

# **”Goddam paper” – Translating Swearwords from English into Finnish**

*The Catcher in the Rye* by J.D. Salinger as a Case in Point

Miljaana Lahdenperä  
Master’s Thesis  
Degree Programme in Multilingual Translation Studies, English  
School of Languages and Translation Studies  
Faculty of Humanities  
University of Turku  
June 2022

The originality of this thesis has been checked in accordance with the University of Turku quality assurance system using the Turnitin OriginalityCheck service.

Master's Thesis

**Multilingual Translation Studies, English**

**Miljaana Lahdenperä**

**"Goddam paper" – Translating Swearwords from English into Finnish**

**Pages:** 37, 6 in Appendices

This MA thesis studies the translation of swearwords from English into Finnish in the context of retranslation, with *The Catcher in the Rye* by J.D. Salinger as the case in point. The research is conducted by analysing the similarities and differences in the first Finnish translation by Pentti Saarikoski and the retranslation by Arto Schroderus.

The research material collected for this thesis are the 50 first instances of the swearwords damn or goddam in the original English novel. The swearwords are collected from the original novel, as well as the two Finnish translations. The translation strategies used by each translator are analysed. The categories of the translation strategies are 'translated', 'softening' and 'omission'.

The aim of the thesis is to find out how swearwords are translated from English into Finnish and how retranslations possibly differ from first translations in their way of translating swearwords. The research is conducted as a case in point study from both a quantitative and a qualitative perspective. The quantitative method addresses the presence of swearwords and the frequency of translation strategies used. The qualitative method addresses the choices of translation strategies and their effects on the translation.

The results of the thesis provide an insight into a specific example of retranslation and how swearwords are translated from English into Finnish. The study finds that there are multiple possibilities for each translator when choosing an appropriate translation strategy, and multiple reasons behind each translatory choice.

This study can be used as motivation for studying the field of retranslation and translating swearwords further. Beyond the scope of this study, there is a multitude of topics and translatory choices that can be researched. It would be beneficial to conduct further study into the translation of swearwords in general, as well as with *The Catcher in the Rye* and the Finnish translations *Sieppari ruispellossa* as the cases in point.

**Key words:** retranslation, swearword, *The Catcher in the Rye*, translation strategy

# Table of Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Background</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Introducing J.D. Salinger and <i>The Catcher in the Rye</i>	4
2.2	The Translators	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Theory</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1	Introducing Retranslation	8
3.2	The Effect of the First Translator	11
3.3	What are Swearwords?	12
3.3.1	Swearing in English	13
3.3.2	Swearing in Finnish	14
3.4	Translating Swearwords	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Material and Methods</b>	<b>17</b>
4.1	Material and Its Collection	17
4.2	Methods	17
<b>5</b>	<b>Analysis</b>	<b>20</b>
5.1	Overview of the Translation Strategies	20
5.2	Goddam paper – dorka paperi or helvetin läpyskä?	24
5.2.1	Similarities of the Translations	24
5.2.2	Differences in the Translations	28
5.3	Summary of Findings	32
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>35</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>38</b>
	Primary sources	38
	Secondary sources	38
	<b>Appendices</b>	
	Appendix 1. Finnish summary	

## List of Tables

**Table 1** Distribution of translation strategies by PS and AS

**Table 2** Translation strategies used by Schroderus when Saarikoski implemented each of the three translation strategies

**Table 3** Translation strategies used by Saarikoski when Schroderus implemented each of the three translation strategies

**Table 4** Finnish swearwords used by Saarikoski and Schroderus

## List of Abbreviations

**JS** = the original English version *The Catcher in the Rye* by J.D. Salinger

**PS** = the first Finnish translation *Sieppari ruispellossa* translated by Pentti Saarikoski

**AS** = the Finnish retranslation *Sieppari ruispellossa* translated by Arto Schroderus

**ML** = the author of this thesis Miljaana Lahdenperä

## 1 Introduction

This master's thesis explores the field of retranslation within the field of translation. More specifically, the research focuses on the analysis of translating swearwords from English into Finnish in two different translations of the same text.

Retranslation is an old practice, with a multitude of texts and text types having been translated since the Middle Ages (Van Poucke and Sanz Gallego 2019, 10–11). But in recent years, a growing interest in the research of retranslations has emerged (see e.g. Gambier 1994; Tahir Gürçağlar 2009. Collombat (2004) went as far as declaring the 21st century to be the “Age of Retranslation”. Despite this growing interest, comprehensive research is still lacking (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 8). Providing a comprehensive analysis of retranslation is extremely challenging; thus, this thesis aims to provide material for a more comprehensive understanding of a specific topic within the field of retranslation. The specific topic of this master's thesis is the translation of the swearwords *damn* and *goddam* from English into Finnish. The case study that will be presented here is J.D. Salinger's novel *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) and its two Finnish translations.

This thesis is inspired by previous research into retranslations, and it aims to explore why and how novels have been retranslated. A key interest behind this research is the comparison of a first translation and a retranslation to the original translation. According to Koskinen and Paloposki (2015b, 25), a deeper analysis into a translation and retranslation(s) of the same source text often shows a connection between the translations. Therefore, this thesis compares the two Finnish translations to one another, in order to explore those possible similarities between them.

The primary aim of this thesis is to explore the translation of the two swearwords from English into Finnish. This thesis explores those swearwords in the two Finnish translations, both named *Sieppari ruispellossa*. The original novel, *The Catcher in the Rye*, was chosen as a case in point due to its language, which is known for its profanity and vulgarity. The novel has gained popularity and unpopularity due to its language since its publishing and thus provides an interesting point of view for the analysis of translating swearwords. As stated, the two swearwords chosen for this research are *damn* and *goddam*. Costello describes *goddam* as “Holden's favorite adjective” (1959, 175). Furthermore, the words *damn* and *goddam* are analysed together since they are used interchangeably with one another and there is no

detectable difference between their meaning in the text (Costello 1959, 175). The words also stood out by their frequency of use in the novel as well as in the way that the swearwords were used in the original novel and its translations, and thus, all the aforementioned factors served as motivation to choose them as the subjects of the analysis.

The secondary aims of this thesis are to find out if and how the Finnish translation and retranslation differ from one another and the English original, and how the time of publishing and the translator may have affected the translations. Understanding translation in different time periods is one particular motivator of researching retractions (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 10). This thesis aims to add on to research that has already been conducted about retranslation and translating curse words (see e.g. Hjort 2014; Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019).

Researching retranslation is generally conducted from a case study approach (Susam-Sarajeva 2009, 37). Case study approach into a specific literary work is often implemented, as it gives an intimate and intensive perspective on how translations and translators of a specific piece have approached the translation process (Susam-Sarajeva 2009, 39). Research into a single aspect or part of retranslation can help understanding or answering questions related to retranslation in general (Van Poucke and Sanz Gallego 2019, 12). In this vein, this thesis focuses on a specific aspect in connection with retranslation, i.e. swearwords, and wishes to draw general-level conclusions on how first translators and retranslators approach translating swearwords in any context.

The case in point of this thesis is *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) by J.D. Salinger. The novel was first translated into Finnish as *Sieppari ruispellossa* in 1961 by Pentti Saarikoski. A retranslation by Arto Schroderus was published under the same name in 2004. This thesis compares the two Finnish translations to their original English version and discusses the translation of swearwords in the two translations from two different eras (of translation). Over 40 years between the original Finnish translation and the Finnish retranslation of *The Catcher in the Rye* give an interesting perspective into the study of similarities and differences in translational strategies.

Besides time, a variety of other factors plays a role in how a translator translates. Deane-Cox (2014, 24) discusses the habitus of the translator and how it affects the way they approach a translation and eventually translate. They define habitus as “the set of dispositions, habits, skills, tastes and so on acquired through everyday experiences since childhood” (Deane-Cox

2014, 24). Aaltonen (2014, 8) shares this opinion, by discussing how the translated text is always influenced by the individuality of the translator. For example, Saarikoski has mentioned that his childhood revolved around the orthodox church (Tarkka 2014, 24).

Besides the individuality, personality and habitus of the translator, according to Koskinen and Paloposki, the first translator is also someone to consider, when retranslating or researching retranslation (2015, 26).

Continuing from the aforementioned notions, this thesis focuses on the following research questions: How do the Finnish translations differ from one another? How do the Finnish translations differ from the original English novel? How does the habitus of the translator affect their translation? Does the first translator have an effect on the retranslation? Which other factors affect the translation of swearwords?

This thesis takes on a comparative approach into the analysis of translational differences between the two Finnish translations. The analysis section will discuss examples of translational strategies used in the Finnish versions. The theoretical framework, for the analysis of the translation strategies, used in this MA thesis comes from Azura, Dewi and Hidayat (2019), who in turn follow the strategies proposed by Baker (2018). Azura, Dewi and Hidayat (2019) explored translation of swearwords from English into Indonesian, also in the context of *The Catcher in the Rye* and divided the data into three categories: 'translated', 'softening' and 'omission'. Their framework and the categories of translation strategies are used in this thesis as well.

## 2 Background

This section introduces the novel used as the basis of the research, its author and translators. It also discusses swearing in general, in the original novel and contextualises it in the US and in Finland, in addition to describing the use of swearwords in the novel and its translations. The research is conducted on *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) by J.D. Salinger, *Sieppari ruispellossa* (1961) translated by Pentti Saarikoski and *Sieppari ruispellossa* (2004) translated by Arto Schroderus. This section also presents the swearwords under analysis in their cultural contexts.

### 2.1 Introducing J.D. Salinger and *The Catcher in the Rye*

Jerome David “J.D.” Salinger was born in New York City in 1919. *The Catcher in the Rye* is not only his most famous novel, but one of the most popular and internationally known novels of the era (Graham 2007, chap. 1). It was originally published in English in serial form in 1945-1946, and later published as a novel in 1951. At times, Salinger questioned whether he would finish the novel (ibid.). After its publication, the novel gained popularity, sold a considerable number of copies and received high praise from reviewers (ibid.). The edition used for this master’s thesis is the 14th printing of the novel from 1952, by Little, Brown and Company. The novel has a total of 26 chapters and 277 pages.

The novel follows the life of Holden Caulfield, who is the main protagonist of the story. The novel is written entirely from his point of view. The novel starts by Holden recalling the events of his life before the previous Christmas. Holden gets expelled from Pencey prep school, after which he embarks on a “journey” into the adult life. “As he wanders around [New York City] he reflects on his past, his family and friends, drinks, smokes and thinks about sex[.]” (Graham 2007, chap. 1). Holden’s mind is filled with anger, melancholy and rebellion, while he is acutely aware of right and wrong (ibid.). Holden decides not to visit his parents, even though they live in the city. His sister Phoebe, whom he does meet, tries to talk sense into him, as well as run away with him, which Holden refuses. Despite often being analysed as a rebellious general young adult, Holden is nonetheless also a product of the life in post-war United States, and tries to navigate his unsure life and future to the best of his abilities (ibid.)

*The Catcher in the Rye* has been translated into multiple languages and has sold millions of copies worldwide (Graham 2007, chap. 1). The novel is known for its language, especially the



use of vulgar, offensive and racist language, which has been a topic of controversy. The novel has been banned in multiple schools for its language, due to its language and content (ibid.) The removal of the book from reading lists or schools in general has majorly been due to fear of the book affecting negatively young readers, who are interested in the novel due to its popularity (ibid.).

The popularity of the novel, the controversy around it and the removal of the novel from schools' reading lists inspired to choose the novel as the case in point of this research. An interest to explore the controversies arises, when a specific novel reaches almost a cult status and keeps it for decades. Since most of the controversy around the novel relates to language use, the subcategory of swearwords was chosen as the item under analysis in this thesis.

## 2.2 The Translators

This section provides an overview of the translators and an insight into their backgrounds. This information will help us understand the setting of their work and their use of translation strategies.

In recent years, in Finland, it has been more common to display the translator as one of the authors of the novel, since a translator gives language to the translation (Tiittula 2016, 155). In the case of *Sieppari ruispellossa*, both Saarikoski and Schroderus are mentioned on the front page as the Finnish translators of their respective translations. Mentioning of their name gives the translator visibility, but also places them under analyses into their work such as this master's thesis.

Pentti Saarikoski, the translator of the first translation, was born in Impilahti, Finland in 1937, right before the Winter War between Finland and the Soviet Union. He was a poet, an author and a translator. He published a great amount of his own poetry and prose throughout his life. He has translated multiple works from English into Finnish, such as F. Scott Fitzgerald's *Tender Is The Night*, James Joyce's *Ulysses* and multiple novels by *Philip Roth*. He has also translated classical works into Finnish, such as Homer's *Odyssey*. Prior to his translation of *The Catcher in the Rye*, he was a fairly unknown poet in Finland (Hietala 2004). Much like the English original in the US, Saarikoski's translation created a similar uproar in Finland (ibid.). The novel and its original author, but more importantly its translator, gained popularity amongst young people, with some of them dubbing Saarikoski as a rock star or a celebrity. Translating *The Catcher in the Rye* made Saarikoski a celebrity (Koskinen and

Paloposki 2015b, 28). Saarikoski even wrote a diary in a magazine directed at adolescents (Hietala 2004). The Finnish edition of Saarikoski's translation, used for this analysis, is the 7th printing from 1962 by Tammi. The novel has a total of 26 chapters, like the original, and 234 pages.

Saarikoski himself was aware of the difficulty of translating a novel such as *The Catcher in the Rye* (Tarkka 2014, 339). His translation of the novel uses a lot of Finnish vernacular, colloquial and slang language, especially that of the 1950s Helsinki (ibid.). Many have criticised Saarikoski's translation as they see Saarikoski's work as an artistic interpretation of the source text rather than as a translation (Hietala 2004). Even if no translation is without mistakes, the ones that Saarikoski made, are according to Schroderus (2005, 87-88) of a kind that professional translators would no longer commit. During the time when Saarikoski was translating, translation strategies and approaches were a topic of discussion and dispute, especially in cases such as translating literature from classical antiquity (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 9).

Arto Schroderus, the translator of the retranslation, was born in 1966 and has also translated various novels throughout his career. Some of his translation works include Hunger S. Thompson's *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas*, Candace Bushnell's *Sex and the City* and Philip Roth's *Nemesis*. Both Saarikoski and Schroderus have translated Roth's works but retranslating *The Catcher in the Rye* was the only time Schroderus retranslated a work previously translated by Saarikoski.

If Saarikoski's translation has been criticised for its liberal approach to translation, Schroderus' translation has been seen as too proper and clean, albeit being truer to the source text (Hietala 2004). Schroderus talks about his own translation, also in relation to Saarikoski, in *Suom. Huom: Kirjoituksia kääntämisestä* (2005) edited by Kristiina Rikman (see section 3.3). The Finnish novel *Sieppari ruispellossa* translated by Schroderus that is used for this master's thesis is the 1st edition published in 2004 by Tammi. The novel has a total of 26 chapters, like the original and the first Finnish translation, and a total of 289 pages.

Lastly, Koskinen and Paloposki (2015b, 33) comment on the differences between the two Finnish translations as follows:

“Saarikoski's translation became (in)famous both because of its own qualities and because of the reputation of the then fairly recent original. When Schroderus wrote his translation 43 years later, he had a different source text: a modern

classic. It follows that the two translations are also different: one rebellious and youthful, the other solemn and serious”.  
(Koskinen and Paloposki 2015b, 33).

Following from Koskinen and Paloposki’s (2015b, 33) notion, Saarikoski’s translation has been called “a funny forgery” (Tarkka 2014, 340, translated by ML) which created a completely new novel in the Finnish language. Schroderus (2005, 91), in his own words, frayed from translating in a similar manner like Saarikoski, who heavily used domestication as a translation strategy, even though it was a risk.

### 3 Theory

This section provides the theoretical framework and background based on which the analysis of this master's thesis is conducted. Firstly, I discuss retranslation, its definitions, motivations and characteristics. Secondly, I provide an overview of the effect of the first translator on subsequent translations of the same source text. Thirdly, I discuss swearwords, their meaning and cultural contexts, and finally delve into the translation of swearwords in a literary context.

#### 3.1 Introducing Retranslation

Researching retranslation has gained popularity in recent years, especially the research of retranslating prose (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 7). In the 21st century, researchers have been interested in retranslation as a phenomenon (see e.g. Koskinen and Paloposki 2010 and 2015a; Deane-Cox 2014), but there is a lack of comprehensive research (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 8). The lack of comprehensive research has resulted in using a case study approach in researching and analysing retranslations (Van Poucke and Sanz Gallego 2019, 11). The multitude and growing number of case study research has pooled into volumes of works that exclusively discuss retranslation (*ibid.*). Many Finnish researchers have studied and analysed retranslation, and Finland has been a pioneer in studies of retranslation in many regards (see for example Koskinen and Paloposki 2010).

Retranslation is generally defined as a translation of an original literary work, which has previously been translated from the same source language to the same target language (Paloposki and Koskinen 2010, 29) or the process of translating such text (see e.g. Tahir Gürçağlar 2009, 233; Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 8–9). Retranslation is a multiplicative event, which provides the possibility of an infinite amount of target language instantiations of a source text (Deane-Cox 2014, 11).

Collombat (2004) titled her article “The 21<sup>st</sup> Century: The Age of Retranslation”. Research into retranslation started even before Collombat's declaration. Gambier (1994, 413) ponders why certain works have been retranslated. His questions include but are not limited to: Why have earlier works of famous authors been retranslated? Has our understanding of languages changed, or do we read and interpret authors differently? What about the notion loyalty; has it changed its meaning? (Gambier 1994, 413). Vanderschelden (2000) is another early researcher who started wondering about the reasons behind retranslation. They list a set of questions that can act as the driving force behind a retranslation: “the quality of the

translation, a different interpretation or the fact that the target text [...] has a specific function” (Vanderschelden 2000, 1). Collombat (2004) discusses translatory concerns as the main motivation behind retranslation. One of the translatory concerns is the ageing of translations, also discussed by Van Poucke (2017, 92). The ageing of translations was mentioned as a motivator for a retranslation already by Berman (1990). As Koskinen and Paloposki (2015b, 27) state, retranslations are motivated by the “understanding that the existing translation is somehow faulty: too old, too outdated, too free, too domesticated or too foreignized[.]”.

What does it then mean to have the ageing of a translation as one of the main motivators for a retranslation? According to Schroderus (2005, 91), all Finnish translations will age over time. Tiittula (2016, 154) comments on the ageing of translation possibly being due to excessive domestication in the translation or the evolvement of language after the publication of the translation (*ibid.*). According to Koskinen and Paloposki (2015a, 10), dissatisfaction with the first translation(s) is one motivator for wanting a retranslation. This dissatisfaction is often related to the language used in the first translation, or the relationship between the translation and the source text (Tiittula 2016, 154).

Some may argue that language has aged, but has it really? Whenever a retranslation is commissioned, has the first translation been analysed for its language to be able to state that its language has aged? If the language has not indeed aged, then there must be another driving force for the retranslation. Tiittula (2016, 154) proposes other reasons for commissioning a retranslation, such as the economic market and matters related to publishing. Van Poucke and Sanz Gallego also ponder about publishers’ economic point of view and question the cost-effectiveness of investing in a retranslation rather than in a revision or a re-edition (2019, 12).

Furthermore, according to Tiittula (2016, 154), reasons may include a new edition of the original, which now needs to be retranslated, or clear mistakes, omissions and additions in the already existing translation. A reason behind carrying out a retranslation may also be the need for a re-interpretation of the source text (Tahir Gürçağlar 2009, 235). As an example of evolving standards and language, Schroderus (2005, 87) discusses Saarikoski’s translation strategies in the first Finnish translation and is of the opinion that any Finnish translator that would use Saarikoski’s translation methods today would remain without work.

Each translation is an interpretation of the source text and therefore a more interesting approach for this thesis is to focus on different translation strategies and translational choices

made by the translator, outlined as a potential research direction by Tiittula (2016, 154). Schroderus (2005, 85) mentions that a new translation into Finnish does not mean that the old (or in this case first) translation is cancelled. In the same vein, according to Deane-Cox, a retranslation can also act as a rejuvenator for the original work (2014, 191). As mentioned above, there are other driving forces that require or motivate a retranslation besides cancelling the first translation.

There are socio-economic and socio-cultural factors that may also ease or hinder a retranslation in specific moments or contexts (Deane-Cox 2014, 11, 28). There are multiple different variables that can affect and predispose the way a translator translates. The habitus of the translator, meaning the skills, habits, sets of disposition and tastes the translator has acquired throughout their life, will affect the way they approach and shape the translation (Deane-Cox 2014, 24). Also the context of the translation can affect specific choices made by the translator, such as the particular purpose of the translation (*ibid.*). Aaltonen also argues that every translator is an individual and their own ways of thinking will influence how they interpret the text they are translating (2014, 8).

Research into retranslation is often based on the hypothesis that a retranslation is closer to the original text than the first translation (Tiittula 2016, 153). In translation studies, this is known as the Retranslation Hypothesis. The idea was originally presented by Berman (1990) and later discussed for example by Chesterman (2000). This approach draws on the idea that a first translation tends towards domestication, while the second translation can be foreignized, as the target audience is already familiar with the source culture (Tiittula 2016, 153).

However, it is not always the case that retranslations follow the retranslation hypothesis (Paloposki and Koskinen 2010, 30; Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 75). There are many reasons for a translator to opt for foreignization (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 75). A foreignized translation may also appear to be a foreignized translation, but its appearance as such can also stem from other factors than from a conscious choice by the translator (*ibid.*).

Despite the growing interest into retranslation as a whole, there is debate as to whether the number of Finnish retranslations has increased, remained the same or decreased (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 7). Gathering exhaustive data on the number of retranslations is laborious, even for a language like Finnish, but a Turkish project is currently underway (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 7–8) to achieve this goal. Smaller languages like Finnish can

act as an inspiration for larger languages and contradict some of the general presuppositions made about retranslation in larger languages (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 15).

### 3.2 The Effect of the First Translator

Before discussing the possible effect of the first translator on subsequent translations, it is important to note the difference between a retranslation and a revised translation. According to Vanderschelden, revision involves “making changes to an existing TT whilst retaining the major part, including the overall structure and tone of the former version” (2000: 1–2). Despite the lack of quantitative definition of the difference between a retranslation and a revision (Van Poucke 2020, 15), based on the discussion earlier in Section 2.2 and later in Section 5, it can be said that Saarikoski’s translation is the first Finnish translation of *The Catcher in the Rye*, and Schroderus’ translation is the first retranslation. The differences between the two translations are evident and range from the translators’ approaches to translating swearwords to overall tone and language.

Oftentimes, the first translation is seen as a literary work that needs to be reworked (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015b, 26). Novels and works that are considered classics are often those that are retranslated (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015b, 27). These classics have already been translated earlier, like Saarikoski’s *Sieppari ruispellossa* in 1961, and then are retranslated for contemporary readers.

Another way to see retranslation is as a process that liberates the translator from any previous translations, translators and the approaches that they have used (Deane-Cox 2014, 11). Therefore, a retranslation differs from a revised translation in that it does not necessarily depend on the first (or previous) translations of the same novel. Koskinen and Paloposki discuss how retranslations are often seen as *independent* texts, not necessarily connected or linked to each other except through the source text (2015, 25, italics by original authors). However, despite the aforementioned common idea, it is still possible that the previous translator and their work affects the retranslator. As stated by Van Poucke (2020, 10), “a retranslator has the opportunity to [--] use the previous translation to get acquainted with [--] translating the source text[.]”. The possible effect of the first translator is also considered in this thesis. Schroderus (2005, 85, translated by ML) in his essay mentions “My first thought was Saarikoski, only the second one was Salinger”. His example displays the effect of the first translator, especially in cases where the first translator is well-known, either as a translator or due to their translated works. Despite the possible effect of the first translator, Schroderus

(2005, 85) provides us with an understanding of Saarikoski's effect on his own process of translating *Sieppari ruispellossa*.

“I had not read *The Catcher*, the English original [--] I had read the Finnish translation, *Sieppari*. [--] I read the original three times and made two versions of the Finnish translation before I opened Saarikoski's *Sieppari* for the second time in my life, for the first time in over twenty years.”  
(Schroderus 2005, 85–86, translated by ML)

This quotation shows the effort that Schroderus used, in order to avoid being too greatly affected by Saarikoski's original translation. Schroderus does however mention, that he did translate one specific word based on how Saarikoski had translated it (Schroderus 2005, 87). Van Poucke mentions that in some cases there are no other ways of translating a specific word, thus the retranslator would resort to the same translation option than the previous translator, and not try to invent another one (2020, 10). Despite using one of Saarikoski's words, by perusing through Saarikoski's translation, Schroderus noticed how differently they each had translated the text (2005, 87).

### 3.3 What are Swearwords?

Swearwords, also called profanities, curse words and expletives among others, exist in every language, culture and country (Jdetawy 2019, 27050). However, their meaning, use, intensity and offensiveness varies greatly (ibid.). Before analysing the translation of swearwords, it is pertinent to define what in fact is a swearword.

According to Merriam-Webster Dictionary, a 'swearword' is “a profane or obscene oath or word”. Merriam-Webster Dictionary defines 'profane' as “not concerned with religion or religious purposes”, “not holy because unconsecrated, impure, or defiled” and “serving to debase or defile what is holy” and 'obscene' as “abhorrent to morality of virtue” and “containing or being language regarded as taboo in polite usage”.

Montagu agrees with the definition of a swearword and states that swearing constitutes profanity, which she defines as “the unsanctioned use of the names or attributes of the figures or objects of religious veneration” (1967, 101). Azura, Dewi and Hidayat's (2019, 45) definition that a profanity is a word that uses “sacred words irreverently but without malicious intent” follows the aforementioned definitions. Therefore, for the purposes of this thesis, a 'swearword' is a word which is profane in its nature and is considered taboo in polite language usage.



Azura, Dewi and Hidayat also refer to profanity and profane words as being related to religion and religious contexts (2019, 45, 47). A profanity's strong connection to religion is therefore also heavily culture-dependent (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 45). Azura, Dewi and Hidayat (2019) are not the only ones who have concerned themselves with the definition, meaning and culture-dependence of swearwords. The severity of swearwords is a common conversation topic (Hjort 2014, 130). The offensiveness, dirtiness or badness of a swearword is dependent on the *potential* emotive reaction of the recipient, which in turn is dependent on the person and the context (Hjort 2014, 130, emphasis by the original author). As seen from Hjort's notions, describing a swearword as inherently bad or good is somewhat challenging. For example, Costello (1959, 175) describes goddam as a fairly weak way of using god's name, whereas Jdetawy (2019, 27051) lists it as a strong swearword. Both however recognise the importance of offensiveness to the recipient of the swearword, which is also highlighted by Hjort (2014). Hjort talks about the quality of swearwords, and to avoid giving swearwords positive or negative connotations, she refers to the quality of the words as force or strength and uses adjectives strong or forceful to describe the swearwords (2014, 130).

As mentioned above, *The Catcher in the Rye* includes a multitude of swearwords, of which the words *damn* and *goddam* were chosen for the analysis. The following sections will discuss the swearwords and swearing first in English and then in Finnish language use. A discussion on the Finnish translations of the words *damn* and *goddam* follows in sections 3.4 and 5.

### 3.3.1 Swearing in English

As typical for many languages, English also has swearwords that can and are being used in multiple different contexts. It is important to note, that *The Catcher in the Rye* is set in the United States and therefore its language content and context is that of the US. Swearing in the US is seen as bad and a big deal, especially when done by a public figure (Moore 2015).

As stated earlier, Costello also found no difference between the meaning of *damn* and *goddam* in the novel (1959, 175). However, the similar use of the words in the text does not equate to similar meaning in reality. Costello (1959, 175) explains, that Caulfield's use of the swearwords *damn* and *goddam* expresses only his either positive, negative or neutral feeling toward the object of the sentence.

Despite swearing being a big part of *The Catcher in the Rye*, it is not the only reason why the book has raised worry among critics, teachers and parents. Combined with Holden's use of

the English language, the topics and activities he describes with his controversial language have caused the book to be banned in schools (Graham 2007, chap. 4).

### 3.3.2 Swearing in Finnish

Tammi's *Suuri kirosanakirja* (2002) (lit. the big swearword book) is a collection of Finnish swearwords which discusses the nature, history and meaning behind the words. Tammi (2002, 11) states that depending on your perspective, the Finnish language has either five or over three thousand swearwords. Even though Tammi's collection approaches Finnish swearwords from a humorous perspective, his commentary can be used to explain the nature of the words.

Depending on the number of swearwords actually present in the Finnish language, it provides a "potential linguistic richness" of swearwords (Hjort 2017, 231). Hjort has researched Finnish swearwords in multiple different occasions and contexts (see e.g. Hjort 2014, Hjort 2015, Hjort 2017). Their notions of Finnish swearwords have guided the research of translating swearwords into Finnish.

One of the common uses of Finnish swearwords is as intensifiers (Hjort 2017, 234). Commonly, an intensifying swearword in Finnish is in the genitive form, such as *helvetin hyvä kroppa* ('hell of a good body') (AS, p. 40). Other functions include interjections, combinations with interrogative pronouns, word formations and constructions of denial (Hjort 2017, 234–235, for a more detailed analysis, see e.g. Hjort 2014, Hjort 2017).

## 3.4 Translating Swearwords

As already mentioned, the meanings, cultural contexts, uses and intensities of swearwords vary greatly. All the variables challenge a translator, whenever they translate swearwords. A translator must always ponder about which translation strategy to use, when translating swearwords (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 43). According to Hjort (2009, n.p.), "[t]he task of translating swearwords is a balancing act: translators interpret the original style and message, make assumptions of reception by the target audience, and choose the translations accordingly."

English and Finnish belong to different language families and therefore have differences between the use of words and expressions. Translating profanities, swearwords and expletives may be challenging for a translator, as any chosen translation strategy affects the target text's literary quality (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 43). Different languages have varying

attitudes towards swearing and the cultures of swearing can also be different (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 44). Languages have different meanings for words and expressions, especially curse words, that display strong emotions. It is important to note that a swearword in English may not have a literal equivalent per se in Finnish, but a Finnish swearword is generally used to replace the English word in translation. There are multiple options for a translator to choose from when translating swearwords, since many languages have a multitude of swearwords used in specific contexts that mean similar, if not the same, thing. The swearing cultures and the swearwords analysed were discussed in sections 2.3.1 and 2.3.2. The differences between Saarikoski's and Schroderus' choices of equivalent Finnish words are further discussed in section 5, Analysis.

Especially in the case of translating swearwords, the personal preferences, values and idiolects of the translator affect how a translator approaches the task (Hjort 2009, n.p.). However, a significant notion to remember is that explaining human action, especially its causative explanation, is demanding, if not impossible (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 21). Translators as humans have pre-existing motives and interests that affect their behaviour and thus their way of translating (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 21). Assumptions based on the general way, method or strategy of translation during a specific era undermine the value and effect of the individual translator (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 22). Analysing material from the particular and expanding into the general, while using multiple methods and approaching the material as a part of a process, are new methods of researching retranslations (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 22) and their translators.

Translating swearwords has been researched in other contexts before (see e.g. Hjort 2009, Briechele and Eppler 2019; Vainio-Puhju 2020). Hjort has studied for example audio-visual translation, whose preconditions differ from translating literature (see e.g. Hjort 2009). Hjort's (2009) notions on translating swearwords in an audio-visual context may be difficult to apply to the translation of swearwords in the context of novels (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 45). In audio-visual translation, translators may omit curse words often due to space constraints, but also because they do not contain important enough information for conveying the message, or the message can be conveyed without the use of a swearword (Hjort 2009, n.p.). Azura, Dewi and Hidayat (2019) discuss the translator's possibilities when encountering a curse word or another profanity:

In translating profanity, a translator has several options: To translate the profanity as it is, to maintain the expressive quality but not the profanity itself (softening),

or to omit the profanity entirely (omission). What option the translator chooses will depend on both linguistic and non-linguistic considerations, such as whether the sentence will flow better or whether the audience will react well. Whatever options the translator chooses, they will affect the text, either positively or negatively.

(Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 45).

Azura, Dewi and Hidayat also discuss that any word or expression may be stylistically important to the text, even when it seems inconsequential, and the absence of such word or expression may affect the text (2019, 45). They continue that “a character that is foul-mouthed should remain foul-mouthed in the target text”, or else the translation will affect characterization (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 46)”. In the case of *The Catcher in the Rye*, an absence of swearwords *damn* and *goddam* in the Finnish translations may paint a false image of Holden Caulfield as a more polite person than he was in the original novel.

## 4 Material and Methods

### 4.1 Material and Its Collection

The material for this thesis is two-fold. The larger scale material for this thesis includes *The Catcher in the Rye* by J.D. Salinger from 1951 and its translations *Sieppari ruispellossa* by Pentti Saarikoski in 1961 and by Arto Schroderus in 2004. The specific object of study for this thesis are the first 50 instances of the swearwords *damn* and *goddam*, and their translations in the two Finnish translations. The analysis will focus on swearwords present in the original English version and compare them with the translators' solutions in the two translations.

These words were chosen among all potential swearwords due to their high frequency in the novel in question. The 50 first mentions of *damn* and *goddam* appeared on the first 42 pages of the original novel. As the novel has a total of 277 pages, the 50 first mentions appeared on a little over 15% into the book. The words stood out amongst other expletives, swearwords, profanities and offensive references, and are therefore the subject of the analysis. Both the words *damn* and *goddam* were chosen for the analysis, since the words were used in a similar manner in the ST, for example as adjectives describing a noun or before another adjective.

The material was collected from all the three versions: the original and the two translations. The analysis was conducted based on the original English language novel and the occurrences of the swearwords in it. The first 50 occurrences of the words *damn* and *goddam* were collected from the source text. Simultaneously, the two Finnish translations were explored, and the Finnish translations of the English swearwords were collected. The data was collected to an Excel sheet with the Finnish translations appearing side by side with the original English word. This allowed the comparison of the first translation and the retranslation to one another and the source text. The collected data was later converted to a table in order to provide a clearer representation of the data.

### 4.2 Methods

This thesis takes inspiration from Azura, Dewi and Hidayat's (2019) classification of translation strategies. Azura, Dewi and Hidayat's (2019) divided translation strategies into three groups; translated, softening and omission. They define the terms as follows: "...to translate the profanity as it is (translated), to maintain the expressive quality but not the

profanity itself (softening), or to omit the profanity entirely (omission)” (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 45).

However, categorizing specific examples is not always straightforward. Firstly, one needs to question what it means to translate something ‘as it is’. Spillner (2002, 37) discusses equivalence in relation to translation studies. Their notions on semantic equivalence, connotative equivalence as well as pragmatic and communicative equivalence are something to consider, when claiming that something is translated ‘as it is’. According to Spillner, the equivalences are defined as follows: Semantic equivalence “requires that the meanings are identical in the source and the target text”. Connotative equivalence means that “the translation should evoke the same associations for the listener/reader as for the listener/reader of the source text”. Pragmatic and communicative equivalence means that “the translation should achieve the same communicative effect and the same reaction of the listener/reader as of the listener/reader of the source text” (2002, 36–37). Following all of these equivalences and others in translation of swearwords is a demanding task. It is sometimes impossible to claim that an English swearword has a direct equivalent in Finnish. For example, Hjort (2015) states the Finnish swearword *vittu* to be denoting *cunt*, but that in its use, force and function the word is closer to *fuck*. In this thesis, the category translated is therefore expanded to include the presence of a swearword in Finnish.

Secondly, the definition of softening should be elaborated. In Azura, Dewi and Hidayat’s (2019) examples on softening, instead of the swearword, the word had been replaced by a more neutral or a less expressive word. According to Baker (2019, 45), it means that the translator has opted for a more neutral or a less expressive translation (2019, 45). Hjort (2014, 128) calls it the mollification of swearwords. I would therefore argue that Azura, Dewi and Hidayat’s (2019) definition needs to be taken a step further: softening would imply the use of a more neutral or a less expressive word, such as (in the case of Finnish) *paska* (lit. ‘shit’), which can be considered as softening rather than as omission. These words are more neutral and/or less expressive than words such as *helveti* (lit. ‘hell’), *jumalauta* (mince of ‘God help’) and *saatana* (lit. ‘satan’).

Lastly, the category of omission is the most straightforward of the three. In this thesis, if a swearword was not translated from the English sentence into the Finnish sentence in any way, shape or form, it is considered an omission.

After dividing the examples in the aforementioned categories, they are further analysed. Examples of different translation strategies are provided. The distribution of used translation strategies by Saarikoski and Schroderus were studied and then represented in table form (Table 1, p. 21) Thereafter, the translation strategies used by Schroderus when Saarikoski implemented each of the three translation strategies were listed and represented, also in table form (Table 2, p. 22). And the translation strategies used by Saarikoski when Schroderus implemented each of the three translation strategies were listed and represented (Table 3, p. 22). Differences on translation strategies by Saarikoski and Schroderus are further elaborated in section 5.2. In each example, the original excerpts are in the following order: original English (marked 'JS'), Pentti Saarikoski's translation (marked 'PS') and Arto Schroderus' translation (marked 'AS'). The numbers in the parentheses indicate the page numbers of the examples in their respective versions.

The analysis is conducted for the English words *damn* and *goddam* only. The six different Finnish translations of the swearwords, used by Saarikoski and Schroderus, and their frequencies are provided in Table 4 (p. 23) and in the examples. The examples highlight specific translation strategies and provide an insight into the similarities and differences between the two translations.

Through an analysis along the lines of a case study approach, this study and its data attempt to provide an insight into specificities of the particular source text and its target texts, and the specific characteristics of Finnish translation, for future researchers. A case study into retranslation has to consider the relationship between general and particular when discussing the general nature and tendencies of retranslation (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 18). Koskinen and Paloposki (2015a, 20) ask to consider if and how a case study into Finnish retranslation can provide researchers with an understanding of what retranslation and retranslations are on a general level, not only within Finland but also elsewhere. Therefore, this study focuses on the particular and then attempts to draw some general level conclusions through the perspective of inductive reasoning. This data and its analysis can act as motivators for further research into the same or a similar topic.

## 5 Analysis

In this analysis section, I will compare and analyse the similarities and differences of the translation strategies of swearwords between the two Finnish translations. I compare the first Finnish translation and the retranslation side by side with the original English text. The goal is to inspect and discuss any particularities of the translations and the translation strategies employed. Before analysing particular examples, this section provides an overview of the Finnish words that were used to translate the English swearwords *damn* and *goddam*. The Finnish words and their English translations (glosses) are also provided in this section, thus allowing the reader to understand the examples and the Finnish language used in them.

The analysis will focus on the translation strategies used in various examples, highlighting the similarities and differences between the translations. A discussion on possible reasons for the translation strategies is provided throughout this section.

A total of 50 expressions were chosen from the original novel. The expressions were chosen in their order of appearance in the original English version, starting from page 1. The gathered data is divided into the three translation strategy categories outlined by Azura, Dewi and Hidayat (2019); translated, softening and omission. An overview of the frequencies of each translation strategy used by Saarikoski and Schroderus is provided, before delving into the specific examples displaying each of the strategies. This provides a general understanding of the data.

The aforementioned abbreviations (JS, PS and AS) are used for each of the analysed texts and the page number of each example is provided in parentheses. The examples are provided either as single words or combinations of words, or as whole sentences. The length of the example varies based on the use of swearwords and the analysed items in each specific case. The swearwords under primary analysis are in italics in both of the languages in all of the examples.

### 5.1 Overview of the Translation Strategies

The first analysis conducted for the collected data was to see whether a swearword was translated, softened or omitted. Out of the 50 analysed expressions, Saarikoski's translation strategies are as follows: 27 translated, 5 softenings and 18 omitted. Schroderus' translation strategies were: 22 translated, 1 softening and 27 omitted. This data is presented in Table 1.



Table 1 Distribution of translation strategies by PS and AS.

	Pentti Saarikoski	Arto Schroderus
Translated	27	22
Softening	5	1
Omission	18	27
Total	50	50

Based on this data alone, it is notable that both Saarikoski and Schroderus have heavily used omission as a translation strategy. I use the term heavily, since for a novel that is famous for its use of swearwords, it is surprising that Saarikoski omitted the swearword in 18 out of 50 instances and Schroderus omitted it in 27 out of 50 instances.

However, based on this analysis which looked only at the original English words for the data collection and then compared them to their Finnish translation, it is impossible to draw conclusions on the overall use of swearwords in the translations. One translation strategy that is commonly used is compensation (Klaudy 2008, 163). This means that the translator has the opportunity to omit lexical elements in a specific instance but compensate for this loss in another instance or with other means (in the case of *The Catcher in the Rye*, a swearword) (ibid.). For the scope and the purposes of this thesis, the translation strategy of compensation is not taken into consideration.

A further possibility for conducting this research would be the analysis of addition, but since this research was conducted from English into Finnish, only cases where *damn* or *goddam* was present are analysed. In the 50 collected examples of *damn* and *goddam*, no addition of a second swearword existed in the Finnish translations.

In order to get a broader understanding of the different translation strategies used by Saarikoski and Schroderus, a comparison between their translated words was also conducted. This section of the analysis compared the number of instances when Saarikoski translated the word, but Schroderus did not, and vice versa. Table 2 displays the differences and similarities of the translation strategies used by Saarikoski and Schroderus in specific instances. The table displays the following information: 1) The translation strategies used by Schroderus when Saarikoski's translation strategy was translated; 2) The translation strategies used by Schroderus when Saarikoski's translation strategy was softening; 3) The translation strategies used by Schroderus when Saarikoski's translation strategy was omission.

Table 2 Translation strategies used by Schroderus when Saarikoski implemented each of the three translation strategies

Pentti Saarikoski		Arto Schroderus		
		Translated	Softening	Omission
Translated	27	14	0	13
Softening	5	1	1	3
Omission	18	7	0	11

Similarly to Table 2, the following Table 3 displays the same information but the other way around, as in the translation strategies used by Saarikoski when Schroderus' chosen strategy was translated, softening or omission.

Table 3 Translation strategies used by Saarikoski when Schroderus implemented each of the three translation strategies

Arto Schroderus		Pentti Saarikoski		
		Translated	Softening	Omission
Translated	22	14	1	7
Softening	1	0	1	0
Omission	27	13	3	11

As seen in Tables 2 and 3, the translation strategies chosen by Saarikoski and Schroderus differ from one another, when looking at specific instances. Out of the 27 specific instances when Saarikoski opted for translated, Schroderus opted only for 14 and omitted the other 13. Similarly, when Schroderus opted for translated in 22 instances, Saarikoski translated only 14 of them.

Tables 2 and 3 showcase how Saarikoski and Schroderus have approached the translation of the swearwords from different perspectives. From the data it is clear that when an English swearword *damn* or *goddam* was present in the original, it did not mean that both Saarikoski and Schroderus would both either translate, soften or omit it.

After the preliminary analysis of the translation strategies, the presence and frequencies of specific Finnish swearwords was analysed. Table 4 presents the Finnish swearwords and their frequency in the instances when the original English word was translated. A total of six Finnish swearwords were used as translations for *damn* and *goddam*. The Finnish swearwords were *saatana* (lit. 'satan'), *helvetti* (lit. 'hell'), *jumalauta* (originates from *jumala auta*, lit.

‘God help’), *jumaliste* (a variant of *jumalauta*), *jumalaton* (lit. ‘godless’) and *piru* (lit. ‘devil’). Out of these six swearwords, Saarikoski used three while Schroderus used five.

All the swearwords under analysis and present in Table 4 have the religion-based component that is used as the defining factor of profanity by Azura, Dewi and Hidayat (2019, 45). As swearing constitutes profanity (Montagu 1967, 101) and a swearword is profane in its nature (Merriam-Webster Dictionary), the religion-based component is also a defining factor of a swearword.

Table 4 Finnish swearwords used by Saarikoski and Schroderus

	Saarikoski		Schroderus	
	damn	goddam	damn	goddam
saatana	4	17	0	0
helvetti	0	1	2	9
jumalauta	1	4	1	6
jumaliste	0	0	0	2
jumalaton	0	0	0	1
piru	0	0	1	0
Total	27		22	

The most common Finnish swearword used by Saarikoski was *saatana* with 21 occurrences out of 27 in total, while the most common swearword used by Schroderus was *helvetti* with 11 occurrences out of 22 in total. Interestingly, as seen from the data, Schroderus did not use Saarikoski’s most common Finnish swearword *saatana* a single time in his translation of the 50 analysed excerpts. Similarly Saarikoski used Schroderus’ most common swearword *helvetti* only once in his translation.

Table 4 shows that Saarikoski heavily favoured the Finnish swearword *saatana*, as he used in 21 times, while the other two swearwords he used, *helvetti* and *jumalauta* only occurred once and five times respectively. Schroderus’ common choice was to opt for the Finnish swearword *helvetti*, but he used a wider variety of swearwords than Saarikoski in his translation.

In the case of softening, Saarikoski used two different Finnish words in his translation, while Schroderus used one for the one instance of softening. Saarikoski translated the swearword *damn* three times as *skeida* (Finnish slang for ‘shit’). In one instance he translated *goddam* as *dorka* (Finnish slang for ‘stupid’, originating from the Swedish ‘crazy’). And in one instance

he translated *goddam* as *kusipää* (lit. ‘piss head’). Schroderus’ one instance of softening was when he translated the word *damn* as *paska* (lit. ‘shit’).

## 5.2 Goddam paper – dorka paperi or helvetin läpyskä?

This main body of the analysis is divided into two parts. The first section provides examples of the translated swearwords and discusses the similarities between Saarikoski’s and Schroderus’ translation of the swearwords. The second section provides examples of the differences.

These examples are raised from the data of 50 excerpts collected from *The Catcher in the Rye*. Both sections, the similarities and the differences, will discuss examples from all of the aforementioned categories of translation strategies. The examples highlight the different translation strategies and swearwords used by each translator and provide a deeper understanding of the data provided in the Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4.

### 5.2.1 Similarities of the Translations

This section provides examples of similarities of Saarikoski and Schroderus in implementing specific translation strategies.

Out of the 50 collected occurrences of the words *damn* and *goddam*, there was only one instance in which both Saarikoski and Schroderus translated the original English word into the same Finnish word.

(1)

JS: *goddam* book (28)

PS: kirjaa *jumalauta* (27)

AS: kirjaa *jumalauta* (34)

In example 1, both of the translators opted for the swearword *jumalauta* (originating from *jumala auta*, lit. ‘God help’). Neither Saarikoski nor Schroderus opted for the common genitive form of Finnish swearwords, which is often used as a modifier for an adjective, adverb or noun (Hjort 2017, 234), despite the original English using the swearword as a modifier. The swearword in the Finnish translations is not an attribute, but more like an exclamation or an intensifier at the end of the sentence.

In examples 2–4, the choice of the swearword was different for the two translators, but in all examples the swearword remained present in the Finnish translation. First, examples where both translators implemented the translation strategy ‘translated’, are presented.

(2)

JS: *damn* near four thousand bucks (4)

PS: neljätonnia *saatana*, melkeen (5)

AS: *jumalauta* lähemmäs neljätuhatta taalaa (8)

In example 2, both translators use the Finnish swearword in its nominative form. Saarikoski’s *saatana* (lit. ‘satan’) and Schroderus’ *jumalauta* are both used as intensifiers to express dissatisfaction with the cost of four thousand bucks. The positioning of the swearword is different, but in either case, moving the swearword to another position in the sentence would not change its meaning. Example 2 is one of the many instances in which Saarikoski used the Finnish word *saatana* to translate the swearword.

(3)

JS: I’m the *goddam* Governor’s son (38)

PS: Mä olen *saatana* kuvernöörin poika (36)

AS: Mä olen kuvernöörin poika *jumalauta* (44)

In example 3 Saarikoski and Schroderus have used the same Finnish words as they used for their respective translations in example 2, but in this instance the English original is *goddam* instead of *damn*. These examples support the previously mentioned interchangeability of the words *damn* and *goddam*, as they both are translated to *saatana* by Saarikoski and to *jumalauta* by Schroderus.

(4)

JS: he thought he had a *damn* good build (34)

PS: se ajatteli että sillä oli *saatanan* hyvä kroppa (33)

AS: se kuvitteli, että sillä oli *helvetin* hyvä kroppa (40)

In example 4, both translators have now used the swearword as a modifier for the following noun in the words’ respective genitive cases. Schroderus’ translation in this instance introduces the use of his most common Finnish translation *helvetti* (lit. ‘hell’).

In the case of softening, there was only one instance in which both Saarikoski and Schroderus softened the original English swearword.

(5)

JS: I don't give a *damn*. (28)

PS: *Skeidat* mä siitä välitän. (27)

AS: Mitä *paskan* väliä sillä on. (33)

Both Saarikoski and Schroderus interestingly opted for a word meaning *shit* in Finnish. Saarikoski's word for *shit* is most common in Helsinki slang, while Schroderus' word is the standard Finnish equivalent for *shit*. The words maintain their expressive quality, but the words are not religious-based. Therefore they both belong to the category of softening (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat 2019, 45). However, as the strength of a swearword is highly culture- and context-dependent, *shit* may be a swearword for someone while for someone else it is considered softening. Despite removing the religious element of the word, the word may still be considered a swearword. A swearword that offends one person may not offend another one (Hjort 2014, 130). Therefore, the emotional reaction of the hearer or the recipient plays a key role (*ibid.*). *Skeidat* is used in a construction of denial here and could be translated literally as 'the shit it is' (note the omission of the Finnish negation *ei* ('no') in this expression; a common spoken language form of expressing a negative attitude). Schroderus has stated that he did not translate or does not write in the 1940s Finnish language (Schroderus 2005, 90), which supports his use of *paska* instead of *skeida*, or some other slang or period-specific word for *shit*.

The following examples display instances where both Saarikoski and Schroderus omitted the swearword.

(6)

JS: I *damn* near dropped dead. (40)

PS: Mä meinasin kuolla. (38)

AS: Hyvä ettei sydän pysähtynyt. (46)

Both Saarikoski and Schroderus have omitted the original English *damn* in their translations. Saarikoski's translation means "I almost died", while Schroderus' translation means "Good that the heart didn't stop". Saarikoski's translation is direct, while Schroderus' translation is more implicit and formal, and he uses an antonym to translate the expression. When omitting

words or expressions in translation, it is inevitable that there is some loss of meaning (Baker 2011, 41). In cases of omission, it is also probable to lose some expressiveness of the sentence, unless achieved in other means.

(7)

JS: He was supposed to be a playwright or some *goddam* thing (42)

PS: Se oli kuulemma joku näytelmäkirjailija tai jotain (40)

AS: Se on mukamas näytelmäkirjailija tai jotain (48)

In example 7, Saarikoski and Schroderus have both omitted the word *goddam*, but otherwise have opted for ‘tai jotain’ meaning ‘or something’. Thus, they both have retained the meaning of the original English sentence, even without the swearword. Despite the expressiveness lacking in this sentence as well, the general indifference towards him being a playwright is achieved with the use of ‘tai jotain’.

(8)

JS: Stop calling me ‘Ackley kid’, *God damn* it. (33)

PS: Älä sano mua pojuksi *jumalauta* kuule. (31)

AS: Lakkaa nyt *jumaliste* sanomasta mua ‘Ackley-pojuksi’. (39)

Example 8 is showcasing the only one of the 50 instances in which *goddam* was written as *God damn*. It is included in the analysis despite its different spelling in the original English. Both Saarikoski and Schroderus translated it with a Finnish swearword. Schroderus’ *jumaliste* is a variant of the swearword *jumalauta*. In this instance, the original English ‘*God damn* it’ is perhaps more prominently placed and expressed in the sentence as in some of the other examples. The swearword’s expressiveness is clear in the original excerpt, and thus it can be argued that it was therefore translated in both of the Finnish versions as well.

(9)

JS: big *goddam* Cadillac (22)

PS: isolla *saatana* Cadillacilla (22)

AS: *jumalattoman* kokoisella Cadillacillaan (28)

In example 9, Schroderus’ use of the swearword *jumalaton* (lit. ‘godless’) is displayed. *Jumalaton* literally means godless, but in everyday Finnish it is used in exactly the way Schroderus uses it. It is used as an amplifier to describe something very big or massive.

Saarikoski's use of the word *saatana* here is again without the use of the genitive form of the modifier.

(10)

JS: *damn* note (17)

PS: *saatana* ilmoituksen (17)

AS: *pirun* nootin (22)

Example 8, the last of the similarities shows how both Saarikoski and Schroderus used the swearword as the modifier of the noun, similarly to the English original, but they opted for the different Finnish swearword. This is the only one of the 50 instances in which Schroderus used the swearword *piru* (lit. 'devil').

### 5.2.2 Differences of the Translations

This section provides examples of differences between the translation strategies of Saarikoski and Schroderus. These examples provide an insight into the different ways in which the translators approached the original English novel and how their approach applied to the translation of swearwords.

The following example is the last of the 50 excerpts collected for the data. In this instance Saarikoski translated the English swearword, while Schroderus omitted it.

(11)

JS: listen to every single *goddam* mystery program on the radio. (42)

PS: kuunteli jotai *saatana* jännäriä radiosta. (40)

AS: kuuntelevan radiosta kaikki salapoliisisarjat mitä sieltä ikinä tuli. (48)

Saarikoski uses his most common translation of *goddam*, *saatana*, while Schroderus simply translated the sentence as "all the detective programs". Interestingly, Saarikoski uses the swearword in its nominative form again, even though in this instance it would be more suitable for the Finnish language to use it in its genitive form before the noun it modifies. However, swearwords can have been used in multiple ways and in multiple grammatical forms throughout time, meaning that the nominative form may have been more common while Saarikoski wrote his translation than when Schroderus wrote his. It may also be that *saatana* is not meant to be a modifier in this instance, but simply a swearword. Similarly, Schroderus could have used a swearword in his translation, but opted for omission. In the



English original there two modifiers for the noun *mystery program*. In Schroderus' translation there is only 'kaikki', meaning 'all' or 'every'.

The following example is of an instance where Saarikoski softened the original expression, while Schroderus translated the swearword.

(12)

JS: *goddam* paper (17)

PS: *dorkan* paperin (17)

AS: *helvetin* läpyskän (21)

Saarikoski's translation *dorka* is a slang term for stupid in Finnish. *Dorka* keeps its expressive quality, since it highlights the dissatisfaction of the protagonist towards the paper, but it is not profane or religion-based in its nature, thus making it an example of softening. Schroderus has translated the word as *helvetti*, which keeps its profane and expressive qualities.

In the next example Saarikoski has omitted the swearword, while Schroderus opted for the translation.

(13)

JS: *goddam* manager (6)

PS: *joku* johtaja (7)

AS: *helvetin* [miekkailujoukkueen] johtaja (10)

In this example, Saarikoski omits the swearword *goddam* and replaces it with the Finnish pronoun *joku* (someone). Schroderus has translated the word as *helvetti*, which again is his most common translation for the swearword *goddam*. Schroderus' translation includes the noun 'miekkailujoukkue' meaning the 'fencing team'. In JS and PS the context of fencing was specified elsewhere.

Example number 11 is one of the most intriguing ones for this research. Previously, in example 5, the same exact sentence in English was under consideration. Unlike in example 5, in this case only Saarikoski has opted for softening. Schroderus has changed his translation and omitted the swearword completely.

(14)

JS: I don't give a *damn* (13)

PS: *Skeidat* mä siitä välitän (14)

AS: Sama se minulle on (18)

Saarikoski has translated the English swearword and the expression in exactly the same manner twice, using the slang term for *shit* as a construction of denial. In this instance however, Schroderus has omitted the expression and replaced it with a different, non-profane expression without any Finnish swearword.

(15)

JS: They were coming in the *goddam* window. (19)

PS: Siellä oli niin paljon *kusipäitä* että se hais kilometrin päähän. (19)

AS: Niitä tunki joka puolelta. (24)

In example 12, Saarikoski has opted for softening while Schroderus has omitted the swearword. Saarikoski uses the swearword *kusipää* (lit. 'piss head') in his translation, but otherwise the translation does not follow the original English sentence. The whole sentence, when backtranslated into English is "There were so many piss heads that it stank even one kilometre away". Schroderus' translation is closer to the original English sentence, despite the lack of a swearword. According to Tarkka (2014, 339), Saarikoski did not understand many of the English words in the original text and translated them without (having the time for) looking at a dictionary.

(16)

JS: He's got this *goddam* superior attitude all the time. (32)

PS: Se on aina sellanen *saatana* diiva. (30)

AS: Sillä on jatkuvasti sellanen ylimielinen asenne. (37)

In this example, Saarikoski's translation includes a Finnish swearword, but again I would argue that Schroderus' translation is closer to the original English in its meaning. Saarikoski's translation would be translated back as "He is always such a satan('s) diva". Schroderus' translation comments on the attitude, as his translation means "He always had that superior attitude". Schroderus (2005, 87), like Tarkka (2014, 339) commented on Saarikoski's translation choices with the notion that if Saarikoski did not understand something in the source text, he will either come up with something of his own or completely leave it out.

However, it is impossible to comment on whether this example is of such a case or simply a translational choice. According to Schroderus (2005) and Tarkka (2014) it is more likely that it is of the former, but as Saarikoski in general approached his translation more freely than Schroderus, and these choices may simply be a result of the liberties he took in his translation.

Examples 17 and 18 are of instances when Saarikoski omitted the swearword, whereas Schroderus translated it.

(17)

JS: asking you to do them a *goddam* favor (37)

PS: pyytää toista jeesaan vähän (36)

AS: samalla *jumaliste* pyytää palvelusta (43)

(18)

JS: You're *damn* right I know her. (40)

PS: Joo varmasti mä tunnen Janen. (38)

AS: Totta *helvetissä* tunnen. (46)

In example 17, Saarikoski's translation means "asks someone to help a little", while Schroderus' translation means asking for the favour. Schroderus' placement of the swearword *jumaliste* in the sentence is not as an intensifier for the noun but nevertheless retains the expressiveness in the sentence level, despite not being focused on the same word as in the original English. Saarikoski's translation, the dissatisfaction with the asking for a favour does not translate into the Finnish sentence.

Example 18 displays a similar case. Saarikoski's translation is more of a generic affirmative reaction to knowing Jane, while Schroderus' translation maintains the strength behind the statement. This does not mean that it needs to be achieved with the use of a swearword, but Saarikoski's "yeah surely I know Jane" lacks the charged statement and attitude of the original English.

(19)

JS: *goddam* autobiography (3)

PS: älytöntä omaelämäkerta (5)

AS: *jumalauta* koko elämäkertani (7)

Example 19 is the first of the 50 occurrences of a swearword in the original English text. Saarikoski's modifier means 'nonsensical' or 'ludicrous', while Schroderus has used the swearword *jumalauta* as a modifier.

The last of the examples, example 20, is a rather interesting one. In this example, the pronouns in the example are in italics, as they are in italics in all the three versions of the novel. The swearwords were not in italics in the three versions of the novel, but as every swearword under analysis in this thesis, they are also in italics in this example.

(20)

JS: *I'm* the one flunking out of the *goddam* place, and *you're* asking me to write you a *goddam* composition. (37)

PS: *Mä* saan fudut tästä torpasta ja sit *sä* pyydät mua kirjottaa jonkun aineen. (35)

AS: *Minähän* tässä reputan ja lennän ulos, ja *sä* pyydät mua kirjottamaan jonkun *helvetin* aineen. (43)

In the original English sentences, parallelism and contradiction are obvious. Both of the contractions involving the pronouns are in italics and both of the swearwords are modifying the noun at the end of the sentence, highlighting the coherence of the sentences. Saarikoski has retained the italics of the pronouns (he is using the colloquial forms of me and you) but omitted both of the swearwords. Schroderus has likewise retained the italics of the pronouns, but interestingly omitted the first swearword but translated the second one as *helvetti*. Moreover, Schroderus has added the Finnish particle *-hän* to the pronoun *minä*. The particle has multiple functions in Finnish, one of which is expressing something that is considered obvious or something that everyone participating in the conversation is aware of. Another function of the particle is to emphasize something or to focalize on something. Both translators have retained the parallelism and coherence of the sentences but have perhaps lost some of the expressiveness. In this instance, it may be that the translators considered highlighting the contradiction between the subjects *me* and *you* more important than translating the retaining the swearwords in both sentences.

### 5.3 Summary of Findings

This analysis into the 50 first instances of the use of the expletives *damn* and *goddam* in J.D. Salinger's *The Catcher in the Rye* discussed the use of different translation strategies by the two Finnish translators, Pentti Saarikoski and Arto Schroderus, how their translation

strategies differed from one another, and how their translational choices affected their target texts and their differences from the source text.

In Saarikoski's translation, the most frequent translation strategy was 'translated'. He used it in 27 out of 50 cases. Saarikoski softened the swearword in 5 cases and omitted the swearword in 18 cases. Schroderus' most frequent translation strategy was omission. He used it in 27 out of 50 cases. Schroderus translated the swearword in 22 cases and softened the swearword in 1 case. Based on the analysis it seems evident that Saarikoski's first translation had minimal effect in Schroderus' translation.

Azura, Dewi and Hidayat discuss two research papers that analysed the different translation strategies that translators use in the case of *The Catcher in the Rye* (2019, 44). In both of these research papers the main strategies used by translators were omission and softening, which were used in order to adapt the novel into the target text culture (Azura, Dewi and Hidayat (2019, 44). This was not the case in the Finnish first translation and the retranslation of *The Catcher in the Rye*. One reason for this difference may indeed be the target text culture.

Based on the analysis of the translation of swearwords, it seems that the effect of the first translator or translation is minimal in Schroderus' translation of *Sieppari ruispellossa*. There was only one instance in which Saarikoski and Schroderus translated the original English sentence in exactly the same way. Moreover, Table 2 and Table 3 show the variation between the translation strategies used by Saarikoski and Schroderus. In instances where Saarikoski translated the swearword in the Finnish text, it was not a given that Schroderus translated it as well, or when Saarikoski omitted a word, that Schroderus omitted it as well.

There is a general presupposition that compared to a retranslation, a first translation is further from the source text (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 8). However, Koskinen and Paloposki (2015) did not find proof for this presupposition and based on the analysis of the words *damn* and *goddam* in this master's thesis it is also not possible to verify this presupposition. There were a few examples (e.g. Example 15 and Example 16) in which Saarikoski's translation was, in its meaning, further from the original English text, while Schroderus' translation was close to, if not exactly, the original (in some cases excluding the swearword).

When simply comparing the translation of swearwords, Saarikoski's translation is closer to the original English than Schroderus'. Saarikoski's 27 translated swearwords compared to Schroderus' 22 shows that at least in the use of translation strategies and retaining the original

English, Saarikoski's translation followed the source text more closely. According to Schroderus, in an ideal situation, after publishing multiple translations of one classic, all of the translations into one language can together be quite close to the source text (2005, 84). Perhaps then, all translations complement each other, and if the 'best' parts of each translation are combined, an ideal translation is what is the result.

Based on the analysis, it is impossible to fully explain reasons for the choices of different translation strategies. Many choices may have been subconscious, which makes it difficult for the translator and a researcher to understand or state any choice as a fact. However, based on the analysis it is possible to understand translating swearwords and the different translation strategies used in translating swearwords into Finnish. The richness of the Finnish language due to the vast number of swearwords and the free sentence structure enables creation of various different Finnish translations of a specific text.

## 6 Conclusion

This thesis aimed to compare the translation of swearwords from English into Finnish and the translation strategies used by the first translator Pentti Saarikoski and the retranslator Arto Schroderus. The main research question of this thesis was “how the swearwords *damn* and *goddam* are translated and what are the similarities and differences between the first translation and the retranslation of *The Catcher in the Rye*?”.

This thesis found some similarities and some differences in the two Finnish translations. In this research, 50 instances of swearwords from the original English novel and its Finnish translations were analysed. The examples were divided into three translation strategy categories: translated, softening and omission. Saarikoski used the aforementioned translation strategies 27, 5 and 18 times respectively. Schroderus used them 22, 1 and 27 times respectively. The most frequent Finnish swearwords used by the translators were *saatana* (21 instances) for Saarikoski and *helvetti* (11 instances) for Schroderus. Saarikoski used two other Finnish swearwords, *helvetti* (1 instance) and *jumalauta* (4 instances), while Schroderus used additional 4: *jumalauta* (7 instances), *jumaliste* (2 instances), *jumalaton* (1 instance) and *piru* (1 instance).

This research found that the meaning, message and sentiment can be retained in translation also without the use of a swearword. The same can be claimed about the instances in which the translators opted for softening. The swearword does not necessarily need to retain its profanity, as long as it retains the expressiveness, in order to convey a message (as) similar (as possible) to the source text. In some instances, omission of a swearword did not affect the effectiveness of the target text either.

All 50 expressions of the data were studied and represented in the Tables 1-4 of this MA thesis. A total of 20 examples out of the 50 studied were described in detail. On the basis of the examples, it is not possible to deduce why specific translation strategies were implemented. Each translator has their own habitus (Deane-Cox 2014, 24) which plays a part in the way each translator translates. It cannot be declared with certainty why each translator chose their specific translation strategy. Despite access to Schroderus' (2005) essay in which he discusses his own translation in relation to Saarikoski's, the aforementioned statement remains, as many choices made by a translator are subconscious and even the translator may struggle with finding reasons for why they translated something in a specific way. His essay

discussed the translations as whole works, not as works with only swearwords. Translating swearwords is a demanding task on its own: a translator has to make a multitude of choices and interpretations regarding style, message and target audience before choosing a fitting translation strategy (Hjort 2009, n.p.). Based on the set of data in this thesis, it is not possible to draw conclusions as to if the similarities between the two translations were due to similarities between the translators, accidental overlap or due to the only viable translation option when considering the target language.

The method used in this study was successful in addressing the research questions. A case study perspective is common in these types of research (Susam-Sarajeva 2009, 37), and worked in this instance as well. A topic specific enough and a large enough set of data provide an insight into how retranslations compare to first translations and the original source text.

This thesis addressed the translation of two swearwords, *damn* and *goddam*, with *The Catcher in the Rye* as a case in point. Any and all results of this thesis are applicable to a similar context. This thesis provides an insight into the background, reasons and results of different translation strategies that can be used in translating swearwords from a language to another. Broader data is required in order to provide a more thorough understanding of the translation of swearwords from English into Finnish.

As for the shortcomings of this master's thesis, this thesis was conducted as a case study into one literary work and its translations. The research and its results are particular to the context of *The Catcher in the Rye* and its Finnish translations *Sieppari ruispellossa*. From the point of view of a single case study, it is challenging to draw conclusions about retranslation on a general level, or about the translators and their habitus as a whole. Beyond the scope of this study, there are possibilities for various methods and approaches to researching retranslation.

One possibility for exploring this topic further is to look at the translation of other swearwords (or expletives) in *The Catcher in the Rye* and discuss a similar topic from the point of view of other expletives. The analysis could also be performed between English and a language other than Finnish.

Another possibility for a further study would be to analyse addition and compensation as translation strategies, which this thesis did not. The words *damn* and *goddam* are not the only swearwords present in *The Catcher in the Rye*. Other words like *hell* and its various forms in



the original novel could also be analysed. The frequency of the Finnish word *helvetti* in Schroderus' translation could provide an interesting insight into looking at the translations of the English swearword *hell*, for example to see if compensation was a frequent translation strategy used by either translator.

As stated earlier, Koskinen and Paloposki (2015a, 8) mention that there is a lack of research into the extent of retranslations. A project in Turkey is underway to give a broader idea into retranslation as a phenomenon, but other research has mainly focused on single case studies (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 8). Research into retranslation is spread in multiple publications in multiple languages and cultures and remains unresearched in broader general research into retranslation (Koskinen and Paloposki 2015a, 10). This thesis aimed to provide a deep analysis of a specific topic within the field of retranslation and inspire anyone interested in researching retranslation to find inspiration from this master's thesis and other similar research papers for their own research.

## Bibliography

### Primary sources

- Salinger, J. D. [1951] 1952. *The Catcher in the Rye*. New York City: Little, Brown and Company.
- *Sieppari ruispellossa*. Translated by Pentti Saarikoski. 7th edition. Helsinki: Tammi, [1961] 1962.
- *Sieppari ruispellossa*. Translated by Arto Schroderus. Hämeenlinna: Karisto Oy. 2004.

### Secondary sources

- Aaltonen, Mea. “Hörönlöröä! – Shifts in the first Finnish translation and the two retranslations of Jane Austen’s *Pride and Prejudice*”. MA Thesis. University of Turku. 2014.
- Azura, Fachrina, Haru Deliana Dewi and Rahayu Surtiati Hidayat. 2019. “Profanity and Characterization: A Study of Translation Strategies and Their Effects on the *Catcher in the Rye*”. *Journal of Language and Literature*, Vol. 19: 43–54.
- Berman, Antoine. 1990. “La retraduction comme espace de la traduction”. *Palimpsestes*, Vol. 4: 1–7.
- Briechle, Lucia and Evan Duran Eppler. 2019. “Swearword strength in subtitled and dubbed films: A reception study”. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, Vol. 16: 389–420.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2000. “A Causal Model for Translation Studies”. In *Intercultural Faultlines*, ed. by Maeve Olohan, 15–27. London: Routledge.
- Collombat, Isabelle. 2004. “Le XXI<sup>e</sup> siècle : l’âge de la retraduction” *Translation Studies in the New Millennium*, Vol.2: 1–15.
- Costello, Donald P. 1959. “The Language of ‘The Catcher in the Rye’”. *American Speech*, Vol. 34: 172–181.
- Deane-Cox, Sharon. 2014. *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation*. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Gambier, Yves. 1994. “La Retraduction, retour et detour.” *Meta*, Vol. 39: 413–417.
- Graham, Sarah. 2007. *Salinger’s The Catcher in the Rye*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. ProQuest Ebrary.

- Hietala, Veijo. 2004. "J.D. Salinger: Sieppari ruispellossa." Review of *Sieppari ruispellossa*, by J.D. Salinger. Turun Sanomat, September 24, 2004.
- Hjort, Minna. 2009. "Swearwords in Subtitles – A Balancing Act" in TRAlinea Special Issue: The Translation of Dialects in Multimedia, ed. by M. Giorgio Marrano, G. Nadiani and C. Rundle. <https://www.intraline.org/specials/article/1718>.
- 2014. "Perkele – A literary companion." In *Swearing in the Nordic Countries*, ed. by Marianne Rathje, 125–149.
- 2015. "Vittu and Fuck – Tales from a Literary Coexistence." In *Miscommunication and verbal violence. Du malentendu à la violence verbale. Misskommunikation und verbale Gewalt*, ed. by Ulla Tuomarla, Juhani Härmä, Liisa Tiittula, Anni Sairio, Maria Paloheimo and Johanna Isosävi. 319–330.
- 2017. "Swearing in Finnish: Folk definitions and perceptions". In *Advances in Swearing Research: New Languages and New Contexts*, ed. by Kristy Beers Fägersten and Karyn Stapleton. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Jdetawy, Loae Fakhri. 2019. "The nature, types, and functions of swear words: a sociolinguistic analysis". *International Journal of Development Research*, Vol. 9, 27048–27058.
- Klaudy, Kinga. 2008. "Compensation in Translation". In "*...mit den beiden Lungenflügeln atmen*": *Zu Ehren von János Kohn*, ed. by Petra Szatmári and Dóra Takács. 163–175.
- Koskinen, Kaisa, and Outi Paloposki. 2010. "Retranslation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, vol. 1, ed. by Yves Gambier, and Luc van Doorslaer, 294–298.
- 2015a. *Sata kirjaa, tuhat suomennosta: Kaunokirjallisuuden uudelleenkäntäminen* [One hundred books, one thousand translations: Literary retranslation into Finnish]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- 2015b. *Anxieties of influence: the voice of the first translator in retranslation*. Target, Vol. 27, 25–39.
- Merriam-Webster dictionary. 2022. "Obscene"  
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/obscene>
- Merriam-Webster dictionary. 2022. "Profane"  
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/profane>
- Merriam-Webster dictionary. 2022. "Swear word".  
<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/swearword>
- Montagu, Ashley. 1967. *The Anatomy of Swearing*. London: Collier-Macmillan Ltd.

- Paloposki, Outi, and Kaisa Koskinen. 2010. "Reprocessing Texts: The Fine Line Between Retranslating and Revising." *Across Languages and Cultures*, Vol.11: 29–49.
- Schroderus, Arto. 2005. "Toisen jäljessä – merkintöjä suomentamisesta. [Following someone's footsteps – notes on translating into Finnish]" In *Suom. Huom: Kirjoituksia kääntämisestä*, ed. by Kristiina Rikman, 83–96. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Spillner, Bernd. 2002. "Monikielisyys, kontrastiivinen kielitiede, kulttuurienvälinen erikoiskielisten tekstien vertailu [Multilingualism, contrastive linguistics, comparison of intercultural special language texts]". In *Interkulturelle Wirtschaftskommunikation. Forschungsobjekte und Methoden*, ed. by Anita Nuopponen, Terttu Harakka and Rolf Tatje, 31–40. Vaasan yliopisto.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem. 2009. "The Case Study Research Method in Translation Studies." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer*, Vol.3: 37–56.
- Tahir Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2009. "Retranslation." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, ed. by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 233–236.
- Tammi, Jari. 2002. *Suuri kirosanakirja* [The big swearword book]. 2nd edition. Jyväskylä: Gummerus Kirjapaino Oy.
- Tarkka, Pekka. (1996) 2014. *Pentti Saarikoski: vuodet 1937–1963* [Pentti Saarikoski: the years 1937–1963]. Keuruu: Otavan Kirjapaino Oy.
- Tiittula, Liisa. 2016. "Miksi kirjoja käännetään uudelleen? Uudelleenkääntäminen osana kirjallisuusinstituutiota. [Why are books retranslated? Retranslation as part of the literary institution]" *Virittäjä*. Vol.1: 151–155.
- Vainio-Puhju, Vilja. "What happens to Swear Words in Subtitling? A Case Study of the Finnish Subtitles of *The Inbetweeners*." MA Thesis. University of Turku. 2020.
- Vanderschelden, Isabelle. 2000. "Why Retranslate the French Classics? The Impact of Retranslation on Quality." In *On Translating French Literature and Film II*, ed. by Miriam Salama-Carr, 1–18. Amsterdam & Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Van Poucke, Piet. 2017. "Aging as a motive for literary retranslation: A survey of case studies on retranslation." *Translation and interpreting studies*, Vol. 12: 91–115.
- Van Poucke, Piet. 2020. "The Effect of Previous Translations on Retranslation: A Case Study of Russian-Dutch Literary Translation." *TranscUlturAl*, Vol.12.1: 10–25.
- Van Poucke, Piet and Guillermo Sanz Gallego. 2019. "Retranslation in context." *Cadernos de Tradução*, Vol.39: 10–22

# Appendices

## Appendix 1. Finnish summary

Tässä pro gradu -tutkielmassa tutkitaan kiro sanojen kääntämistä englannin kielestä suomen kielelle. Tutkielman kohteena on uudelleenkääntämisen ala osana käännöstieteitä. Tutkielman esimerkkitapauksena on J.D. Salingerin alkuperäisromaani *The Catcher in the Rye* (1951) ja sen kaksi suomennosta: ensimmäinen, Pentti Saarikosken käännös, vuodelta 1962 ja Arto Schroderuksen uudelleenkäännös vuodelta 2004. Tutkielmassa tutkitaan kiro sanojen *damn* ja *goddam* kääntämistä suomen kielelle ja niitä käännösstrategioita mitä kääntäjät ovat käännöksissään käyttäneet. Tutkielmassa mainitut ja käytetyt käännösstrategiat ovat 'käännetty', 'pehmenys' ja 'poisto'. Tutkielman esimerkkiromaaniksi valittiin *The Catcher in the Rye*, koska alkuperäisteos on erityisesti kielenkäytöltään maailmanlaajuisesti tunnettu ja kiistaa aiheuttanut teos. Kiro sanat *damn* ja *goddam* valikoitiin tarkastelun kohteiksi sekä korkean esiintyvyyden että käyttö- ja käännöstapojen vuoksi.

## Teoria

Viime vuosien aikana uudelleenkääntämistä on tutkittu eri näkökulmista, eri esimerkkien kautta ja erilaisilla metodeilla (katso esim. Vanderschelden 2000; Koskinen ja Paloposki 2020; Deane-Cox 2014). Uudelleenkääntämisellä tarkoitetaan lähdetekstin kääntämistä samalle kohdekielelle toistamiseen tai uudelleen (Paloposki ja Koskinen 2010, 29). Tällöin uudelleenkäännös on edellä mainitun prosessin lopputulos.

Syitä uudelleenkäännöksille ja uudelleenkääntämiselle on löydetty useita. Yksi uudelleenkäännösten tekemiseen vaikuttava syy on tyytymättömyys ensimmäiseen tai aiempaan käännökseen (Koskinen ja Paloposki 2015a, 10). Tyytymättömyys johtuu usein erityisesti ensimmäisessä tai aiemmassa käännöksessä käytettyyn kieleen tai käännöksen ja alkuperäisteoksen väliseen suhteeseen (Tiittula 2016, 154). Uudelleenkääntämisprojektit alkavat usein siitä, että ”jo olemassa oleva käännös nähdään jollain tapaa virheellisenä” (Koskinen ja Paloposki 2015b, 27). Virheellisyyteen liittyvät esimerkiksi ensimmäisen tai aiempien käännösten vanheneminen (katso esim. Van Poucke 2017, 92), aiempien käännösten liika kotouttaminen tai vieraannuttaminen (Koskinen ja Paloposki 2015b, 27) ja kirjakustantamoihin liittyvät taloudelliset asiat (Tiittula 2016, 154).

Uudelleenkääntämisen ja -käännösten yhteydessä on myös puhuttava ensimmäisen kääntäjän vaikutuksesta. Uudelleenkääntäjällä on mahdollisuus inspiroitua ensimmäisen kääntäjän teoksesta ja ottaa siitä vaikutteita (Van Poucke 2020, 10). Tällöin uudelleenkääntäjä käyttäisi alkuperäistä samalle kielelle käännettyä teosta apuna omassa käännöstyössään. Toisaalta uudelleenkääntäminen nähdään myös prosessina, joka vapauttaa uudelleenkääntäjän ensimmäisestä käännöksestä, sen kääntäjästä ja ensimmäisen kääntäjän valinnoista (Deane-Cox 2014, 11). Tämä tarkoittaa sitä, että uudelleenkääntäjä kääntää suoraan lähdetekstistä, eikä käytä ensimmäistä tai aiempaa käännöstä apuna kääntäessään uudelleen jollekin tietylle kielelle.

Tutkielman analyysin kohteena on kirosanojen kääntäminen. Kirosanalla tarkoitetaan epäpyhää ja häpäistyä sanojen käyttöä ilman ilkeää tarkoituspäätä (Merriam-Webster Dictionary; Montagu 1967, 101; Azura, Dewi ja Hidayat 2019, 45). Kiro sanojen vahvuus ja hävyttömyys ovat vahvasti sekä kulttuuri- (Azura, Dewi ja Hidayat 2019, 45) että kontekstisidonnaisia (Hjort 2014, 130). Kiro sana, joka loukkaa yhtä henkilöä, ei välttämättä loukkaa toista henkilöä. Kontekstiin liittyvistä asioista kiro sanan vastaanottajan tai kuulijan mahdollinen tunnereaktio on pääosassa (ibid.).

Kirosanoja kääntäessä kääntäjällä on monia eri vaihtoehtoja ja vastuita lähestyessään kääntämistä: hänen tulee esimerkiksi tulkita lähtötekstin tyyliä ja ennakoida kohdeyleisön reaktioita, jotta hän voisi valita oikean käännösstrategian (Hjort 2009, n.p.). Kääntäjän henkilökohtainen *habitus* vaikuttaa hänen tapansa kääntää mitä tahansa tekstiä (Deane-Cox 2014, 24). Jokaisella kääntäjällä on ihmisenä ennalta olemassa olevia motiiveja ja mielenkiinnon kohteita, jotka vaikuttavat heidän käyttäytymiseensä ja sitä myötä myös heidän kääntämiseensä (Koskinen ja Paloposki 2015a, 21).

## **Aineisto ja metodologia**

Tässä tutkielmassa ja tutkimuksessa käytettävä materiaali kaksitasoista. Ensinnäkin materiaalina ovat J.D. Salingerin *The Catcher in the Rye* (1952), Pentti Saarikosken käännös *Sieppari ruispellossa* (1962) ja Arto Schroderuksen käännös *Sieppari ruispellossa* (2004). Toiseksi tutkimuksen materiaalina ovat alkuperäisteoksesta kerätyt *damn-* ja *goddam-* kiro sanojen 50 esiintymää ja niiden suomenkieliset käännökset. Tutkimuksessa analysoidaan alkuperäisteoksessa esiintyviä kiro sanoja ja niiden suomenkielisiä vastineita. Samalla analysoidaan Saarikosken ja Schroderuksen käyttämiä käännösstrategioita

kääntäessään kyseisiä kiro sanoja suomen kielelle sekä vertaillaan kääntäjien käyttämiä käännösstrategioita toisiinsa.

Tutkimuksen metodina käytetään Azura, Dewi ja Hidayatin (2019) käyttämää menetelmää, jossa käännösstrategiat jaettiin kolmeen eri luokkaan: 'käännetty', 'pehmennys' ja 'poisto'. Käännetyllä tarkoitetaan strategiaa, jossa lähtötekstissä ollut kiro sana on käännetty kiro sanaksi suomen kielelle. Pehmennyksellä tarkoitetaan kiro sanan kääntämistä sillä tavalla, että sana on ilmaisultaan edelleen kiro sanan tyylinen, mutta ei sisällä itse kiro sanaa. Tällaisesta esimerkkinä on kiro sanan *damn* kääntäminen suomeksi sanalla *paska*. Poistolla tarkoitetaan kiro sanan poistoa.

Kiro sanat *damn* ja *goddam* valittiin tarkastelun aiheiksi erityisesti niiden korkean esiintyvyyden perusteella. Tarkastelun alla olevat 50 kiro sanaa esiintyivät alkuperäisteoksen ensimmäisillä 42 sivulla. Tämä vastaa hieman yli 15 prosenttia koko teoksen sivumäärästä. Sanat *damn* ja *goddam* nousivat korkean esiintyvyyden vuoksi esille muiden kiro sanojen joukosta.

Kiro sanojen *damn* ja *goddam* käyttö englannin kielellä oli hyvin samankaltaista, mikä myös motivoi kyseisten kiro sanojen valitsemiseen tutkimuksen analyysin materiaaliksi ja erityisesti niiden samanaikaiseen analysointiin. Sanoja käytetään lähdetekstissä esimerkiksi substantiivien määritteenä tai adjektiivina toisen adjektiivin määritteenä. Suomentoksissa käytettyjä kiro sanoja analysoidaan myös siltä pohjalta, miten niitä käytetään osana virkettä ja mikä lauseenjäsen kiro sana tietyssä kohdissa on.

## **Analyysi**

Tutkielman analyysi koostuu kahdesta osasta. Ensimmäisessä osassa käydään läpi määrällistä analyysiä kiro sanojen esiintyvyydestä, käännösstrategioiden käytöstä ja eri suomenkielisten kiro sanojen esiintyvyydestä. Taulukko 1 esittää Saarikosken ja Schroderuksen käyttämät käännösstrategiat, Taulukot 2 ja 3 vertailevat heidän käyttämiä käännösstrategioita toisiinsa ja Taulukko 4 erittelee käännöksissä käytetyt suomenkieliset kiro sanat ja niiden esiintyvyydet Saarikosken ja Schroderuksen käännöksissä. Analyysin toisessa osassa nostetaan esille 20 esimerkkiä kerätystä datasta ja keskustellaan ensimmäisen käännöksen ja uudelleen käännöksen yhtäläisyyksistä ja erilaisuuksista. Esimerkkien kautta analysoidaan Saarikosken ja Schroderuksen käännöksiä suhteessa toisiinsa ja alkuperäisteokseen.

Alkuperäisteoksesta kerätyistä 50 kirosanasta Pentti Saarikosken käyttämät käänösstrategiat jakautuivat seuraavanlaisesti: 27 käännettyä, 5 pehmenettyä ja 18 poistoa. Arto Schroderuksen käänösstrategiat olivat 22 käännettyä, 1 pehmenetty ja 27 poistoa. Tämän alustavan analyysin perusteella Saarikoski on siis kääntänyt kirosanat useammin kuin Schroderus, joka on käyttänyt käänösstrategioista eniten poistoa.

Koska tutkielman materiaali kerättiin ensin englanninkielisestä lähde-teksestä ja sen jälkeen suomennoksista samoista kohdista, analyysissä keskityttiin vain sellaisiin tapauksiin, joissa kirošana oli mainittu alkuperäisteoksessa. Analyysissä ei siis huomioida tapauksia, joissa kääntäjä on mahdollisesti kompensoinut poistamansa kirosan toisessa kohtaa tai lisännyt kiro sanoja tekstiin.

Tutkimuksessa vertailtiin myös Saarikosken ja Schroderuksen käyttämiä käänösstrategioita toisiinsa. Osiossa analysoitiin Schroderuksen käyttämiä käänösstrategioita silloin kun Saarikoski on kääntänyt, pehmentänyt tai poistanut kirosan ja päinvastoin. Tulosten perusteella Saarikosken ja Schroderuksen käänöksissä oli eroavaisuuksia eri käänösstrategioiden osittain yleisellä tasolla sekä tiettyjen esimerkkien kohdalla. Jos Saarikoski käänsi kirosan, ei Schroderus sitä välttämättä tehnyt ja niin edelleen. Esimerkiksi Saarikosken 27 käännetystä kirosanasta Schroderus käänsi niistä 14 ja poisti 13. Vastaavasti Schroderuksen 27 poistosta Saarikoski käänsi 13, pehmensi 3 ja poisti 11 kiro sanaa.

Saarikosken suomennoksessa yleisin suomenkielinen kirošana oli *saatana*, jota hän käytti yhteensä 21 kertaa 27:stä kääntäessään kiro sanoja *damn* ja *goddam*. Schroderuksen yleisin suomenkielinen kirošana oli *helvetti*, jota hän käytti 11 kertaa 22:sta. Saarikosken käänöksessään käyttämät kiro sanat olivat *saatana*, *helvetti* ja *jumalauta*. Schroderuksen käänöksessä esiintyivät kiro sanat *helvetti*, *jumalauta*, *jumaliste*, *jumalaton* ja *piru*.

## **Tulokset**

Tässä tutkielmassa analysoidut esimerkit näyttivät käänösten välillä olevan sekä yhtäläisyyksiä että eroavaisuuksia. Saarikoski ja Schroderus käyttivät monissa kohdin samaa käänösstrategiaa, mutta täysin samankaltaisia käänöksiä ei ollut kuin yksi. Muissa yhtäläisyytapauksissa käänösstrategia oli sama, mutta kääntäjä valitsi toisen kääntäjän työhön verrattuna esimerkiksi eri kirosan, pehmenetyn ilmauksen tai poisti kirosan kokonaan. Kääntäjien käyttämät kiro sanat poikkesivat usein toisistaan, mutta lisäksi niiden



käyttötavat olivat erilaisia. Saarikosken kiro sanat ovat usein nominatiivimuodossa myös esim. substantiivin määritteinä, kun taas Schroderus käyttää niitä genetiivimuodossa määrittämässä esimerkiksi substantiivia.

Analyysin perusteella ei voida esittää selkeitä syitä eri käännösstrategioiden valitsemiselle. Kääntäjien erilaiset *habituks* ja käännöstävät voivat olla heille itselleenkin alitajuntaisia, minkä takia ulkopuolisen tutkijan on mahdotonta kommentoida pitäviä syitä erilaisille käännöksille ja käännösstrategioiden valitsemisille. Analyysin perusteella voidaan kuitenkin todeta, että käännöksissä on hyvin paljon eroavaisuuksia ja joitain samankaltaisuuksia. Lisäksi voidaan todeta, että Saarikosken vaikutus ensimmäisenä kääntäjänä Schroderuksen uudelleen kääntöön on minimaalinen, ellei olematon.

Analyysin avulla voidaan saada lisää tietoa eri käännösstrategioista ja kiro sanojen kääntämisestä suomen kielelle. Analyysi näyttää, miten suomen kielelle kääntäessä kääntäjällä on monia eri vaihtoehtoja lähestyä kääntöä. Käännösstrategioista tietyn sanan valitsemiseen ja kaikki siltä väliltä voivat vaihdella eri kääntäjien välillä. Suomen kielen kiro sanojen rikkaus ja vapaa lauserakenne mahdollistavat usean eri kääntöksen syntymisen.

Tämä pro gradu -tutkielma ja siinä analysoidut aiheet voivat toimia inspiraationa muille tutkimuksille. Kiro sanojen kääntämisessä Hjort (2009, 2014, 2015 ja 2017) on tehnyt suomennosten osalta pitkäjänteistä työtä. Lisätutkimukset ja eri näkökannat ovat tervetulleita. Kiro sanoja voidaan tutkia *Sieppari ruispellossa* -romaanin suomennoksissa myös eri kiro sanoja analysoimalla. Tähän tutkielmaan valittujen *damn*- ja *goddam*-sanojen tilalta voidaan analysoida alkuperäisteoksessa esiintyviä muita kiro sanoja. Schroderuksen kääntöksessä useasti esiintyvä kiro sana *helvetti* voi tarjota mielenkiintoisen lähtökohdan sen kiro sanan esiintyvyyden ja sen kääntämiseen käytettyjen strategioiden analysointiin. Kiro sana *helvetti* voisi myös mahdollistaa käännösstrategioiden 'kompensaatio' ja 'lisäys' analysoinnin *Sieppari ruispellossa* -romaanin suomennoksissa. Kaikki edellä mainitut analyysit voidaan myös suorittaa alkuperäisteoksen ja jollekin toiselle kielelle käännetyn teoksen välillä.

Lisäksi käännösosalalla uudelleen kääntämisen kattavaa tutkimusta kaivataan edelleen. Erityisesti Koskinen ja Paloposki ovat tutkineet uudelleen kääntämistä jo usean vuoden ajan, ja Suomessa on yleisestikin tutkittu uudelleen kääntämistä kattavasti. Uudelleen kääntämisen analysointia on tehty monilla eri kielillä ja monissa eri kulttuurikonteksteissa, mutta yleistä ja laajamittaista tutkimusta uudelleen kääntämiseen kaivataan (Koskinen ja Paloposki 2015a, 10).

Tämä pro gradu -tutkielma, siinä analysoidut esimerkit ja löydetyt tulokset toimivat osana jatkuvasti kehittyvää uudelleenkääntämisen tutkimusta. Tämä tutkimus kiro sanojen kääntämisestä suomen kielelle toimii esimerkkitapauksena uudelleenkääntämisen tutkimuksesta ja toivon mukaan inspiroi uusia uudelleenkääntämisen tutkimuksia esimerkiksi *Sieppari ruispellossa* -romaanin näkökulmasta tai eri kiro sanoja analysoimalla.