* contains about half a million words of both fictional and non-fictional material. The fictional material consists of long extracts from four English and four Finnish novels and their translations published from the 1950's onwards. The non-fictional material consists of newspaper articles and history text books with their translations. (See Appendices 1 and 2 for further information.)

Although offering plenty of material, there were some difficulties in the use of *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*, mainly due to the fact that I had no access to the equipment necessary for the effective handling of the material. Also, the lack of any general tool for bilingual corpus material meant that a large amount of almost manual work was needed, first of all, to find the relevant matches, i.e. the pronouns *he*, *she* and *hän*. Searches were done in all four categories – English fiction and non-fiction and Finnish fiction and non-fiction – and findings will also be briefly discussed with reference to category. However, the main focus will be on the pronouns in general, regardless of the category they appear in. Several search keys were used to ensure that every occurrence would be found. (See appendix 3 for further information.) The sorting was done with the Microsoft Word – program with the help of different colour codes. After sorting the different strategies, the occurrences of each strategy were counted and placed in tables so that the distribution of the strategies could be more easily seen. The percentages were also counted at this point. Next, I printed out all of the extracts found in the less common strategies and every second page of

the main strategies except the ones in which the translation was a pronoun. This was done simply because I felt it easier to analyse the extracts on paper than on a computer screen. The strategy of translating with a pronoun was not printed due to the fact that the file was very large and, on the other hand, most of the extracts were of no particular interest. Only half of each of the main strategies were printed because the files were large. Thus only half of the extracts in which the translation was a proper noun, ellipsis, or ellipsis and possessive suffix were analysed. Nevertheless, the analysed material alone is substantial, so that it may be assumed to be representation of all of the material. The analysis of the material, in short, involved studying the extracts so that a reason for the translation strategy used in each case could be found. However, the reason for choosing a particular strategy was not clear on every occasion. Each category of a translation strategy proved to have a couple of more prominent reasons and some less commonly used. In most cases, I only noted the more prominent ones, because the less commonly used could, for instance, all come from a single translator and thus not represent the true situation.

In the following chapters, the strategies found for translating each of the three pronouns will be presented. They will be more closely discussed in chapter 3.

2.1 Translation of the masculine 3rd person singular pronoun into Finnish

As could be expected, the most common strategy for translating the masculine 3rd person singular pronoun *he* into Finnish was with the pronoun *hän*. See table 2 below.

Table 2. Translations of *he*

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male person	Pronoun	1445	56,3%
	Ellipsis	679	26,4%
	Noun	418	16,3%
	Other	25	1%
Total		2567	100%

More than half of the cases found in the corpus were translated with the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*. The category of pronoun also contains a few instances of the pronoun *tämä*. The second most typical solution was ellipsis, in which there is no element in the translation to be found corresponding to the original element. Ellipsis counts for one fourth of all the cases studied. A third substantial strategy with 16 per cent was the use of noun, including both common noun and proper noun. Lastly, a small amount of the findings do not match any of the strategies found. They will be discussed in chapter 3.1 below.

The situation described above does not change remarkably if we look at the strategies found with regard to genre, i.e fiction and non-fiction. Especially the strategies found in fictional writing seem to correspond very closely to the overall situation. The difference in the use of ellipsis and noun seems to diminish – fewer cases of ellipsis and more nouns were found in fictional writing as opposed to the overall situation. (See table 3 below.)

Table 3. Translations of *he* in fictional writing

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male person	Pronoun	836	57,2%
	Ellipsis	322	22%
	Noun	289	19,8%
	Other	14	1%
Total		1461	100%

However, in non-fictional writing, there seems to be a much stronger trend towards favouring ellipsis over the use of noun. A third of all the instances of *he* found in the non-fictional writings were translated with ellipsis, while a common or proper noun was used in about every tenth instance of *he*. (See table 4 below.)

Table 4. Translations of *he* in non-fictional writing

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male person	Pronoun	609	55%
	Ellipsis	357	32,3%
	Noun	129	11,7%
	Other	11	1%
Total		1106	100%

2.2 Translation of the feminine 3rd person singular pronoun into Finnish

The strategies found for translating the feminine 3rd person singular pronoun *she* were rather similar to the ones regarding the masculine pronoun. See table 5 below.

Table 5. Translations of *she*

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Female person	Pronoun	939	47,7%
	Ellipsis	550	28%
	Noun	424	21,6%
	Other	53	2,7%
Total		1966	100%

A little less than half of the instances with *she* found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* were translated with the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*. The second most common solution is ellipsis, and the third most common strategy is the use of a noun. Indeed, the only remarkable difference between the strategies of translating the masculine and feminine pronouns can be found in the proportion of the use *hän* and a noun. The use of the Finnish pronoun *hän* seems to be somewhat more common when translating the masculine pronoun, *he*, whereas nouns are found more often in the translation of the feminine pronoun, *she*. (See table 6 below.)

Table 6. Translations by a pronoun or noun

	Pronoun	Noun
Male	56,3%	16,3%
Female	47,7%	21,6%

A look at the strategies with regard to genre shows that the situation is very similar to the one regarding the masculine pronoun *he*. Again, the strategies found in fictional writing correspond very closely to the overall situation. (See table 7 below.)

Table 7. Translations of *she* in fictional writing

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Female person	Pronoun	713	47,6%
	Ellipsis	419	28%
	Noun	356	23,7%
	Other	11	0,7%
Total		1499	100%

The anomaly in the strategies found in non-fictional writing (see table 8 below.) – the large proportion of other strategies – is largely explained by the feminine 3rd person singular pronoun being used to denote countries (see chapter 1.3.1 above and chapter 3.1.4 below).

Table 8. Translations of *she* in non-fictional writing

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Female person	Pronoun	226	48,4%
	Ellipsis	131	28%
	Noun	68	14,6%
	Other	42	9%
Total		467	100%

2.3 Translation of the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun into English

A large proportion of all the occurrences of *hän* in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* were translated with a corresponding 3rd person singular pronoun in English, i.e. *he* or *she*. (See table 9 below.)

Table 9. Translations of *hän*

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Pronoun	1200	84,4%
	Ellipsis	140	9,8%
	Noun	37	2,6%
	Other	45	3,2%
Total		1422	100%

The percentage of pronouns is as large as 84 per cent. The second most common strategy, ellipsis, is only used in ten per cent of all of the instances with *hän*. Use of a common or a proper noun is not very frequent in Finnish-English translation. The other strategies found for translating *hän* into English, as well as the main strategies, will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.3 below.

As with the English 3rd person singular pronouns, the strategies found for translating the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun in fictional writing are very similar to the overall situation. (See table 10 below.)

Table 10. Translations of *hän* in fictional writing

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Pronoun	962	84,1%
	Ellipsis	124	10,8%
	Noun	24	2,1%
	Other	34	3%
Total		1144	100%

However, translation of *hän* in non-fictional writing shows more deviation. Ellipsis is used much less frequently, whereas there is an increase in the use of a pronoun or noun. (See table 11 below.)

Table 11. Translations of *hän* in non-fictional writing

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Pronoun	238	85,6%
	Ellipsis	16	5,8%
	Noun	13	4,7%
	Other	11	3,9%
Total		278	100%

3. Discussion

The English 3rd person singular pronouns will be discussed together in chapter 3.1. This is due to the fact that there were no major differences found in the translation of the masculine and feminine pronouns, which is rather unexpected when compared to my previous study into the same topic (see chapter 1 above). By dealing with the two pronouns together one can avoid repetition. However, the existing differences will be discussed separately in chapter 3.2.

Chapter 3.3 deals with the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*. The translation strategies of the English and Finnish pronouns will be compared in chapter 3.4, and chapter 3.5 addresses the question of genre. Finally, chapter 3.6 discusses topic continuity.

3.1 Translation of the English 3rd person singular pronouns into Finnish

Since the differences found in the strategies for translating the English 3rd person singular pronouns *he* and *she* into Finnish were rather small, it is more appropriate and economical to deal with the pronouns together. Table 12 below shows the figures from table 2. Translations of *he* and table 5. Translations of *she* added up. As can be seen, the figures do not differ significantly from the original ones, so that, for instance, the order of the strategies is the same.

Table 12. Translations of the English 3rd person singular pronouns

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Pronoun	2384	52,6%
	Ellipsis	1229	27,1%
	Noun	842	18,6%
	Other	78	1,7%
Total		4533	100%

3.1.1 Pronoun

Roughly half of all the instances of the English 3rd person singular pronouns *he* and *she* found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* have been translated with the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*. A small amount of the pronoun *tämä* was also found. Table 13 below shows the proportion of the two pronouns in relation to the overall situation:

Table 13. The category of Pronoun.

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	<i>hän</i>	2326	51,3%
	<i>tämä</i>	58	1,3%
Total		2384	52,6%

Pronouns are used to create cohesive ties within texts by reference to a presupposed element in a preceding sentence (see chapter 1.2 above). See examples (3.1) and (3.2) below:

(3.1) The priest scrambled off and began to laugh. *He* was feeling happy.

(P&G 2:1a:7-8)

Pappi kompuroi sen selästä ja alkoi nauraa. *Hän* oli onnellinen.

(3.2) Dorothy Fairfield, 75, a former teacher in the West Midlands, was married in 1951 at the age of 24. *She* was among the last of her friends to wed.

(ST 2003 1:8:35-36)

Dorothy Fairfield, 75, entinen opettajatar, meni naimisiin 24-vuotiaana vuonna 1951. *Hän* oli ystäväpiirinsä viimeisiä avioliiton satamaan purjehtijoita.

In (3.1) and (3.2), a person mentioned in the previous sentence – *the priest* in (3.1) and *Dorothy Fairfield* in (3.2) – is referred to with a personal pronoun. This is the most typical case of anaphoric reference (see chapter 1.2 above). There is no need to alter anything in the translation since this cohesive device is common in both languages. Similarly, it is possible in both languages for a pronoun to refer to a presupposed element which occurs earlier in the

text than in the previous sentence. In other words, the anaphoric reference chain may be longer than only one or two sentences, as in (3.3) and (3.4) below:

- (3.3) For *he* had got over despair too. *He* was a bad priest, *he* knew it:
(P&G 2:1a:38-39)
Sillä *hän* oli sivuuttanut epätoivonkin. *Hän* oli huono pappi, *hän* tiesi sen,
- (3.4) But *she* was not interested in the finished product. *She* "didn't much care for reading," *she* said.
(1984 2:3:84-85)
Mutta viimeistelty tuote ei enää herättänyt *hänen* mielenkiintoaan. Niin kuin *hän* itse sanoi, *hän* ei välittänyt lukemisesta.

The pronouns in example (3.3) actually refer to *the priest* and *pappi* in (3.1), so that the anaphoric reference chain includes roughly 30 sentences thus far and actually continues until sentence 64, in which the priest is referred to with a noun (*father*). Thus the anaphoric reference chain is as long as nearly 60 sentences altogether, although not all of the sentences contain reference to the character. Also, two other characters are referred to in the text, but nevertheless, reference to the priest continues to be done by a pronoun. Only when a woman addresses the priest, a noun is used and the anaphoric reference chain is broken. Similarly, the pronouns in (3.4) refer to *Julia* in extract 1984 2:3:75; thus the anaphoric reference chain is ten sentences thus far. For the second time Julia is named in the original in extract 1984 2:3:112, and in Finnish a few sentences earlier in extract 1984 2:3:107 after a conversation with another character. Thus the anaphoric reference chain is about 30 sentences long altogether. See appendix 4 for full extracts.

It can be said that pronouns are used in the translation unless there is a reason to clarify the reference. Ambiguity arises in situations with more than one participant, since the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun cannot distinguish between a larger amount of participants on its own. See (3.5) below:

- (3.5) "Bite it," *she* said. *He* bit and began to weep.
(P&G 2:1b:155-156)
- Puraiskaa sitä, *hän* sanoi. *Hän* puraisi ja alkoi itkeä.

Since both the feminine and masculine pronouns have been translated with the pronoun *hän*, the translation is ambiguous. It is uncertain whether the pronouns refer to the same person or not. However, there are other factors which will help the reader to decide who is being referred to with the second occurrence of *hän*. These factors will not be discussed in this study. In example (3.6) below, there are two masculine 3rd person singular pronouns which have both been translated with the pronoun *hän*.

- (3.6) They badly mauled Ismail, severely injured him. *He* was declared dead after being taken to hospital," *he* said.
(REUTERS 4:5:8-9)
Ne raatelivat Ismailin pahoin ja vahingoittivat tätä vakavasti. Sairaalassa *hänet* julistettiin kuolleeksi," *hän* sanoi.

In this case, however, there is no danger of ambiguity in the translation or in the original, since the pronouns clearly refer to different persons. This can be inferred from the fact that the second person is actually reciting a happening in which the first person is involved in.

The corpus also contained a few instances of *tämä*, which is a rather important pronoun in Finnish. When there are two persons mentioned in a sentence, the subject is referred to as *hän*, and the other person with *tämä* (White 1997, 122). Example (3.7) shows that the subject, *hän*, is still *hän* in the second clause, whereas the object, *tyttö*, has been replaced by *tämä*, not by *hän* or *tyttö*, which would make the second clause ambiguous or repetitive:

- (3.7) He moved towards her with infinite caution, as if *she* were an animal who distrusted him.
(P&G 2:1b:479-480)
Hän lähestyi tyttöä äärettömän varovaisesti, ikään kuin *tämä* olisi ollut eläin, joka ei luottanut häneen.

Unlike *hän*, the pronoun *tämä* may not be used repeatedly more than perhaps twice (*Iso suomen kielioppi* 2004: 1372). After *tämä*, the reference is usually made with *hän*. See (3.8) below, in which the first reference is with *tämä* and the following with *hän*:

- (3.8) Their attachment to the person of Fox until *his* death in 1806, and to *his* memory afterwards, was one of the accidental circumstances which moulded the course of English politics. Fox was made to be loved by his friends.
(TREV 4:196-197)
Heidän kiintymyksensä Foxiin *tämän* kuolemaan asti (1806) ja jälkeenpäin *hänen* muistonsa oli eräs niitä satunnaisia seikkoja, jotka vaikuttivat Englannin politiikan kehityskulkuun. Fox oli luotu ystävien rakastettavaksi.

Laitinen (2005; 76) claims that *tämä* is commonly used in contrast to *hän* to distinguish between ambiguous references to human beings when translating into Finnish from languages with two separate 3rd person singular pronouns, such as English. However, the data collected from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* does not offer much support for this claim. A little more than one per cent of all the instances of translating *he* or *she* into Finnish, were in fact translated with *tämä*, but this amount is too low to consider it a feature used commonly. It must be taken into account, however, that most of the material in the corpus originates from the 1950's and 1960's so that it is possible that the situation today is indeed similar to what Laitinen claims.

In conclusion, the most common strategy for translating the English 3rd person singular pronouns *he* and *she* into Finnish is a pronoun, usually *hän* but in some cases also *tämä*. The Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun is normally used when there is no danger of ambiguity in the translation. The pronoun *tämä* may be used to clarify ambiguous references.

3.1.2 Ellipsis

The second most common strategy for translating the pronouns *he* and *she* into Finnish is ellipsis, or the absence of any translated element corresponding to the original pronoun.

Ellipsis is indeed a rather important strategy for translating a 3rd person singular pronoun – more than 25 per cent of all the instances with *he* or *she* were translated with nothing. It was possible to distinguish at least three different types of ellipsis according to how the translation has been changed from the original clause. See table 14 below for the different types of ellipsis and their distribution.

Table 14. The category of Ellipsis.

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Ellipsis+ possessive suffix	559	12,3%
	Ellipsis	502	11,1%
	Contracted sentence	168	3,7%
Total		1229	27,1%

In the following chapters, each of the groups will be discussed in more detail. In the extracts, Ø stands for the omitted translation.

(a) Ellipsis + possessive suffix

In the largest group (12 per cent) within all the cases of ellipsis, the pronoun has not been translated at all and a 3rd person singular possessive suffix has been added to the head noun.

See examples (3.9) and (3.10) below:

- (3.9) Miriam was startled. She heard him putting *his* bicycle in the stable underneath, and talking to Jimmy, who had been a pit-horse and who was seedy.
(S&L D:108-109)
Miriam oli hämmästynyt. Hän kuuli Paulin asettavan Ø pyöränsä huoneen alla olevaan talliin ja juttelevan Jimmylle, entiselle, loppuun kuluneelle kaivoshevosele.
- (3.10) Maria was to be - already was - a famous singer, and Jackie the singing and piano-playing wife of a rich Greek shipowner. When Maria returned to *her* dressing-room in the first interval of Tosca, her mother was waiting for her.
(CALLAS 3:151-152)
*** Marian palatessa Ø pukuhuoneeseensa Toscan väliajoilla Evangelia oli siellä odottamassa häntä.

This type of translation in the case of ownership is, in fact, rather expected in Finnish (see chapter 1.3.2 above). Indeed, if the noun phrase *his bicycle* in (3.9) had been translated into Finnish as *hänen pyöränsä*, the meaning would be ambiguous so that the Finnish sentence would suggest that the bicycle Paul put in the stable could be either his or Miriam's.

Similarly, if there was a pronoun in the Finnish translation of (3.10), the reference could be to

Maria's dressing-room but also it could belong to someone else. So, first of all, ellipsis is a strategy for avoiding ambiguity. However, in some cases with possessive forms the pronoun can not be left out of the translation, as in (3.11) below:

- (3.11) advising blue chip companies on how to avoid fraud and designing tamper-free payroll cheques. He even lectures at the FBI Academy in Virginia without charge - *his* way of repaying his debt to society.
(ST 2003 1:1:26-27)
joka opastaa arvopapereita valmistavia yrityksiä estämään huijauksia ja suunnittelee palkkashekkejä, joita on mahdotonta peukaloida. Hän jopa luennoi ilmaiseksi FBI:n akatemiassa Virginiassa - se on *hänen* tapansa maksaa velkansa yhteiskunnalle.

In this case, the possessive pronoun must be translated, because there is no previous mention of the person in question in that particular clause. For instance, in examples (3.12) and (3.13) below, there is a mention of the person in the same clause (although in (3.13) it has been omitted in both the original and the translation):

- (3.12) And beyond went woods and hills, right away to the pale grey heights of the Pennine Chain. Paul looked down the garden for *his* mother.
(S&L C:180-181)
Taempänä alkoivat metsät ja kukkulat ulottuen etäällä siintäviin Pennine Chainin harjanteisiin saakka. Paul etsi puutarhasta Ø äitiään.
- (3.13) Surely there could never have been a time when that seemed ordinary? Julia woke up, rubbed *her* eyes, and raised herself on *her* elbow to look at the oilstove.
(1984 2:4:187-188)
Ei kai toki milloinkaan ole ollut sellaista aikaa, jolloin tämä kuului säännölliseen elämänjärjestykseen? Julia heräsi, hieraisi Ø silmiään, kohottautui Ø kyynärpänsä varaan ja vilkaisi öljykeittimeen päin.

Examples (3.12) and (3.13) above can be looked at for another reason also. It seems that the possessive pronoun is commonly left out with relatives and body parts. Indeed, Quirk et al. (1985: 270) mention that with reference to body parts, a possessive pronoun is often replaced by the definite article *the*. This suggests that references to parts of the body found in the data represent less typical instances.

(b) Ellipsis

The second largest group – only slightly smaller than the largest group – within the category of ellipsis consists of translations with ellipsis only, that is, the pronoun has not been

translated and nothing else has been added to the clause. Examples (3.14) and (3.15) below show that references to relatives and body parts were found also in this group:

- (3.14) Jack Nicholson arrives looking as if he has stepped straight from one of the vast billboards advertising his latest film along Sunset Strip. Hair is swept back, devil's eyebrows ride high, a sleek pair of shades hides *his* eyes and a smile is fixed around a cigar.
(ST 2003 5:5:4-5)
Kun Jack Nicholson saapuu haastatteluun, näyttää siltä kuin hän olisi astunut suoraan ulos tuoreinta elokuvaansa mainostavasta jättijulisteesta, joita on rivissä Los Angelesin Sunset Stripin varrella. Tukka on suittu taakse, paholaismaiset kulmakarvat ovat koholla, kapeat aurinkolasit piilottavat Ø silmät, ja virnuilevassa suupielessä käryää sikari.
- (3.15) But he had come into her life before she made any mark on his. One dull afternoon, when the men were on the land and the rest at school, only Miriam and *her* mother at home, the girl said to him, after having hesitated for some time: "Have you seen the swing?"
(S&L B:49-50)
Mutta Paul oli astunut Miriamin elämään jo aikoja ennen kuin Miriam merkitsi Paulille mitään. Eräänä koleana iltana, kun miehet olivat pellolla ja pojat koulussa sekä vain Miriam ja Ø äiti kotona, sanoi Miriam hetken epäroityään Paulille: - Oletko nähnyt keinun?

Another situation in which ellipsis seems to be favoured is when there is a need in Finnish to generalise. That is, for one reason or another the Finnish translation has opted for a more general sense of the word in question by omitting the personal pronoun. See (3.16) and (3.17) below:

- (3.16) He couldn't believe that he hadn't recognised her. It was making light of *his* mortal sin:
(P&G 2:1a:220-221)
Hän ei voinut uskoa, ettei hän olisi tuntenut tyttöä. Sellainen oli Ø kuolemansynnin väheksymistä,
- (3.17) The next summer she repeated Tosca, this time announced in her own right. The reports *about her* became more lyrical, enthusiastic and wild with every performance,
(CALLAS 3:158-159)
Seuraavana kesänä Maria esiintyi jälleen Toscassa, tällä kertaa omissa nimissään. Lehtikirjoitukset Ø kävivät esitys esitykseltä lyyrisemmiksi, innostuneemmiksi ja hurjemmiksi

In (3.16), the possessive pronoun has been omitted to bring out a more general sense of the noun phrase *mortal sin*. The reference in the Finnish translation is not to any particular person, but rather to mortal sin in general. Similarly, in (3.17), the prepositional phrase *about her* has been left out, so that in Finnish, the noun phrase *lehtikirjoitukset* is in a very general

sense. Nevertheless, in my opinion, there is an understanding that the reports indeed concern Maria Callas, even if the connection is not spelled out in the text.

The kind of ellipsis discussed next might be considered different to those discussed above, but will nevertheless be dealt with here. In some cases, a verb phrase containing the pronoun has been omitted altogether. This occurs when there is another verb phrase in the same sentence, so that this other verb phrase extends to include the complement of the omitted verb phrase, as well. In other words, a verb phrase may be omitted because another one functions in a similar manner. See (3.18) below:

- (3.18) In an interview with "Good Morning America," Pham said he prayed to God during his ordeal, asking: "Let me go right away. Don't let me stay like this." The rainwater *he drank* and sea creatures that sustained him, as well as his rescue by the Navy frigate McClusky were God's answers to those prayers, he said.
(REUTERS 3:5:7-8)
Good Morning American hastattelussa Pham sanoi rukoilleensa Jumalaa koetuksensa aikana ja pyytäneensä että tämä antaisi hänen kuolla heti, eikä joutuisi kärsimään pitkään. Sekä sadevesi Ø ja merieläimet jotka *pitivät hänet hengissä*, että pelastuminen laivaston fregatti McCluskyn ansiosta olivat Jumalan vastaus kyseisiin rukouksiin, hän totesi.

This kind of ellipsis is more common with verb phrases such as *he said* in connection with reported speech, especially in non-fictional writing. See (3.19) and (3.20) below:

- (3.19) "We don't need any help," *he snapped*. "Why hasn't Putin called us? Who does he think he is? Is he that important, is he that big that he cannot find time to deal with this situation?
(ST 2002 10:3:25-26)
- Me emme tarvitse apua Ø. Miksi Putin ei ole soittanut meille? Kuka hän luulee olevansa? Onko hän niin tärkeä, niin iso että hänellä ei ole aikaa hoitaa tätä asiaa?
- (3.20) and the best way of meeting people is in public places. Women, *she says*, must learn to use body language and eye contact to encourage men, since most men are put off by direct approaches.
(ST 2003 2:5:31-32)
Paras tapa tavata muita ihmisiä on hakeutua julkisille paikoille. Naisten Ø on opittava käyttämään kehon kieltä ja katsekontaktia rohkaistakseen miehiä, koska päällekkävyä lähestymistapa on omiaan karkottamaan useimmat urokset.

Another type of ellipsis connected to verb phrases takes place when the 3rd person singular pronoun is omitted in a sequence of more than one verb phrase. It is common in Finnish that only the first verb phrase has a pronoun and that the other ones are omitted

provided that the subject is the same in all of the verb phrases (see chapter 1.3.2 above). This kind of ellipsis is an effective means of reducing repetition. See example (3.21) below:

- (3.21) He didn't drink, *he* didn't smoke, *he* didn't swear," said Hope. "He was very, very quiet, he was a gentleman," he added, saying he would carry on Sutch's tradition with this year's conference - "a giant step backward for mankind."
 (REUTERS 3:11:23-24)
 Hän ei juonut, Ø tupakoinut tai Ø kiroillut", Hope kertoi. "Hän oli hyvin, hyvin hiljainen, hän oli herrasmies", hän lisäsi sanoen jatkavansa Sutchin perinteitä tämän vuoden kokouksessa - "valtava askel taaksepäin koko ihmiskunnalle."

In (3.21), there are three verb phrases in sequence. In the original, each of the verb phrases has a pronoun, *he*, while in the translation, only the first verb phrase has a pronoun. As the subject is the same, the pronouns have been omitted in the two following verb phrases. In

(3.22) below, the distance between the two verbs is rather large, but that does not obstruct the omission of the second pronoun:

- (3.22) He could not be sure, but she seemed deliberately to press her forefinger down; a second later *she* was staring at a crimson drop of blood.
 (FLW 21:85-86)
 Charles ei voinut olla varma, mutta tyttö näytti tahallisesti painavan etusormellaan ja Ø tuijotti hetkeä myöhemmin kirkkaanpunaista veripisaraa.

The last type of ellipsis found in this group involves fixed expressions in which there are no pronouns in Finnish. See (3.23) below:

- (3.23) "Here now, at this minute, your fear and my fear are part of heaven, where there will be no fear any more for ever." He *turned his back* on them and began very quickly to recite the Credo.
 (P&G 2:1b:63-64)
 - Nyt juuri, tällä hetkellä, teidän pelkonne ja minun pelkoni ovat osa taivaasta, jossa ei enää milloinkaan tule olemaan pelkoa. Hän *kääntyi selin* heihin ja alkoi hyvin nopeasti lausua uskontunnustusta.

Other expressions found include *take his chance* translated as *tarttua tilaisuuteen* and *take his pitch* translated as *ottaa oppia*.

(c) Contracted clause or other change in the structure of the sentence

The third and smallest (4 per cent) group within the category of ellipsis consists of translations with a contracted clause or some other major change in the structure of the

sentence. Contracted clauses involve the modifying of a subordinate clause in a way that the pronoun is usually left out. See examples (3.24) and (3.25) below:

- (3.24) Sam went into the bedroom next to the sitting-room, while Charles stood at the window. *As he looked down*, he saw in the light from the inn-windows a small boy run up the far side of the street, then cross the cobbles below his own window and go out of sight.
(FLW 25:51-52)
Sam meni olohuoneen vieressä olevaan makuuhuoneeseen Charlesin jäädessä seisomaan ikkunan ääreen. *Katsoessaan alas* hän näki majatalon ikkunoista tulevassa valossa pienen pojan juoksevan ylös kadun toista puolta, ylittävän kivetyksen hänen ikkunansa alla ja katoavan näkyvistä.
- (3.25) Twain has said *she was originally motivated* by childhood misery. Born Eilleen Twain, she was raised in the Canadian mining town of Timmins, where her mother stood her on a bar stool to sing for food.
(ST 2002 12:4:21-22)
Twain on kertonut *saaneensa alkuperäisen kipinänsä* kurjasta lapsuudestaan. Eilleen Twainiksi ristitty tyttönen varttui kanadalaisessa Timminsin kaivoskaupungissa, jossa hänen äitinsä nosti hänet baarijakkaralle laulamaan ruokapalkalla.

In (3.24), the translation could be *kun hän katsoi alas*, but the translator may have wanted to avoid repetition, since there is a pronoun in the proximity. In (3.25), instead of a contracted clause, the original clause could have been translated as *että hän sai alkuperäisen kipinänsä*. In this case there is no danger of repetition, and so the translator must have chosen a contracted clause of stylistic reasons. In fact, nearly all of the instances of contracted clause found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* were in the non-fictional writings, and only a few were found in the fictional data.

In this group I have also included instances in which there is a change in the structure of the sentence other than a contracted clause. The changes found are various and thus there is no one explanation to them. In the following, only the more commonly found instances are discussed. In many cases, a noun phrase has been translated with a corresponding verb phrase (see (3.26) below):

- (3.26) He had prepared the country and the Empire for this supreme test by ten years of sound government at home, and by his Canadian and Indian legislation. But it was certainly not *his expectation or his wish* that Britain should be subjected to a fresh ordeal within so short a time of the loss of the American colonies.
(TREV 5:53) (TREV 5:54)
Hän oli valmistanut maansa ja imperiumin tätä raskainta koetusta varten kymmenen vuoden kelvollisella hallinnolla kotimaassa ja Kanadaa ja Intiaa koskevalla

lainsäädännöllään (ks. etempänä, ss. 275-277). Mutta varmaa on, ettei hän *odottanut tai toivonut* Britannian joutuvan uuteen tulikokeeseen niin pian Amerikan siirtokuntien menettämisen jälkeen.

Some of the cases in which a noun phrase has been translated with a verb phrase can be connected to the fixed expressions discussed above. However, as there are changes other than merely the omission of a pronoun, they will be included in this group. See example (3.27)

below:

- (3.27) Nicholson has been here since the age of 17, when he travelled nearly 3,000 miles from his native New Jersey to become an office boy at MGM. *He made his film debut* in 1958 after training to become an actor.

(ST 2003 5:5:85-86)

Nicholson on ollut Hollywoodissa 17-vuotiaasta saakka, jolloin hän matkusti lähes 3 000 mailia kotikaupungistaan New Jerseyä ja ryhtyi MGM-yhtiön toimistotyöntekijäksi. *Hän debytoi elokuvassa* vuonna 1958 opiskeltuaan näyttämistä.

Many of the instances here include substitution of parts of the sentence in the translation with something rather different. The translators have for one reason or another decided to rephrase a fraction of a sentence, which means that the original text and the translation will have some structural changes. See (3.28) and (3.29) below:

- (3.28) The convoy was drawing to an end. In the last truck *he could see* an aged man, his face a mass of grizzled hair, standing upright with wrists crossed in front of him, *as though he were used to having them bound together*.

(1984 2:1:307-308)

Kulkue alkoi loppua. Viimeisessä autossa *oli* harmaapartainen ikämies, joka seisoi käsivarret ristissä rinnalla *kuin ne olisivat olleet yhteensidotut*.

- (3.29) *Debra Breuklander, 43, who lives in the white-picket-fence suburb of Clive in Iowa, told how her "home-brew" got her through a typical day:* after finishing her nursing job she would rush off to her parent teacher association before going home to cook dinner for her three children.

(ST 2002 9:1:20-21)

Amerikka on saanut kuulla viime aikoina paljon vastaavanlaisia naisten tarinoita: [sic] työpäivän jälkeen kiireellä vapaaehtoispuuhien pariin, sitten kotiin loihtimaan ateria perheelle,

In (3.28), there are two instances of a differing translation. The first one involves a sort of passive point of view in the translation. In the second one, the translator has decided not to convey the idea that the man was used to having his hands bound together, which possibly affects the image of the man that is portrayed to the reader. In (3.29), the translation of the

first sentence bears no resemblance at all to the original text. In fact, also the second sentence has been translated in a rather more impersonal manner.

Finally, in some cases a part of the original text has not been translated at all. See examples (3.30) and (3.31) below:

- (3.30) The person immediately ahead of him in the queue was a small, swiftly moving, beetle-like man with a flat face and tiny, suspicious eyes. As Winston turned away from the counter with his tray, *he saw that* the little man was making straight for the girl's table.
(1984 2:1:185-186)
Winstonilla oli edessään jonossa pieni, vilkasliikkeinen, synkännäköinen mies, jolla oli litteät kasvot ja epäluuloiset silmät. Kun Winston kääntyi jakelupöydän luota tarjoimeen, Ø pikku mies asteli suoraan tytön pöytää kohden.
- (3.31) it was Tosca that she sang *the first day she moved her piano* to the door of the balcony to disobey the German ban on noise. One evening when she was once again singing Tosca on the balcony a man answered her across the roof tops singing Mario.
(CALLAS 3:114-115)
Toscan hän lauloi Ø parvekkeen ovella vastalauseeksi saksalaisten melunvälttämiskäskylle. Eräänä iltana hänen jälleen kerran laulaessaan Toscaa parvekkeella kattojen yli vastasi miesääni laulaen Marion osaa.

In (3.30), a verb phrase has not been translated, and in (3.31), a noun phrase indicating the date has been left out of the translation.

In conclusion, there were three distinct groups of ellipsis found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*. Ellipsis with a possessive suffix attached to a noun mainly functions as a tool to avoid ambiguity. Ellipsis alone can be used to generalise nouns, or to avoid repetition in a sequence of two or more verb phrases. Ellipsis was also found in connection to contracted clauses or other changes to the structure of the sentence.

3.1.3 Noun

The third most common strategy for translating the English 3rd person singular pronouns into Finnish found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* was the use of common noun or a proper noun. Table 15 below shows that proper nouns were used significantly more often than common nouns.

Table 15. The category of Noun.

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Common noun	211	4,7%
	Proper noun	631	13,9%
Total		842	18,6%

A common noun was found in the translations to Finnish in only about five per cent of all the instances of *he* and *she*. Despite its rather small proportion, the main function of nouns in translation is important. Most of the nouns found function as distinguishing tools in instances where the reference would otherwise be ambiguous. In sentences in which there are two or more participants there is a need to make some sort of distinction between them. In English, this is taken care of by the distinctive pronouns, *he* and *she*. In Finnish, however, there is only one pronoun used for both sexes, and thus some other means have to be used. The most obvious way is to either name the other person or to refer to him or her with a common noun that describes, for instance, their occupation or sex. See examples (3.32) and (3.33) below:

(3.32) The child sniggered. *He* turned his face quickly away and stared up at the roof, where a spider moved.

(P&G 2:1a:279-280)

Lapsi tirskeili. *Pappi* käänsi kiireesti kasvonsa pois päin ja tuijotti kattoon, jossa kulki hämähäkki.

(3.33) While Dad, or Hef, as *she* calls him, is living the life of Riley in his mansion in Los Angeles and overseeing the magazine, Christie runs the corporate show. That's the way it has been since 1988 when *she* took the top job,

(ST 2002 11:3:29-30)

Kun isä - tai Hef, kuten *tytär* häntä kutsuu - elää lokoisaa elämää kartanossaan Los Angelesissa ja valvoo lehden toimintaa, Christie Hefner pyörittää firman liikeasioita. Näin on ollut vuodesta 1988 saakka, jolloin *tytär* otti ohjat käsiinsä,

In (3.32), if the pronoun *he* had been translated with the pronoun *hän*, it would be unclear whether the reference is to the child in the previous sentence or to the priest. In the original sentence, there is no such ambiguity since the child is a girl. In (3.33), *she* has been translated as *tytär* since *hän* would be ambiguous. A proper noun would possibly also be ambiguous in

this case, because the referents are a father and daughter with the same surname. Of course, it would be possible to refer to them by their whole names or first names, but that could be either uneconomical or too colloquial. In examples (3.34) and (3.35) below, the second referent has been translated with a proper noun:

- (3.34) She was expecting some religious state in *him*. Still yearning she was half aware of *his* passion, and gazed at him, troubled.
(S&L D:362-363)
Hän odotti *Paulinkin* joutuvaan uskonnollisen hartauden valtaan. Ja isotessaan tätä hän samalla puolittain ymmärsi *Paulin* intohimon ja tuijotti häneen levottomana..
- (3.35) From the outset his motives had been of the purest; he had cured *her* of her madness;
(FLW 22:13-14)
Hänen motiivinsa oli alun pitäen ollut mitä puhtain, hän oli parantanut *Sarahin* hulluudesta

In both the examples above, there are two participants, male and female. In (3.34), the pronouns *him* and *his* have been translated with the proper noun *Paul*, and in (3.35), the pronoun *her* has been translated with the proper noun *Sarah*. Indeed, had the pronouns been translated with the Finnish pronoun *hän*, the sentences would be highly ambiguous.

In the four extracts above, only one of two referents within a sentence has been translated with a proper noun. However, there was a considerable amount of extracts with both referents having been translated with a proper noun. Especially the translator of *Sons & Lovers* has on many occasions translated both referents with a proper noun although there does not always seem to be a clear reason to that. See (3.36) below:

- (3.36) Now *she* stood with *him* and for him. When, about this time, *he* outraged the family feeling at Willey Farm by some overbearing insult, *she* stuck to him, and believed he was right.
(S&L C:300-301)
Miriam oli nyt täydellisesti *Paulin* puolella. Kun *Paul* kerran näihin aikoihin pahasti loukkasi Willey-farmin perhettä jollakin pöyhkeällä solvauksella, piti *Miriam* hänen puoliaan ja katsoi hänen olevan oikeassa.

In (3.36), many of the pronouns *he* or *she* have been translated as *Paul* or *Miriam*, respectively. This strategy might seem somewhat repetitive or too exact in the sense that the reference chains are made extremely clear. It is quite impossible to make any incorrect

deductions about references. Nevertheless, to avoid repetition the translator could have, for instance, replaced the second mention of *Paul* with the pronoun *tämä*.

Not all the instances with a common or proper noun in the translation have to do with avoidance of ambiguity. For instance, a common noun may have been chosen for the translation because of a need to generalise. See example (3.37) below:

- (3.37) The family had become in effect an extension of the Thought Police. It was a device by means of which everyone could be surrounded night and day by informers who knew *him* intimately.
(1984 2:3:176-177)
Näin oli perhe itse asiassa tullut Ajatuspoliisin apulaiseksi. Se oli keino, jolla jokaisen ympärillä voitiin yötä päivää pitää tiedoittajat, jotka tunsivat *uhrinsa* mitä läheisimmin.

In the original extract of (3.37), the pronoun *him* refers to the word *everyone* and is thus used in a generic manner (see chapter 1.3.1 above). However, in Finnish, pronoun *hän* is not used as a generic pronoun, and so the translator has chosen a more general noun for the translation.

In non-fictional writing, there seems to be a trend in Finnish to favour common and proper nouns over pronouns. This suggests that anaphoric reference chains are longer in English than in Finnish. See (3.38) below:

- (3.38) Then came the first news of the massacres in the Paris prisons. "I really consider," *he* wrote, "the horrors of that day and night as the most heart-breaking event that ever happened to those who, like me, are fundamentally and unalterably attached to the true cause."
(TREV 4:115-116)
Sitten saapuivat ensimmäiset uutiset Pariisin vankiloiden verilöylyistä. "Pidän todella", kirjoitti *Fox*, "tuon päivän ja yön kauhuja sydäntäsärkevimpänä tapahtumana kaikille niille, jotka, kuten minä, ovat täysin ja horjumattomasti kiintyneet oikeaan asiaan.

The pronoun *he* in (3.38) refers to the proper noun *Fox* in extract TREV 4:112, thus the distance is three sentences. In the translation, nevertheless, there is a proper noun to remind the reader about who is being referred to. However, in some cases the length of the reference chain can not be the reason for the translator to use a common noun or a proper noun. In (3.39) below, the distance between the referents is merely one sentence. The result is rather repetitive:

- (3.39) Reynolds wanted to introduce Hickson to Saunders but as soon as the conversation started, it quickly became clear that Saunders wanted to cut short the pleasantries. *She* said she wanted to make a cash offer for AWG and was prepared to offer 25% premium.
(ST 2003 1:10:38) (ST 2003 1:10:39)
Reynolds halusi esitellä Hicksonin Saundersille, mutta heti kättelyssä kävi ilmi, että Saunders halusi antaa palttua kohteliaisuuksille ja mennä suoraan asiaan. *Saunders* kertoi haluavansa tehdä käteistarjouksen AWG:sta ja olevansa valmis tarjoamaan 25 prosentin premion.

One more point to be discussed as regards nouns in English-Finnish translation is first-mention pronouns – pronouns whose referent has not been mentioned in the previous context or that is not mentioned at all. Ritva Laury's article (2005: 56-74) addresses first-mention demonstratives *se*, *tämä* ja *tuo* in spoken Finnish. The data studied for this dissertation contains no spoken material, but at least a few instances of first-mention pronouns were found in non-fictional material. Newspaper articles written originally in English seem to use first-mention pronouns as a tool to arouse the reader's interest in the beginning of an article. As can be seen in example (3.40) below, the Finnish counterpart does not take advantage of first-mention pronouns but translates the pronoun with a proper noun:

- (3.40) 'Secretary' bodyguards protect Russia's rich
She looks like the secretary of a rich businessman, but underneath her pinstriped jacket Natalia Bykova, 25, carries a Makharov pistol.
(ST 2003 7:3:2-3)
Naisen valtti on yllätys [sic]
Natalia Bykova, 25, näyttää rikkaan liikemiehen sihteeriltä, mutta kantaa liituraiatakkinsa alla Makarov-pistoolia.

It must be noted here that the translation is not necessarily a proper noun but, for instance, ellipsis.

In conclusion, the most important function of common nouns and proper nouns in translations found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* is to avoid ambiguity. They can also be used to create a more general reference or to keep reference chains shorter and more manageable.

3.1.4 Other strategies

Less than two per cent of all the translations of the 3rd person singular pronouns found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* could not be fitted into any of the three main categories. These include the use of the neutral 3rd person singular pronoun *se* and the 3rd person plural pronoun *he*. Most commonly in this group, the pronouns have been translated with the word *oma*, or the relative pronoun *joka*. Half of all the instances in this group involve the use of the feminine 3rd person singular pronoun to denote countries in the political sense. When the referent is a country, the pronoun *she* has most often been translated with the neutral 3rd person singular pronoun *se*, as could be expected. The translations here also include proper nouns, common nouns, ellipsis and the pronoun *tämä*.

In the following, these other strategies found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* will be shortly discussed.

The largest group within the other strategies is the use of the word *oma* as a translation equivalent for the possessive pronouns *his* or *her*. *Iso suomen kielioppi* (2004: 1394) mentions that the use of the word *oma* in connection with a possessive suffix means that the possession is somehow unexpected or contrasted to other possessive relationships. See (3.41) below:

- (3.41) Schwarzenegger also has a lethal weapon in the shape of *his* wife Maria Shriver, niece of John F Kennedy, who has taken firm control of his campaign. She has asked CAA, the Hollywood agency that handles him, to rally other stars on its books to his cause.
(ST 2003 8:6:37-38)
Schwarzeneggerillä on käsissään "tappava ase" *oman* vaimonsa, presidentti John F. Kennedyn sisarentyttären Maria Shriverin muodossa. Shriver on pyytänyt Schwarzeneggerin käyttämään hollywoodilaista CAA-artistinvälitystoimistoa mobilisoimaan toimiston muita artisteja miehensä tueksi.

In (3.41), the possessive pronoun *his* has been translated with *oma* perhaps to emphasize the benefits of this possession. Schwarzenegger benefits from the fact his own wife is helping him rather than somebody else's.

The translation of a 3rd person singular pronoun with a relative pronoun is also rather common within this group. See example (3.42) below:

- (3.42) He had hoped to be alone for a little while during the lunch hour, but as bad luck would have it the imbecile Parsons flopped down beside him, the tang of *his* sweat almost defeating the tinny smell of stew,
(1984 2:1:84-185)
Hän oli toivonut saada olla lounasaikana edes hetken rauhassa yksinään, mutta pahaksi onneksi mätkäytti itsensä hänen viereensä typerä Parsons, *jonka* hien löyhkä miltei voitti keiton kirpeän katkun.

The translation for the pronoun *his* is the relative pronoun *jonka*, which simultaneously acts as another kind of cohesive device by tying the two clauses together more closely than in the original.

The use of the neutral 3rd person singular pronoun *se* found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* is closely connected to inanimate and personified referents (see chapter 1.3.1 above). As could be expected, Finnish uses the pronoun *se*, while in the original there is either *he* or *she*. See (3.43) and (3.44) below:

- (3.43) He leant his head back against the wall and half closed his eyes - he remembered Holy Week in the old days when a stuffed Judas was hanged from the belfry and boys made a clatter of tins and rattles as *he* swung out over the door.
(P&G 2:1c:276-277)
Hän nojasi päätänsä seinään ja sulki puoliksi silmänsä - hän muisti muinaisten aikojen pääsiäisviikon, jolloin Juudasta esittävä nukke hirtettiin tapuliin ja pojat kalistelivat peltiastioita ja räikkiä *sen* heiluessa oven yläpuolella.
- (3.44) she would spend hours watching fascinated while David, perched in his cage, almost burst his feathered throat singing. She would put her fingers on her throat and watch David's quiver, and every few moments she would break into amazed cries of "How does *he* do it?"
(CALLAS 2:137-138)
Hän saattoi viettää tuntikausia katsellen haltioituneena Davidia, joka häkissään istuen melkein halkaisi höyhenpeitteisen kurkkunsa laulullaan. Hän asetti sormensa kurkunpäälleen ja katsellen Davidin kurkun värinää puhkesi hämmästyneisiin huudahduksiin: - Kuinka *se* oikein tekee sen?

In (3.43), the pronouns – *he* in the original and *se* in the translation – both refer to the inanimate doll, which in the original has been personified. In (3.44), the referent is a bird called David, and again there is personification in English but not in Finnish.

In some cases where there are more than one participants in a sentence, the translator has replaced the singular pronoun found in the original with a plural one, as in (3.45) below:

- (3.45) It is not known where the gun came from, and Juan Carlos has never publicly discussed what he was doing with his brother at the time the shot was fired. There has been speculation that *he* played a prank, believing that the weapon was not loaded.

(ST 2003 5:2:23) (ST 2003 5:2:24)

Ei tiedetä, mistä pistooli oli saatu. Juan Carlos ei ole koskaan puhunut mitä hän teki veljensä kanssa laukaushetkellä. On arveltu, että *he* leikkivät aseella kuvitellen, ettei se ollut ladattu.

A half of all the instances included in the other strategies involve the use of the feminine 3rd person singular pronoun being used to denote a country as a political unit (see chapter 1.3.1 above). All of these instances come from Trevelyan's *History of England*. See (3.46) below:

- (3.46) It was for *her* alone to decide how many *she* would give back of the colonies which she had seized in the war. On the whole *she* was not ungenerous in her restorations.
(TREV 5:328) (TREV 5:329)
Se yksin päätti, kuinka monta sodan aikana valtaamistaan siirtokunnista *se* antaisi takaisin. Yleensä *se* osoitti tässä suhteessa jalomielisyyttä.

In example (3.46), it is clearly a question a country acting as a political entity. In 25 of the 38 instances of reference to a country the neutral 3rd person singular pronoun *se* has been used in the translation. Other translations include the name of the country, a common noun (*maa*), ellipsis, or the pronoun *tämä*.

In conclusion, the other strategies that could not be included in the main categories include the use the word *oma*, which can be used for emphasis. In some cases the translation is a relative pronoun, which simultaneously creates a closer tie between clauses. The corpus also contained instances of personification, which in Finnish are translated with the pronoun *se*, and instances where a singular pronoun was replaced by a plural one. Reference to countries was mostly translated with the pronoun *se*.

3.2 Contrastive analysis: *he* and *she*

In this chapter, the differences found in the translation strategies for, on the one hand, the masculine and, on the other hand, the feminine 3rd person singular pronouns will be discussed.

The first difference to be discussed is the amount of pronouns as translation equivalents. The masculine 3rd person singular pronoun has been translated with the pronoun *hän* in 55 per

cent of all instances, while the corresponding figure for the feminine pronoun is only 46 per cent. See table 16 below:

Table 16. Translations as *hän*

Translation	Referent	Percentage
<i>Hän</i>	Male person	55,1%
	Female person	46,3%

This difference might be due to the fact that Finnish does not inflect for gender, and thus the ambiguity must be resolved in some other way, on various occasions, for instance, by naming the less prominent participant in a sentence. Because most of the protagonists in the novels and other material included in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* are male, the female characters are often the ones to be referred to by some other means (see chapter 1.2.2 above). This also leads to the fact that nouns are more commonly used as translations for references to female characters. See table 17 below:

Table 17. Translations as a common noun

Translation	Referent	Percentage
Common noun	Male person	2,5%
	Female person	7,4%

However, compared to my earlier study, the results here are significantly more consistent. The earlier study showed that the masculine 3rd person singular pronoun was translated with *hän* in 75 per cent of all the instances, whereas the corresponding figure for the feminine pronoun was 48 per cent. Similarly, there was a considerable difference in the distribution of common nouns and proper nouns when resolving the *he/she* ambiguity in Finnish: common nouns and proper nouns were almost equally used as translations for the feminine pronoun *she*, whereas

for the masculine pronoun *he*, common nouns were used much less frequently than proper nouns. (See appendix 5 for more details.)

3.3 Translation of the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun into English

In this chapter, the strategies found for translating the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän* into English will be discussed in detail. See table 9 on page 22 for the distribution of the strategies.

3.3.1 Pronoun

The majority of all the instances of the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän* was translated with an English 3rd person singular pronoun *he* or *she*. This was an expected outcome, since *hän* rarely causes ambiguity which should be clarified in the translation by the use of other strategies. See table 18 below for the distribution of the masculine and feminine pronouns in the translations:

Table 18. The category of Pronoun.

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	<i>he</i>	867	61%
	<i>she</i>	333	23,4%
Total		1200	84,4%

That the figures for the masculine pronoun are significantly greater is probably due to the fact that most of the participants in the Finnish material included in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* are, in fact, masculine.

Pronouns are used in the translation unless there is danger of ambiguity. See examples (3.47) and (3.48) below:

- (3.47) Viljakauppiaan poika tahtoi kiertää kätensä kaulaani ja sanoi minua tytöksi, niin että minun oli pakko pistää *häntä* piirtimellä. *Hänen* läheisyytensä oli minulle vastenmielinen, sillä *hän* haisi pahalta.
(SINU 1:4:82-83)
the corn merchant's son would try to put his arm round my neck and called me a girl until I had to jab *him* with my stylus. *He* revolted me for *he* had an evil smell,
- (3.48) Silja oli kyllästynyt Siiveriin ja koko kyläkuntaan. *Hän* painui taas tuohon unenkaltaiseen tilaansa, jolloin *hän* ei ympäristöstään mitään välittänyt.
(SILJA 13:144-145)
Silja was tired of Siiveri and the whole village. *She* relapsed into that dreamlike state in which *she* cared nothing for her surroundings.

In (3.47) and (3.48), the pronouns refer to elements introduced earlier in the text – *the corn merchant's son* and *Silja*. It would be rather difficult to make any incorrect assumptions about who is being referred to, and so to translate *hän* with either *he* or *she* is adequate. In fact, to find an ambiguous translation in English is unlikely, since if the original Finnish text is unambiguous, there should be no danger of an ambiguous translation. In Finnish translation, however, the translator needs to be vigilant enough as not to mistakenly make the translation ambiguous.

The length of the anaphoric reference chain in the Finnish originals is possibly not as long as in the English originals. Example (3.49) below shows the beginning of an anaphoric reference chain in which Manta is referred to as *hän*. Manta is next named in extract SILJA 13:78, and so the length of the anaphoric reference chain is less than ten sentences. See chapter 1.2 above.

- (3.49) Siljan vuodetoveriksi tuli Manta, joka iältään luultavasti jo lähenteli kolmeakymmentä. *Hän* oli oikea piika ja hän piti itseänsä piikana, osasi tarvitessa kirotta ja pystyi vastauksellaan nujertamaan ruokottomimmankin heittopuheen.
(SILJA 13:69-70)
Silja's bedfellow was Manta, whose age was probably approaching thirty. *She* was a real maid and held herself to be a maid, could swear on occasion and was able to counter the lewdest thrust with her own tongue.

Judging from the data in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*, it seems that anaphoric reference chains are longer in English than in Finnish. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 3.4 below.

3.3.2 Ellipsis

Translation with an English 3rd person singular pronoun accounts for nearly 85 per cent of all the instances of the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*. Thus the strategies found in the remaining 15 per cent are rather marginal. However, of these other strategies, ellipsis is the most significant – a translation equivalent has been omitted in ten per cent of all the instances of *hän*. In English-Finnish translation, three groups of ellipsis could be separated. In Finnish-English translation, however, only two of the groups were found – ellipsis and contracted clause. See table 19 below:

Table 19. The category of Ellipsis.

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Ellipsis	88	6,2%
	Contracted clause	52	3,6%
Total		140	9,8%

(a) Ellipsis

Most of the instances of ellipsis found in Finnish-English translation are similar to those found in English-Finnish translation (see chapter 3.1.2(b) above), namely omission of pronouns in a sequence of verb phrases, omission of verb phrases such as *hän sanoi*, and fixed expressions. Prepositional phrases have also been omitted on many occasions. In the following, each of these cases will be shortly discussed. In the extracts, ∅ stands for the omitted translation.

An effective means of avoiding repetition is the omission of pronouns in a sequence of more than one verb phrases (see chapter 3.1.2(b) above). See examples (3.50) and (3.51) below:

- (3.50) Kirkonkylästä hän saisi ostetuksi lisää. Toivo otti rasian puseronsa rintataskusta. Sitten *hän* alkoi kaivella taskujaan.
(PTALO 7:2:16-17)
He could buy more in the village. Toivo took the tin from the pocket of his blouse, then Ø dug further into his pockets.
- (3.51) Agatha oli kuitenkin tunnesyistä hyvin tyytyväinen tähän elokuvaan. Hän oli nimittäin itse nuorena lähtenyt juuri Idän pikajunalla matkalle Bagdadiin, ja tällä matkalla *hän* kohtasi tulevan aviomiehensä.
(TRANS E9:8-9)
However, Agatha was very satisfied with this film for sentimental reasons; for as a young woman, she had set off for Baghdad herself on this very train, the Orient Express, and on the journey Ø had met her future husband.

In (3.50), the pronoun *hän* in the original has not been translated since the subject of the previous verb phrase extends its effect to the second verb phrase, as well. Furthermore, the two separate sentences of the original have been transformed into one sentence so that the omission of the pronoun would be possible. In (3.51), the second occurrence of the pronoun *hän* in the original has not been translated. Curiously, this pronoun could have been omitted from the original text, as well, if the verb phrase would have corresponded to the preceding verb phrase, that is Ø *oli kohdannut*.

In a few instances, a phrase similar to *he/she said* has been omitted from the translation (see chapter 3.1.2(b) above). See (3.52) below:

- (3.52) tarttui epäuskoisesti käteeni ja katseli sormusta. "Voi, kaikki Osiriksen neljäkymmentä oikeamielistä paviaania!" *hän sanoi*.
(SINU 2:2:150-151)
he gripped my hand suspiciously and stared at it. "By all the forty just baboons of Osiris!
Ø

Contrary to the English-Finnish translation, this kind of ellipsis was only found in fictional writing.

Some instances of fixed expressions were also found. A phrase containing the pronoun has been translated with an expression that does not include a pronoun. See (3.53) below:

- (3.53) Suoraan edessä. Mies nosti päätään ja kuiskasi tukahtuneesti, jännityksen *salvatessa hänen hengityksensä*:
(TS 9:4:19-20)
Straight ahead. The man raised his head and, *hardly able to breathe* for excitement, whispered in a choking voice:

Other fixed expressions found include *hän taivutti ruumistaan* translated as *at each movement of his body* and *puhua hän ei enää osannut* translated as *with nothing more to say*.

Omission of a prepositional phrase seems to be rather common in Finnish-English translation. Omitting a prepositional phrase possibly results in a more general view of the situation. See example (3.54) below:

- (3.54) Tempppelin ovelta näin hänen pihassa nousevan koristeltuun kantotuoliin. Esijuoksija lähti huutaen raivaamaan tietä *hänelle* ja ihmiset väistyivät hänen tieltään ja jäivät kuiskailleen katselemaan kantotuolin jälkeen.
(SINU 2:2:146-147)
Through the temple door I saw her step into a carved and ornamented chair that was awaiting her in the courtyard. A runner went before and shouted to clear a way Ø

In (3.54), the prepositional phrase omitted would probably be *for him*.

(b) Contracted clause or other change in the structure of the sentence

Similar to chapter 3.1.2(c) above, this chapter contains instances of contracted clauses as well as occurrences of some other structural changes within a sentence.

As Leech and Svartvik (1994: 192) point out, non-finite clauses are a means of avoiding repetition and thus commonly used in written English. Non-finite clauses, especially *-ing* clauses were found in the translations of the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*. See examples (3.55) and (3.56) below:

- (3.55) Vasta paljon myöhemmin ymmärsin, että vanha Kipa-rukka sanomattoman mielellään olisi ollut rikas. *Mutta koska hän oli* vain köyhäin lääkärin vaimo, hän tyydytti unelmiaan saduilla.
(SINU 1:3:36-37)
It was not until much later that I realized how dearly poor old Kipa longed to be rich. *Being* but the wife of a poor physician, she stilled her yearnings with stories.
- (3.56) Värikkikin tajusi, että oli tärkeämpääkin tehtävää kuin miesten haukkuminen, ja alkoi nopeasti järjestää puolustusta. *Hän toivoi* vielä saavansa vihollisen pysäytetyksi, ja äskeisiä sanojaan lieventääkseen hän huuteli miehilleen:
(TS 9:6:37-38)

Now at last the officer realized that there were more important things to do than abuse his men and began rapidly to organize a defense. *Hoping* to still be able to hold up the Russians and thus alleviate the sting of the recent reproaches, he called out to his men:

In (3.55), the translation is significantly more economical than the original – four words have been translated with only one without any change in the meaning. In (3.56), the contrast between the original and translation is not as remarkable, but the translation still manages to avoid repetition in a successful way.

Some of the translations contain rephrased elements, that is a part of the sentence has been somehow modified so that there are structural changes. These structural changes also include the omission of a translation equivalent for the pronoun *hän*. See (3.57) and (3.58) below:

- (3.57) Yhtä kuuluisia ovat Trinity ja St John's, joiden kellotornit ja pihat ovat 1200-luvulta. Meillä ei ole mitään tähän verrattavaa, mutta kun suomalainen opiskelija tarkastelee Cambridgen collegeja, *hän* kummastelee olojen erilaisuutta muistakin syistä.

(TRANS H10:4-5)

Just as famous are Trinity and St John's, whose belltowers and quadrangles date from the 13th century. There is nothing comparable to this in Finland, but *a Finnish student looking at the Cambridge colleges will be struck* by the difference in conditions for other reasons too.

- (3.58) Ahne sotamies oli kerran aikaisemmin käynyt kirveensä kanssa hakemassa huopasaappaat ja tuonut ne korsiin sulamaan. Silloin muut korsun asukkaat olivat karkoittaneet *hänet* saappaineen.

(MK 3:406-407)

Once before our man had gone off with an axe after a pair of felt boots, and had brought them back to the dugout to thaw them out. The others in the dugout *didn't exactly fall in love with those stuffed boots*.

In (3.57), the subordinate clause in the original text has been translated as an *-ing* clause postmodifying the noun *a Finnish student* and thus the pronoun *hän* in the original main clause has been omitted. Again, rephrasing the original avoids repetition. In (3.58), however, the rephrasal is rather different from the original. The translation leaves the reader the choice of imagining what happens next. That the soldier should be banished from the dugout is only one of the options, and so the translator gives the readers an opportunity to decide themselves what will happen in a situation like this on the basis of their own knowledge.

One final point discussed in this chapter is the omission of clauses. In some cases, a whole clause has been left untranslated for one reason or another. See (3.59) and (3.60) below:

- (3.59) Hän väisti pukunsa syrjään ja pani käteni paljasta rintaansa vasten, *niin että tunsin hänen sydämensä sykkivän, mutta* hänen rintansa oli pehmyt ja viileä käteni alla.
(SINU 2:2:97-98)
She pulled away her robe and held my hand to her bare breast. ∅ It was soft and cool beneath my hand.
- (3.60) Itse asiassa hän oli ensimmäinen ns. anti-sankari: hän ei ollut kaunis tai ulkomuodoltaan puoleensavetävä, *laista hän ei erikoisesti piitannut*, mutta - käyttääksemme kovin kulunutta sanontaa - rosoisen pinnan alla sykki lämmin sydän.
(TRANS M20:5-6)
In fact, he was the first so-called "anti-hero": he was not good-looking or outwardly attractive, ∅ but - to use the well-worn cliché, - beneath the rugged exterior there beat a warm heart.

Both in (3.59) and (3.60), a whole clause has been omitted from the translation without any particular reason. The clauses would not be too difficult to translate, and their inclusion in the translation would only bring additional information but no significant changes.

In conclusion, *-ing* clauses can be used to avoid repetition. Rephrasal or omission of clauses are also possible ways to translate clauses containing the pronoun *hän*, although the motivation to do so is not always clear.

3.3.3 Noun

A common noun or a proper noun was found in a small amount of the translations from Finnish into English. Common nouns, especially, were rather rare – only ten instances were found altogether. See table 20 below:

Table 20. The category of Noun.

Referent	Translation	Number of instances	Percentage
Male or female person	Common noun	10	0,7%
	Proper noun	27	1,9%
Total		37	2,6%

In the translations from English to Finnish the main function of nouns seemed to be avoidance of ambiguity. However, since English has two distinct 3rd person singular pronouns to handle ambiguous cases, nouns are not nearly as often used to make a distinction between participants. There are, nevertheless, a few instances in which the Finnish original is possibly ambiguous or repetitive and a proper noun has been used to clarify the references. See example (3.61) below:

- (3.61) Kenties hän on minulle velkaa jotakin. Kenties mieheni on matkoilla ja odotan *häntä* lohduttamaan minua surussani."
 (SINU 2:2:51-52)
 Perhaps he owes me something. Perhaps my husband is on a journey, and I am waiting for *Metufer* to come and console me in my grief."

In (3.61), it is possibly unclear whether the second pronoun *häntä* refers to the husband or to the same referent as the first pronoun in the extract. By translating the pronoun with a proper noun, the reference is clarified to the reader. It is also possible that a proper noun has been chosen over a pronoun in the translation, since a pronoun would be ambiguous. See (3.62) below:

- (3.62) Ähkien ja huudellen iloisia tervehdyksiä nousi Ptahor kantotuolista tervehtimään isääni, joka kumarsi ja laski kätensä polvien tasalle hänen edessään. Ptahor pani kätensä *hänen* olkapäilleen, joko osoittaakseen, ettei hänen tarvinnut olla niin juhmallinen tai hakeakseen tukea.
 (SINU 1:5:41-42)
 With puffings and cheerful cries of greeting Ptahor stepped from the chair to hail my father, who bowed and stretched forth his hands at knee level. The guest laid his hands on *Senmut's* shoulders, either to show him that ceremony was needless or to steady himself.

In (3.62), the original text is not ambiguous since the pronoun *hänen* in front of the word *olkapäilleen* means that the shoulders are not Ptahor's but belong to someone else (see chapters 1.3.2 and 3.1.2(a) above). However, in English, *his shoulders* would be ambiguous and so a proper noun has been chosen here.

The avoidance of ambiguity is not, however, the only reason for a proper noun to be used in the translation. On some occasions, when the original text includes both a proper noun and a pronoun close to each other, the translation has been rephrased so that only a proper noun is used. See examples (3.63) and (3.64) below:

- (3.63) ja Lahtinen luuli tuon äänettömyyden merkitsevän sitä, etteivät toiset vielääkään tajunneet ja tunnustaneet tilanteen toivottomuutta. Senpä vuoksi *hän* jatkoikin herätystyötään:
(TS 9:5:13-14)

And in the belief that their silence indicated that even now they did not understand or would not admit the hopelessness of the situation, *Lahtinen* continued his missionary work:

- (3.64) Shakespearen ystävä, Christopher Marlowe, sai surmansa 29-vuotiaana kapakkatappelussa, melkein joka päivä oli nähtävissä teloitus, ja huvielämä oli kuumeista. Suureksi osaksi Shakespearen kuusitoista ensimmäistä vuotta, jotka *hän* vietti pääkaupungissa ovat pimeyden peitossa.

(TRANS E1:3-4)

Shakespeare's friend, Christopher Marlowe, was killed at the age of twenty-nine in a tavern brawl, there was a public execution almost every day, and in the theatres the plays were often violent. For the most part, the first sixteen years that *Shakespeare* spent in the capital are shrouded in mystery.

In the two examples above, two sentences of the original text have been rephrased as one sentence in the translation possibly for economical reasons.

In a few cases, an anaphoric reference in the original text has been translated as a cataphoric reference (see chapter 1.2 above). In other words, in the original, a pronoun follows a proper noun, whereas in the translation, a pronoun precedes a proper noun. See (3.65) below:

- (3.65) Siitä mentiin ja tultiin ja pirtin ilma oli ovesta vyöryvän kylmyyden ja tupakansavun usvaamaa. *Kaukon* alkujännityksen kaikottua *hän* alkoi seurailta pirtin tapahtumia.
(PTALO 6:3:281-282)

There was coming and going and the air in the room was foggy with tobacco smoke and condensation from the cold air that rushed in through the open door. When *his* initial excitement had subsided, *Kauko* began to note what was happening.

The reason for thus delaying the proper noun might be to have it in a more important position – as a subject in the main clause instead of as a possessive pronoun in a subordinate clause.

In the non-fictional material translated from English into Finnish, there seemed to be a tendency to favour nouns over pronouns (see chapter 3.1.3 above). Curiously, the same phenomenon is found in the non-fictional material translated from Finnish into English, that is, opposite to the previous assumption. In both languages, the non-fictional translations seem to use common nouns and proper nouns without any particular reason. See (3.66) and (3.67) below:

- (3.66) Uotila tähdentää, että Suomen suhdannekehitys on edelleen selvästi parempaa verrattuna euroalueen keskitasoon. "Seitsemän ennätysmäisen lihavan vuoden jälkeen on odotettua, että talouskasvu hidastuu", *hän* rauhoittelee.

(HS 2001 13:26-27)

According to Uotila, the economic outlook in Finland is still markedly better than the average level in the euro area. "After seven record-breakingly fat years it is really only to be expected that things cool off on the growth front," says *Uotila* reassuringly.

- (3.67) ja hallitusohjat olivat hänen täysi-ikäiseksi tultuaankin ylhäisaatelin, ensi sijassa vanhan Oxenstiernan käsissä. Kun *hän* torjui kaikki avioliittosuunnitelmat, tuli kysymys kruununperimyksestä aktuaaliseksi,

(JUT 5:5:3-4)

Even after she had come of age, the reins of government remained in the hands of the upper nobility, principally those of old Chancellor Axel Oxenstierna. *The queen* rejected all plans for her marriage, bringing the issue of the succession to a head.

In (3.66), the same proper noun, *Uotila*, is mentioned twice in the translation making it somewhat repetitive. And in (3.67), there does not seem to be any particular reason for naming the queen in the translation except to remind the reader of who is being referred to with the pronoun.

The use of common nouns found in the Finnish-English translations in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* is rather inconsistent. Common nouns seem to be used to create references to more general elements (see chapter 3.1.3 above), or to make a contrast between participants as in (3.68) below:

- (3.68) emäntä, joka oli naapuripitäjästä tunnettua sukua, oli komea ja sanavalmis nainen. Oli somaa kuulla joskus *hänen ja isännän* välistä kisailevaa sananvaihtoa.

(SILJA 13:182-183)

his wife, of a family well-known in the adjoining parish, was a fine woman with a ready tongue. It was pleasant sometimes to hear the badinage between *master and mistress*.

In conclusion, common nouns and proper nouns are rather rarely used in Finnish-English translation as equivalents to the 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*. Proper nouns are used to avoid ambiguity either in the original or in the translation. In some cases, the original text has been rephrased so that proper noun replaces both a pronoun and a proper noun, or to delay a proper noun so as to have it in a subject position. Non-fictional translations seem to favour common and proper nouns over pronouns in both languages.

3.3.4 Other strategies

The proportion of other strategies in Finnish-English translation is actually larger than that of nouns. However, since these other strategies include various different types, the use of nouns can still be considered to be of greater importance. Other strategies in Finnish-English translation mainly include the use of the 3rd person plural pronoun *they*, the relative pronoun *who*, and the definite article *the*. Other translations found in this group are not as significant and will not be discussed here.

The most commonly found translation strategy within this category is the English 3rd person plural pronoun *they*. It is found especially in situations in which the translation is made more general, so that in the original text reference is perhaps to one particular person, but in the translation it is to a group of people. See examples (3.69) and (3.70) below:

- (3.69) Naxos tarjoaa aidon kreikkalaisen elämyksen Naxos on Kreikan Kykladien ryhmän saari, jonka välitön tunnelma tarttuu kävijään heti *hänen* laivasta noustuaan.
(TRANS B106:1-2)
Naxos - for a genuine Greek experience Naxos is one of the Greek islands known as the Cyclades, and visitors are taken by its easy-going atmosphere as soon as *they* step off the boat.
- (3.70) Eikä hän itse siinä vedonlyönnissä mitään omaa menettäisi. *Hän* löi kättä päälle.
(MK 3:296-297)
It wasn't his own money he was risking either. *They* shook hands on the deal.

In (3.69), the pronoun *hänen* refers to singular noun *kävijä*, whereas in the translation, the noun has been made plural – *visitors* – and so the pronoun referring to it is also in the plural.

In (3.70), the pronoun *hän* in the original text has been translated as *they*, since the act of shaking hands is usually understood to involve two persons. The pronoun in the original is in singular probably because of the expression *lyödä kättä päälle*, which nowadays, however, would seem to be used with a plural pronoun in Finnish, as well.

Instances of the relative pronoun *who* were also found in Finnish-English translation. Similarly to those instances of a relative pronoun found in English-Finnish translation, the ones found here tie the two adjacent clauses together. See (3.71) below:

- (3.71) ja panevat varansa ovenvartijain ja kirjuriin lahjomiseen päästäkseen kultakirjaisen, kalliilla voiteella sivellyn papin puheille. *Hän* nyripistää nenäänsä heidän hajulleen, hän puhuttelee heitä tönkeästi.
(SINU 1:5:13-14)
They spent their substance on bribes to doorkeeper and clerk for the privilege of a word with a gold-embroidered, perfumed, and anointed priest, *who* wrinkled his nose at the smell of them and gave them harsh words.

Lastly, on a few occasions, the Finnish possessive pronoun *hänen* has been translated with the definite article *the*. See (3.72) below:

- (3.72) Laihan unisen näköisen miehen molemmilla puolilla istuvat miehet uskalsivat sen verran siirtyä, että hän sai penkille takamuksensa. *Hänen* laihat kasvonsa olivat uneliaat, niin kuin hänellä olisi ollut toinen jalka unessa.
(MK 2:68-69)
The men on whose lap the soldier was sitting managed to move sufficiently for him to get his behind at last on the bench, *the* gaunt face so full of sleep that he looked as if he was already nodding.

The reason for this translation might be avoidance of repetition, since, for instance, this sentence contains already four instances of the pronoun *he*.

In conclusion, the other strategies found for translating the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän* into English include the use of the 3rd person plural pronoun *they*, the relative pronoun *who*, or the definite article *the*. Other strategies with only a few occurrences were also found but were not discussed.

3.4 Contrastive analysis: English and Finnish

In this chapter, the differences found in the strategies for translating the 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish will be discussed.

The most obvious difference between the strategies of translating the English 3rd person singular pronouns *he* and *she* and, on the other hand, the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän* is the distribution of the strategies. In English-Finnish translation, a pronoun was found in the translation in 53 per cent of all the instances of *he* or *she*, while the corresponding figure in Finnish-English translation is 84 per cent. See table 21 below:

Table 21. Translations as a pronoun

Translation	Referent	Percentage
Pronoun	<i>he</i> or <i>she</i>	52,6%
	<i>hän</i>	84,4%

The reason for this difference is, nevertheless, well known, namely the fact that a translator has to resort to other strategies when dealing with ambiguous sentences. Because of the two distinct pronouns used to distinguish gender in English, ambiguous sentences are more likely to arise in English-Finnish translation. Thus *hän* is more likely to be translated with *he* or *she*, than either *he* or *she* as *hän*.

The large proportion of pronouns as a translation strategy in Finnish-English translation results in notably smaller proportions for the other strategies than for those found in English-Finnish translation. This, in turn, means that comparing the distribution of these strategies is perhaps not worthwhile. However, what should be pointed out here is that the order, or usefulness, of the strategies is the same in both English-Finnish and Finnish-English translation. It is rather remarkable that in languages as different as English and Finnish, the strategies for translating the 3rd person singular pronouns are the same – pronoun, ellipsis,

common noun or proper noun and lastly some minor strategies which are also similar to an extent.

Another matter worth mentioning is the fact that although there is a similar amount of material in English and Finnish in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* (see appendix 1 below), the amount of 3rd person singular pronouns in the two languages is very different. In the English material, the amount is around 4500, whereas in the Finnish material, it is less than 1500. It can be inferred from this fact that, according to the data found in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*, 3rd person singular pronouns are less used in Finnish than they are in English.

The issue of anaphoric reference chains has been referred to on various occasions in the discussion above (see chapters 1.2.1, 3.1.1, 3.1.3, and 3.3.1 above). The data in *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* gives reason to assume that anaphoric reference chains are longer in English than in Finnish. In chapter 3.1.1 two extracts containing anaphoric reference chains were discussed, and based on those extracts it was assumed that the length of anaphoric reference chains in the two languages might be different. Example (3.73) below shows an extract from *Tuntematon sotilas*, originally written in Finnish:

- (3.73) *Koskela* saatiin nurin. Viisi kuusi miestä makasi *hänen* päällään, mutta *hän* pyöriähteli läjän alla kuin karhu. Viimein heidän onnistui sitoa *hänet* kolmella vyöllä ja niin oli *Koskela* avuton. Mutta siitä huolimatta *hän* örisi hammasta purren: Minä en lannistu perkele...Minä en lannistu perkele. Sitten *häntä* lähdettiin kantamaan teltalle vahvan saattojoukon seuraamana. Kariluoto kulki *hänen* vieressään ja puheli koko ajan rauhoittelevasti, niin että *Koskela* viimein kysyi: Kukas sinä olet?
(TS 10:3:97-103)

They pinned *Koskela* down. Five or six men were on top of *him*, but *he* turned and rolled under the pile like a bear. At last they succeeded in binding *him* with three belts, and *he* lay helpless. Nevertheless *he* went on grunting, grinding *his* teeth: I won't give in, damn you... I won't give in... *He* was carried bodily to the tent, Kariluoto walking beside *him*, speaking so soothingly that *Koskela* at last asked: Who the hell are you?

This extract further demonstrates that anaphoric reference chains might indeed be shorter in Finnish. *Koskela* is referred to pronominally only for four sentences in the Finnish text, while in the English translation, full noun phrase reference is used after eight sentences. The reason

why Finnish writers use shorter anaphoric reference chains might have to do with ensuring that the reference is as clear as possible to the reader, while English writers might pay more attention to the flow of discourse. Another reason could be found in the issue of hierarchy of the discourse structure, discussed in 1.2.2. There are possibly some differences in the hierarchy of discourse structures in the two languages which affect the choice of pronoun or full NP as a referent. To give an example, extract 2 in appendix 4 contains a conversation between Julia and Winston. According to Fox (1987b: 164), pronouns may be used to refer to two characters of different sexes during a fast-paced interaction, such as conversation. In the end of the original English text, Winston and Julia are both referred to nominally and pronominally, and the Finnish translation follows this rather closely. However, on one occasion, pronominal reference to Julia has been translated as a proper noun. This might be regarded as a sign of a difference in discourse structures, but on closer inspection, it might also have to do with avoiding ambiguity arising from the fact that there are two participants of different sexes and so Finnish has to resort to strategies other than pronominal reference. Whether the difference in the length of anaphoric reference chains has to do with the hierarchy of discourse structures or simply with avoiding ambiguity can not be answered within this dissertation.

In addition to what has been mentioned above in this chapter, there seem to be differences in the use of common nouns and proper nouns in English-Finnish and Finnish-English translation. In English-Finnish translation, common nouns and proper nouns are mainly used to avoid ambiguity (see chapter 3.1.3 above). However, in Finnish-English translation, there are some other functions for nouns in addition to avoiding ambiguity, such as delaying the subject until the end of a sentence (see chapter 3.3.3 above). In the non-fictional material of both languages, pronouns have on many occasions been translated with a

common noun or a proper noun without any particular reason, other than reminding the reader about who the referent is.

3.5 Translations as regards genre

In chapter 2 above, the results of the study were presented also as regards the genre. In this chapter, these results will be discussed in more detail.

It seems that the most significant differences are found in the use of ellipsis and nouns as translations for any of the three pronouns studied. The proportion of pronouns translated as pronouns in fiction or non-fiction is similar to the proportion of pronouns translated as pronouns in all of the data and also when comparing the two genres. Additionally, other strategies do not have obvious differences, except for the translation of the feminine 3rd person singular pronoun in non-fiction. This, however, can be explained by the use of *she* to refer to countries (see chapter 3.1.4 above). In the following, the use of ellipsis and nouns as translations for each of the three pronouns will be discussed with regard to the genre they are used in.

The masculine 3rd person singular pronoun *he* has been translated with ellipsis significantly more often in non-fiction than in fiction (see table 22 below).

Table 22. Translations of *he* as regards genre.

<i>he</i>	Fiction	Non-fiction
Ellipsis	22%	32,3%
Noun	19,8%	11,7%

This might be due to the fact that non-fictional writings, newspapers for instance, seem to favour some degree of impersonality. Also, non-fictional writings tend to be shorter than fictional writings, so a need to avoid repetition is present. These assumptions are supported by the fact that nouns are not as frequent in non-fiction as they are in fiction. A look at the two

genres separately shows that in fiction, the proportion of ellipsis and nouns is almost equal – ellipsis is used only slightly more often than nouns as translations for *he*. On the other hand, in non-fiction, ellipsis is found almost three times as often as nouns. This suggests that non-fictional writings strive for a more impersonal style as regards the use of pronominal reference.

The feminine 3rd person singular pronoun *she* has been translated with ellipsis as frequently in both fiction and non-fiction, and so the difference found in translations of *he* is not present here (see table 23 below).

Table 23. Translations of *she* as regards genre.

<i>She</i>	Fiction	Non-fiction
Ellipsis	28%	28%
Noun	23,7%	14,6%

Otherwise the situation is very close to the one described above – ellipsis is used more frequently than nouns in both genres, and the use of nouns is significantly lower in non-fiction than in fiction.

In the translation of the Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän*, the most significant differences can also be found with ellipsis and nouns. However, there are some rather important differences. For instance, with the English 3rd person singular pronouns, the proportion of ellipsis and nouns were rather equal in fiction, whereas in Finnish-English translation, it is the non-fiction genre which shows equal figures (see table 24 below).

Table 24. Translations of *hän* as regards genre.

<i>hän</i>	Fiction	Non-fiction
Ellipsis	10,8%	5,8%
Noun	2,1%	4,7%

Ellipsis is only very slightly more frequent in non-fictional writings than in fictional ones.

This suggests that translators are not opting for a more impersonal style when translating from Finnish into English, at least not by the use of ellipsis. In fiction, however, ellipsis is found five times as often as nouns as translations of *hän*. Here, the frequent use of ellipsis might be caused, for instance, by recurring references to the same person by ellipsis (see chapters 1.3.2 and 3.1.2(b) above). The lower amount of nouns found in fictional writings than in non-fictional ones is rather surprising, especially in contrast to the situation with the English pronouns. It would seem that in fiction translated from Finnish into English, nouns are not common at all, but rather a rarity.

3.6 Topic continuity

Cheryl Brown's study on topic continuity in written English narrative refers to an earlier study by T. Givón (1981). Unfortunately this study proved to be difficult to find, but Givón addresses the same subject in another study (1983). In this chapter, I will mostly refer to Brown (1983) but also to some extent to Givón (1983). The relevance of topic continuity and Brown's study for this dissertation is the fact that the main subject of this study – 3rd person singular pronouns – functions effectively as a marker of topic continuity. Furthermore, using methodology from Brown's study to conduct another study with data from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* enables comparison between topic continuity in English and Finnish, another theme relevant to the present study.

Topic continuity, in short, refers to the ways an entity is being referred to throughout a text. Some of the strategies of maintaining reference are simple and relatively clear for the reader, while others are not as clear and identifying the reference demands some work from the reader. According to Givón (1983: 16), topic identification is affected by, firstly, generally shared knowledge, secondly by specifically shared knowledge of the particular discourse, and thirdly by specifically shared knowledge of the particular speaker and hearer. Of these three, specifically shared knowledge of the particular discourse is of most importance for this study. Knowledge of a particular discourse involves very closely the context – what has been said or written earlier and how these mentions of particular participants or other entities have been maintained. Givón (1983: 17) further introduces a concept of topic accessibility and a scale of most and least continuous topics. This scale will be returned to later in this chapter.

Givón (1983: 13-15) describes three discourse measurements with which the topic continuity of a text can be assessed. These measurements are referential distance, potential ambiguity and persistence; Brown (1983: 318-9) uses slightly different labels of lookback, ambiguity and persistence, respectively. Lookback measures the length of the gap between two occurrences of the same referent (topic) in terms of number of clauses to the left (Givón 1983: 13). Maximal continuity would thus be expressed by value 1, meaning that the gap between the occurrences is one clause. Ambiguity addresses the problem of interfering referents, in that the identification of a topic may be endangered by the occurrence of other topics. Givón assesses ambiguity within five previous sentences on a scale of one to three, with the value 1 corresponding to a situation in which there is only one possible referent for the topic in question. Value 2 then corresponds to two or more possible referents being present, and value 3 to a situation in which no possible referent is present. Persistence focuses on the context following the topic, measuring the importance of the topic in the

discourse. Givón (1983: 15) assumes that a more important topic will occur more frequently and a topic of no importance will be discontinued in the discourse.

Brown's study on topic continuity in written English narrative has been documented in such a meticulous way that conducting another study with data from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* using Brown's methodology should be possible. However, some adjustments have to be made, mainly to the extent of the material as topic continuity is not the main factor of this dissertation. Thus, opposed to Brown's fifty pages (1983: 318), I will only look at roughly five pages taken from two original texts and their translations. Each of the four pieces of text contains around forty tokens which were found in a main, subordinate or co-ordinate clause. The number of constructions studied will be significantly lower, taking into consideration only those constructions which are essential to the subject of this dissertation. Thus, the constructions studied will be zero anaphora, unstressed pronouns, names, definite article + NP, and indefinite referentials. Furthermore, only human referents will be included my study. In applying each of the three discourse measurements, the methods used by Brown (1983: 318-20) will be followed as closely as possible.

In table 25 below I have reproduced the measurements of topic continuity for selected constructions from Brown (1983). The measurements will be briefly discussed below.

Table 25. Selected figures from Brown (1983: 328) table IV.

	∅ Anaphora	Unstressed Pronouns	Names	Definite Articles + NPs	Indefinite Referentials	Overall Totals and Averages
# Tokens	234	264	226	39	16	779
Average Lookback	1,00	1,78	6,47	11,10	18,81	4,45
Average Persistence	2,13	1,98	1,63	1,03	0,88	1,78
Average Ambiguity	1,08	1,24	1,59	1,35	3,00	1,38

The average lookback value, or the length of the gap between occurrences of a referent, is the lowest for zero anaphora and the highest for indefinite referentials. This is rather obvious, since zero anaphora requires that the deleted item can be identified from the context near the structure (Brown 1983: 330). The other constructions studied form a sort of a continuum towards indefinite referentials, so that the gap bridged by unstressed pronouns is slightly larger than the one bridged by zero anaphora. As the length of the gap between referents grows larger, names, definite article + NPs and indefinite referentials are used to help the reader remember the identity of the referent. Average persistence or the importance of the topic functions in a rather different direction. Zero anaphora and unstressed pronouns are used for topics that remain in the discourse for a longer time than those referred to by indefinite referentials, for instance. Average ambiguity is the highest for topics referred to by names, which are often used in situations with more than one participant. The ambiguity value for indefinite referentials is 3,00 since, according to Brown (1983: 339), indefinite referentials possibly refer to all referents in the previous context.

The three discourse measurements used by Brown (1983) – lookback, persistence and ambiguity – were applied to an extract from *1984* and its translation into Finnish, and to an

extract from *Tuntematon sotilas* and its translation into English (see appendix 6). The extracts contain roughly 40 tokens, and in order to be able to look at English and Finnish separately the measurements from the extracts in the same language were combined into two tables (tables 26 and 27 below). Separate tables for each of the four extracts are found in appendix 7. Firstly, the figures obtained by applying the discourse measurements to the original English text and the text translated into English will be compared to the figures from Brown's study. Secondly, and more importantly to this dissertation, the measurements of topic continuity in English and Finnish will be compared.

Table 26 below shows the topic continuity measurements for the English extracts studied. The figures will be discussed and compared to Brown's corresponding measurements.

Table 26. Topic continuity in English, data from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*.

	∅ Anaphora	Unstressed Pronouns	Names	Definite Articles + NPs	Indefinite Referentials	Overall Totals and Averages
# Tokens	10	32	17	11	8	78
Average Lookback	1,00	1,69	7,35	8,27	16,13	5,24
Average Persistence	0,70	0,41	1,00	0,73	0,25	0,60
Average Ambiguity	1,00	1,34	2,06	1,73	3,00	1,68

Average lookback follows the same ascending trend as found by Brown (1983) (see table 25 above). The referent for zero anaphora and unstressed pronouns must be identifiable in the near context, thus the low lookback values. In the data from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* there are some minor differences as regards the use of names,

definite article + NP and indefinite referentials as markers of topic continuity. Names were able to bridge slightly longer gaps in my data than in Brown's, albeit the difference is rather small. However, the definite article + NP and indefinite referentials in my data seem to bridge shorter gaps, which in turn suggests that the gaps found in the extracts from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* are indeed shorter than the ones in Brown's data (*Doctor No* by Ian Fleming). In other words, the distance between referents in my data is shorter.

Average persistence shows more significant differences. The average persistence of the topics in my data is without exception weaker than that of the topics in Brown's study. On most occasions in my data, a topic is not mentioned twice in a row without the intervention of another topic. This is especially true of the extract from *Tuntematon sotilas*, in which it seems to be common that two participants are referred to by turns in a continuous manner. See example (3.74) below:

- (3.74) Lopulta *Rahikainen_i* lähti laiskasti noljakoimaan tiehensä. Kun *Mäkälä_j* näki *hänen_i* poistuvan polun mutkan taakse, meni *hän_j* teltaan ja paneutui makuulle.
(TS 10:1:19-20)
At last *Rahikainen_i* strolled nonchalantly away and *Makila_j*, seeing *him_i* vanish round a bend in the path, went to *his_j* tent to sleep.

Names seem to indicate the most important topics in my data while in Brown's data most importance is given to reference by zero anaphora.

The values of average ambiguity in the two studies are closer together than those of average persistence. Even the order of the constructions is the same: zero anaphora, unstressed pronouns and definite article + NP are less ambiguous, while names are used in situations with possible ambiguity. Indefinite referentials possibly refer to any participant in the discourse. The topics in my data seem to be slightly more ambiguous than those of Brown's. An example of a possibly ambiguous reference is given below in (3.75), in which the possessive pronoun *his* could perhaps refer back to either *he* on the first line or to *an enormous prole* on the second line:

(3.75) Soon *he* was within arm's length of the girl, but the way was blocked by *an enormous prole* and an almost equally enormous woman, presumably *his* wife, who seemed to form an impenetrable wall of flesh.

(1984 2:1:251-252)

Pian *hän* oli käsivarrenmitan päässä tytöstä. Välillä oli enää vain *jättiläismäinen prole* ja tämän vieressä yhtä jättiläismäinen eukko, luultavasti *hänen* vaimonsa, kaiken kaikkiaan läpitunkemattoman näköinen lihamuuri.

In short, the greatest similarities in the data used in the two studies can be found in average lookback values as well as in average ambiguity values. Gaps bridged in my data were somewhat shorter, and the topics possibly more ambiguous than Brown's. Average persistence showed more differences, the main point being that topics in my data were abandoned soon after their occurrence. Also the importance of the topic seemed to be expressed with a different construction – with zero anaphora in Brown's data and with names in my data.

Of more importance and interest for this study is the comparison of the values obtained by the three discourse measurements in English and Finnish. This comparison might shed some light on the similarities and differences of the use of cohesive devices in the two languages, a theme included in this dissertation in the form of discussion on the translation the 3rd person singular pronouns. Table 27 below shows the topic continuity measurements for the Finnish extracts studied.

Table 27. Topic continuity in Finnish, data from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*.

	∅ Anaphora	Unstressed Pronouns	Names	NPs	Overall Totals and Averages
# Tokens	14	19	18	20	71
Average Lookback	1,00	1,32	7,33	1,25	5,86
Average Persistence	0,57	0,26	1,00	0,20	0,49
Average Ambiguity	1,00	1,53	2,17	1,90	1,69

Since in Finnish there are no means to distinguish grammatically between definite or indefinite noun phrases as such, the two constructions have been combined into a construction called NPs. Thus the constructions studied for Finnish are zero anaphora, unstressed pronouns, names, and NPs.

A comparison of tables 26 and 27 shows that the values for topic continuity in English and Finnish, on the basis of the extracts from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*, are surprisingly similar. Only slight differences can be found, mainly with unstressed pronouns. The average lookback of English unstressed pronouns is a little longer, and the average persistence is stronger for English unstressed pronouns. However, unstressed pronouns seem to be slightly more ambiguous in Finnish. These differences in the use of unstressed pronouns as markers of topic continuity might be affected by differences in the structure and content of the extracts (see discussion on context affecting the choice of pronoun in chapter 1.2.2).

Although no significant differences were found between English and Finnish, a look at the separate tables (appendix 7) shows that there are interesting differences between the

original text and its translation. For instance, in the translation of *1984*, there are differences in the average lookback and persistence values for unstressed pronouns as opposed to the original text. Average lookback in the translation is significantly lower (1,27) than the average lookback in the original (2,11). Also the average persistence for unstressed pronouns and names is lower in the translation than in the original. This might be taken to suggest that these values are lower in Finnish than in English. This assumption would, however, be incorrect, since the same phenomenon can be found in *Tuntematon sotilas* and its translation. Average lookback for unstressed pronouns and average persistence for names are lower in the translation than they are in the original. Thus the assumption that average lookback and persistence values were lower in Finnish than in English is not true. Rather, these two extracts and their translations suggest that there is a trend towards lower values of lookback and persistence in translations. This assumption is backed by most of the other values for zero anaphora, unstressed pronouns and names, as well. Discourse measurement values for NPs (definite articles + NPs and indefinite referentials in English), however, seem to portray different changes, namely that the values in translations tend to be higher than in the original, especially with *Tuntematon sotilas*. The reasons for these differences in the values obtained by applying the three discourse measurements are unclear and possibly difficult to find. Although finding reasons would be interesting, it will not be discussed in this study.

One more point discussed in this chapter is the scale of topic accessibility introduced by Givón (1983: 17). (See appendix 8 for Givón's scale.) Brown (1983) also compares the ease of identification of referents on the basis of the average measures. See table 28 below for the figures relevant to this discussion of Brown's study:

Table 28. Relevant figures from Brown (1983: 328) table V.

Average Lookback	Average persistence	Average Ambiguity
∅ Anaphora 1,00	∅ Anaphora 1,78	∅ Anaphora 1,12
Unstressed Ps 1,72	Unstressed Ps 1,69	Unstressed Ps 1,23
Names 9,99	Names 1,17	Def Art + NP 1,38
Def Art + NP 16,66	Def Art + NP 0,29	Names 1,67
Indefinite Ref 19,17	Indefinite Ref 0,18	Indefinite Ref 3,00

Brown's study suggests that zero anaphora, for instance, is highly continuous and its reference is rather easily identified by the reader. Indefinite referentials, on the other hand, are barely continuous and highly ambiguous. The corresponding tables were drawn for the English and Finnish extracts from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* in order to compare, first of all, the data from English to Brown's figures, and then to compare topic accessibility in English and Finnish. See tables 29 and 30 below:

Table 29. Topic accessibility in English.

Average Lookback	Average persistence	Average Ambiguity
∅ Anaphora 1,00	Names 1,00	∅ Anaphora 1,00
Unstressed Ps 1,69	Def Art + NP 0,73	Unstressed Ps 1,34
Names 7,35	∅ Anaphora 0,70	Def Art + NP 1,73
Def Art + NP 8,27	Unstressed Ps 0,41	Names 2,06
Indefinite Ref 16,13	Indefinite Ref 0,25	Indefinite Ref 3,00

Topic accessibility as regards average lookback and average ambiguity in Brown (1983) are exactly the same as in my study. However, with average persistence, there are significant differences in the figures. In Brown's study, zero anaphora functions in the most persistent way, while in my data names are maintained longest in the discourse. Similarly, Brown found that unstressed pronouns were highly persistent, while in 1984, they were very low in persistence. Rather interestingly, table 30 below demonstrates that topic accessibility in

Finnish, based on the data from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*, is more similar to the English data from the same corpus (cf. table 29) than to Brown's.

Table 30. Topic accessibility in Finnish.

Average Lookback		Average persistence		Average Ambiguity	
∅ Anaphora	1,00	Names	1,00	∅ Anaphora	1,00
Unstressed Ps	1,32	∅ Anaphora	0,57	Unstressed Ps	1,53
Names	7,33	Unstressed Ps	0,26	NPs	1,90
NP	12,25	NP	0,20	Names	2,17

Names are clearly more persistent than zero anaphora; and unstressed pronouns are not very persistent at all. Although topic accessibility in English and Finnish based on the data studied seems to be highly similar, there are two points where English and Finnish differ. First of all, the order of unstressed pronouns and NPs is reversed as regards average persistence, and NPs and names as regards average ambiguity (value for NPs in English 0,49 for persistence and 2,37 for ambiguity). In other words, NPs are more persistent than unstressed pronouns in English, while the opposite is true in Finnish. And in English, NPs are potentially more ambiguous than names, while in Finnish, names are most ambiguous. As names are typically considered to have unique reference, this result seems a little strange. However, as only one extract was studied, the results should not be taken to apply on all occasions. All of these differences might be explained by differences in the type of discourse studied, albeit the genre is similar in all three. Other reasons surely exist, but again, the analysis of them falls outside this study.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the results of this study were obtained from such a small sample of the two languages that no serious attempts at any robust results should be made based on them. However, the recreation of Brown's study showed, first of all, that the methodology used by Brown can indeed be used for conducting another study and

comparable values can thus be obtained. Secondly, this study demonstrated that there were no significant differences in the extracts studied as regards English and Finnish. Differences between the original text and its translation, however, seemed to be more interesting. Topic accessibility seemed to correlate more closely between the extracts from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*, than between the two extracts of English.

4. Conclusion

In this concluding chapter, the main points of the study will be briefly summarised. In addition, possible implications of the study will be discussed.

Translation of the 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish proved to be not as straightforward as one might think. The fact that Finnish has to resort to other strategies to resolve the problems of ambiguity created by the two English pronouns was not as surprising as the fact that Finnish-English translation uses the same strategies. Although Finnish-English translation, at first, would seem to be unproblematic as regards 3rd person singular pronouns, data from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* showed that translators have indeed used exactly the same strategies as for English-Finnish translation. This suggests that the problems of translating 3rd person singular pronouns are similar in both languages, albeit in different proportions. For instance, problems of ambiguity were found in both translation pairs, but in significantly larger amount in English-Finnish translation. A translation strategy other than pronoun was used in roughly half of all the instances in English-Finnish translation, while the corresponding figure for Finnish-English translation is only 15 per cent.

To solve the problem of ambiguity, English and Finnish resorted to either ellipsis, the use of common noun or proper noun, or to some other less frequent strategy. Ellipsis, despite the fact that it is the second most common strategy for translating any of the three pronouns, seems to be used for purposes other than pure avoidance of ambiguity. For instance, omission of pronouns in a sequence of verb phrases is not connected to the problem of ambiguity, but rather to avoiding repetition. The most important strategy for distinguishing between participants in ambiguous cases is the use of common nouns or proper nouns. Their main function is to clarify any references which might cause trouble to the reader as regards who

exactly is being referred to. Especially proper nouns are very effective in pinpointing the reference, since they have to have unique reference. Thus the reader should immediately, when given the name of a character, be sure of who is being referred to. The other minor strategies found for translating the 3rd person singular pronouns are not usually used to resolve the problem of ambiguity.

A study conducted using methodology from Cheryl Brown's study on topic continuity enabled comparison of the two languages in terms of how long and how clearly referents are kept in focus. Also ambiguity of referents was measured. The study showed that topic continuity in English and Finnish is rather similar, but that differences arise in translation. Differences were also found in the scales measuring lookback, persistence and ambiguity. Brown's study and the other study connected to it provided a broader view on cohesion and reference in the two languages studied.

The aim of this study was to describe the strategies of translating the 3rd person singular pronouns in English and Finnish with emphasis on the problem of ambiguity created by the fact that English has to pronouns to distinguish the genders, while Finnish has only one. Besides description of the strategies, questions concerning cohesion in the two languages have emerged as a result of the study. For instance, the length of anaphoric reference chains is one of the most interesting aspects of cohesion that came up repeatedly in the study. Indeed, further research into anaphoric reference chains as well as other cohesive factors in the two languages might be a fruitful area for further study.

Only a few bilingual English-Finnish corpora exist, *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* being one of them. In the course of the study, *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* proved to be a valuable tool for a contrastive study of Finnish and English. It contains roughly half a million words, which is enough to enable the user to make assumptions and generalisations about the use of the two languages.

The fact that the corpus contains an equal amount of fictional and non-fictional material makes it useful for studies of genre, as well. However, the tools to handle the data should be improved so that the use of the corpus could be more easily available to anyone interested in using it.

The implications of the study are, in brief, that there is a need for further contrastive research into cohesive devices and their use in English and Finnish, and the improvement of *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus* to enable its public use.

Bibliography

- Beaugrande, Robert de and Wolfgang Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. Longman Linguistics Library 26. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Bloor, T. and Bloor M. 1995 *The Functional Analysis of English*. London: Arnold.
- Brown, Cheryl. 1983. "Topic Continuity in Written English Narrative." In Givón, T. (ed.) *Topic Continuity in Discourse: a Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 313-341.
- Brown, Gillian and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Christophersen, Paul and Arthur O. Sandved. 1969. *An Advanced English Grammar*. London: Macmillan Education Limited.
- Cornish, Francis. 1986. *Anaphoric Relations in English and French*. London: Croom Helm.
- Fox, Barbara. 1987a. *Discourse Structure and Anaphora: Written and Conversational English*. Cambridge Studies in Linguistics 48. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Fox, Barbara. 1987b. "Anaphora in Popular Written English Narratives." In Tomlin, Russell (ed.) *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 157-174.
- Georgakopoulou, Alexandra and Dionysis Goutsos. 1997. *Discourse Analysis: An Introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Givón, T. 1983. "Topic Continuity in Discourse: an Introduction." In Givón, T. (ed.) *Topic Continuity in Discourse: a Quantitative Cross-Language Study*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. 1-42.
- Givón, T. 1981. "Typology and Functional Domains." *Studies in Language*.
- Hakulinen, Auli, Maria Vilkuna, Riitta Korhonen, Vesa Koivisto, Tarja Riitta Heinonen, and Irja Alho. 2004. *Iso suomen kielioppi*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 950. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1987. *Cohesion in English*. English Language Ser. 9. 1976. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Huddleston, Rodney and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Laitinen, Lea. 2005. "Hän, the third speech act pronoun in Finnish." In Laury, Ritva (ed.)

- Minimal Reference. The Use of Pronouns in Finnish and Estonian Discourse.* Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. 75-106.
- Laury, Ritva. 2005. "First and Only: Single-mention Pronouns in Spoken Finnish." In Laury, Ritva (ed.) *Minimal reference. The Use of Pronouns in Finnish and Estonian Discourse.* Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. 56-74.
- Leech, Geoffrey and Jan Svartvik. 1994. *A Communicative Grammar of English.* 2nd edition. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Miller, C. and Swift, K. 1982. *The Handbook of Non-Sexist Writing.* London: Women's Press Ltd.
- Nilsson, Tiina. 1999. *Pronominien kääntämisen problematiikka suomi-englanti ja englanti-suomi -käännöksissä.* MA thesis, Tampere University.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* London: Longman Group Limited.
- Sadeniemi, Matti et al. 1980. *Nyky-suomen sanakirja.* 7th edition. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Strawson, P. F. 1950. "On Referring." *Mind* 54.
- Wales, Katie. 1996. *Personal Pronouns in Present-day English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, Leila. 1997. *Suomen kielioppia ulkomaalaisille.* Loimaa: Oy Finn Lectura Ab.

Appendices

Appendix 1. *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*

Fiction and biography			
English fiction ¹	96,314 words	Finnish fiction ¹	108,827 words
Callas biography*	35,571 words	Päätaalo*	40,314 words
<hr/>			
Total	131,885 words		149,141 words

Non-fiction (Press reports and history)

<i>Sunday Times</i> ²	68,978 words	<i>Helsingin Sanomat</i> ³	21,678 words
Reuters ⁴	27,103 words	Translation texts ⁵	76,800 words
Trevelyan*	37,932 words	Jutikkala*	35,207 words
<hr/>			
Total	134,013 words		133,685 words

Grand total: 548,724 words

1. Long extracts from four novels*
2. Articles appearing Feb-July 2003 in both *The Sunday Times* and *Aamulehti*
3. On-line articles appearing in 2001 (both English and Finnish)
4. On-line articles appearing in 2001 in English: translated into Finnish by students at the University of Tampere
5. Texts taken from a variety of Finnish newspapers and magazines: translated into English by Robert Cooper (Cooper, R. *Finnish Texts for Translation into English*)

*See Appendix 2 for more details

Appendix 2. *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*

SINU = *Sinuhe*
SILJA = *Nuorena nukkunut*
TS = *Tuntematon sotilas*
MK = *Manillaköysi*
PTALO = *Koillismaa*
JUT = *Suomen historia*
HS = *Helsingin Sanomat*
TRANS = translation texts

FLW = *The French Lieutenant's Woman*
P&G = *Power and Glory*
1984 = *Nineteen Eighty-Four*
S&L = *Sons and Lovers*
CALLAS = *Maria Callas: the Woman Behind the Legend*
TREV = *History of England*
REUTERS = *Reuters*
ST = *The Sunday Times*

SINU 1:1:34 = *Sinuhe* Book 1, Chapter 1, Sentence 34
SILJA 10:21 = *Nuorena nukkunut* Chapter 10, Sentence 21 etc
*** = Sentence omitted in the translation

<u>Original</u>	<u>Translation</u>
Waltari, Mika. <i>Sinuhe</i> . WSOY, Porvoo. 1945.	Waltari, Mika. <i>Sinuhe</i> . Pocket Books, New York. 1965. [Translator's name not given]
Sillanpää, F.E. <i>Nuorena nukkunut</i> . Kompassikirja, Otava, Helsinki. 1972. Osa luvusta "Tyttär" (ss 116-156).	Sillanpää, F.E. <i>The Maid Silja</i> . Norman S Berg, Publisher, "Sellandra," Dunwoody, Georgia. 1974. Translated from the Finnish by Alexander Matson. Part of the chapter "Daughter", (20-23).
Linna, Väinö. <i>Tuntematon sotilas</i> . Werner Söderström Oy Porvoo. 1954. Luvut 9-11.	Linna, Väinö. <i>The Unknown Soldier</i> . W.Collins & Co Ltd and G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York. 1954/1957. [Translator's name not given]
Meri, Veijo. <i>Manillaköysi</i> . Otava, Helsinki. 1957.	Meri, Veijo. <i>The Manilla Rope</i> . Alfred A. Knopf, New York. 1967. Translated by John McGahern and Annikki Laaksi.
Päätalo, Kalle. <i>Koillismaa</i> . Jyväskylä: Gummerus. 1960. Luvut 6 ja 7.	Päätalo, Kalle. <i>Our Daily Bread</i> . San Luis Obispo: Finn Heritage. 1990. Translated by Richard A. Impola. Chapter 6 and 7.

- Jutikkala, Eino ja Pirinen, Kauko. *Suomen historia*. Helsinki: Weilin & Göös. 1966. 5. luku.
- Jutikkala, Eino and Pirinen, Kauko. *A History of Finland*. London: Thames and Hudson. 1962. Translated by Paul Sjöblom. Chapter 5.
- Fowles, John. *The French Lieutenant's Woman*. Triad, Granada. 1977. Ch 21-26 (pp 156-189).
- Fowles, John. *Ranskalaisen luutnantin nainen*. Arvi A. Karisto Oy, Hämeenlinna. 1973. Suomentanut Kaarina Jaatinen. Runot suomentanut Hannu Sarala. Luvut 21-26 (ss 192-230).
- Greene, Graham. *The Power and Glory*. The Vanguard Library. 1977. From Part II, Chapter I (pp 58-90).
- Greene, Graham. *Voima ja kunnia*. Tammi, Helsinki. 1965. Suomentanut Tauno Tainio. Toinen osa, osa luvusta 1 (ss 79-120).
- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Secker & Warburg/Octopus, London. 1976. Part II, Chapters 1-4 (pp 805-830).
- Orwell, George. *Vuonna 1984*. WSOY, Porvoo. 1976. Suomentanut Oiva Talvitie. II osa, 1. luku (ss 118-164).
- Lawrence, D.H. *Sons and Lovers*. The Viking Press, Inc, New York. 1976. From Part Two, Chapter VII (pp 142-167).
- Lawrence, D.H. *Poikia ja rakastajia*. WSOY, Kolibrikirjasto, Juva. 1980. Suomentanut Anne Brotherus. II osa, luku 7 (ss 155-182).
- Strassinopoulos, Arianna. *Maria Callas: the Woman Behind the Legend*. London: George Weidenfield & Nicholson Ltd. 1980. Chapters 2-5.
- Strassinopoulos, Arianna. *Maria Callas*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä. 1981. Suomentanut Kaarina Ripatti. Luvut 2-5.
- Trevelyan, G. M. *History of England*. Longmans. 1945. Book 5: chapters 4-7.
- Trevelyan, G. M. *Englannin Historia*. London: Porvoo: Werner Söderström Oy. Suomentaneet Jussi Teljo ja Antero Manninen. 5. kirja: luvut 4-7.

Appendix 3. Search keys.

English:

HE	SHE
#HE	#SHE
HIM	HER
HIS	#HER
#HIS	HERS

indicates sentence initial pronoun

Finnish:

HÄN
#HÄN

Appendix 4. Pronominal reference chains

Extract 1.

The priest scrambled off and began to laugh. *He* was feeling happy. It is one of the strange discoveries a man makes that life, however you lead it, contains moments of exhilaration: there are always comparisons which can be made with worse times: even in anger and misery the pendulum swings. *He* came cautiously out of the belt of trees into a marshy clearing: the whole state was like that, river and swamp and forest: *he* knelt down in the late sunlight and bathed *his* face in a brown pool which reflected back at *him* like a piece of glazed pottery the round, stubby and hollow features. They were so unexpected that *he* grinned at them - with the shy, evasive, untrustworthy smile of a man caught out. In the old days *he* often practised a gesture a long while in front of a glass so that *he* had come to know *his* own face as well as an actor does. It was a form of humility - *his* own natural face hadn't seemed the right one. It was a buffoon's face, good enough for mild jokes to women, but unsuitable at the altar rail. *He* had tried to change it - and indeed, *he* thought, indeed I have succeeded, they'll never recognise me now, and the cause of *his* happiness came back to *him* like the taste of brandy, promising temporary relief from fear, loneliness, a lot of things. *He* was being driven by the presence of soldiers to the very place where *he* most wanted to be. *He* has avoided it for six years, but now it wasn't *his* fault - it was *his* duty to go there - it couldn't count as sin. *He* went back to his mule and kicked it gently, "Up, mule, up," a small gaunt man in torn peasant's clothes going for the first time in many years, like any ordinary man, to *his* home. In any case, even if *he* could have gone south and avoided the village, it was only one more surrender: the years behind *him* were littered with similar surrenders - feast days and fast days and days of abstinence had been the first to go: then *he* had ceased to trouble more than occasionally about *his* breviary - and finally *he* had left it behind altogether at the port in one of *his* periodic attempts at escape. Then the altar stone went - too dangerous to carry with *him*. *He* had no business to say Mass without it: *he* was probably liable to suspension, but penalties of the ecclesiastical kind began to seem unreal in a state where the only penalty was the civil one of death. The routine of *his* life like a dam was cracked and forgetfulness came dribbling in, wiping out this and that. Five years ago *he* had given way to despair - the unforgivable sin - and *he* was going back now to the scene of *his* despair with a curious lightening of the heart. For *he* had got over despair too. *He* was a bad priest, *he* knew it: they had a word for *his* kind - a whisky priest, but every failure dropped out of sight and mind: somewhere they accumulated in secret - the rubble of *his* failures. One day they would choke up, *he* supposed, altogether the source of grace. Until then *he* carried on, with spells of fear, weariness, with a shamefaced lightness of heart. The mule splashed across the clearing and they entered the forest again. Now that *he* no longer despaired it didn't mean, of course, that *he* wasn't damned - it was simply that after a time the mystery became too great, a damned man putting God into the mouths of men: an odd sort of servant, that, for the devil. *His* mind was full of a simplified mythology: Michael dressed in armour slew a dragon, and the angels fell through space like comets with beautiful streaming hair because they were jealous, so one of the Fathers had said, of what God intended for men - the enormous privilege of line - this life. There were signs of cultivation; stumps of trees and the ashes of fires where the ground was being cleared for a crop. *He* stopped beating the mule on: *he* felt a curious shyness... A woman came out of a hut and watched *him* lagging up the path on the tired mule. The tiny village, not more than two dozen huts round a dusty plaza, was made to pattern: but it was a pattern which lay close to *his* heart. *He* felt secure - *he* was confident of a welcome: that in this place there would be at least one person *he* could trust not to betray *him* to the police. When *he* was quite close the mule sat down again - this time *he* had to roll on the ground to escape. *He* picked himself up

and the woman watched *him* as if *he* were an enemy. "Ah, Maria," *he* said, "and how are you?" "Well", she exclaimed, "it is you, *father*?"

(P&G 2:1a:7-64)

Pappi kompuroi sen selästä ja alkoi nauraa. *Hän* oli onnellinen. Eräs ihmisen kummallisia huomioita on, että olipa elämä millaista tahansa, niin siihen sisältyy hilpeitä hetkiä, aina voidaan suorittaa vertailuja pahempiin aikoihin, vaaran ja kurjuudenkin keskellä heiluri heilahtaa. *Hän* tuli varovaisesti puuvyöhykkeestä suonaukeamalle. Tällaista oli koko valtio: jokea ja suota ja metsää. *Hän* polvistui iltapäivän auringossa huuhtomaan kasvojaan ruskeassa lammessa, joka lasitetun saviastian tavoin kuvasteli *hänen* pyöreitä sänkisiä ja laihtuneita kasvojaan; näky oli niin odottamaton, että *hän* naurahti sille - ilmi tulleen miehen arkaa välttelevää epäluotettavaa hymyä. Ennen muinoin *hän* harjoitteli usein pitkän aikaa jotakin elettä peilin ääressä, niin että *hän* oli oppinut tuntemaan omat kasvonsa kuin näyttelijä. Se oli eräänlaista nöyryyttä - *hänen* omat luonnolliset kasvonsa eivät olleet näyttäneet olevan oikein sopivat. Ne olivat leikinlaskijan kasvot, jotka kyllä soveltuivat esittämään leppoisia sukkeluuksia naisille, mutta eivät soveltuneet alttarinkaiteen ääreen. *Hän* oli koettanut muuttaa niitä - ja tosiaan, *hän* tuumi, tosiaan olen onnistunut, sillä nyt he eivät ikinä tunne minua, ja *hänen* onnellisuutensa syy palasi takaisin *hänen* mieleensä kuin konjakin maku luvaten hetkeksi helpotusta pelosta, yksinäisyydestä, kaikenlaisesta. Sotilaitten saapuminen ajoi *häntä* kohti sitä paikkaa, missä *hän* eniten halusi olla. *Hän* oli vältellyt sitä kuuden vuoden ajan, mutta nyt tämä ei ollut *hänen* syynsä - *hänen* velvollisuutensa oli mennä sinne - sitä ei voitu pitää syntinä. *Hän* palasi muulinsa luokse ja potkaisi sitä ystävällisesti: - Ylös muuli, ylös, pieni laiha mies resuiset maamiehen vaatteet yllään lähdössä, ensi kertaa vuosikausiin, aivan kuin mikä tavallinen mies tahansa, kotiin. Vaikka *hän* olisi lähtenyt eteläänkin ja välttänyt kylää, se olisi kuitenkin joka tapauksessa ollut vain yksi luopuminen entisten lisäksi: *hänen* takanaan olevat vuodet vilisivät samanlaisia luopumisia - juhlapäivät ja paastopäivät ja pidättymisen päivät olivat menneet ensimmäisinä. Sitten *hän* ei ollut välittänyt rukouskirjastaan kuin joskus satunnaisesti - ja vihdoinkin *hän* oli jättänyt sen kokonaan satamaan erään ajoittain uusiutuvan pakoyrityksensä yhteydessä. Sitten meni alttarikivi - liian vaarallisena mukana kuljetettavaksi. *Hänellä* ei ollut minkäänlaista oikeutta pitää messua ilman sitä, luultavasti *hänet* voitaisiin pidättää virantoimituksesta, mutta kirkolliset rangaistukset alkoivat näyttää epätodellisilta valtiossa, jossa ainoa rangaistus oli siviiliviranomaisten määräämä kuolema. *Hänen* jokapäiväinen elämänsä oli kuin säröillyt sulku, jonka halkeamista unohdus tihkui pyyhkäisten pois yhtä ja toista. Viisi vuotta sitten *hän* oli antanut periksi epätoivon anteeksiantamattomalle synnille, ja nyt *hän* oli matkalla takaisin epätoivonsa näyttämölle sydän kummasti keventyneenä. Sillä *hän* oli sivuuttanut epätoivonkin. *Hän* oli huono pappi, *hän* tiesi sen, *hänen*laisiaan varten oli nimityskin: viinapappi, mutta kaikki epäonnistumiset jäivät pois näkyvistä ja pois mielestä. Ne kerääntyivät jonnekin kaikessa salaisuudessa - *hänen* epäonnistumisiensa roskaljää. *Hän* oletti, että jonakin päivänä ne tukkisivat tyystin armon lähteen. Siihen saakka *hän* jatkoi pelon, uupumuksen ja häpeilevän sydämen keveyden vuorotellessa. Muuli kulkea loiskutteli aukion poikki ja he painuivat jälleen metsään. Mutta kun *hän* ei enää ollut epätoivon vallassa, se ei tietenkään merkinnyt, ettei *hän* olisi ollut kirottu - asian laita oli yksinkertaisesti sellainen, että jonkin ajan kuluttua mysteeri kasvoi liian sureksi, kirottu mies pani Jumalan ihmisten suuhun. Omituinen pahalaisen palvelija sekin. *Hänen* mielensä oli yksinkertaisen jumalaistaruston täyttämä: haarniskapukuinen Mikael tappoi lohikäärmeen ja enkelit putosivat pyrstötähtien tavoin halki avaruuden kaunis tukka hulmuten, koska kadehtivat, niin oli eräs isistä sanonut, sitä, minkä Jumala oli aikonut ihmisille - elämän, tämän elämän suunnatonta etuoikeutta. Viljelyksen merkkejä alkoi näkyä: kantoja ja tuhkaa, missä maata oli kastettu kylvöä varten. *Hän* lakkasi hoputtamasta muulia. Outo ujous valtasi *hänen* mielensä... Erästä majasta astui nainen ja jäi katselemaan, kun *hän* hölkötti polkua pitkin väsyneen muulin

selässä. Pieni kylä, joka käsitti vain pari-kolmekymmentä majaa pölyisen plazan ympärillä, oli kaavamainen, mutta se oli kaava, joka oli lähellä *hänen* sydäntään; *hän* tunsi olevansa turvassa - *hän* odotti olevansa tervetullut ja että tässä paikassa oli ainakin yksi henkilö, johon *hän* saattoi luottaa, joka ei kavaltaisi *häntä* poliisille. *Hänen* saavuttuaan aivan lähelle muuli kävi jälleen istumaan - tällä kertaa *hänen* oli kierähdettävä maahan päästäkseen siitä irti. *Hän* nousi seisomaan ja nainen tarkasteli *häntä*, ikään kuin *hän* olisi ollut vihollinen. - Ah, Maria, *hän* sanoi, miten voit? - No mutta, nainen huudahti, tekö se olette, *isä*?

Extract 2.

Julia was twenty-six years old. *She* lived in a hostel with thirty other girls ("Always in the stink of women! How I hate women!" *she* said parenthetically), and *she* worked, as he had guessed, on the novel-writing machines in the Fiction Department. *She* enjoyed her work, which consisted chiefly in running and servicing a powerful but tricky electric motor. *She* was "not clever", but was fond of using *her* hands and felt at home with machinery. *She* could describe the whole process of composing a novel, from the general directive issued by the Planning Committee down to the final touching-up by the Rewrite Squad. But *she* was not interested in the finished product. *She* "didn't much care for reading," *she* said. Books were just a commodity that had to be produced, like jam or bootlaces. *She* had no memories of anything before the early "sixties, and the only person *she* had ever known who talked frequently of the days before the Revolution was a grandfather who had disappeared when *she* was eight. At school *she* had been captain of the hockey team and had won the gymnastics trophy two years running. *She* had been a troop-leader in the Spies and a branch secretary in the Youth League before joining the Junior Anti-Sex League. *She* had always borne an excellent character. *She* had even (an infallible mark of good reputation) been picked out to work in Pornosec, the sub-section of the Fiction Department which turned out cheap pornography for distribution among the proles. It was nicknamed Muck House by the people who worked in it, *she* remarked. There *she* had remained for a year, helping to produce booklets in sealed packets with titles like Spanking Stories or One Night in a Girls' School, to be bought furtively by proletarian youths who were under the impression that they were buying something illegal. "What are these books like?" said Winston curiously. "Oh, ghastly rubbish. They're boring, really. They only have six plots, but they swap them round a bit. Of course I was only on the kaleidoscopes. I was never in the Rewrite Squad. I'm not literary, dear - not even enough for that." He learned with astonishment that all the workers in Pornosec, except the heads of the departments, were girls. The theory was that men, whose sex instincts were less controllable than those of women, were in greater danger of being corrupted by the filth they handled. "They don't even like having married women there," *she* added. "Girls are always supposed to be so pure. Here's one who isn't, anyway." *She* had had her first love-affair when *she* was sixteen, with a Party member of sixty who later committed suicide to avoid arrest. "And a good job too," said *Julia*, "otherwise they'd have had my name out of him when he confessed."

(1984 2:3:75-112)

Julia oli kuudenkolmatta ikäinen. *Hän* asui yhteismajoituksessa kolmenkymmenen muun tytön kanssa ("Aina pitää haista naiselta! Minä inhoan naisia!"), ja niin kuin Winston oli arvannutkin, *hän* työskenteli Kirjallisuusosaston romaaninkirjoituskoneissa. *Hän* piti työstään, jona oli pääasiallisesti voimakkaan mutta oikullisen sähkömoottorin käyttäminen ja huoltaminen. *Hän* ei ollut "älyllinen", vaan käytti mielellään käsiään, ja koneiden seurassa *hän* tunsi olevansa kuin kotonaan. *Hän* osasi tarkalleen selostaa romaanin syntymistapahtuman kokonaisuudessaan alkaen Suunnittelulautakunnan yleisohjeista aina Uudelleenkirjoitus-ryhmän suorittamaan lopulliseen viimeistelyyn asti. Mutta viimeistelty

tuote ei enää herättänyt *hänen* mielenkiintoaan. Niin kuin *hän* itse sanoi, *hän* ei välittänyt lukemisesta. Kirjat olivat vain hyödyke, jota oli tuotettava aivan samoin kuin hilloa tai kengännauhoja. Varhaisemmalta ajalta kuin kuusikymmenluvun alkupuolelta *hän* ei muistanut mitään, ja ainoa *hänen* tapaamansa henkilö, joka oli enemmältä puhunut Vallankumousta edeltäneestä ajasta, oli isoisa, joka oli kadonnut *hänen* ollessaan kahdeksan vuoden ikäinen. Koulussa *hän* oli ollut hockey-joukkueen kapteeni, ja kahtena vuonna *hän* oli voittanut voimistelupalkinnon. *Hän* oli ollut Vakoojissa joukkueenjohtaja ja ennen liittymistään Nuorison Sukupuolisuudenvastustamisliittoon osastosihteerinä Nuoriso-liitossa. *Hän* oli aina nauttinut erinomaista arvonantoa. Niinpä *hänet* oli valittu (pettämätön hyvän maineen merkki) työskentelemään Pornosecissä, Kirjallisuuden osaston alaosastossa, joka tuotti halpaa siveetöntä kirjallisuutta jaettavaksi prole-luokan keskuudessa. "Sontahuoneeksi" sitä sanoivat siellä työskentelevät, *hän* kertoi. Kokonaisen vuoden *hän* oli ollut siellä valmistamassa sinetöidyissä pakkauksissa lähetettäviä kirjoja, joiden niminä oli sellaista kuin "Mainioita Juttuja" tai "Yö tyttökoulussa" ja joita proletariinuoriso osti salaa luullen ostavansa jotakin kiellettyä. "Millaisia ne kirjat oikeastaan olivat?" kysyi Winston, jonka uteliaisuus oli herännyt. "Oh..., pelkkää törkyä. Aivan ikävystyttäviä. Niissä oli vain kuusi eri juonta, joita aina vain vähän muokattiin. Minä olin tietenkin vain kaleidoskoopeissa, en koskaan Uudelleenkirjoitus-ryhmässä. Enhän minä ole lainkaan kirjallinen, kultaseni...en edes sen vertaa." Winston sai ihmeekseen kuulla, että päällikköä lukuunottamatta kaikki Pornosecissä työskentelevät olivat tyttöjä. Asia käsiteltiin siten, että miehet, joiden sukupuolivaistot olivat vaikeammin hallittavissa kuin naisten, olivat suuremmassa turmeltumisen vaarassa käsitellessään sellaista saastaa. "Sinne ei haluttu edes naimisissa olevia naisia", lisäsi *Julia*. "Arveltiin, että tytöt ovat niin puhtaita. Mutta tässä on ainakin yksi, joka ei ole." Ensimmäinen rakkausseikkailunsa *hänellä* oli ollut kuusitoista-vuotiaana. Siinä oli toisena eräs puolueen jäsen, joka sittemmin teki itsemurhan välttääkseen vangitsemisen. "Ja hyvä se olikin", sanoi *Julia*, "sillä muutenhan he olisivat hänen tunnustaessaan saaneet tietoonsa minunkin nimeni."

Appendix 5. Information on the previous study on the translation of the English 3rd person singular pronouns.

The data in the study comes from *The Tampere Finnish-English Bilingual Computer Corpus*, as well. However, only sentence initial pronouns in fictional writings were analysed.

The Finnish 3rd person singular pronoun *hän* as a translation.

Translation	Referent	Percentage
<i>Hän</i>	Male person	75%
	Female person	48%

Distribution of common noun and proper noun as translations for the pronouns *he* and *she*.

	Common noun	Proper noun
Male	16%	84%
Female	48%	52%

Appendix 6. Topic continuity.

Extract 1.

Winston was in Victory Square before the appointed time. *He* wandered round the base of the enormous fluted column, at the top of which Big Brother's statue gazed southward towards the skied where he had vanquished the Eurasian aeroplanes (the Eastasian aeroplanes, it had been, a few years ago) in the Battle of Airstrip One. In the street in front of it there was a statue of *a man* on horseback which was supposed to represent Oliver Cromwell. At five minutes past the hour *the girl* had still not appeared. Again the terrible fear seized upon *Winston*. *She* was not coming, *she* had changed *her* mind! *He* walked slowly up to the north side of the square and Ø got a sort of pale-coloured pleasure from identifying St Martin's Church, whose bells, when it had bells, had chimed "You owe me three farthings." Then *he* saw *the girl* standing at the base of the monument, reading or pretending to read a poster which ran spirally up the column. It was not safe to go near *her* until some more *people* had accumulated. There were telescreens all round the pediment. But at this moment there was a din of shouting and a zoom of heavy vehicles from somewhere to the left. Suddenly *everyone* seemed to be running across the square. *The girl* nipped nimbly round the lions at the base of the monument and Ø joined in the rush. *Winston* followed. As *he* ran, *he* gathered from some shouted remarks that a convoy of Eurasian *prisoners* was passing. Already a dense mass of *people* was blocking the south side of the square. *Winston*, at normal times the kind of person who gravitates to the outer edge of any kind of scrimmage, Ø shoved, Ø butted, squirmed *his* way forward into the heart of the crowd. Soon *he* was within arm's length of *the girl*, but the way was blocked by *an enormous prole* and *an almost equally enormous woman*, presumably *his* wife, who seemed to form an impenetrable wall of flesh. *Winston* wriggled himself sideways, and with a violent lunge Ø managed to drive his shoulder between *them*. For a moment it felt as though *his* entrails were being ground to pulp between the two muscular hips, then *he* had broken through, sweating a little. *He* was next to *the girl*. *They* were shoulder to shoulder, both staring fixedly in front of *them*.

(1984 2:1:232-257)

Jo ennen sovittua aikaa oli *Winston* Voiton torilla. *Hän* kierteli suunnatonta, uurretua pylvästä, jonka päässä Ison Veljen kuvapatsas seiso i tähyten eteläiselle taivaalle, missä hän Ilmakaista Ykkösen ilmataistelussa oli tuhonnut Euraasian ilmavoimat (Itä-Aasian, niin sanottiin viisi vuotta takaperin). Patsaan edessä olevalla kadulla oli toinen, *miestä* hevosen selässä kuvaava patsas, jonka arveltiin esittävän Oliver Cromwellia. Viisi minuuttia oli jo kulunut määrääjasta, eikä *tyttöä* vielä kuulunut. Taas valtasi kauhistava pelko *Winstonin*. *Tyttö* ei sittenkään tulisi, vaan Ø oli muuttanut mieltään! *Winston* käveli hitaasti torin pohjoisreunalle. Siellä tarjosi hyvin väljähtynyttä lohtua Pyhän Martin kirkko, jonka kellot, jos siinä yleensä oli ollut kellot, olivat kaikuneet kolmea puupenniä. Samassa *hän* näki *tytön* seisovan patsaan jalustan edessä ja lukevan tai olevan lukevinaan julistusta, joka kiersi ylös pylvästä. Ei ollut turvallista mennä lähelle ennen kuin kokoontui enemmän *väkeä*. Joka puolella patsaan jalustaa oli kaukovarjostimia. Mutta yhtäkkiä alkoi kuulua kovaa huutoa ja raskaiden ajopelien jyrinää jostakin vasemmalta. *Kaikki* näyttivät juoksevan torin poikki. *Tyttö* pujahti ketterästi patsaan jalustalla olevien leijonien ohi ja Ø yhtyi juoksijoihin. *Winston* seurasi perässä. Juostessaan *hän* kuuli jonkun huutavan, että euraasialaisia *sotavankeja* siellä vietiin. Taaja *ihmisjoukko* tukki umpeen koko torin eteläpään. *Winston*, joka tavallisissa oloissa pysytteli syrjässä kaikista katukahakoista, syisi, Ø työnteli, Ø puskeskeli, Ø luikersi aivan keskelle joukkoa. Pian *hän* oli käsivarrenmitan päässä *tytöstä*. Välillä oli enää vain *jättiläismäinen prole* ja *tämän* vieressä yhtä *jättiläismäinen eukko*, luultavasti *hänen* vaimonsa, kaiken kaikkiaan läpitunkemattoman näköinen lihamuuri. *Winston* vääntäytyi

hiukan sivummalle ja Ø onnistui ankarasti ponnistaen tunkemaan olkapäänsä *heidän* väliinsä. Hetken tuntui kuin *hänen* sisälmystensä olisi pakko purskahtaa ulos kaksien väkevien lanteiden puristuksessa. Vihdoin *hänen* onnistui soluttautua *heidän* välistään. *Hän* seiso nyt aivan *tytön* vieressä, olkapää olkapäässä, ja molemmat tuijottivat suoraan eteensä.

Extract 2.

Mäkilä olisi mennyt nukkumaan, mutta Ø ei oikein uskaltanut. Tuolla nojaili kenttäkeittiötä vasten *Rahikainen* ja Ø puhutti *vartiomiestä*. *Se* aikoo varastaa jotakin. *Mäkilä* ei enää osannut ajatella, että *Rahikainen* liikkuisi muissa hommissa, ja senpä vuoksi *hän* kuunnikin yhä valveilla, peläten että *vartiomies* antaisi petkuttaa itseään. Lopulta *Rahikainen* lähti laiskasti noljakoimaan tiehensä. Kun *Mäkilä* näki *hänen* poistuvan polun mutkan taakse, meni *hän* teltaan ja Ø paneutui makuulle. *Rahikainen* käveli jonkun matkaa polkua myöten, Ø pysähtyi sitten ja Ø vihelsi hiljaa. Vastaus tuli heti. *Rahikainen* otti suunnan ja jonkun matkaa hiivittyään *hän* löysi *Rokan* istumassa kiveltä. [(TS 10:1:24-32) keskustelu poistettu] *He* erosivat. *Rokka* painui metsään, ja *Rahikainen* alkoi hiipiä polun vartta takaisin.

Pensaikon suojassa ryömien *hän* pääsi muutaman metrin päähän keittiöstä ja Ø jäi siihen odottamaan. *Vartiomies* katseli puiden välistä vilkkuvalle lammelle tupakkaa poltellen. Jonkun matkan päässä oli töpinän miesten telta, mutta siellä oli kaikki hiljaista. Metsästä kuului tömähdys, ja *vartiomies* kääntyi nopeasti pudottaen kiväärin olalta kainaloonsa. Oksa rasahti metsässä, ja *mies* päästi varmistimen. Sitten *hän* otti muutaman askeleen äänen suuntaan ja Ø jäi kuuntelemaan, *Rahikainen* liukui kuin käärme keittiön luo ja Ø tarttui sen vieressä kumollaan olevaan keittoastiaan alkaen hiljaa vetää sitä pensaikon suojaan. Metsässä tömähti jälleen. *Vartiomies* kysyi teeskennellyn römeällä äänellä, pelkoaan peitellen: Tunnussana. Sitä ei kuulunut, mutta teltasta lappoi ulos alusvaatteisillaan olevia *miehiä*.

(TS 10:1:14-43)

Makila would have gone to bed if *he* had not been afraid to do so, for leaning idly on the field kitchen chatting with *the sentry* was *Rahikainen*. *He* was up to something. It never entered *Makila's* head that *Rahikainen* could be out on any other errand than to steal something, and thus *he* moved about to keep himself awake, afraid that *the sentry* might let himself be gulled. At last *Rahikainen* strolled nonchalantly away and *Makila*, seeing *him* vanish round a bend in the path, went to *his* tent to sleep. But *Rahikainen* went only a short distance along the path before stopping and emitting a low whistle. An answer came immediately. *Rahikainen* noted the direction and soon Ø found *Rokka* sitting on a rock. [(TS 10:1:24-32) discussion omitted] *They* parted, *Rokka* making *his* way farther into the forest as *Rahikainen* stole back along the path. Crawling through some bushes *he* reached a spot a few paces from the field kitchen and Ø waited silently. *The sentry*, a cigarette between *his* lips, stared at the pool gleaming between the trees. A short distance away stood the cooks' tent, but all was silence there. A noise came from the forest, and *the sentry* turned swiftly, letting the rifle drop from *his* shoulder to the crook of *his* arm. A twig snapped, and *the sentry* released the safety catch. *He* took a few steps toward the forest and Ø stood listening. Silently *Rahikainen* slid like a snake to the field kitchen, Ø seized a large pot standing upside down beside it and Ø began stealthily dragging it into the bushes. Again a sound came from the forest. *The sentry* cried out in a voice made gruff to mask his alarm: Give the countersign. From the forest there was no answer, but *men* streamed out of the cooks' tent dressed in *their* underwear.

Appendix 7. Topic continuity in the four extracts.

1984 – original.

	∅ Anaphora	Unstressed Pronouns	Names	Definite Articles + NPs	Indefinite Referentials	Overall Totals and Averages
# Tokens	5	19	5	5	7	41
Average Lookback	1.00	2.11	7.20	8.60	15.57	5.68
Average Persistence	1.20	0.53	1.80	0.80	0.14	0.73
Average Ambiguity	1.00	1.26	2.20	1.80	3.00	1.70

1984 – translation.

	∅ Anaphora	Unstressed Pronouns	Names	NPs	Overall Totals and Averages
# Tokens	6	11	6	13	36
Average Lookback	1.00	1.27	6.67	13.23	6.45
Average Persistence	1.00	0.09	1.33	0.15	0.47
Average Ambiguity	1.00	1.45	2.00	1.92	1.64

Tuntematon sotilas – original.

	∅ Anaphora	Unstressed Pronouns	Names	NPs	Overall Totals and Averages
# Tokens	8	8	12	7	35
Average Lookback	1.00	2.75	7.67	10.43	5.26
Average Persistence	0.25	0.50	1.67	0.29	0.51
Average Ambiguity	1.00	1.63	2.25	1.86	1.74

Unknown Soldier – translation.

	∅ Anaphora	Unstressed Pronouns	Names	Definite Articles + NPs	Indefinite Referentials	Overall Totals and Averages
# Tokens	5	13	12	6	1	37
Average Lookback	1.00	1.08	7.42	8.00	20.00	4.76
Average Persistence	0.20	0.23	0.67	0.67	1.00	0.46
Average Ambiguity	1.00	1.46	2.00	1.67	3.00	1.65

Appendix 8. Topic accessibility scale by Givón (1983: 17).

Most continuous/accessible topic

Zero anaphora

Unstressed/bound pronouns or grammatical agreement

Stressed/independent pronouns

R-dislocated DEF-NP's

Neutral-ordered DEF-NP's

L-dislocated DEF-NP's

Y-moved NP's

Cleft/ focus constructions

Referential indefinite NP's

Most discontinuous/inaccessible topic