

## Emphatic Phrases in Finnish Literary Texts and their Hungarian Translations

Eliisa PITKÄSALO

This paper examines the translation of the emphatic phrases that are used primarily in spoken language and that are embedded in a sentence as an affective commentary. More specifically, this study focuses on the jussive mood phrases in a literary context. These jussive phrases (such as *hitto vieköön*) comment on the content of the sentence in which they are embedded. However, the question remains whether the position of these phrases affects the overall message of the sentence, and whether the phrases maintain their original tone and affective index in the Hungarian translation of Finnish literature. To illustrate this, an analysis of the phrases *piru vieköön*, *hitto vieköön* and *jumala paratkoon* in three novels is presented. The main finding of this study is that even if the same grammatical structure is used in Hungarian, the emphatic phrases are not necessarily translated by using it. As an example, there are seven alternative translations in Hungarian of the phrase *jumala paratkoon* in the same novel. Each of these has a different message, and the position of the phrase can affect the interpretation of the sentence.

### 1. Introduction

Emphatic and swearing phrases in literary context are an excellent research topic when studying languages such as Finnish and Hungarian, as both have numerous swearing phrases in frequent use. The usage of affective swearing phrases is decidedly more frequent in spoken than written language, with the exception of the hybrid forms of written and spoken language such as blog texts. In fiction, emphatic and swearing phrases likewise appear to occur most frequently in dialogues and monologues that depict spoken language and in the voice of the first-person narrator.

This article will present an analysis of one specific form of swearing phrases, crystallised emphatic phrase (in Finnish *kiteytynyt päivittely* cf.

VISK § 1666). More specifically, I will focus on the jussive construction that is formed with an expletive acting as the subject and a predicate in the finite, third-person singular, form of the imperative mood. An example of this type of construction is the phrase *hitto soikoon*. For the sake of clarity, I will henceforth refer to the emphatic phrases using the jussive construction simply as emphatic phrases.

This article addresses the following questions: how are emphatic phrases used in Finnish works of fiction; where in the sentence structure can an emphatic phrase be positioned and how does its positioning affect the meaning of the sentence; and how have the emphatic phrases been translated into Hungarian and how do the selected translations affect the meaning of the phrases?

My research material consists of the electronic corpus *Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden klassikoita* (Classics of Finnish literature) of the Institute for the Languages of Finland (Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus) as well as a random sampling of other Finnish literature that has been translated into Hungarian: Risto Isomäki's *Sarasvatin hiekkaa* (Sands of Sarasvati), Aleksis Kivi's *Seitsemän veljestä* (Seven Brothers) and Väinö Linna's *Tuntematon sotilas* (The Unknown Soldier). The translations (in chapter 3) under the examples are verbatim re-translations from Hungarian into Finnish and its verbatim translation into English. These translations will illustrate the use of emphatic phrase in each example. The examples have not been completely glossed. I have glossed in detail only the emphatic phrases that are the target of my study.

## **2. Emphatic phrases and their parentheticality**

Central concepts in this article include parenthesis and emphatic phrases using the jussive construction. In this chapter, I will define these concepts as well as examine the positioning of emphatic phrases and the effect it has on the surrounding text.

### **2.1. Parenthetical Addition**

The electronic version of *Iso suomen kielioppi* (VISK: §1071) defines parenthesis as an addition that is located in the middle of a syntactic structure and which can assume various forms. In other words, parenthesis is a grammatically unnecessary addition that interrupts the structural framework in which it has been embedded. There appears to be no unambiguous definitions for parenthesis to be easily found, but it seems that researchers are

unanimous regarding one of its features: its commenting nature (for example, Aronen 2005: 248; Duvallon – Routarinne 2001: 136).

Parenthesis naturally belongs to the scope of the study of spoken language (see, for example, Routarinne 2003), but on the other hand, the speech in fiction is merely an illusion of speech created by the author. Thus, the study of spoken language cannot be applied as such to the analysis of text fragments including dialogues, monologues and the first-person narrator's voice. Nonetheless, there is some convergence between spoken and written speech.

A parenthetical addition is usually separated from the surrounding text by means of punctuation marks: dashes, commas and, occasionally, brackets. In literary texts, however, the transition to parenthetical additions is not always indicated to the reader. This may be due to an error or to stylistic reasons. On occasion, the writer may use the lack of punctuation marks to illustrate that prosodic signs, for example, those relating to a change in intonation or stress, are also not found in the speech to indicate the beginning of a parenthetical addition. Instead, this addition is integrated into speech without intermission. Duvallon and Routarinne (2001: 125) remark that prosodic markings also do not appear to be necessary features of the parenthesis in conversational speech, citing the studies conducted by Mondada and Zay (1999) as well as Blanche-Benveniste (1997: 72–73, 121–123).

## 2.2. Emphatic Phrases

Emphatic phrases constitute one subcategory of swearing phrases and other expletives. Their relation to the content of the construction that they are embedded in can be perceived as commenting on it as an unnecessary affective addition. However, emphatic phrases do not contain any extraneous thoughts. In the research material I have analysed in this article, the emphatic phrases using the jussive construction consist of two components. According to the electronic version of *Iso suomen kielioppi* (VISK: §1666) this is a common phenomenon. Furthermore, the subject component frequently uses a name of a character of religious origin, for example *hitto*, *piru*, *jumala* and *lemppö* (Hjort 2007: 66). However, occasionally the subject component may be formed with other words, such as *koira* or *kissa*. The predicate component, on the other hand, is a verb in third-person singular imperative, such as *vieköön*, *soikoon*, and *paratkoon*. When the phrase is formed by combining a subject component that refers to a central character of Christianity, *jumala* or *herra*, with the verbs *parata\** (meaning *parantaa*, 'to heal'), *varjella*, or *siunata*, it may have originally signified a prayer or a prayer-like appeal. None-

theless, analysing these types of phrases required special vigilance in selecting the material. Examples 1 and 2 demonstrates this difference in meaning:

- (1) *Jumala siunatkoon, auttakoon ja varjelkoon sinua, herttainen lapsi!*  
(SKK: Pakkala)
- (2) „*Herra siunatkoon, kukas tuolta tulee!*” kaikuu silloin Aina Kustavan ääni sisältä. Ja samassa emäntä juoksee aamuröjyssään eteiseen...  
(SKK: Lehtonen)

The phrase *Jumala siunatkoon, auttakoon ja varjelkoon* has the object *sinua* in example 1. This indicates that the phrase is a prayer, request or desire rather than an emphatic phrase. In example 2, however, the phrase, where blessing, healing, or protection is requested from the characters of Christianity (*herra siunatkoon*), is an emphatic phrase due to its context. In other words, the original meaning has been removed from the phrase and therefore is not related to a Christian prayer. Ulla-Maija Kulonen (1990), however, asserts that there is no guarantee that the subject component is Christian in origin, although the names of the characters are decidedly religious in nature – be it Christian or pagan.

In some instances, the emphatic phrase assumes the characteristics of an interjection, which is generally not categorised as being parentheses owing to its phonological brevity, among other reasons. The research material includes some instances where an emphatic phrase has been shortened into a single-word phrase, but is still recognisable as an emphatic phrase because the jussive construction has lost its subject instead of its predicate (*siunatkoon*). In borderline cases, the emphatic phrase is separated from the text by an exclamation mark. This practice does, however, question the parentheticality of the emphatic phrase. I have excluded emphatic phrases that merely have an interjective function from my research material, except for those instances that are illustrated by example 3:

- (3) Simeoni. *Jumala paratkoon!* hillitön, villitty on elämämme ollut aina tähän päivään asti (Kivi 2012: 12).

In these types of examples, the emphatic phrase is separated from the rest of the sentence by an exclamation mark. The continuation of the sentence is, however, indicated by using a lower-case letter in the word following the exclamation mark.

The function of the emphatic phrase can be regarded as commenting on the content of its structural framework as an interpersonal addition. This is, in addition to specifying, correcting, expanding, anticipating and providing

background knowledge, one of the functions of a parenthetical addition (VISK: §1071). Emphatic phrases necessarily include some affect, which further supports their inclusion of into parentheses, as this has traditionally been considered as one of the features of the parenthesis (Ravila 1945: 10). Moreover, an emphatic phrase functions as a textual space that speakers may visit in order to observe the action they have taken, which is exactly how Duvallon – Routarinne (2001: 151) have described the metaphorical nature of the parenthesis.

### 2.3. The Positioning of Emphatic Phrases

An emphatic phrase may be positioned in the beginning, middle or end of a sentence. The parenthetical nature of the emphatic phrase, however, becomes questionable, especially at the beginning of a turn, if it cannot be deemed to interrupt any sentence structure. An emphatic phrase positioned at the beginning of a sentence prompts the reader to begin deducing what is to be expected of the rest of the turn and how to react to it, as in example 4.

- (4) Juhani. *Jumala paratkoon!* sitähan olemmekin aatelleet ja aprikoinneet oikein vahvasti ja tulleet ymmärtämään mikä siitä pojat perii. Niin, niin, peeveli meidät perii, ja sentähden olemme myös valinneet peevelin onnen osan (Kivi 2012: 297).

In this instance, the emphatic phrase influences the constructions that follow. Its sphere of influence includes the entire sentence, and possibly continues until the end of the turn.

An emphatic phrase that is positioned in the middle of a sentence or other construction may comment on the entire sentence; however, the reader receives an indication as to how to react to its content only in the middle of the turn. In the middle of a sentence structure, the emphatic phrase serves a punctuating function and, thus, its affective influence is more forceful in the middle of a structure than in the beginning. Examples 5 and 6 illustrate this kind of positioning.

- (5) Mutta emme nyt huoli ajatella ensinkään niitä asioita, emme *hiisi vieköön* huolikaan, koska meillä kerran on parempiakin tuumittavana. Niinkuin esimerkiksi tämä koppi. Sanokaas, eikö tämä ole hauska ja mukava, vai mitä? (SKK: Canth)
- (6) „Vai liian vanha?” toisteli hän tuon tuostakin. – „Kyllä minä näytän niille keltanokille, viikinki-penikoille!” – haukuskeli hän minulle tuon tuostakin poikiaan. „No, sen minä nyt kyllä huomaan, etten enää voi

oppia itse tätä kieltä käyttämään, mutta sen minä, *saakeli soikoon*, näytän, että ainakin voin ilman kielenkääntäjän apua saada selkoa asiakirjoista.” (SKK: Aho)

The spheres of influence of the emphatic phrases in examples 5 and 6 work in different directions. In both examples, the emphatic phrase encourages the reader to focus their attention on what is being expressed. In addition, it causes the reader to focus on whether the writer’s intent is to uphold the attitude created by the emphatic phrase for the length of the entire turn or only until the next punctuation mark. In example 5, the emphatic phrase appears to influence only the words immediately preceding and following it (*emme* and *huolikaan*), or, in any case, it does not influence the following subordinate clause as strongly as in example 6. This is probably caused by the fact that the emphatic phrase in example 5 is included in the parenthesis *emme hiisi vieköön huolikaan*, which restricts its immediate sphere of influence to the commas indicating the beginning and end of the parenthesis. The emphatic phrase in example 6, however, is an autonomous parenthetical addition that interrupts the structural framework. This causes it to maintain the force of its sphere of influence until the end of the sentence. As a consequence, the emphatic phrase, positioned in the middle of the sentence, has a stronger influence on the end than on the beginning. In fact, from the preceding turn, only the words immediately preceding the emphatic phrase, *mutta sen minä*, are included in its sphere of influence.

When positioned at the end of a sentence, an emphatic phrase comments on both the entire sentence preceding it and its content. This influences the entire sentence, and occasionally the entire turn. The function of this type of an addition is to highlight what has been expressed previously, as in example 7.

- (7) Lukkari. – Niin, olinpa teille kiinteä opettaja, kiinteä ja kova, sen tunnustan, ja katkerasti olen sitä jo katunut. Mutta samalla kiinteällä keinolla on kerran minua itseäkin opetettu, samalla kouristelevalla keinolla, *paratkoon Jumala!* (Kivi 2012: 345–346).

Example 7 features the emphatic phrase in an unconventional order, the predicate preceding the subject, but it remains an emphatic phrase due to its position at the end of the sentence.

In example 8, the emphatic phrase is no longer an unnecessary addition. Instead, it is connected to the surrounding structure seamlessly and cannot be detached from it.

- (8) Juhani. – Siinä mahdat istua ja haukoitella niinkuin parhaiten maistaa. Jörri sinä. Hehehee! Siinä saat istua rauhassa ja katsella kurran juoksu. – Mutta *soikoon saakeli*, ellei tässä kiekkoa löydetä! Etsimään sitä joka mies! (Kivi 2012: 249.)

In this case, one can still consider it an emphatic phrase, just not a parenthetical one.

### 3. Translating emphatic phrases

Translating emphatic and swearing phrases can pose problems because they are culture-bound concepts. Furthermore, the use of expletives is connected to both geographical and social language usage which, in turn, influences the translator's choices (Hjort 2006: 82–83). In this chapter, I will examine three emphatic phrases (*piru viekөөn*, *hitto soikoon* and *jumala paratkoon*) that are found in the three novels analysed in this article (*Sarasvatin hiekkaa*, *Seitsemän veljestä* and *Tuntematon sotilas*) along with their Hungarian translations (*Elsodort világok*, *A hét testvér* and *Az ismeretlen katona*). Furthermore, I will examine how the translator's choices can affect the tone and meaning of the text. The aim of my study is not to discuss the role of the editor in the final version of the translation, but only to point out the kind of strategies the translator seems to have used.

#### 3.1. Jussive Construction into Conditional or Single-word Noun Phrase

Occasionally, the jussive construction in Finnish can be translated directly into Hungarian. This is because the imperative mood can be conjugated in all persons in Hungarian and because the language possesses the same grammatical construction. However, the translator may also choose to use other constructions. In example 9, the jussive construction has been replaced by the conditional.

- (9a) – Mukana ollaan. Mukana ollaan ja rattailta pysytään, *piru viekөөn* (Linna 2008: 24).

- (9b) – Mi is részesei leszünk. Részesei leszünk,  
 Me myös osallisia olemme + FUT Osallisia olemme + FUT  
 és nyél-be üt-jük a dolg-ot, hogy  
 ja kädensija-ILL lyödä-2PL ART asia-ACC että  
*az ördög vinné el* (Linna 1982: 22).  
 ART piru viedä+COND VERBPART

'Meistä tulee osallisia. Meistä tulee osallisia, ja me teemme sen, piru vie. / We'll become involved. We'll become involved, and we will do it, the Devil take (us).'

The text in this example does not in itself indicate an explicit motive for selecting the conditional. However, it appears that the translator has chosen the conditional instead of the imperative mainly because the emphatic phrase would have too strong an affective impact if translated with the imperative.

Example 10 is from modern Finnish fiction. The translator's choices might have been influenced by it being recent:

(10a) *Hitto vieköön*, minusta me löysimme nämä rauniot vähän turhan helposti. (Isomäki 2009: 108.)

(10b) *A fené-be!* Túl könnyen találtunk rá  
 ART hiisi-ILL Liian helposti löysimme VERBPART  
 ezek-re a romok-ra (Isomäki 2010: 118).  
 nämä-SUBL ART rauniot-SUBL

'Hiiteen/Hitto! Löysimme nämä rauniot liian helposti.'  
 '(Go) To hell! We found these ruins too easily.'

Here the translator has selected a single-word noun phrase, even though using the jussive construction *fene egye meg* (trans. may the devil eat him/her/it) would have been an option. Instead, the translator has chosen a lighter and more vernacular phrase *a fenébe* (trans. 'to hell') that suggests the use of domesticating translation strategy (Leppihalme 2007: 372–373). The translator's choices could further be influenced by the predicate of the construction *fene egye meg* being a definite conjugation. However, the object of the construction cannot be deduced from the context.

### 3.2. Seitsemän veljestä: *jumala paratkoon*

I have selected Aleksis Kivi's novel *Seitsemän veljestä* as part of my research material because it contains a relatively large amount of emphatic phrases and has been translated into Hungarian. The most common emphatic phrase in the novel is *jumala paratkoon* which has seven alternative translations in the Hungarian version. In two instances, the phrase has been re-





(11b) *Juhani*. Én is azt gyanítom, mert Aapeli  
 Minä myös sitä epäilen koska Aapeli

csufondáros fickó. Ő költötte azt a gonosz gúnyverset  
 ilkikurinen heppu Hän runoili sen ilkeä pilkkarunon

öreg káplánukról is, aki – *Isten bocsá'*! –  
 vanha kappalaisesta myös joka Jumala antaa anteeksi+ IMP+ 2SG

a katekizmusvizsgán kissé beszennyezte az orrát. (Kivi 1955: 39.)  
 katekismikokeessa vähän likasi nenänsä

'Minäkin epäilen sitä, koska Aapeli on ilkikurinen heppu. Hän teki myös sen ilkeän pilkkarunon vanhasta kappalaisestamme, joka – Jumala anna anteeksi! – likasi nenänsä katekismikokeessa. / I also doubt it because Aapeli is a mischievous man. He did write that awful cruel poem about the old chaplain who – God, forgive (me)! – dirtied his nose in the catechism examination.'

As the conjugation of the imperative mood changes from the third-person singular to the second-person singular, the tone of the emphatic phrase changes accordingly, resembling an appeal.

In example 12, the re-positioning of the parenthetical addition to the end of the sentence changes its sphere of influence as well as how the sentence is punctuated and stressed.

(12a) *Juhani*. Me olemme, *Jumala paratkoon*, Impivaarasta (Kivi 2012: 171).

(12b) *Juhani*. Mi vagy-unk itt Impivaará-ról,  
 Me olla-3PL täällä Impivaara-ABL

*áld-j-on meg az Isten.* (Kivi 1955: 139.)  
 siunata-IMP-3SG+DEFC VERBPART ART Jumala

'Me olemme Impivaarasta, siunatkoon Jumala! / 'We hail from Impivaara, God bless (us)!'

Positioned in the middle of a sentence in the original text, the emphatic phrase both interrupts the speech and punctuates it, intensifying the force of the phrase. In the Hungarian translation, on the other hand, the emphatic phrase is positioned in the end and consequently, only amplifies what is expressed previously. In addition, the verb choice (*áld*, 'to bless') gives the emphatic phrase a more religious tone.

In example 13, the position of the emphatic phrase remains at the end of the sentence, and hence its impact, sphere of influence, and meaning remain unaltered.

(13a) Lukkari. – Mutta samalla kiinteällä keinolla on kerran minua itseäkin opetettu, samalla kouristelevalla keinolla, *paratkoon Jumala!* (Kivi 2012: 345–346.)

(13b) *A kántor.* Azonban annak idején engem is  
Mutta se+DAT aikaan+POSS+ADE minua myös

ily szigorúan, ilyen kemény kézzel tanít-ott-ak  
näin ankarasti tällainen kova kädellä opettaa-PRET-3PL

*Isten óvjon tőle!* (Kivi 1955: 281.)  
Jumala varjella-IMP-3SG ABL+POSS 3SG

'Mutta siihen aikaan minuakin näin ankarasti ja kovalla kädellä opetettiin, Jumala varjelkoon! / But at the time I was also taught strictly and heavy-handedly, God protect (me)!'

The emphatic phrase *jumala paratkoon* has several alternative translations in the Hungarian translation which may result from the language possessing numerous expletives of religious origin. Nonetheless, the translator's choices might have resulted from an attempt to avoid repetition.

### 3.3. Seitsemän veljestä: *koira vieköön*

Another emphatic phrase that appears frequently in the novel *Seitsemän veljestä* is *koira vieköön*. The translation of this phrase presents an interesting feature: in one instance, the phrase has been translated to convey a religious origin, as illustrated in example 14. Like example 11, the translator has also switched the speaker, as Timo's words are spoken by Juhani.

(14a) Timo. Ja lapsekkaita kuin piimänaamaiset kakarat. Niinpä syövätkin, ryysyt rinnoilla, ja eivätpä – *koira vieköön!* – osaa lusikkaansaakaan nuolla, koska pöydästä nousevat; sen olen nähnyt omilla silmilläni suureksi ihmeekseni (Kivi 2012: 131).

(14b) *Juhani.* És gyermekesek, akár a tejfelesszájú kölykök.  
Ja lapselliset kuin ART kermaviilisuinen kakarat

Úgy is esznek, mint azok: kendővel a nyakukban  
Niin myös syövät kuin ne liina+INSTR-KOMIT kaulassaan

és nem tud-ják – *Isten uccse!* [= úgy segél-j-en] –  
 ja ei tiedä-3PL+DEFC Jumala niin auttaa-IMP-3SG+INDC

hogy ha fölkelnek az asztaltól, hát illenek tisztességgel  
 että jos nousevat pöydästä PART olla sopivaa säädyllisyydellä

lenyalni a kanalat! Ezt nagy csodálkozással  
 nuolla lusikan Tämän suuri ihmetyksellä

magam is láttam (Kivi 1955: 107–108).  
 itse+POSS 1SG myös näin

’Ja lapsellisia, aivan kuin maitopartaiset kakarat. He syövätkin niin kuin ne: liina kaulassaan eivätkä tiedä – Jumala auttakoon! – että kun he nousevat pöydästä, niin olisi sopivaa ja säädyllistä nuolla lusikka! Tämän olen itsekin nähnyt suureksi ihmeekseni. / And childish, as brats with milk moustache. They even eat alike: cloths on their necks and not knowing – God help (them)! – that stand up from the table it is proper and respectable to lick the spoon. This I have witnessed to my great surprise.’

As is evident in example 14, the tone of the translated phrase is decidedly different from the original. To a modern day reader, the emphatic phrase *koira vieköön* is a humorous remark whereas the Hungarian phrase *Isten uccse* is archaic and is not humorous.

In example 15, the emphatic phrase *koira vieköön* has been translated with the participle construction *kutya teringette*.

(15a) Timo. „Ja nuorempi veljensä Timoteeus!” Ja saipa, *koira vieköön!*  
 Kaisa lapsellensa isän. (Kivi 2012: 90.)

(15b) *Timo.* „És fiatalabb testvére, Timotheus!”  
 Ja nuorempi veli+POSS 3SG Timotheus

Hanem aztán, *kutya tering-ett-e!* -  
 Vaan sitten koira luoda-PARTIC-GEN

kapott is Kaisa apát a fattyújának. (Kivi 1955: 75.)  
 sai myös Kaisa isän äpärälleen

’Ja nuorempi veljensä Timoteeus! Mutta sitten, koiran luoma! Kaisa saikin isän äpärälleen. / And his younger brother Timoteeus! But then, cur’s creation! Kaisa did get a father for his bastard.’

The Hungarian translation does not contain the same construction as the original phrase, but the parentheticality of the emphatic phrase has been retained.

The translation of the novel has two instances where the subject in *koira viekään* has been changed from a dog into a bird – a black kite (*kánya*). The only difference between the two exceptions is that one lacks a verb particle. Thus, I have chosen to present only one of the translations here.

(16a) Mikko. Sekalaista, sekalaista sekä hyvää että pahaa, mutta ainapa, *koira viekään*, hyvä kuitenkin täällä päällimmäisenä keikkuu, ja tämän elämän retkutus käy laatuun, käypä se. (Kivi 2012: 347.)

(16b) *Mikko*. Hát vegyesen, vegyesen, van jó is, meg  
PART sekalaisesti sekalaisesti on hyvä myös ja

rossz is. De *vi-gye* *el* *a kánya*,  
huono myös mutta viedä-IMP+3SG+INDC VERBPART haarahaukka

végül mégis mindig a jó kerül felül  
lopulta kuitenkin aina hyvä pääsee päälle

s az élet mégis megéri a pénzét (Kivi 1955: 283).  
ja elämä kuitenkin on arvoinen raha+POSS+ACC

'No, sekalaisesti, sekalaisesti, on sekä hyvää että myös pahaa. Mutta viekään haarahaukka, lopulta kuitenkin hyvä pääsee päälle ja elämä on kuitenkin rahan arvoista. / Well, it's a mix, it's a mix, there is both good and evil. But may a black kite take (us), in the end good will win and life is worth the money (living), after all.'

In the source text of example 16, the emphatic phrase *koira viekään* is a clearer parenthetical addition because it interrupts its structural framework '*mutta ainapa hyvä kuitenkin täällä päällimmäisenä keikkuu*'. Moreover, the translation, *vi-gye el a kánya*, has retained the jussive construction as well as its parentheticality, even though the structural framework of the target text has fewer words than the source text. The punctuation of speech in the translation has been marked with different punctuation marks, but remains similar in relation to the emphatic phrase.

#### 4. Conclusions

This article has presented an analysis of the emphatic and swearing phrases in three Finnish novels and their Hungarian translations. The emphatic phrases using the jussive construction rarely appear in written texts which meant material to compare was scarce. In addition, the amount of Finnish

fiction that has been translated into Hungarian is limited. The research material is, however, sufficient to answer the questions on how the emphatic phrases are used in Finnish fiction, how they are translated into Hungarian, and how their meanings are changed in the translations.

In terms of syntax, the emphatic phrase is a parenthetical addition if it interrupts its structural framework. Hence, in principle, parenthetical additions cannot be positioned at the beginning or at the end of a sentence in a written text. In written speech, however, pauses are indicated by punctuation which means that a full stop and an exclamation mark can be used to punctuate the speech without necessarily signaling the end of the sentence structure. The emphatic phrase can, therefore, be a parenthetical addition at the beginning or end of a sentence if it interrupts the narration. For example, the emphatic phrases in the novel *Seitsemän veljestä* are often punctuated with exclamation marks even though the sentence continues after the exclamation mark. In the Hungarian translation, a new sentence always begins after an emphatic phrase that ends in an exclamation mark, although in some instances these phrases clearly interrupted the construction or turn.

Comparing the novel *Seitsemän veljestä* and its Hungarian translation, I found no substantial differences in how the sphere of influence of the emphatic phrases changed. The source text contains only one instance in which the emphatic phrase both punctuates and interrupts the narration in order to emphasise meaning. In the Hungarian translation, however, this has been achieved by positioning the emphatic phrase at the end of the sentence and this emphasises the previous clause.

One noteworthy difference between the Finnish emphatic phrases and their Hungarian translations is that although the jussive construction can be found in both languages, it was not necessarily preferred for the translation into Finnish. The primary reason for this may be the translator's own language usage that is influenced by, for example, geographical variation. Another point is that the jussive construction is common in the gender vocabulary of swearing phrases in modern Hungarian spoken language. These types of swearing phrases are often too crude to be used as the translations of the emphatic phrases that are analysed in this study (cf. Vertanen 2007: 153). Moreover, other jussive construction phrases are in many cases too archaic in the Hungarian language. In the case of newer literature, it is likely that the translator, trying to imitate authentic modern Hungarian, does not want the speech to sound outdated. The emphatic phrases in older fiction, on the other hand, have to convey a more religious tone, which may be due to the archaic nature of the Hungarian equivalents.

Comparing emphatic phrases and their Hungarian translations demonstrates that to achieve authenticity the translator has to balance between the meanings expressed in the source language and the conventions of the target language, but the tone of speech can be affected by fairly subtle changes. These changes include removing of the emphatic phrase, changing its position in the sentence structure, and moderating or reinforcing of its tone. By using these techniques, the writer creates an illusion of the tone of the speech, the positioning of the stress, and the pauses heard in the speech.

### Abbreviations Used in the Examples

ABL	= ablative case	ILL	= illative case
ACC	= accusative case	INDC	= indefinite conjugation
ADE	= adessive case	IMP	= imperative mood
ALL	= allative case	INSTR-KOMIT	= instrumental-comitative case
ART	= article	PART	= particle
COND	= conditional mood	PARTIC	= participle
DAT	= dative case	POSS	= possessive suffix
DEFC	= definite conjugation	PRET	= preterite
FUT	= future tense	SUBL	= sublative case
GEN	= genitive case	VERBPART	= verbal particle

### Primary Sources

- Isomäki, Risto 2005/2009: *Sarasvatin hiekkaa*. Tammi, Helsinki.
- Isomäki, Risto 2010: *Elsodort világok*. (Transl. János Benyovszki, Brigitta Endresz, Klaudia Kiss, Bella Lerch and Ágnes Pasztercsák). Nyitott Könyvműhely, Budapest.
- Kivi, Aleksis 1870/2012: *Seitsemän veljestä*. Helsinki: SKS.
- Kivi, Aleksis 1955: *A hét testvér*. (Transl. István Rácz). Új Magyar Könyvkiadó, Budapest.
- Linna, Väinö 1954/2008: *Tuntematon sotilas*. WSOY, Helsinki.
- Linna, Väinö 1982: *Az ismeretlen katona*. (Transl. Gábor Bereczki) Magvető Kiadó, Budapest.
- SKK = Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden klassikoita [corpus]. – Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus [cited on 15.2.2013]. (The corpus is included in the collection of corpora of the Institute for the Languages of Finland.) Available at: [http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/klassikot/meta/klassikot\\_coll\\_rdf.xml](http://kaino.kotus.fi/korpus/klassikot/meta/klassikot_coll_rdf.xml)

---

**Literature**

- Aronen, Hanna 2005: Pitkien virkkeiden parenteettisuus englannista suomeksi käännettyissä ja alun perin suomeksi kirjoitetuissa akateemisissa teksteissä. In: Anna Mauranen – Jarmo H. Jantunen (eds.), *Käännösuomeksi. Tutkimuksia suomennosten kielestä*. Tampere University Press. 245–263.
- Chesterman, Andrew 2007: Kääntämisen normit. In: H. K. Riikonen et al. (ed.), *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia 2*. SKS, Helsinki. 357–364.
- Duvallon, Outi – Routarinne, Sara 2001: Parenteesi keskustelun kieliopin voimavarana. In: Mia Halonen – Sara Routarinne (eds.), *Keskusteluanalyysin näkymiä*. *Kieli 13*. Helsingin yliopiston suomen kielen laitos, Helsinki. 122–153.
- Hjort, Minna 2006: Kirosojen valikoituminen audiovisuaaliseen ja kaunokirjalliseen käännökseen. In: *Erikoiskielet ja käännösteoria. VAKKI-symposiumi XXVI*. Vaasa. 74–84.
- Hjort, Minna 2007: Kirošana vai voimasana ja muita karkeita terminologisia pohdintoja. In: *Översättningsteori, fackspråk och flerspråkighet. Publikationer av VAKKI, Nr. 34*. Vasa. 63–75.
- Kulonen, Ulla-Maija 1990: Miten suomalaiset kiroilivat ennen kristinuskoa? *Kielikello 1990/1*: 3–6.
- Leppihalme, Ritva 2007: Kääntäjän strategiat. In: H. K. Riikonen et al. (ed.), *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia 2*. SKS, Helsinki. 365–373.
- Ravila, Paavo 1945: Lauseeseen liittyneet irralliset ainekset. *Virittäjä 49*: 1–16.
- Routarinne, Sara 2003: Tytöt äänessä. Parenteesit ja nouseva sävelkulku kertojan vuorovaikutuskeinoina. SKS, Helsinki.
- Tammi, Jari 2007: *Suuri kirosanakirja*. WSOY, Helsinki.
- Tiittula, Liisa – Nuolijärvi, Pirkko 2013: Puheen illuusio suomenkielisessä kaunokirjallisuudessa. SKS, Helsinki.
- Vertanen, Esko 2007: Ruututeksti tiedon ja tunteiden tulkkina. In: Riitta Oitinen – Tiina Tuominen (eds.), *Olellaisen äärellä. Johdatus audiovisuaaliseen kääntämiseen*. Tampere University Press, Tampere. 149–170.
- Vilkuna, Maria 1996: Suomen lauseopin perusteet. *Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja 80*. Edita, Helsinki.
- VISK = The electronic version of Iso Suomen Kielioppi. <http://scripta.kotus.fi/visk/etusivu.php>