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1 Introduction

Translating forms of address and reference from English to Finnish is not an uncomplicated task, especially when the genre is a subtitled television series. Finnish, unlike English, has two second person pronouns used in address, and the translator has to decide whether to translate the English address pronoun you with the solidarity and superiority expressing singular sinä or the distant and respectful plural te. For instance, the study of Anu Anttila showed that this difference easily leads to inconsistencies in translation solutions, the translators basing their solutions on their subjective interpretations of the communication situation (1993: passim).

In English and Finnish, there are also differences in the use of nominal address forms, titles and proper names being more common in English than in Finnish speech. The length restrictions limit the use of nominal address forms in subtitles (see e.g. Utti 2002, Vertanen 2007), but nevertheless, nominal address can contain information essential to the collocutors’ relationship. The translator must know when it is safe to omit and when the nominal address form should be included in the subtitles, and this requires deep knowledge of the series and the characters.

Nominal forms of reference pose a challenge as well, as they can express information not only about the relationship of the speaker and the referent, but also about the relationship of the addressee and the referent. Another challenge arises from another difference between the languages: Finnish, unlike English, has only one third person singular pronoun, hän, which is used to refer to both male and female referents. Therefore, in Finnish it is sometimes necessary to include a nominal reference form in an utterance that in English only contains pronoun he or she in order to unambiguously specify the referent.

The present study aims to observe how pronominal address forms and nominal address and reference forms are translated in Finnish subtitles of an English television programme. The study material consists of two subtitled versions, from now on called the TV version and the DVD version, of five episodes of the fourth season of the British television series Downton Abbey (2013). The TV version was translated by Annu James for the Finnish Broadcasting Company Yleisradio and the DVD version by an unknown number of unidentified translators for the DVD release.
I will attempt to define the main strategies followed in the two versions, focusing especially on the differences between them. I will also attempt to find out whether there is any variation of strategies within either of the versions.

The intention of this paper is by no means to criticise the translators’ solutions or to decide which translation is “better”, but rather to find out what kind of reasons have led to the differences and what consequences they have to the viewer. Since the subtitles are naturally not the only source of information for the viewers, minor differences might not create any misunderstandings. However, if the used address and reference forms are unclear or even contradict with the knowledge the viewer has of the characters, it might create unwanted confusion that makes the series more difficult to follow. However, it is naturally impossible to make any unambiguous conclusions about the viewers’ experience of the series without questioning the viewers themselves.

Previous studies on translation quality have shown that working conditions affect the quality of products; if people need to do their work in a hurry or if the work is divided between people who do not communicate with each other, it seems evident that the quality of products will suffer (see e.g. Abdallah 2007, Hietamaa 2012, Kurvi 2013).

There has been relatively little study on the effects of working conditions on the quality of work in the field of translation: as Tarmo Hietamaa has stated (2012: 8), the sociology of translation is a new field of study and there are therefore not many studies that focus on the working conditions of translators. Traditionally, translation studies have focused on the translation products, but Hietamaa, among others, wishes for a change in this tradition (ibid: 50). The reason for lack of studies on the subject might also be the term quality being difficult to define and therefore to study.

Figure 1, originally from Kristiina Abdallah (2007: 238), demonstrates the relevance of translators’ working conditions to the present study.
Product quality, situated in the centre of the illustration, encompasses the quality of the translation product (Abdallah 2007: 283). In the present study, this refers to the consistency and validity of the translations of address and reference forms.

Product quality does not exist in a vacuum. The white area in Figure 1, the process quality, refers to the translation process, including its stages and the tools and materials available to the translator (Abdallah 2007: 283–284). In the present study, the process quality is related to questions about whether the translators had access to video material, previous translation solutions, and the script. However, no conclusions can be drawn about the working conditions of the translators without interviewing the translators themselves, which was not possible in the scope of this study.

Previous studies suggest that process quality has direct influence over the consistence of translation solutions. Tarmo Hietamaa, who studied realia and register in the science fiction series *Star Trek: Deep Space Nine*, came to the conclusion that if the translators did not have enough time and deep knowledge of the series, it had a negative effect on the translation (Hietamaa 2012: 40–49). The first four seasons of the series were translated by one person, while the fifth season had several translators working on the episodes (ibid: 16). In the fifth season, there were no established translations for realia and there was no consistency in the different translations’ style and level of domestication, which Hietamaa supposes to have resulted from lack of time (ibid: 40). Furthermore, there was no consistency in register and the characters’
relationship was not reflected by their use of address pronouns (ibid: 43–44). The use of second person plural and singular varied not only between different translators and episodes but also within single lines (ibid: 49). According to the translators interviewed for the study, the translators of the fifth season spent approximately twice as much time on each episode than the translator of the first four seasons. According to Hietamaa, the reason for this could be that the original translator could utilise his previous translations and did not have to spend so much time on information seeking. (ibid: 61–62.)

The outermost area in Figure 1 represents social quality, which includes the working conditions, the contracts under which the translators work, and the relationship of the actors to each other and to the rest of society (Abdallah 2007: 284–285). Tiina Kurvi’s study strongly suggests that fees have direct influence over the product quality. Better fees can lead to better quality as they enable the translators to spend more time on reworking the text and searching for information. Correspondingly, low fees can affect the translators so that they give less attention to the quality of their work. (Kurvi 2013: 39–41.) In the above-mentioned study of Hietamaa, the translator of the first four seasons defines the fees he received for his work as being very reasonable in relation to the amount of work and time required, but of the translators of the later seasons only one person defines their fees as so much as reasonable. Only the fees of the translator of the first four seasons followed the Yhtyneet agreement. (Hietamaa 2007: 57.)

Furthermore, the first seasons had been translated by a person working as a freelancer directly for MTV3. The translators of the latter seasons, however, worked as subcontractors, so they never contacted MTV3 themselves but always via the translation agency. Therefore, the translators could not discuss quality demands and practical matters directly with the client (Hietamaa 2012: 54–56).

According to Abdallah, the translators’ education program focuses excessively on product quality. She points out that students who are taught to strive for the best possible product quality might not be fully prepared for the strict deadlines and other demands of real-life assignments. (Abdallah 2007: 276–277.) Perhaps it is because of this emphasis in their education that translators have been unwilling to sacrifice quality, as Abdallah states (ibid: 275–276), even when they realise that their
employers are asking them to work too fast for too little payment, in other words, when the quality of the two outer dimensions is poor. Product quality is the only dimension translators can directly affect, but Abdallah stresses that this does not mean that translators should carry the full responsibility for product quality (ibid: 286). She points out that translation norms focus excessively on translators’ responsibilities, which can cause a conflict between translators’ unchanging professional ethics and changing work conditions (ibid: 279).

Yleisradio has committed itself to the collective Yhtyneet agreement that guarantees AV translators a certain income. Most of the other employers of AV translators did reach a collective agreement in 2015, but it was not in effect at the time when the fourth season of Downton Abbey was translated and is therefore not relevant to the present study. According to Abdallah, Yleisradio as an employer has more interest in the outer dimensions of quality than the private sector. According to her, the position of translators working for Yleisradio is significantly better than of those working for other employers. (Abdallah 2007: 272–273.)

In Abdallah’s opinion, the emergence of translation agencies has decreased social quality in many ways, as translators working as subcontractors make less money than before and have lost some of the appreciation they receive as experts in their field (Abdallah 2007: 274). The present development has also led to lower fees, changing working conditions, and tighter deadlines (ibid: 277).

The TV translation of Downton Abbey was made for Yleisradio and the DVD version by a translation agency whose name, let alone the translators’ names, are not mentioned anywhere. One cannot say for certain, of course, that there were any significant differences in their working conditions, but if there are differences in the two versions’ product quality, one can suppose that differences in process and social quality might be at least one of the factors behind them. My hypothesis, based on above-mentioned research on the quality dimensions, is that there were indeed differences in the outer dimensions of quality and that the differences have affected the two versions, the TV version being more coherent in its translation solutions applied to terms of address and reference. I also assume that the translators have strived for the best possible results the two outer dimensions allow.
In chapter 2, I will introduce the British drama series Downton Abbey and its characters relevant to the analysis as well as the method I will use to analyse the material. In chapter 3, I will present the theoretical framework of this study and explain the address systems of both English and Finnish by utilising the framework. In chapter 4, I will present my findings from the study material, and lastly, in chapter 5, I will draw my final conclusions and provide some suggestions for future studies on the subject.
2 Material and Method

In this chapter, I will provide information on the study material, above all on the characters relevant to the analysis chapter.

My study material consists of two different versions of Finnish subtitles of the British drama series Downton Abbey, written by Julian Fellowes and co-produced by Carnival Films and Masterpiece. The material includes episodes five to eight from the series’ fourth season and the Christmas special The London Season that takes place between seasons four and five. The TV version, translated by Annu James, was aired by Yleisradio on channel TV1 in 2013 and shown as a rerun in 2014. The episodes of the study material were recorded from the rerun. The DVD with Finnish subtitles was released in 2014. The translator of the DVD subtitles is not mentioned anywhere, so there is a possibility that there has been more than one translator.

I went through the study material slowly, stopping the video every time a character was addressed with a nominal form or a pronoun or referred to with a term of reference. In order to do that, I needed the full five episodes of both versions. The TV versions of the episodes were recorded from Yleisradio’s rerun between the 11th of September and the 9th of October 2014. Unfortunately, some minutes from the beginning of some episodes were missing from the recording, so I contacted the translator Anna James, who supplied me with the missing pieces of translated dialogue.

I assembled my observations on the terms of address and reference in a table, where it was easier to see and compare the strategies and solutions of the two versions. I marked the most significant differences and compared the translation solutions to the nominal address forms in the original English dialogue. The analysis of the examples is based on models of the use of address and reference forms, observed in more detail in chapter 3.

Though the episodes are from the season’s latter half, I will refer to them as episodes 1 to 5, episode 1 being the fifth episode of the fourth season, episode 2 the sixth and so on. This way the analysis will be easier to follow, as the numbering logically starts from number one. Running time of the first three episodes in the study material is
approximately 47 minutes, the fourth 68 minutes and the last one 93 minutes. Thus, since the material includes two versions of each episode, it consists of approximately 10 hours of audiovisual material. There was no specific reason for choosing these particular episodes for the analysis, and one studying different episodes might receive slightly different results.

When discussing audiovisual translation, it is not always self-explanatory what terms source text and target text refer to, as they may or may not include everything that is to be seen and heard in the material, from the dialogue to the background music. In the present study, source text, from now on ST, refers to the original English dialogue and nothing else. Whenever something in the audio track or on the screen needs to be noted in the analysis, it will be mentioned separately.

The timings of the TV version that are marked in the example table are from the recordings. Therefore, when an example is not in the recordings, no timing will be specified.

I chose Downton Abbey as the research material of this paper because of the era in which the series takes place. In the early 20th century, social status was very important in Britain, so the series’ dialogue is rich with titles. In Finnish, titles are not nearly as common, and furthermore, they are often omitted from the subtitles along with other nominal forms of address. More natural and space-saving way of conveying information about the collocutors’ relationship are the two Finnish pronouns of address, but since English has only one second person pronoun, there is no explicit stimulus in the source text that would determine which pronoun to use in the translation. Therefore, the translator also needs to utilise non-verbal information, which makes the subtitles of the series such an interesting material to study.

The series takes place in a fictional country house called Downton Abbey in the early 20th century, and the story revolves around the fictional Crawley family and their servants. The following table presents the characters that will be relevant in the analysis.
Table 1: Characters relevant to the analysis

| Upper class                     | Robert Crawley (earl)                      |
|                                | Cora Crawley (countess; Robert’s wife)    |
|                                | Mary and Edith Crawley (daughters of Robert and Cora) |
|                                | Violet Crawley (dowager countess; Robert’s mother) |
|                                | Rosamund Painswick (Robert’s sister)      |
|                                | Rose MacClare (relative of the Crawleys)   |
|                                | Madeleine Allsopp, Freda Ward (friends of Rose’s) |
|                                | Lord Aysgarth (Madeleine’s father)         |
|                                | Martha Levinson (Cora’s mother)            |
|                                | Harold Levinson (Cora’s brother)           |
| Middle class                   | Tom Branson (husband of Robert’s late daughter Sybil) |
|                                | Isobel Crawley (widow of a relative of Robert’s, mother of Mary’s late husband) |
|                                | Charles Blake (works for the government; Mary’s suitor) |
|                                | Tony Gillingham                           |
|                                | Evelyn Napier                             |
|                                | Doctor Clarkson (doctor)                  |
|                                | Michael Gregson (editor)                  |
|                                | Sarah Bunting (teacher)                   |

| Upper servants                 | Mr Carson (butler)                        |
|                                | Mrs Hughes (housekeeper)                 |
|                                | Mrs Patmore (cook)                       |
|                                | Mr Bates, Mr Green, Ethan Slade (valets)  |
|                                | Thomas Barrow (underbutler)              |
|                                | Anna Bates, Miss Baxter (lady’s maids)    |

| Lower servants                 | Daisy, Ivy (kitchen maids)               |
|                                | Jimmy, Mr Molesley (footmen)             |

For the sake of practicality, I will use the names the characters are usually addressed in the series. This does cause some inconsistencies in the naming strategies, some characters being referred to by their first names and some by titles and last names, but it makes the analysis easier to follow, as the characters are referred to by the same names that are usually used in the dialogue.
Robert Crawley, the 5th Earl of Grantham, is the head of the Crawley family and the patriarch of Downton Abbey. Her wife, the originally American Cora Crawley, has the title of a countess. The couple has two daughters, the ladies Mary and Edith, the former a widow and the latter unmarried. Robert’s mother, the sharp-tongued dowager countess Violet, lives not far from the family and often spends time with Isobel Crawley. Isobel was originally a nurse and is not blood-related to the Crawleys. She is the mother of lady Mary’s late husband.

After the death of her husband, Lady Mary has attracted three suitors: Charles Blake, Tony Gillingham, and Evelyn Napier. Charles works for the government and stays at Downton while conducting a study on the area’s farms. At first, he and Mary dislike each other, but gradually they develop warm feelings for each other.

Tom Branson was originally the Crawleys’ chauffeur but became more of a family member after marrying Sybil, Robert and Cora’s late daughter. He is not quite sure that he belongs in the house with the aristocrats, especially after the death of his wife. He feels much more comfortable with Sarah Bunting, a teacher he meets at a political gathering.

Miss Rose MacClare is a young relative of the Crawleys who is staying with them while her parents are visiting India. Madeleine Allsopp is a friend of hers and the daughter of a greedy nobleman lord Aysgarth. Freda Ward is a newer acquaintance of Rose’s, a married woman and the mistress of the Prince of Wales.

Martha Levinson is Cora’s mother and Harold her brother. They both live in America and seldom visit the Crawleys, and they both feel out of place among the English aristocrats.

In real country houses, there was a strict social hierarchy among the servants, and it was usual that upper and lower servants did not mix socially and even ate separately (Musson 2009: 228). In Downton, the hierarchy is not as strict as that and the servants spend plenty of time together in their common dining room.

At Downton, there are two possible nominal ways to refer to or address upper servants: last name or title plus last name. They are addressed with title by all the other servants, but only the cook and the housekeeper are addressed with their titles.
by the upper-class characters as well. All the male upper servants as well as ladies’ maids are addressed by their last names by the upper class.

The upmost of the upper servants is Mr Carson, the butler of the house, and the second after him is Mrs Hughes, the housekeeper. Traditionally, butlers and housekeepers were the “rulers” of the servants’ hall (Durant 1996: 45, 169). Despite her title, Mrs Hughes is unmarried; Mrs is only a courtesy title housekeepers of the time used to receive (ibid: 169). Both Mr Carson and Mrs Hughes are addressed by their title and last name in the original English dialogue. In addition to them, only the cook Mrs Patmore is addressed with her title by all the characters.

Every adult member of the upper class has their personal servant. The male servants of the male family members are called valets. Mr Bates serves Robert Crawley, Mr Green serves Tony Gillingham, and Ethan Slade serves Harold Levinson. Miss Baxter and Mr Bates’ wife Anna are the ladies’ maids of Cora and Mary. Most valets and ladies’ maids are addressed by their title and last name by the servants and by their last name by the upper class, but Anna is an exception. After marrying Mr Bates and becoming a lady’s maid, Anna should be addressed with her last name by the upper class. This, however, would lead into the family having two servants that are addressed with the name Bates. Furthermore, she had worked at Downton for a long time as a housemaid, so the servants had become used to calling her Anna. Therefore, she is addressed with her first name by most of the characters in the series.

Thomas Barrow, like Anna, has climbed the career ladder from being a footman all the way to the status of an underbutler. Unlike her, however, he is addressed with his last name by the upper class and title and last name by the servants. Nevertheless, it is not uncommon that the other characters refer to him with his first name when he is not present.

Lower servants, as a rule, are addressed with their first names. This goes for Daisy and Ivy, who work in the kitchen under Mrs Patmore, as well as the footman Jimmy, whose responsibilities include waiting at tables under the supervision of the butler. The status of Mr Molesley, who becomes a footman within the episodes of the study material, is not quite as easy to define. Because of Mr Molesley’s downhill career path from butler to valet and from valet to footman, he should be addressed with his
first name *Joseph* by rule. However, all the other characters, as well as the viewers, have learnt to know him by his last name or title plus last name, depending on if the speaker is a member of the upper class or a servant. As Violet and Robert explicitly mention in the second episode of the study material, the characters would find the change of address unnatural. Therefore, Mr Molesley is addressed like an upper servant though he is actually a lower servant.
3 Theoretical Framework

In this chapter, I will present the main concepts related to the study of address and explain how they can be used to describe and compare the use of address and reference forms in English and Finnish. I will use the model originally developed by Roger Brown and Albert Gilman (1960) and later supplemented by other researchers. Subchapters from 3.1 to 3.3 present the “universal” rules of address and reference, while the last two subchapters go into more language-specific details.

Sociolinguistic rules may vary within languages, and they vary even more between languages and cultures (Ervin-Tripp 1972: 230–231). Therefore, two languages as different from each other as Finnish and English cannot be compared without a thorough examination of their sociolinguistic rules of address. As Arnon Grundberg stresses, directly transferring address and reference forms from one system to another can distort the original social meaning (1985: 139).

I know that since my study material does not consist of authentic language use, analysing it with Brown and Gilman’s framework can seem somewhat forced. Since my study material consists of Finnish subtitles based on fictional English dialogue based on an idea of actual language use in the early 20th century, it is far from authentic Finnish language use. However, the present study does not strive to be primarily sociolinguistic analysis of language but only exploits Brown and Gilman’s model to keep the analysis of address and reference more objective.

I also know that the collocutors’ relationship and rank also can be expressed by means other than those related to address forms. In American English, for instance, both inferiors and equals tend to be addressed with their first names, but inferiors receive more imperatives than equals do (Ervin-Tripp 1972: 227–228). Naturally, a system is always more complicated than any model describing it. As Johannes Helmbrecht puts it, people cannot be said to be merely senders, receivers or subjects of a message but are connected to each other within a complicated net of social roles, relations and cultural practices (2003: 192). But in scope of this study, I can only concentrate on forms of address and reference, and therefore I treat the collocutors simply as speakers, addressees or referents of a message.
3.1 Pronouns of address

In this chapter, I will present the main concepts and most important studies on the use of second person address pronouns. Of course, there are also other pronominal ways to show respect, such as third person pronouns or reflexive pronouns. Furthermore, some languages express politeness by avoiding pronominal address. (Helmbrecht 2003: 196.) In scope of the present study, however, only second person pronouns can be included in the analysis of pronominal address. Johannes Helmbrecht, who studied a sample of 100 languages established independently of his study, observed that at least in his material, second person plural was clearly the most common pronominal form of polite address (2003: 196).

Sociolinguistic study of address is said to have started in 1960 with the highly influential article of Roger Brown and Albert Gilman (Braun 1988: 14). Brown and Gilman studied the use of address pronouns in English, French, Italian, Spanish, and German, and despite the differences between the languages, they found enough similarities to be able to make some generalisations about the pronoun use and its development (Brown & Gilman 1960: passim.). To make it easier to compare different languages and their different systems of address, Brown and Gilman introduced the symbols T and V, which they use to refer to second person singular and plural pronouns respectively. The symbols are abbreviations of the Latin second person singular and plural pronouns *tu* and *vos*. (ibid: 254–255.)

In languages with T/V distinction, the second person singular pronoun is usually used when there is only one addressee and the second person plural when there are more than one, but Brown and Gilman’s study focuses on cases in which the V pronoun is used to address a single addressee. This kind of “singular” use of a plural pronoun has often been said to have been initiated in Rome, from where it spread to Europe (e.g. Hook 1984: 183, Yli-Vakkuri 2005: 189), but V pronouns have been shown to exist also in languages completely unrelated to Latin (Head 1978: 159). It has been suggested that the second person plural was originally used to avoid referring to the addressee directly: by making the request ostensibly to multiple addressees, the speaker could reduce the actual addressee’s obligation to act (Helmbrecht 2003: 194–195). There are large geographic areas with similar
politeness distinctions in pronouns (ibid: 199), which suggests that the use of V
pronouns is likely to spread from language to language.

In Brown and Gilman’s model, the use of T and V is governed by two semantic
dimensions. The first of these two is the power semantic dimension, which refers to
the status differences between the speaker and the addressee. The other, the
solidarity semantic dimension, refers to the intimacy of the relationship between the
colloctors. (Brown & Gilman 1960: 253–258.) Other researchers have made similar
observations. In their study, Roger Brown and Marguerite Ford refer to the semantic
dimensions with the terms vertical and horizontal of social relationship (1961: 377),
and Minna Nevala uses similar terms power and distance (2004: 200). According to
Brian F. Head, the use of V is usually related to either respect or social distance
(1978: 190–191). Also Johannes Helmbrecht acknowledges these two “social
parameters” as crucial (2003: 192–193). Despite their differing terminology, it is
common for all these studies that the concepts of power and intimacy are somehow
acknowledged.

Despite the similarities, it has been pointed out that different researchers’ definitions
of the concepts differ. Nevala’s definition of distance, for instance, includes both
familiarity and social similarities such as rank. Her definition of power includes
relative power, such as a father has over his children, and the asymmetric differences
of social rank that come from the structures of the society. (Nevala 2004: 200.)
Therefore, we must define the dimensions in order to use them in the present study.

The two-dimensional model is by no means the only model in existence. Michael
Clyne, Catrin Norrby and Jane Warren, for instance, see social distance as a
“multidimensional concept” that covers both power and solidarity dimension. In their
view, the three dimensions of social distance are affect (mutual attraction), solidarity
(mutual rights and obligations) and familiarity (mutual knowledge of personal
information), and they might or might not be interrelated. This model does not
include a factor specifically related to social status of the interactants, but solidarity
comes nearest since it is normative in nature. The collocutors’ position in all of the
three dimensions can be either symmetrical or asymmetrical: attraction, for example,
can be mutual, but is not necessarily so. Furthermore, it depends on the individual
how much social distance affects the choice of address pronouns. (Clyne et al. 2009: 29.) For the scope of this study, however, two dimensions are enough.

In this paper, I will utilise Brown and Ford’s terminology and use the term *vertical distance* to describe the collocutors’ distance in the semantic dimension of power and *horizontal distance* for their distance in the semantic dimension of solidarity. Figure 2, originally used in my unpublished BA thesis (Roininen 2013: 10), presents the two dimensions as a simple coordinate system.

*Figure 2: Semantic dimensions*

![Semantic dimensions diagram](image)

The easiest way to interpret Figure 2 is to place the person whose social relations one is analysing in the intersection of the axes and all the other people on the coordinate system according to their relationship with the person. As said, distance on the vertical axis represents status differences between the collocutors. When vertical distance is long, one collocutor has some kind of power over the other, which makes the relationship between the two asymmetrical. Hence, the exchange of address pronouns is also asymmetrical, the person of higher social status addressing the other with T and receiving V. Distance on the horizontal axis represents the solidarity of the collocutors. Their relationship is symmetrical, and the greater the distance, the more likely they are to reciprocally exchange V. (Brown & Gilman 1960: 255–258.)

As Helmbrecht points out, even though several languages use a V pronoun to express politeness, it does not necessarily mean that its use follows the same rules. For instance, in different languages different kinds of people are addressed with V, and whether T and V are used reciprocally or unreciprocally varies between languages.
The pragmatic rules governing the use of address pronouns in a particular language may also undergo diachronic changes. (Helmbrecht 2003: 190.) Thus, even if two languages have T/V distinction, they might not share the same rules of address. Since languages and cultures differ, a simple coordinate system cannot be used to explain all the T/V systems.

Tables 2 to 4, originally from my unpublished BA Thesis (Roininen 2013: 8–9), present three different systems of address, in which the effect of the semantic dimensions is different. Since a person can be a close friend but a superior or a distant acquaintance but an inferior, one semantic dimension must have more influence than the other. When power is the governing semantic dimension, vertical distance has more influence than horizontal distance. Table 2 illustrates this kind of use of address pronouns.

*Table 2: Power as the governing semantic dimension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Equal:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>V</td>
<td>V, when high social status – T, when low social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inferior</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this kind of an address system, superiors always receive V from inferiors and address them with T, regardless of the collocutors’ horizontal distance. Social status governs the pronoun use among power equals as well: when their social status is high, they exchange V, and when it is low, they exchange T. In this kind of an address system, the horizontal distance of the collocutors has no or only little effect on pronoun use. According to Brown and Gilman, this kind of pronoun use is typical for a static society with strict social roles (1960: 264) and it was typical in many societies during the medieval period (ibid: 256).

According to the study of Brown and Gilman, the solidarity semantic is likely to gain more importance as time goes by and societies become more democratic and their people more socially mobile (1960: 264). In address pronoun use presented in Table
3, originally from Brown and Gilman (ibid: 259), the power semantic still governs the use of T and V when there is any vertical distance between the collocutors, but the solidarity semantic decides the pronoun use among power equals.

*Table 3: Semantic dimensions working in parallel*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior</th>
<th>Equal AND solidary</th>
<th>Equal and NOT solidary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pronoun use presented in Table 3 persisted for a considerably long time in all the languages Brown and Gilman analysed. The power semantic remained central well into the nineteenth century, but solidarity semantic took its place in the twentieth century. (Brown & Gilman 1960: 258–259.) Hook has stated that as societies become more fluid, horizontal distance becomes more central in determining the use of T and V (1984: 184). Table 4, originally from Brown and Gilman (1960: 259), illustrates the pronoun system that results from the shift of importance between the two semantic dimensions.

*Table 4: Solidarity as the governing semantic dimension*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Superior AND solidary</th>
<th>Superior and NOT solidary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equal AND solidary</th>
<th>Equal and NOT solidary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inferior AND solidary</th>
<th>Inferior and NOT solidary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As one can see, all pronoun use in this kind of a system is governed by horizontal distance. Vertical distance does not play any role.
As already stated in the beginning of this chapter, a system is always more complicated than any model describing it, and the Brown and Gilman model cannot be applied to all languages with T/V distinction. Some languages, e.g. German, have four second person pronouns, a T and a V pronoun for both single and several addressees (Clyne et al. 2009: 2). That kind of systems cannot be described with the model without some modifications. Furthermore, in addition to the two social dimensions, the setting of the interaction situation and whether the addressee is a member of the speaker’s household affect the use of T and V (Ervin-Tripp 1972: 232–233).

The age of the collocutors is typically a central factor in choosing an address form, but the forms used in similar situations still differ between different languages. The study of Michael Clyne, Catrin Norrby and Jane Warren (2009) compares nominal and pronominal address in four languages, namely English, Swedish, German, and French. In all the languages, the addressee’s age affects the forms of address, but the languages do not follow the same rules. In German and French, for instance, the shift from T to V happens relatively early and is typically related to the addressee’s coming of age, rites of passage, or the end of young adulthood. In Swedish, people typically start to receive V when they approach the age of retirement or even after retirement. (Clyne et al. 2009: 61.)

Brown and Gilman’s study has later been criticised for its relatively small amount of study subjects, most of whom were male, as well as for its T/V dichotomy that cannot be applied to languages with more complicated pronoun systems. (Clyne et al. 2009: 15.) Arnon Grundberg goes as far as to state that the Brown and Gilman model is too simplistic to describe any single language, neither written nor spoken, and that languages with T/V distinction cannot be claimed to use the pronouns for the same social meanings (1985: 139–140).

Brown and Gilman’s hypothesis of universal development towards T pronouns replacing the use of V has also been questioned. In the study of Clyne et al. some evidence of cyclical development is observed in French, German and Swedish. Furthermore, English is a perfect example against the Brown and Gilman model of the development of pronominal address. The model also ignores intralingual
variation and the possibility of influence from other languages. (Clyne et al. 2009: 16.)

Some French interviewees of Clyne et al. report being either *tu* or *vous* persons, i.e. naturally exchanging either T or V with people (Clyne et al. 2009: 76). Some of the younger German interviewees do not think there is any social significance in the choice between T and V, but some of them still describe themselves as either T or V persons. This kind of individualism seems prevalent in all the four languages and is also visible the other way round: people want to be able to decide how they are addressed by other people. (ibid: 159–161.)

Shared experiences, common background, and similar interests and attitudes make it more likely that people exchange T. According to some German interviewees, sometimes the situation could release people from normal address rules: when one is high mountaineering with strangers, it is likely that everyone exchanges T. (Clyne et al. 2009: 70–71.) Also in Swedish and German, the interviewees reported situational variation and some said that they found it difficult to switch back to informal forms of address after a formal situation. (ibid: 123–124.)

Clyne et al. conclude that often the communicational situation is the most important factor in the use of address norms: horizontal and vertical distances do play a role, but their influence is not fixed and stable. People might even use the appearance of the addressee as a clue of how to address them. (Clyne et al 2009: 79.) In some domains, even the topic of discussion can affect the use of address pronouns: people might be more likely to use T when discussing very personal matters. (ibid: 123–124.)

### 3.2 Nominal address

In this chapter, I will explain how the model presented in 3.1 can be used to describe the use of nominal address forms. For practicality’s sake, I will use the following abbreviations of the different forms of nominal address: FN (first name), LN (last name), TLN (title and last name), KT (kinship term) and NN (nickname). In the present study, the NN category also includes the terms of endearment such as *dear*. Table 5 illustrates the connection between pronominal and nominal address. The right column is not split in two, since there are no universal rules in combining
nominal forms with T and V. However, the higher the form appears on the list, the more likely it is to be combined with V.

Table 5: Pronominal and nominal address

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V</th>
<th>titles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TLN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>KT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One of my sources in this subchapter as well as in 3.3 is Minna Nevala’s dissertation (2004), in which she studies nominal address in letters from Late Middle to Late Modern England. I do realise that there are most likely significant differences in address forms between written and spoken language. However, as Nevala states, the norms of address usage are “deeply rooted in societal conventions”, not originated in the letters (Nevala 2004: 253), which means that the address forms used in spoken discourse can be expected to have followed similar norms as the ones used in letters. She admits that people might be more likely to concentrate more on the address forms when writing a letter than when speaking, but she nevertheless believes that the nominal address forms in her material are similar to the spoken language from the time when the letters were written (Nevala 2004: 259).

Not all languages have T/V distinction, but nominal address has been observed to follow same kind of rules as pronominal address, for instance the address forms in American English (Brown & Ford 1961: 380.) In a very simplified case, there can be said to be three possible patterns of nominal address between two collocutors: asymmetrical use in which one collocutor uses FN but is addressed with TLN, or reciprocal use of either of the address forms (Brown & Ford 1961: 375–376). In reality, the case is not this simple, since there are more than one kind of titles that can be used with last names and FN and TLN are by no means the only nominal address
forms available. While the T/V distinction means a possibility to choose between two alternatives, the number of different address forms is, as Eleanor Dickey puts it, “virtually infinite” (1997: 259). According to Donald Hook, titles should be ranked in order for them to be comparable at all (1984: 185).

As the use of T and V, the use of nominal address forms changes over the course of time. For instance, Minna Nevala has observed that changes in social hierarchy have caused changes in nominal address in British English. In the time period she studied, social mobility increased and the boundaries of social categories became less clear. At the same time, FNs and NNs became more common in letters to family members and many status terms were gradually lost or conventionalised. (Nevala 2004: 260.)

In most of the letters studied by Nevala, vertical distance is an important factor in the decision of nominal address terms: the used terms vary according to whether one is writing to a superior or an inferior. In address among power equals, horizontal distance has more influence. However, Nevala notes that the choice of address terms does not necessarily depend only on the vertical and horizontal distance. They can be used to show the writer’s attitude towards the addressee (one might use more deferential address terms to show that one is angry with the recipient), or the age of the recipient (one might use less deferential forms when the addressee is younger than the writer). Even the mood of the letter might affect nominal address. It is always possible that someone else than the recipient reads a letter, and this fact might affect the use of address terms. The same applies to spoken communication: the presence of overhearers can affect the address forms. (Nevala 2004: 248–251.)

Naturally, in reality the case is not as simple as in theory. Intimacy and solidarity are not always the same thing; for instance, in some cultures one is expected to address workmates with FN even if one dislikes them. Sometimes, the higher the number of different address variants such as NNs a person receives from another, the shorter their horizontal distance is. (Ervin-Tripp 1972: 231.)

The use of nominal and pronominal address is not entirely the same since T and V are pronouns but nominal address can require the use of the addressee’s name. For instance, FNs can be seen as private or intimate, and some people can find it unpleasant to have a stranger call them by their FN even if they would not react the
same way to being addressed with T by the same person. (Clyne et al. 2009: 148.)

This depends on the culture, of course. In German and Russian, for instance, people are relatively rarely addressed with their FNs. (Grundberg 1985: 141.)

Furthermore, the way that pronominal and nominal address correspond is not universal. In French and German, combinations of T + title, T + LN and V + FN are all possible. Sometimes, the T pronoun in such combinations can be used to shorten horizontal distance, while the title is meant to express the addressee’s high status. (Clyne et al. 2009: 155.) In Swedish, however, the V pronoun can only be combined with TLN (ibid: 38–43).

According to Clyne et al., a nominal address system is more susceptible to influence from other languages and socio-political factors than a pronominal system. They point out, however, that since the use of T pronouns and FNs is quite interrelated, an increase in the use of FNs can lead to an increased use of the T pronoun. (Clyne et al. 2009: 146.)

### 3.3 Terms of reference

In this subchapter, I will present some theory and previous studies on terms of reference and ways in which it is connected to forms of address.

According to Donald Hook, there is a clear connection between the forms of address and the forms of reference: people are referred to with the same forms they are addressed with (1984: 188). Previous studies suggest that the use of reference terms is less consistent than address terms and that direct address could be seen as the “normal form” from which reference might deviate for some reason. (Nevala 2011: 198.) According to Nevala, in letters, terms of reference are often chosen from the repertoire of address terms available to either the writer or the recipient (ibid: 217).
Figure 3 is originally from Brown and Levinson (1987: 181), but in the present study, I use it for a slightly different meaning. The original figure represents all linguistic politeness, whereas I use it to illustrate the factors affecting the choice of reference terms.

Figure 3: Terms of reference

![Figure 3: Terms of reference](image)

Figure 3 includes the factors that affect the use of the terms of reference. The *speaker-referent axis* is quite self-explanatory, meaning the relationship between the person that is speaking and the person who is being referred to. Sometimes, the speaker might even change their style of speech because of the referent, for instance to show respect for them, even though the referent is not present at the speech situation (Nevala 2004: 236). The effect of the addressee will be covered later in this chapter.

The *speaker-bystander axis* refers to the effect that other people present at the communication situation have on the terms of reference. Nevala, for instance, includes the so-called *second addressees*, namely auditors, overhearers, bystanders, and eavesdroppers, as such factors: for instance, if the writer of a letter knows that the letter might be read also by other people in addition to the recipient, it can affect the choice of reference terms (2004: 196). The presence of bystanders affects speech communication as well. For instance, speakers are more likely to use a solidary term
of reference if other people present would be able to use the same term. (Murphy 1988: 337.) The *speaker-setting* axis refers to the way in which the setting affects the social roles assumed by the collocutors (Brown and Levinson 1987: 181).

The connection between forms of address and reference has been studied by Eleanor Dickey (1997). She examined the connection in two kinds of settings: in communication with relatives and in academic interaction. Her results suggest that a strong correlation does exist but so do some significant differences. First of all, terms of endearment were practically never used in reference (Dickey 1997: 261). Another quite significant observation was that the addressee might affect the terms of reference the speaker would use. In family interaction, this was particularly noteworthy when the referent was a relative or a family member and the addressee a younger person, especially a child, and in academic interaction when teachers referred to each other when talking to students. Speakers adapted their speech, in other words used the reference forms the addressees were expected to use. (ibid: 261–264.) This happened mainly when the addressee’s status was somehow lower than the speaker’s.

Therefore, when examining terms of reference, one must keep in mind that in addition to the speaker and the referent, also the addressee influences the use of reference terms. As Dickey concludes, people *usually* choose the same reference terms they would use as address terms when talking to the referent. If the used reference term differs from the corresponding address term, the most likely reason is the influence of the addressee. (Dickey 1997: 268.) In many situations, it could be considered rude to use a reference term the addressee would not be able to use (Murphy 1988: 328). Speakers are also likely to listen to which reference form the addressee is using and use the same term (ibid: 333).

Pamela A. Downing (1996) has made similar observations. She notes that reference systems are not identical with address systems, but not independent of them, either. Whether or not an address term can be used as a reference term in a certain situation depends on whether it could be used as an address term by both the speaker and the addressee. (Downing 1996: 122.)
When referring to a person, specifying the referent is often more important than the correct term of reference. For instance, the speaker or writer may use a KT + FN or FN + LN to refer to a person who they would address with a title, in order to unambiguously identify the referent. (Nevala 2004: 217.) Nevala calls the FNs and LNs used this way referent specifiers (ibid: 212). The need for such specifiers depends on the collocutors’ common ground, i.e. the amount of information they share. Furthermore, in addition to possessing the shared information, the collocutors must also be aware of each other possessing it. (Murphy 1988: 320.)

Nevala notes that even though the same kind of structures are used in both address and reference, in reference it is more difficult to define what kind of politeness strategies they are used for. She notes that people of higher status are allowed more variation when choosing reference terms: they can use them either to emphasise or to downgrade their relationship with the addressee or the referent. (Nevala 2004: 215.) People can stress their high status by using an intimate form of reference of a person in their in-group, and speakers who are of lower status than their addressees might try and present themselves as members of the referent’s in-group. (Nevala 2011: 64). Differences can be shown by slight differences such as the choice between the possessive pronouns my and our combined with the referential form friend (ibid: 76).

### 3.4 Address and reference in English

In this chapter, I will describe the use of address and reference forms in English with the help of the models presented in the previous subchapters.

Since the second person singular pronoun thou gradually disappeared from English in the eighteenth century (see e.g. Hook 1984: 183), there is no T/V distinction in the language. However, as stated in 3.2, vertical and horizontal distance can also be expressed with nominal address forms (Hook 1984: 184). Titles are often used to express formality and terms of endearment and NNs to express intimacy or informality (Clyne et al. 2009: 4). Speakers can also use titles to express that they are aware of the high status of the addressee or to show additional respect to them (ibid: 69).

Table 6 has been formed by combining Hook’s list of address terms in American English (1984: 184) and Nevala’s list of address (2004: 89) and reference terms
(2004: 97) in English correspondence. The higher a form appears on the list, the greater vertical distance its nonreciprocal use signifies. The lower a form appears, the shorter horizontal distance its reciprocal use signifies. The greater the vertical distance between the collocutors, the higher the possibility of asymmetrical use of address forms (Hook 1984: 185). The examples are drawn from the study material. The last column describes the typical relationship between the sender and the recipient, based on the use in letters which Nevala examined.

Table 6: Nominal address and reference forms in English

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address/reference form</th>
<th>Example</th>
<th>Relationship with the addressee/referent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>title</td>
<td>your/his lordship, my lady</td>
<td>Significant vertical distance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title + LN (TLN)</td>
<td>Miss Baxter, Mr Barrow</td>
<td>Nuclear family, other kin, friends, acquaintances, servants, strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title + FN</td>
<td>Lady Edith</td>
<td>Nuclear family, acquaintances, servants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>title + FN + LN</td>
<td>Mr Charles Blake</td>
<td>Acquaintances, servants, strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LN</td>
<td>Green, Bates</td>
<td>Friends, acquaintances, strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN + LN</td>
<td>Tony Gillingham, Charles Blake</td>
<td>Acquaintances, strangers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT + FN</td>
<td>Cousin Isobel, Cousin Cora</td>
<td>Nuclear family, other kin, friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KT</td>
<td>grandmamma, my father</td>
<td>Nuclear family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>Anna, Robert</td>
<td>Nuclear family, friends</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>Jimmy, Sybbie</td>
<td>Nuclear family, friends</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nevala (2004: 211) notes that when comparing nominal address and reference, some forms can be used in both without any modifications, while in some at least the modifying pronouns (such as in your/his lordship) need to be altered. In terms of reference, possessive pronouns such as my and your tend to have a more deictic function than in direct address, meaning that they are used to refer to for instance the
speaker’s or the addressee’s relatives (my father etc.). In some cases, possessive pronouns can be used as a part of a conventionalised whole in reference as well, as in his lordship, but it is not as common as in direct address. (Nevala 2004: 212.)

Even though the use of TLN ranks high in Table 6, it is not as simple as that. Hook notes that in the Victorian era and sometime after, some women addressed their husbands with the title Mr and their last name despite their short horizontal distance (Hook 1984: 188). Nowadays, according to the study of Clyne et al., age is a significant factor when choosing an English address forms. The older the addressee, the more likely they are to receive TLN, whereas younger addressees more often receive FN. (Clyne et al. 2009: 59–60.)

The meanings and use of the various titles and other address and reference forms that appear in the study material as well as in Table 6 are explained in Leslie Dunkling’s A dictionary of epithets and terms of address (1990). I will briefly introduce the ones relevant to the analysis.

As can be seen in Table 6, the use of titles signifies a significant vertical distance. Nowadays, My Lord is mainly used to address a judge in court, but it can also be used when formally addressing a nobleman below the rank of a duke. Your Lordship and Lord + LN are alternatives of this address form and they are used in the same kinds of situations to address the same people. (Dunkling 1990: 158–159.) Both My Lady and Your Ladyship were used by servants to address a wife of a nobleman or a noblewoman in her own right. When the speaker was someone other than a servant, both forms would be replaced by Lady + LN, My Lady possibly also by a polite form such as Madam. (ibid: 147–148.) The address form Lady + FN was used to address a daughter of a duke, a duchess, or an earl (ibid: 109).

According to Dunkling, it is more common to use plain LN to male than female addressees or referents (1990: 149). Until the early twentieth century, men would, even after a long acquaintance, address each other with LN (ibid: 104). It was usual that in a society where close male friends addressed each other with LN, their wives addressed the same friends with the more polite Mr + LN form. (ibid: 150–152.)

Women, however, would switch toFNs sooner than men, as their acquaintanceship developed into friendship. However, in the middle class, not even women would use
FNs in the beginning of their acquaintance. For men and women to use FNs to address each other was even rarer and required a very advanced stage of friendship. Starting to use FNs was a significant step needed for the relationship to develop further, and unless this was the reason, young men would find it almost shameful to be addressed with their FNs. Status differences might sometimes call for a nonreciprocal use of FN. (Dunkling 1990: 104–106.)

Even nowadays, changing from TLNs to FNs can be a way for the speaker to express a wish to get to know the addressee better. Sometimes this is perceived as rude, especially when the speaker is a stranger such as in a transactional dialogue on telephone. (Clyne et al. 2009: 74–75.)

In schools, the use of address forms is mostly non-reciprocal. Teachers address students with either FN or LN and are addressed with TLN by them. Younger teachers might be more likely to address their students with FN and in some schools, older students can address their teachers by their FNs. (Clyne et al. 2009: 93–94.) In academic interaction, staff and students typically use FNs. But because of the vertical distance between them, the use of FNs is generally initiated by the academics. (ibid: 99.)

In working life, English-speakers report using mostly FNs. The use of FNs seems to have become more common in the past decades (Clyne et al. 2009: 106–107), but the traditionally respectful address forms Sir and Madam can still be used to distance oneself from the addressee (ibid: 159–160).

The use of diminutive forms of FNs as NNs could sometimes depend on the social status of the addressee. A working-class man named James might expect to be called Jim, but a middle-class man of the same name might find the NN offensive. Educated people can find the use of diminutives a sign of sloppiness or laziness, even when the speaker is trying to express friendliness (Dunkling 1990: 107–108).

The KTs Grandmamma and Grandmother have both their own entry in the dictionary. The former was used by upper-class speakers in the late eighteenth and throughout the nineteenth century, while the latter was used by both middle and upper-class speakers. Grandmother was likely to shorten into Granny or Gran by lower-class speakers. (Dunkling 1990: 123.)
Papa was used by the “polite society” especially in the 19th century. Mainly, the form was used by children to address or refer to their fathers. (Dunkling 1990: 193.) Mama (or mamma) was also mainly used in middle-class and upper-class families in Britain (ibid: 166). Word cousin could be used of a collateral relative more distant than a sibling, often a nephew or a niece (ibid: 79), and even of people who were not blood-relatives of the speaker (Nevala 2004: 89).

Susan Ervin-Tripp’s study on sociolinguistic rules of address focuses on American English, but British English can be expected to follow approximately the same rules. In her material, KTs follow a specific set of rules: ascending generation (and only them) receive a KT in address. This means that a first cousin would be addressed with FN but parents’ cousins with KT. Aunts, for instance, would receive KT regardless of their age, and FN might be added to the address form if there were more than one person with the same KT. (Ervin-Tripp 1972: 229.)

In family interaction, use of address forms is most likely asymmetrical, children being addressed with FN and addressing their parents and grandparents with KT. Some English people address their parents with FNs – and some do it to irritate them – but some people find it disrespectful. People typically address their aunts and uncles with KTs as children but switch to FNs as they grow older. (Clyne et al. 2009: 87–88.)

The more there is horizontal distance, the more the address forms are governed by social constraints. In the 17th century, for instance, if the horizontal distance was longer than in family correspondence, titles and LNs were most common. Superiors could use FNLN or TLN to address their inferiors. Power equals addressed each other with an occupational title + LN, NN + LN, friend + LN or a premodified LN. However, when a superior was addressed by an inferior, only titles were used. (Nevala 2004: 243–244.)

3.5 Address and reference in Finnish

In this chapter, I will describe pronominal and nominal address forms of Finnish with the help of the models presented in subchapters 3.1 to 3.3.
Unlike English, Finnish has a T and a V pronoun, sinä and te respectively. Often the use of T and V is not conveyed by pronouns themselves but personal suffixes in verbs and nouns. Because of the Finnish grammar, the pronouns are not always necessary for a sentence to be grammatical. The difference between the address systems of Finnish and English is made especially obvious by the fact that the English expression to be on first name terms translates into Finnish as tehdä sinunkaupat that refers to starting to use the sinä pronoun. This reflects the fact stated in 3.2: address forms and address pronouns are governed by the same semantic dimensions. It is also noteworthy that whereas English uses the gender-specific pronouns he and she, Finnish has only one third person singular pronoun, hän, which can be used to refer to both male and female referents.

Originally, the use of the V pronoun spread into Finnish language from Swedish. V as a formal way to address a person was at first only used in the higher social classes, but in the 18th century it begun to spread among the lower classes as well, and in the 19th century it became the official form of address. (Yli-Vakkuri 2005: 189–190.) This created an asymmetrical address system in which social status determined whether a person should receive T or V. Even though this asymmetry begun to change a century later, even nowadays some people may say T but expect to receive V. (Uotila 2007: 11.) According to Valma Yli-Vakkuri (1989: 54), reciprocal use of T is the most common way of address in Finland and the V pronoun is used in formal situations.

In her Master’s Thesis (2007), Ulla Uotila examines the use of T and V in Finnish literature that was written and takes place in the late 19th century. Even though her study material consists of fictional dialogue, its pronoun use most likely reflects the actual pronoun use of the time. For this reason, her observations can, to some extent, be examined as an example of actual use of address forms.

In Uotila’s material, reciprocal T was used especially when the collocutors belonged to the same social class, were of the same gender and approximately of the same age, and knew each other well (Uotila 2007: 12). In other words, both vertical and horizontal distances were short. When the collocutors did not know each other very well and were of different gender, but their social class and age were the same, they
were more likely to reciprocally exchange V (ibid: 34). In other words, vertical distance was short but horizontal distance was long.

In Uotila’s material, different social status and especially a significant difference in age were likely causes of nonreciprocal use of V. A person could also initiate the use of V if another person’s use of T was perceived as too intimate. (Uotila 2007: 37–42.) In other words, nonreciprocal V was used when the collocutors’ vertical distance was long or when the speaker wished to lengthen their horizontal distance.

Also dialect could have an impact on the pronoun use in the late 19th century Finland. For instance, in eastern dialects, family members were most likely to exchange T, but in western dialects, older family members were more likely to receive V. (Uotila 2007: 17–18.) This could be a sign of horizontal distance being more significant in the eastern than in the western dialects. Anyhow, in the late 19th century, the Finnish address system was experiencing a change as the power semantic dimension was losing ground to solidarity and the use of address pronouns was becoming more symmetrical (ibid: 11). As stated in 3.1, this change is typical for the development of address systems.

In the late 19th century, when addressing a stranger or a member of a higher social class, the speaker was expected to use their title, especially in the western dialects. However, it was a common opinion among language experts of the time that the use of titles was bothersome in communication, and they wished to extinguish it altogether. (Yli-Vakkuri 1989: 60–62.) Nowadays, the use of titles is obsolete, and they are mainly used in customer-service situations (Yli-Vakkuri 2005: 194–196).

According to Yli-Vakkuri, *herra*, *rouva* and *neiti* are “titles of the titleless”: *herra* has never been neutral the same way as its counterparts in other languages, and when referring to a female person it is more polite to use the adjective *arvoisa*. According to her, *rouva* and *neiti* should not be combined with a title, since they add the unnecessary information of the addressee’s or referent’s marital status. (Yli-Vakkuri 1989: 47–48)

Yli-Vakkuri explains that in Finnish, people mainly use nominal address forms when they have specific enough information about their addressee, that is, in “official, ceremonious” communication situations and in familiar or intimate speech. In formal
official speech, speakers tend to use the V pronoun and titles, whereas in the other extreme they may use the T pronoun and e.g. NNs, FNs and KTs. When the situation is something between these two extremes, the collocutors typically do not know each other well enough to know their vertical distance, so nominal address is left out when possible. (Yli-Vakkuri 2005: 196–197.) Finns typically avoid referring to the addressee or hearer directly (ibid: 200). In Finland, nominal address is rarer than in many other European languages, and it is mostly used to get the addressee’s attention (ibid: 194). Terms of endearment are not as common in Finnish as in English, and it is far more common for an English person to address someone as dear than for a Finn to address someone as kulta or kultaseni.
4 Analysis

In this chapter, I will present my observations on the study material. In subchapter 4.1, I will observe the use of nominal address and reference in the translations, and subchapter 4.2 focuses on the use of T and V pronouns.

Because of the great amount of material, the focus of this study is on some specific points of interest. Most of the time, I will concentrate on the differences between the two subtitled versions. I will attempt to point out both the obvious and the less obvious dissimilarities and attempt to find a way to explain them. Another point of interest will be the dialogues in which address or reference forms somehow differ from the strategy usually applied in the translation in question. I will attempt to find an explanation for these cases as well.

One of the most obvious differences between the TV and DVD version was the amount of nominal address forms: they were significantly more common in the DVD version than in the TV version. One possible explanation for this is the difference in the limits on the length of subtitles, which allowed the DVD subtitles to be longer. However, this difference does not receive much attention in the present study as it is not directly relevant to the study question.

Each subchapter includes a number of examples drawn from the study material. The translations are formatted so that there is an empty line between the subtitles. This way it is easier to understand e.g. the length restrictions. Line division of the translations is not identical with the subtitles that appear on the screen. When parts of the dialogue have been omitted, the omission is marked with three dashes.

4.1 Nominal address and reference

In this chapter, I will focus on nominal address forms used in the translations. They are divided in four subchapters that focus titles, first and last names, kinship terms, and terms of endearment respectively.
4.1.1 Titles

It is likely that length and time limitations have affected the use of titles more than the other address and reference forms analysed. However, title use was not solely determined by time and length but the translators’ strategies can also be seen in the translations.

When examining certain translation solutions in the DVD subtitles, it seems obvious that there have been more than one translator working on the series. Reasons for this and further possible effects of this on the translation product will be addressed in more detail in chapter 5, but the high possibility of the use of several translators should be kept in mind when comparing the two versions.

This possibility is most obviously shown by the varying translations of the titles used when referring to and addressing the members of the upper class. They are presented in Table 6. The first row shows the translation solutions used in the TV version of the subtitles, and the five others show the solutions used in the DVD version. Titles marked with a hyphen do not occur in the episode in question. In the analysis, these titles will be considered synonymous.

*Table 7: Translations of the titles of the upper-class characters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>My lord</th>
<th>My lady/m’lady</th>
<th>Your ladyship</th>
<th>Her ladyship</th>
<th>His lordship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TV</td>
<td>herra jaarli</td>
<td>lady FN, rouva kreivitär, arvoisa lady</td>
<td>teidän armonne, rouva kreivitär</td>
<td>kreivitär, rouva kreivitär</td>
<td>herra jaarli, jaarli, lordi Grantham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD 1</td>
<td>teidän armonne</td>
<td>ladyni</td>
<td>teidän armonne</td>
<td>lady, hänen armonsa</td>
<td>lordi, hänen armonsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD 2</td>
<td>lordini, lordi</td>
<td>ladyni, lady</td>
<td>arvon lady</td>
<td>arvon lady</td>
<td>arvon lordi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVD 3</td>
<td>lordini</td>
<td>ladyni</td>
<td>teidän armonne</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>hänen armonsa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the DVD version, the translation solutions are followed consistently within the episodes, but there is not much consistency between the episodes. From this – amongst other things that will come up later in the analysis – we can draw the conclusion that the episodes have most likely not been translated by the same person.

In the TV version, the terms chosen depend on the speaker and the addressee, for instance *my lady* has been translated as *rouva kreivitär* when the addressee is the countess and as *lady FN* when the addressee is one of her daughters.

Example 1, drawn from episode 2, gives a sample of the different translations of the titles of the upper class. In the TV translation, *his lordship* has mostly been translated as *jaarli* or *herra jaarli*, but in this one scene it has been exceptionally translated as *lordi Grantham*. Lady Mary is referring to her father, the earl, when giving her thanks to a musician, who has been singing in a party at Downton.

*Example 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 45:38–45:45</th>
<th>DVD 46:36–46:45</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Mr Ross, I wanted to thank you for a marvellous evening. And also to ask you if you would be kind enough to send the bill to <em>his lordship.</em></td>
<td>Herra Ross, kiitän suurenmoisesta illasta - ja pyydän lähettämään laskun <em>lordi Granthamille.</em></td>
<td>Hra Ross, halusin kiittää mahtavasta illasta. Ja pyydän, että voisit lähettää laskun <em>arvon lordille.</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mr Ross is not familiar with the earl as he has only seen him at the party. The TV translator might have used a different reference form than usually because of vertical distance: since the speaker’s vertical distance to the referent is much shorter than the addressee’s, she adjusts the reference form to the one that Ross would be most likely
to use. In the DVD translation, Mary uses the same form of reference that is used throughout the episode.

As one can see from Table 6, the address form *ladyni* is in constant use in the DVD versions of the first four episodes as the translation of *m’lady*. In the TV version, the translation includes the name of the addressee when the addressee is one of the earl’s daughters. Therefore it uses the same form the ST uses as a reference form for the same characters, *lady* FN.

*Example 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 32:59–33:05</th>
<th>DVD 34:45–34:52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>I’m ever so sorry, m’lady.</td>
<td>Anteeksi, <strong>lady Mary</strong>.</td>
<td>-Anteeksi, <strong>ladyni</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Please don’t apologise.</td>
<td>-Älä suotta pyytele…</td>
<td>-Älä pyydä anteeksi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivy</td>
<td>Ivy, m’lady.</td>
<td>Ivy.</td>
<td>-Ivy, <strong>ladyni</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Ivy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>-Ivy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the *lady* + FN form, the translator has an opportunity to repeat the character’s name, which possibly makes it more memorisable.

In the original dialogue, both Cora, the earl’s wife, and Violet, the earl’s mother, are often referred to as *lady Grantham*. However, when the referent is Violet, the reference form includes the adjective *old*. Most likely to avoid misunderstandings, the TV translator has translated the title as *leskikreivitär*, “dowager countess”, when it refers to Violet and *lady Grantham* or *kreivitär*, “countess”, when it refers to Cora.

In Example 3, drawn from episode 3, Isobel Crawley and Tom Branson are discussing a politician who is coming to Ripon to give a speech.
Example 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 09:00–09:09</th>
<th>DVD 10:28–10:37</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isobel</td>
<td>Let’s go. What do you say?</td>
<td>Mennään kuuntelemaan. - Olkaa sitten kiltä minulle, - tai kerron leskikreivittäreille, että sanoitte Lloyd Georgea ressukaksi.</td>
<td>Mennään sinne. Mitä sanot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>I say you better be nice to me, or I’ll tell old lady Grantham you called Lloyd George “poor dear.”</td>
<td>Sinun on paras olla mukava minulle tai kerron lady Granthamille, että kutsuit Lloyd Georgea ”raukaksi.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the original dialogue, it is apparent that Tom is talking about Violet and not Cora because he refers to old lady Grantham. But since the viewers cannot be expected to understand the source language, they might be unable to identify the referent in the DVD subtitles. As mentioned in chapter 3.3, it is often more important in communication to unambiguously specify the referent than to use the right terms of reference. Even though the reference to Violet is not particularly essential to the conversation topic, any ambiguity in subtitles can create unnecessary confusion.

Neither of the versions seems to follow any strict strategy in omitting and maintaining titles in TLN constructions. In most cases, length limitations seem to be the determining factor, for instance in Example 4 from episode 5.

Example 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 47:51–47:56</th>
<th>DVD 50:11–50:16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Suppose Uncle Harold would rather go to the theatre with the others?</td>
<td>Jospa eno menee teatteriin. - Ei, jos lordi Aysgarth tuo tyttären mukanaan.</td>
<td>Entä jos eno haluua teatteriin?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The TV version has maintained the title, whereas the DVD version has omitted it. When comparing the lengths of the subtitles, it seems probable that the DVD translator has omitted the title to make the subtitle fit in one line on the screen. Actually, Aysgarth is not the man’s last name but the name of the place where he holds barony. Therefore, it is questionable whether the name can be used as a reference form without the title.

The translations have applied the same strategies of maintaining and omitting in Example 5 from episode 4, but this time the reasons are not quite as apparent. Most likely, length limitations in subtitles would have allowed the DVD translator to maintain the title. This dialogue was not in the TV recording.

Example 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV --:------:--</th>
<th>DVD 03:02–03:04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isobel</td>
<td>And Mr Levinson has one of these companies?</td>
<td>Onko herra Levinson sellainen yrittäjä?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Mr Levinson in question is the countess’s brother who lives in America. Since he is not part of any English class, it is difficult to define his and Isobel’s vertical distance, but their horizontal distance is very long since they have never met. Though the TLN form has been marked as more formal in Table 5 than the plain LN, the difference is less significant with the title herra than many other titles, and the loss of information is therefore not significant.

No coherent strategy can be seen in the omitting and maintaining of title herra in neither of the translations; it seems to be the nominal address form most susceptible to omission when the length restrictions require something to be left out.
Example 6 is from episode 4. Lady Mary is one of the daughters of the earl and Anna is her maid. Mr Bates and Mr Green are valets, and Mr Bates also is Anna’s husband, to whom she refers with TLN in the ST.

Example 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 04:23–04:39</th>
<th>DVD 08:08–08:22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Mr Bates doesn’t know it was him. But the more he comes here, the more likely it is that Mr Bates will find out.</td>
<td>Herra Bates ei tiedä mutta arvaa ennen pitkää, jos Green käy täällä.</td>
<td>Hra Bates ei tiedä, että se oli hän. Mutta jos hän käy täällä, hra Bates saa sen selville.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Then I’ll telephone him and tell him not to come, or not to bring Green.</td>
<td>Peruutan lordin tulon tai pyydän häntä tulemaan yksin.</td>
<td>Soitan lordille ja kiellän tulemasta tai tuomasta Greeniä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>I’m frightened every time Mr Green and Mr Bates are in the same room.</td>
<td>Pelkään aina, kun Green ja Bates ovat samassa huoneessa.</td>
<td>Pelkään aina, kun hra Green ja hra Bates ovat samassa huoneessa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>You think, if he guesses, he’ll do something.</td>
<td>Luuletko, että Bates tekisi jotain?</td>
<td>Luulet, että jos Bates arvaa sen, hän tekee jotain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ST, Anna refers to both Green and Bates with their TLNs, whereas Mary refers to Green with his LN only. As mentioned in chapter 2, this is the usual way male upper servants are addressed in the series: the upper class addresses them with LN and upper servants with TLN. In Example 6, the DVD version follows the ST’s reference forms, whereas the TV version has omitted most of the titles. The DVD
version’s solution reflects the vertical distance between the collocutors: Mary, who refers to the men with LN, has a significantly higher status than Anna, who uses the more formal TLN. The TV translation lacks this differentiation.

Example 7 is from episode 5. Thomas is the house’s under-butler, who is temporarily taking care of the butler’s duties.

*Example 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 24:23–24:28</th>
<th>DVD 26:15–26:19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Tom    | There’s no need for you to stay. | Ei teidän tarvitse jäädä.  
- Pidän kaikkea silmällä **Carsonin** tapaan. | Sinun ei tarvitse jäädä. |
| Thomas | I like to keep an eye on things, sir, do it **Mr Carson**’s way. | Pidän kaikkea silmällä **herra Carsonin** tapaan. |

As in Example 6, the TV version has omitted the title and the DVD version has maintained it. The omission of the title does have an effect on the dialogue. Thomas is not the kind of servant that aims to shorten his horizontal distance to the people he serves, and furthermore, he loathes Tom. Therefore, he could not be using the same form the upper class would use to express familiarity. Most likely, the TV translator has omitted the title because of length restrictions, but the plain LN gives a slightly different impression of the men’s vertical distance than the TLN form. However, in Examples 6 and 7, it is not self-evident that the loss of the titles affects the viewers’ notion of the characters’ vertical distance.

In Example 8 from episode 5, the upper-class characters are discussing who to send to steal back a stolen love letter.
Example 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert</td>
<td>We could ask</td>
<td>Pyydetään Evelyn Napier.</td>
<td>-Pyydetään Evelyn Napieria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Evelyn Napier.</td>
<td>Hän on Ranskassa.</td>
<td>-Hän on Ranskassa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well, he’s in</td>
<td>-Charles Blake sitten.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>France.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>Mr Blake, then. He</td>
<td></td>
<td>Herra Blakea sitten.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>can do it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DVD translator has maintained the ST’s TLN construction, but the TV translator has chosen to use a FNLN form. One reason could be that the translator has used the FN as a referent specifier to make sure that the viewer knows who is being referred to. Possibly she has also wanted to make the reference form similar to that of Evelyn Napier. This difference is not likely to create any confusion to the viewers.

4.1.2 Kinship terms

Length and time limitations do not seem to affect the use of kinship terms as much as titles. Nevertheless, there are differences between the translations in this category as well.

There are several scenes in the TV translation in which the subtitles include a KT even though the ST uses some other kind of reference term. In episode 2, for example, Tom Branson and lady Mary are discussing the earl, and Tom refers to him as lord Grantham. Tom, who used to be a chauffeur before marrying one of the earl’s daughters, never addresses Robert or Cora by their first names in the ST. In the TV subtitles, he refers to him as isäsi, “your father”.
Example 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 04:08–04:16</th>
<th>DVD 04:36–04:40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td><strong>Lord Grantham</strong> got a letter from him this morning. It wasn’t good news.</td>
<td><strong>Isäsi sai huonoja uutisia enoltasi.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lordi Grantham sai häneltä kirjeen tänä aamuna.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Later in the same episode, Mary refers to Robert as *his lordship* in the ST when talking to her maid. This reference has been translated as *isäni*, “my father”, in the TV version.

Example 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Did I tell you that Mr Napier and Mr Blake will be here in time for dinner on <em>his lordship</em>’s birthday?</td>
<td>Herrat Napier ja Blake saapuvat ennen <em>isäni</em> syntymäpäivääillallisia.</td>
<td>Kerroinko, että hra Napier ja hra Blake tulevat illasselle arvon lordin syntymäpäiville?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As mentioned in 3.3, it is usual for people of higher status to adapt their reference terms to an addressee of lower status. This is exactly what Mary is doing in the ST and in the DVD version. If she was directly addressing her father, she would call him *papa*.

In Examples 9 and 10, a title has been replaced by a KT in the TV version, but there are also cases of other reference forms having been translated the same way. In episode 3, Rosamund Painswick’s FN reference to Edith’s mother Cora has been translated as *äidillesi*, “to your mother”, in the TV version.
### Example 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 36:30–36:34</th>
<th>DVD 37:55–38:01</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosamund</td>
<td>Are you going to tell Cora?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aiotko kertoa äidillesi? - Kaipa minun täytyy ennen pitkää.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>I suppose I must do, at some stage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kerrotko Coralle?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kai on pakko, jossakin vaiheessa.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 12 is similar to Example 11: Violet’s reference to Edith’s father Robert has been translated as isäsi, “your father”. Robert is Violet’s son, and she always addresses him with his FN.

### Example 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 01:17–01:23</th>
<th>DVD 02:13–02:19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>I’m going up on Tuesday. Robert’s got me invited to the supper after the presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lähden tiistaina. Isäsi järjesti kutsun debytanttien buffet’lle palatsiin.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Menen sinne tiistaina. Robert hankki minulle kutsun esittelyn jälkeisille illallisille.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Example 13, drawn from episode 5, presents a similar difference between the translations of a brief exchange of words between the King of England and lady Rose.

### Example 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 33:59–34:15</th>
<th>DVD 36:03–36:16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>Ah. The Prince of Wales has spoken about your father’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walesin prinssi kertoi isänne vieraanvaraisuudesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Walesin prinssi on kertonut isänne vieraanvaraisuudesta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>He was honoured to entertain His Royal Highness, Your Majesty.</td>
<td>Vierailu oli suuri kunnia, Teidän Majesteettinne.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>The Indian tour was a great success, thanks to lord Flintshire.</td>
<td>Ja menestys isänne ansiosta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the beginning of the original English conversation, the King refers to Lord Flintshire as *your father*, which has been translated literally in both versions. Slightly later, when he refers to the same man as *lord Flintshire*, the TV translation repeats the KT. The reason for this solution might be the length restrictions of subtitles, *lordi Flintshire* being a longer expression than *isänne*. The same limitations are a plausible explanation for the FN reference *Cora and Robert* being translated as *vanhempasi*, “your parents”, in the TV version of episode 2.

As one can see, adding KTs to the dialogue is quite common in the TV translation. One of the possible reasons could be the fact that Finnish KTs are often shorter than names and titles and can therefore be used to keep the subtitles within the length limitations. However, this is not always the case: *äidillesi*, for instance, is a longer word than *Coralle*. Another reason behind this strategy could be that the TV translator has attempted to make the subtitles easier to follow. The names of the characters might not be as easily memorised when reading subtitles, since they are so often omitted, so the translator has attempted to make sure that the viewer knows who is being referred to. Furthermore, foreign names might be more difficult to memorise and take a longer time to read than familiar words *äiti* and *isä*. The translator might also have thought that it would be more idiomatic to refer to the addressee’s or the speaker’s parents with KTs.
However, it is possible that omitting proper names of the characters might make them more difficult to memorise. Therefore, the DVD translation’s strategy can help the viewers memorise the foreign names better as it repeats them more often.

As mentioned in 3.4, the KT *cousin* can also be used to address and refer to relatives who are not actual cousins of the speaker. In the ST, the referents are often more distant relatives with whom the speaker is not familiar enough to use their FNs. This use is directly mentioned in Example 14 from episode 2.

*Example 14*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 02:16–02:25</th>
<th>DVD 02:44–02:55</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>Cousin Cora?</td>
<td>Cora-serkku.</td>
<td>Cora-serkku?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>I think you can call me Cora now.</td>
<td>Voit jo sanoa minua Coraksi.</td>
<td>Voinet sanoa minua nyt Coraksi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cora tells Rose that she can drop the KT and just call her Cora. Rose does as she is told but tells Cora that she would not dare to try the same with Robert, which suggests that her horizontal distance with Robert is longer than with Cora, or maybe that Robert considers the vertical distance to be more important in deciding the forms of address and reference.

The DVD translator has, most likely unintentionally, made Rose refer to Robert with a more solidary term of reference than what she would address him with; after all, she explicitly says that she would not dare to address Robert with his FN. It seems possible, however, that the DVD translator has misunderstood the line, since the Finnish translation could be understood as Rose not daring to call Cora with her FN when Robert is present.
This use is repeated in episode 3, where Rose again refers to Robert as *Robert* instead of *Robert-serkku* in the DVD translation. Omission of a relatively unnecessary KT is understandable in subtitles, though, at least when it is not relevant to the conversation. However, by omitting the KT, the DVD translation ignores the horizontal and/or vertical distance between Rose and Robert.

### 4.1.3 First names and last names

At first, one might think that proper names should be no problem at all in subtitling. As they do not need to be translated, it might seem that all the translator has to do is to decide whether or not to include them in the subtitles. However, at least in my study material, names are sometimes included in the subtitles even when they are not directly mentioned in the English dialogue. The most obvious reason behind this is the difference between English and Finnish third person singular pronouns, mentioned in 3.5. Since there are no gender-specific pronouns in Finnish, it is sometimes necessary to explicitly mention a person’s name in a Finnish translation, when the referent can be specified with a personal pronoun in the English ST.

In Example 15, the English pronoun *she* has been translated differently in the two versions. It is drawn from episode 4 and presents a conversation in which Edith, Violet, and Rosamund discuss Tony Gillingham, who is courting Mary despite being engaged to someone else.

*Example 15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 52:50–53:08</th>
<th>DVD 56:11–56:33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Edith</strong></td>
<td>What does Miss Lane Fox think about it? That’s what I wonder.</td>
<td>Mitähän mieltä neiti Lane Fox on?</td>
<td>Mitähän nti Lane Fox ajattelee siitä?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violet</strong></td>
<td>I agree. He’s the most unconvincing fiancé I’ve ever</td>
<td>Toista noin häilyväistä sulhasta en ole tavannut.</td>
<td>Niin. Hän on epäuskottavin sulhanen, jonka olen tavannut.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
come across.

| Rosamund       | Perhaps she doesn’t know. | Ehkä neiti ei tiedä.  
|                |                          | - Jos me tiedämme, tietää hänkin.  
|                |                          | Ehkä Mabel ei tiedä.  

| Violet         | If we know, she knows. You can count on that. | Tietää, jos mekin tiedämme.  
|                |                                               | Voit olla varma siitä.  

The TV version uses a title, whereas the DVD version uses the referent’s FN. Miss Lane Fox has never been seen on screen and there is no evidence that Edith, Rosamund or Violet have ever met her. Thus their vertical distance to her is significant and it would be unlikely that any of them would address her by her FN.

Example 16 presents a similar difference. The scene is from episode 5, and Rose and Robert are discussing Mrs Dudley Ward and her missing love letter.

Example 16

|----------------|----------|----------------|-----------------|
|                | Sampson took it to make money. The question is whether he means to blackmail Mrs Dudley Ward or sell it on to the foreign press. | Hän otti sen saadakseen rahaa.  
|                |          | Hän joko kiristää rouva tai myy kirjeen ulkomaisille lehdille.  
|                |          | Sampson aikoo tienata sillä.  
|                |          | Kiristääkö hän rouva Wardia vai myykö hän kirjeen lehdille?  

| Rose           | Oh, no wonder she was in such a state. I can’t tell you what it said. | Ei ihme että Freda järkytyi.  
|                |                          | En voi kertoa, mitä kirjeessä oli.  
|                |                          | Ei ihme, että rouva järkytyi.  
|                |                          | En voi kertoa kirjeestä.  


In the original dialogue, Rose refers to her simply as *she*. Both translations specify the referent, but the TV translation uses her first name *Freda* while the DVD version uses her title *rouva*. It is clear from the previous scenes that Rose and Freda’s horizontal distance is short and they are on first name terms. The fact that Robert, whose horizontal distance to her is longer, refers to Mrs Ward with her title has possibly confused the DVD translator so that they have made Rose to refer to her that way as well. It seems possible that the DVD translator might have not been wholly aware of the social relations between the characters.

Same kind of confusion might be behind another case later in the same episode. In Example 17, Rosamund and Edith are discussing Edith’s missing fiancé Michael Gregson.

**Example 17**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 44:30–44:36</th>
<th>DVD 47:06–47:12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosamund</td>
<td>Remember. You were never going to mention it, even if he came back.</td>
<td>Lupasit, ettet kerro siitä vaikka Gregson tulisi takaisin.</td>
<td>Muista, ettet aikonut puhua tästä, vaikka Michael palaisi.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Edith is on first name terms with her fiancé, but most of the other characters refer to him with TLN, LN or FNLN (he is not seen in the episodes of the study material), with the exception of Edith’s mother Cora, who refers to him with his FN in episode 2. In the original dialogue, Rosamund refers to him simply as *he*, but again, both TV and DVD translator have decided to clarify who is being referred to. The TV translation uses his LN *Gregson* while the DVD translation uses his FN *Michael*. Again, it is possible that Edith constantly referring to him as *Michael* has confused the DVD translator so that they have made also Rosamund, whose vertical distance to the referent is significantly longer, to refer to him with FN.
4.1.4 Nicknames and terms of endearment

As mentioned in 3.5, terms of endearment are less common in Finnish than in English. Therefore, direct translation rarely works on them, especially in subtitle translations where also other kinds of address forms are often omitted.

In the TV translation, and most of the time in the DVD translation as well, terms of endearment are not used unless they are somehow essential to the conversation. In the study material, the terms of endearment that lady Edith receives from the other characters are often maintained in both translations. In this case, they are often relevant to the dialogues, since she is devastated over her missing fiancé and the other characters are trying to cheer her up. In that kind of a situation, it is idiomatic to use terms of endearment in Finnish as well.

The DVD version uses more terms of endearment than the TV version, as Example 18 from episode 3 demonstrates.

Example 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isobel</td>
<td>I might go home and have a bath. Shall I come back later?</td>
<td>Voisin käydä kotona kylvyssä. Tulenko myöhemmin takaisin?</td>
<td>Taidan mennä kotiin kylpyyn. Tulenko takaisin myöhemmin?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>Oh, oh yes, dear. That would be very kind.</td>
<td>Se olisi erittäin ystävällistä.</td>
<td>Kyllä, kultaseni, se olisi ystävällistä.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violet is not especially fond of Isobel, or if she is, she would never admit it. Therefore, her addressing Isobel with a term of endearment catches one’s attention. However, it could be justified with the fact that in the scene, she is doing her best to be polite to her.
In Example 19, from episode 1, Mr Molesley has come to speak to Mr Carson, the butler of the house, about a possible vacancy at Downton. Carson is quite irritated with Molesley, and the following line is spoken in a sarcastic manner.

Example 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Carson</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 41:02–41:05</th>
<th>DVD 40:59–41:02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oh, dear, Mr Molesley, I’m afraid that Alfred is not leaving now.</td>
<td>Hyvä herra Molesley, Alfred ei lähdekaään.</td>
<td>Hra Molesley, pelkään pahoin, ettei Alfred lähdekaään.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is open to interpretation whether the word dear is part of the exclamation (oh dear), or the noun phrase (dear Mr Molesley). The TV and DVD translators have interpreted it differently. In the TV version, the use of adjective hyvä, ‘good’, makes the line sound even more sarcastic.

Example 20 is from episode 5, from a scene in which a group of men are playing poker.

Example 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampson</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 59:50–59:54</th>
<th>DVD 1:00:54–1:01:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s rather sad poor Mr Gregson won’t be joining us.</td>
<td>Ikävää ettei Gregson-parka ole mukana. - Olette kuullut siitä.</td>
<td>Harmi, ettei herra Gregson ole mukana.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Robert</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 59:50–59:54</th>
<th>DVD 1:00:54–1:01:17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You’ve heard about that?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kuulitte siitä.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sampson refers to Gregson as poor Mr Gregson because he is missing and no one knows what has happened to him. The TV translator has chosen to omit the title Mr, whereas the DVD translator has omitted the adjective poor. By using the Finnish
word *parka*, “poor”, the TV translation stresses the fact that Gregson is not participating due to something negative and thus reminds also the viewers of his situation. It also makes Robert’s reply appear more logical.

### 4.2 Pronominal address

In this chapter, I will present my observations on the use of pronouns of address in the translations and the most significant differences between them. In 4.2.1, I will focus on pronoun use among upper servants, in 4.2.2 the pronouns upper servants are addressed with by lower servants, in 4.2.3 the pronouns upper servants are addressed with by upper class characters, and in 4.2.4 the pronouns middle class characters are addressed by upper class characters. Lastly, in 4.2.5, I will analyse address pronoun use among the upper-class characters. I will use the abbreviations T and V to refer to the Finnish second person singular and plural pronouns, *sinä* and *te* respectively.

#### 4.2.1 Upper servants

In the TV translation, the upper servants address each other with V (with some exceptions that will be presented later in this chapter), but in the DVD version there is a high amount of variation. This is another trait that makes it seem plausible that there has been more than one translator working on the episodes of the study material.

In the DVD version of episode 1, upper servants address each other with T with no exceptions. In episode 2, the translator has mainly followed the same strategy, but there is one dialogue in which the housekeeper Mrs Hughes addresses the butler Mr Carson with V. Before and after this one scene, she addresses him with T, and in the dialogue itself can be seen nothing that would suggest any reason for this change is pronoun use.

*Example 21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Not so fast, Mrs Hughes. We led the</td>
<td>Me johdimme mailman</td>
<td>Eipä hypätä asioiden edelle. Johdimme maailmaa orjuuden</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
world in the fight against slavery. Remember Lord Henley’s judgement of 1763, “If a man sets foot on English soil, then he is free.”

Hughes  Don’t undo Mr Ross’s good work.  Älkää tehkö herra Rossin saavutusta tyhjäksi.  Älkää tehkö hra Rossin työtä tekemättömäksi.

The switch from T to V suggests a sudden change in either the vertical or horizontal distance of the characters; it is impossible to say which, as one cannot see if the use of V is reciprocal or not.

In episode 3, there is more variation. Again, upper servants mainly address each other with T, but, in the end of the episode, there are two instances in which V is used instead. In Example 22, the valet Mr Green arrives at the servants’ hall and is greeted by the other servants.

Example 22

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>I think this is the right place.</td>
<td>Tämä lienee oikea paikka.</td>
<td>Tämä taitaa olla oikea paikka.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patmore</td>
<td>Er, I suppose you’ve come to</td>
<td>Tulitte taas ravistelemaan meitä.</td>
<td>Taisitte tulla aiheuttamaan lisää harmia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It is noteworthy that Molesley, who is in fact a lower servant (though he is addressed like an upper servant because of his previous, higher status), addresses Green with T, whereas Mrs Patmore, an upper servant, addresses him with V. Furthermore, Mrs Patmore is one of the upper servants who are addressed with TLN by everyone in the ST, even the upper class. It seems probable that the translator has based their interpretation of the social status of the characters on the situation or on the characters’ appearance. Then it could have been possible to interpret Mrs Patmore to be lower on the vertical scale than Mr Molesley or Mr Green.

Example 23, also from episode 3, presents a scene with nonreciprocal V.

Example 23

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>They said you were in here.</td>
<td>Kuulin, että <strong>olette</strong> täällä. - Miten voin auttaa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green</td>
<td>What can I do for you, <strong>Mrs Hughes</strong>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>Nothing! You can do nothing for me. Because I know who you are and I know what you’ve done. And while you’re here, if you value your life, I should stop playing the joker and keep to the shadows.</td>
<td><strong>Ette</strong> millään tavalla, sillä tiedän mikä <strong>olette</strong> ja mitä <strong>olette</strong> tehnyt. <strong>Jos henkene on teille</strong> kallis, - <strong>Pysytelette</strong> täällä vähin äänin taka-alalla.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’m afraid we were a bit drunk that night, Anna and I. So you’re right, we were both to blame.

Olimme Annan kanssa hieman humalassa. Olette oikeassa. Syytä oli meissä molemmissa.

Olimme vähän juovuksissa sinä iltana. Anna ja minä. Olette siis oikeassa, se oli molempien syytä.

No, Mr Green. You were to blame, and only you.

Ei, herra Green. Te olitte syyllinen ja yksin te.

Ei, hra Green. Se oli ainoastaan sinun syysi.

It is worth noting that in the ST, both characters use the TLN address. In the DVD version, both titles have been maintained, and in the TV version, Green’s title herra. Regardless of this use, which suggests the characters to be equal on the vertical scale, only Green uses the V pronoun in the DVD version while Hughes addresses him with T. In the TV version, both address each other with V. Hughes’s social standing in the house is higher than Green’s. Therefore, the vertical distance suggested by the asymmetry of address pronouns can be justified. She also has the upper hand in the communication situation.

In episode 4, the DVD translator has followed a different strategy: in this episode, most upper servants address each other with V. T is, however, used three times. One of these cases is Example 24, in which Mrs Patmore, the cook, addresses Miss Baxter, who is a lady’s maid.

Example 24

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 00:37–00:42</th>
<th>DVD 04:32–04:35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patmore</td>
<td>Can I ask you to put that machine away? We’ll be laying for tea in a minute.</td>
<td>Voisitteko panna koneen pois? Katamme kohta pöydän.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the basis of the ST title use, the use of T could be justified. Mrs Patmore is one of the upper servants who are addressed with TLN by the upper class, while Miss
Baxter is addressed with her LN only. This suggests a vertical distance that could justify the use of the T pronoun (assuming that its use is nonreciprocal). But Example 25, a dialogue between Mrs Patmore and Mrs Hughes, makes this theory seem less plausible.

*Example 25*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 26:03–26:12</th>
<th>DVD 29:12–29:19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patmore</td>
<td>I thought I’d give her the day off. You won’t mind, do you?</td>
<td>Annan hänelle vapaapäivän, jos sopii.</td>
<td>Ajattelin antaa hänelle vapaata. Ei kai haittaa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>If you think it best. It’s you who’ll do the extra work, not me.</td>
<td>Ihän niin kuin <strong>haluatte</strong>. <strong>Teillehän</strong> siitä tulee lisätyötä.</td>
<td>Jos se on <strong>mielestäsi</strong> parasta. <strong>Sinä teet</strong> lisäyöt, en minä.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Mrs Hughes and Mrs Patmore are addressed with TLN by the upper class in the ST. Again, it would be possible to justify this pronoun use with vertical distance, since Mrs Hughes has an even higher social status than Mrs Patmore. Mr Carson, who has a higher status than either of them, addresses all the upper servants with V, however. It is also possible that the translator has based the pronoun use on the women’s short horizontal distance, which is apparent in the scene.

The third sample is Example 26, drawn from a dialogue between two valets, Mr Green and Mr Bates.

*Example 26*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 18:35–18:38</th>
<th>DVD 22:00–22:02</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bates</td>
<td>Where do you live when you’re there?</td>
<td>Missä <strong>asutte</strong> siellä?</td>
<td>Missä <strong>aiot</strong> asua siellä?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bates and Green are not very familiar with each other – actually they mutually dislike each other – and they do not even work in the same house. Therefore, their horizontal distance is long. The use of T could be explained with their lack of vertical distance.

In episode 5, the pronoun use among upper servants is more consistent than in the previous episodes of the study material: the upper servants address each other with V most of the time. There is a scene, however, in which Mr Carson addresses Ethan Slade, who is a valet, with T. Before and after this one scene, he addresses Ethan with V.

*Example 27*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carson</td>
<td>Have you lost your mind?</td>
<td>Oletteko seonnut?</td>
<td>-Oletko sinä järjiltäsi?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>You’re a footman, not a travelling salesman. Please keep your opinions on the catering to yourself!</td>
<td>Olette palvelija ettekä kauppamatkustaja. Mielipiteitä ei kaivata.</td>
<td>Olet lakeija, et kaupustelija. Älä ilmaise mielipiteitäsi ruoasta.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most likely reason behind the sudden change from V to T is that Ethan has been asked to act as a footman (a lower servant) for the evening. Therefore, he is dressed as a footman and serving the dinner quests. In the dialogue, Carson is scolding Ethan for being too eager when trying to make the quests taste the food he is carrying. The fact that the translator has not realised that Ethan is an upper servant taking care of lower servants’ duties is quite noteworthy. Most likely they have interpreted the vertical distance between the two men to be longer than it actually is. Naturally, it is
also possible that the translator has attempted to stress Ethan’s temporarily lowered status.

In addition, the same Ethan is addressed with T by Mrs Patmore and later by Mrs Hughes:

Example 28

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>Lord Aysgarth’ll come, if he knows old mother Levinson’s aboard.</td>
<td>Lordi Aysgarth tulee taatusti, jos mamma Levinson on mukana.</td>
<td>Lordi Aysgarth tulee kunhan kuulee Levinsonin eukosta.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patmore</td>
<td>Well, very respectful, I must say.</td>
<td>Olipa kunnioittavasti sanottu.</td>
<td>Oletpa kunnioittava.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is possible that the translator has misinterpreted Ethan’s social status. In Example 28, he is spending time with a kitchen maid in the kitchen, and furthermore, he is quite young. Again, the translator might have forgotten that Ethan’s status is equal or almost equal to Patmore’s, as they both are upper servants.

Example 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 42:52–43:00</th>
<th>DVD 45:33–45:41</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>A place called the Albert Memorial, but, uh, will I know it when I see it?</td>
<td>Paikassa nimeltä Albert Memorial. Löydänköhän sen?</td>
<td>Albertin muistomerkin luona. Mistä minä tunnistan sen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hughes</td>
<td>You most certainly will, I can promise</td>
<td>Aivan varmasti.</td>
<td>Tunnistat sen aivan varmasti.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most of the time, everyone addresses Ethan with V, so Examples 27 to 29 are exceptions to the rule. Since Mrs Hughes is a housekeeper, her social status in the house is higher than the valet’s and she is also significantly older than him, so her use of T in Example 29 could be justified. However, when they meet for the first time, she addresses him with V, and therefore the T address is unlikely to be intentional.

*Example 30*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 09:40–09:45</th>
<th>DVD 10:37–10:42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Do you know London?</td>
<td>Tunnetteko Lontoota?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- On ensi kertaa täällä.</td>
<td>Tunnetko Lontoota?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethan Hughes</td>
<td>Oh, I’ve never crossed the Atlantic before.</td>
<td>Toivon, etä <strong>viihytte</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Well, I hope you enjoy yourself.</td>
<td>-En ole ylitännyt Atlanttia ikinä.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-Toivottavasti <strong>viihytte</strong>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reason for V use here could be that Ethan has just told the other characters that he is a valet. Therefore, the translator most likely was aware of his social status as well.

Anna Bates, the maid of lady Mary, is an exception to the rule in both translations. She is addressed with T by almost every character in both translations, even though a lady’s maid is an upper servant. The most plausible explanation is that she is addressed with FN in the ST, as mentioned in chapter 2.

In addition to Anna Bates, also the address pronoun use between under-butler Thomas Barrow and lady’s maid Miss Baxter is an exception to the rule. At first, they exchange mutual T in both translations. Example 31 is drawn from episode 1.
Baxter addresses Thomas with FN in the ST. He addresses her with TLN, though the address form does not appear in Example 31. For the viewers of the show, it is clear that Thomas and Baxter have known each other even before Baxter starts working at Downton, but how exactly they know each other is not revealed until later. Their horizontal distance is short, and both translations express this with reciprocal use of T. In episode 5, however, Baxter attempts to lengthen their horizontal distance and starts to use Thomas’s TLN in the ST. At the same moment, the TV translation starts to use the V pronoun.
**Example 32**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 1:01:33–1:01:55</th>
<th>DVD 1:02:48–1:03:08</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>You’re very thoughtful, Miss Baxter.</td>
<td>Neiti on kovin mietteliä.</td>
<td>Olette ajatoksissanne, neiti Baxter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>Am I?</td>
<td>Olenko?</td>
<td>Olenko?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>It’s no use ganging up with Mr Molesley. He can’t protect you like I can and he doesn’t know what I know, does he?</td>
<td>On turha liittoutua Molesleyn kanssa. Hän ei voi suojella kuten minä. Hän ei tiedä mitä minä tiedän.</td>
<td>Turha liittoutua Molesleyyn kanssa. Hän ei voi suojella teitä eikä hänellä ole minun tietojani.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baxter</td>
<td>He knows how to be kind, Mr Barrow. He has the advantage of you there.</td>
<td>-Hän on hyvä ihminen, herra Barrow. Toisin kuin te.</td>
<td>Hän osaa olla ystävällinen. Se etu hänellä on.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TV version seems to be avoiding the use of address pronouns in the beginning of the dialogue by using the less common third person address form neiti instead. This way, Baxter is the first to use V – the same time she starts using Thomas’s TLN in the ST. In the DVD version, Thomas is the first to switch to the V pronoun, and it already happens earlier in the episode:

**Example 33**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 58:51–58:54</th>
<th>DVD 1:00:03–1:00:04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>I know you. There’s</td>
<td>Mitä on tekeillä? Näen että on.</td>
<td>Tunnen teidät. Jotain on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the TV version, the translation uses address pronouns to express that it is Miss Baxter who wants to lengthen their horizontal distance. In the DVD version, the effect is lost, since the characters switch from mutual T to mutual V without a clear change in their relationship.

### 4.2.2 Upper servants and lower servants

In the TV version, lower servants address upper servants with V, Anna being the only exception. Lower servants almost always receive T in both translations, so except for some exceptions, they are not interesting from the point of view of this study. In the DVD version, however, there is some variation in the pronouns lower servants use to address upper servants.

In the DVD version of the first three episodes, no upper servant receives V from a lower servant except for the valet Mr Green, who is addressed with V by the footman Jimmy in episode 3. In episode 1, Daisy, who is a kitchen maid, is the only lower servant who addresses an upper servant with a pronoun. In the DVD version, she addresses both Miss Baxter and Mrs Patmore with T.

*Example 34*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 05:07–05:12</th>
<th>DVD 05:01–05:05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>But if it’s electric, aren’t you worried it’s going to run away with itself and sew your fingers to the table?</td>
<td>Eikö pelota että se huristaa itsekseen ja ompelee sormet kiinni pöytään?</td>
<td>Mutta jos se on sähköinen, etkö huoli, että se pääsee käsitäsi ja ompelee sormesi pöytään?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Baxter has not been working at Downton very long, and her horizontal distance with Daisy is not short. In Example 34, however, the situation is quite informal as the characters are merely spending time in the servants’ hall, and it is possible that the informality has affected the translator’s choice of pronouns. Even though the TV
version in Example 34 does not include pronominal address, there is no reason to expect that the translator would not have used the V pronoun.

Example 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 45:17–45:21</th>
<th>DVD 45:46–45:49</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patmore</td>
<td>What are you grinning about?</td>
<td>Mikäs noin hymyilyttää? - Mitäs luulisitte? Hän ei lähde.</td>
<td>Miksi virruilet?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>What do you think? He’s not going!</td>
<td></td>
<td>Miksi luulet? Hän ei lähde!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Daisy has been working together with Mrs Patmore for a long time and their horizontal distance is very short, which is the most likely reason to their pronoun use in the DVD translation. However, in the ST she always addresses the cook with TLN, which suggests that their vertical distance is more important in the ST dialogue, and the TV translation expresses the distance with V.

In episode 2, there is no dialogue in which a lower servant addresses an upper one with T or V. In episode 3, footman Jimmy addresses both Thomas Barrow and Mrs Patmore with T.

Example 36

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 04:38–04:54</th>
<th>DVD 05:16–05:30</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Well, I’m not sorry. I can say that.</td>
<td></td>
<td>En ole pahoillani. Sen voin sanoa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though there is vertical distance between Thomas and Jimmy, their horizontal distance is quite short. Therefore, it seems that the TV translator has based their choice of pronouns on vertical distance and the DVD translator on horizontal.
Mrs Patmore is higher than Jimmy on the vertical scale, and they are not very near each other on the horizontal scale either. It is possible that the DVD translator has misinterpreted their vertical distance. Again, one possible reason is Mrs Patmore’s appearance.

In episode 4, lower servants address upper servants with T most of the time. There is, however, some variation that does not seem intentional: in one scene, Jimmy addresses Mr Molesley with T, but in the scenes that come later he addresses him with V.

Example 38
In fact, there should be no vertical distance between Jimmy and Molesley, since they both are footmen. Therefore, Jimmy addressing Molesley with T does make sense. In Example 39, however, drawn from the scene immediately after Example 38, Jimmy addresses Molesley with V.

*Example 39*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Molesley</td>
<td>Oh, I like the bazaar. I always enjoy it. I hope you will.</td>
<td>-Toivottavasti tekin.</td>
<td>-Ettékö voi auttaa häntä nauttimaan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jimmy</td>
<td>Can’t you help her to, Mr Molesley?</td>
<td>Auttakaa neitii nauttimaan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both Jimmy and Molesley are still wearing the same clothes they were in the previous scene, and it seems unlikely that the translator would not have known that they are the same characters as in the previous scene. Actually, also V makes sense in address between Jimmy and Molesley. As mentioned in chapter 2, in the ST Molesley is always addressed with TLN or LN because of his previous, higher status in the house, and for the same reason he could be addressed with V in the subtitles (which is the case in the TV version). However, this kind of variation, especially within one episode is quite illogical. It is possible that the DVD translator has followed the ST’s use of TLN in Example 39. In Example 38, there are no nominal address forms.

In episode 5, the DVD translation does not seem to have a coherent strategy in the address pronouns upper servants receive from lower servants. Both T and V appear approximately as often.
Quite interestingly, in the TV version of episode 5, a valet addresses a kitchen maid with V consistently throughout the episode. Example 40 is the first dialogue between them.

*Example 40*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 09:24–09:50</th>
<th>DVD 10:21–10:47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethan</td>
<td>What about you?</td>
<td>Oletteko töissä täällä?</td>
<td>Oletko sinä täällä töissä?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you work here?</td>
<td>- Tulin Yorkshiresta auttamaan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daisy</td>
<td>I work at the house in Yorkshire, but I’m up here for a bit.</td>
<td>Oletteko kamarineiti?</td>
<td>-Oletko kamarineiti?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

| Ethan  | Are you excited?          | Oletteko innoissanne? | -Oletko innoissasi? |
|        | I’m never excited.        | - En koskaan.         | -En ikinä. |

At first, Ethan mistakes Daisy for a lady’s maid and therefore addresses her with V in the TV version. Even after learning about their vertical distance, he keeps using the V pronoun. In the DVD translation, he addresses her with T even when he mistakes her for an upper servant.

Since the beginning of the episode, it is clear that Ethan has a crush on Daisy. This is the most plausible explanation for him continuing to address her with V in the TV translation despite of the fact that he addresses her with her FN in the ST. In
addition, later in the episode, he asks her to start working as a cook for his master, and as a cook she would be an upper servant. In the DVD version, Daisy never receives V from any of the characters. Daisy addresses Ethan with V in both translations.

In the DVD version of episode 5, Daisy addresses both Miss Baxter and Mrs Patmore with V, even though she has used T in the previous episodes.

4.2.3 Upper class and upper servants

In the TV translation, upper class characters address upper servants with V, Anna being the only exception. In the DVD subtitles, there is some variation both between and within episodes. In many scenes, it seems probable that the TV translator has based her use of T and V on the ST’s nominal address forms, whereas the DVD translators have used the vertical and horizontal distance as the basis of their use of pronominal address.

In episode 1, there are only two conversations in which an upper-class character addresses an upper servant with a pronoun of address. In the first one, T is used, but there is a scene in which Cora Crawley addresses her cook, Mrs Patmore, first with T and then with V within a single dialogue.

*Example 41*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>I’ve come down to persuade you.</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Tulin tänne suostuttelemaan sinua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patmore</td>
<td>I just don’t see why it’s better than an ice-box.</td>
<td>Miten se olisi jäävarastoa parempi? -Jääkaappi on tehokkaampi.</td>
<td>En ymmärrä, miksi se on jäälaatikkoa parempi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>Well, a refrigerator is more efficient. It keeps food fresh</td>
<td>Ruoka säilyy siinä kauemmin, eikä jäitä tarvitse enää tuoda.</td>
<td>Jääkaappi on tehokkaampi. Ruoka säilyy tuoreena</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
longer. We won’t need ice to be delivered.  

Emme tarvitsisi jäitä kuljetukseen.  

Patmore  

But the papers will still be delivered and the groceries and all sorts, or are we to stop that, too?  

Lehdetkin tuodaan ja ruokaostokset. Vai lopetetaanko nekin?  

Mutta lehdet ja ruoat tuodaan silti, vai loppuko sekin?  

Cora  

Mrs Patmore, is there any aspect of the present day that you can accept without resistance?  

Rouva Patmore, onko nykyajassa mitään, mitä ette vastusta?  

Rva Patmore, voitteko hyväksyä mitään modernia ilman vastarintaa?

First Cora addresses Mrs Patmore with T and later with V. This is almost certainly unintentional. It is possible that the TLN form in the ST has stimulated the use of V in the last line, while the DVD translator would usually have used T.

Also in episodes 2, 3 and 4 of the DVD version, the upper class members consistently address upper servants with T. Since the strategies in the first four episodes are so similar, there is no need to include more than one example.

*Example 42*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 49:01–49:08</th>
<th>DVD 52:12–52:18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

In the ST, Bates is addressed with LN. In the TV version he receives V from his lord and in the DVD version T. In the first four episodes of the study material, the
translators have expressed the vertical distance between the upper class and upper servants by the nonreciprocal use of V. In the TV translation, the pronoun use seems to have been based on the nominal address forms in the ST: a character that is addressed with either LN or TLN receives V in the subtitles.

In episode 5, pronoun use is less consistent. Unlike in episode 3, the housekeeper receives V from lady Mary. However, Tom Branson and the earl address the under-butler Thomas Barrow with T.

*Example 43*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 24:30–24:54</th>
<th>DVD 26:21–26:39</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Only last night… I was concerned you may have misunderstood.</td>
<td>Eilen illalla… Ymmärsitte ehkä väärin.</td>
<td>Eilen illalla… Pelkään, että käsität väärin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>Sir?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Herra?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>I was having dinner with Miss Bunting in the village and she was curious to look around the house. Mr Barrow?</td>
<td>Olin syömässä neiti Buntingin kanssa ja hän halusi nähdä talon. <strong>Herra Barrow</strong>? - Hän näkisi tämän paremmin päivänvalossa.</td>
<td>Söin pubissa neiti Buntingin seurassa. Hän halusi nähdä kartanon. <strong>Herra Barrow</strong>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas</td>
<td>She might perhaps see it to more advantage in the daylight, sir.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Ehkäpä hän olisi nähnyt enemmän päivänvalossa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tom is the only member of the Crawley family who addresses Thomas with TLN in the ST. For instance, in episode 5 Robert addresses Thomas with LN, and in episode 3 both Mary and Robert refer to Thomas with FN. The translators have possibly
based their solutions on different things, the TV translator wanting to use V to express the same horizontal distance the ST expresses with TLN and LN, and the DVD translation choosing the T pronoun because of the characters’ vertical distance.

In the middle of the same episode, there is a dialogue in which Robert uses both T and V to address his valet Mr Bates.

*Example 44*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Robert Marius Bates, during your time away, did you ever meet a man who could copy someone’s writing?</td>
<td>Bates, kun olitte… poissa, - tapasitteko taitavaa käsilaita stajillään?</td>
<td>Bates, kärsiessästuomiota tapasitteko ketään, joka osaa matkia käsilaloja?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is difficult to find an explanation for the DVD version’s sudden change of pronouns. It is possible that the ST’s use of Bates’s LN has stimulated the use of T in the beginning of the sentence.

4.2.4 Upper class and middle class

Some of the central characters in the series are not members of the upper class, but their social status is higher than that of the servants. This group includes professionals such as a doctor and a teacher as well as a tenant farmer. In the TV translation, the middle class characters are mostly addressed with V and in the DVD version with T.

One such character is Charles Blake, who stays at Downton Abbey while conducting a study on the area’s farms. He arrives to the house in episode 2. At first, in both translations, he receives V from every member of the Crawley family. However, in the DVD subtitles, he starts to exchange mutual T with Mary within the same episode even though there is no change in their horizontal or vertical distance. Example 45 contains the first dialogue between them in which the T pronoun is used.
Because of Charles and Mary’s vertical distance, Charles should not have the right to initiate the use of T; as mentioned in 3.1, the person with higher social status has that right. In the TV translation, this shift from reciprocal V to reciprocal T does not happen until the end of episode 4. The most obvious reason for the change is a scene in episode 3 in which Mary and Charles save pigs together, end up all muddy, and have a late snack in the servants’ dining room. After that, there is no pronominal address between them until the end of episode 4. The pig rescue shortens horizontal distance between Mary and Charles, and when they meet again, they address each other with FN in the ST and with exchange T in the TV version.

In the DVD subtitles, there is also some variation in how Charles addresses and is addressed by other members of the Crawley family. In the TV translation, other family members except for Rose keep addressing him with V even after Mary has switched to T. But already in episode 3 of the DVD version, the earl’s mother...
addresses him with T, even though she addresses him with TLN in the ST. In the DVD version of episode 4, Charles addresses Tom Branson and the countess with T.

In the DVD translation of episodes 4 and 5, Cora and Charles exchange reciprocal T, even though Charles still calls her *lady Grantham*. Examples 46 and 47 are drawn from episode 4.

*Example 46*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Good luck with your bazaar.</td>
<td>Onnea myyjäisiin.</td>
<td>- Onnea myyjäisiin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>Can’t you stay and lend me a hand?</td>
<td>- <em>Ettekö</em> jäsäsi auttamaan?</td>
<td>- <em>Etkö</em> voi jääää auttamaan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>Don’t tempt me.</td>
<td><em>Älkää</em> houkutelko.</td>
<td><em>Älä</em> houkuttele.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this point of the series, Mary and Charles have not addressed each other with their FNs. Therefore, it is quite interesting that the DVD translator has interpreted his and her mother’s horizontal distance to be short enough for reciprocal T.

*Example 47*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 1:02:04–1:02:10</th>
<th>DVD 1:06:12–1:06:18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cora</td>
<td>It was so kind of you to come.</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>Oli ystävällistä, että tutil</em>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Earlier in the same episode, Charles addresses Cora with T, but in this example, he addresses her with her title. Even though combining titles and T pronouns is possible in some languages (see chapter 3.2), it is unusual.

Example 48 is a conversation between Charles and Violet, Mary’s grandmother.

**Example 48**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 04:02–04:17</th>
<th>DVD 04:41–04:54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>Are the pigs a good idea, Mr Blake?</td>
<td>- Onko siat hyvä ajatus, herra Blake?</td>
<td>Ovatko siat hyvä ajatus, hra Blake?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles</td>
<td>It’s a good idea for estates like this to maximize and diversify. The question is whether or not lord Grantham and lady Mary fully appreciate what they are taking on.</td>
<td>Tällaisen tilan kannattaa maksimoida ja monipuolistua. Mutta ymmärtävätkö jaarli ja lady Mary mihin ryhtyvät?</td>
<td>Tällaisen tilan on hyvä maksimoida ja monipuolistaa toimintaansa. Kysymys on siitä, ymmärtävätkö lordi ja lady, mitä heiltä vaaditaan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violet</td>
<td>Oh? You ask as if the answer were no.</td>
<td>Kysytte kuin vastaus olisi ei.</td>
<td>Tunnut ajattelevan, että vastaus on ei.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the TV translation, Violet addresses Charles with V, which seems to arise from the ST’s use of TLN. In the DVD version, she addresses him with T, possibly because of the vertical distance between them or because of the informality of the situation.

Isobel Crawley, who used to be a nurse, is friends with Clarkson, the doctor of the village. They are not on first name terms, and in TV version, they exchange mutual V. Though she is a Crawley, Isobel is rather middle-class than upper-class. The DVD version is not wholly consistent with pronoun use. Example 49 is from episode 1, from a scene in which the two are just chatting informally.
Example 49

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 07:28–07:35</th>
<th>DVD 07:14–07:20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Isobel</td>
<td>He’s going to be so disappointed when he finds out how ordinary I really am.</td>
<td>Poika pettyy kun tajuaa etten ole jalosukuinen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson</td>
<td>You’re part of the family. That’s how the village sees you.</td>
<td><strong>Kuulutte</strong> perheeseen kyläläisten silmissä.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the DVD version, Isobel receives T from Clarkson, possibly because of their short horizontal distance or because of the informality of the situation. Example 50 is from episode 3, in which Violet falls ill and Isobel and Clarkson take care of her.

Example 50

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson</td>
<td>Well, tonight there can be no let up. You mustn’t sleep, you must not let her temperature get higher.</td>
<td>Ensi yönä on vahdittava, ettei kuume nouse tuosta yhtään.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The family took me in and kept me close when my link with them was gone. I owe them a great deal.

If you insist. I’ll look in later. Ring at the slightest change.

In this scene, doctor Clarkson is acting primarily as a doctor and only secondarily as Isobel’s friend. Therefore, it is possible that the DVD translator has interpreted their horizontal distance to be longer than in Example 49. It is possible that this change in pronouns confuses viewers, who are used to Clarkson and Isobel being on familiar terms.

Though friends with Isobel, Clarkson is not very familiar with the rest of the Crawley family. In Example 51, drawn from episode 1, Clarkson has come with Isobel to see Violet to discuss her young gardener, whom Violet accuses of stealing her belongings.

Example 51
In this scene, Clarkson is again acting primarily as Isobel’s friend and their short horizontal distance is apparent. The horizontal distance between him and Violet, however, is much longer. Nonetheless, in the DVD version he addresses Violet with T. He addresses Violet with T only in episode 1, but the T use is consistent throughout the episode.

Mr Drewe is a tenant farmer who lives on the Crawleys’ land. In the ST, the upper-class people address him and refer to him with TLN or LN. In the TV version he receives V from all of them, and in the DVD version he is addressed with T. Example 52 is from episode 4. The scene was not in the TV recording.

*Example 52*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV --:--:--:--</th>
<th>DVD 01:04–01:33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Mr Branson is right. He should have made sure. You would have done.</td>
<td>Hänen olisi pitänyt tarkistaa.</td>
<td>Branson on oikeassa. Hänen olisi pitänyt varmistaa se.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Te olisitte</strong> tehnyt niin.</td>
<td><strong>Olisit</strong> tehnyt niin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edith</td>
<td>Where did you learn about pigs?</td>
<td>Missä <strong>opitte</strong> hoitamaan sikoja? - Meillä on aina ollut muutamia.</td>
<td>Missä <strong>opit</strong> sianhoitoa?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drewe</td>
<td>We’ve always had pigs at Yew Tree, m’lady. Not many, but enough to learn their ways.</td>
<td>Yew Treessä on ollut aina sikoja, ladyni. Ei monta, mutta opin tuntemaan ne.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Thank heavens you did.</td>
<td>Taivaan kiitos.</td>
<td>Luojan kiitos.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drewe</td>
<td>So, have you found a man to take over?</td>
<td>Oletteko löytäneet uuden hoitajan? - Emme vielä.</td>
<td>Oletteko löytäneet tilalle uuden miehen?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the TV version both sisters as well as Tom address Mr Drewe with V and in the DVD version with T. The DVD version follows this strategy consistently except for episode 5, in which Edith addresses Drewe with V. There are also several dialogues in the material between the earl and and the farmer, and in these, Drewe always receives V in the TV version and T in the DVD version.

The most likely reason for the T use in the DVD version is the vertical distance between the Crawleys and the farmer. When Edith addresses Drewe with V in episode 5, she is asking him to take care of her daughter in secret, and the formality of the situation might have affected the pronoun use. The TV version’s V use could have several possible motives. One is horizontal distance, as none of the upper-class characters is very familiar with the farmer. Another could be deference. Even though Drewe is lower on the vertical scale than the Crawleys, they want to show him respect.

Though Tom is not fully a member of the Crawley family, he is still perceived as one by the village people. He meets a young woman called Sarah Bunting, who works as a teacher in the village. They meet in episode 3, and though they like each other, they are not on first name terms. In the TV translation they exchange V. In the DVD translation they exchange V in the beginning of their acquaintanceship but start using T in episode 5, when they meet again after a relatively long time. After their first encounter, they have met briefly in episode 4.

Example 53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You’ve been avoiding me.</td>
<td>Olette vältellyt minua.</td>
<td>Olet vältellyt minua.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tom
No, I haven’t. I’ve just been busy these past few months. Anyway, I’m here now.

Sarah
I should get on with this marking.

Tom
I’m going to the pub to get something to eat. Why don’t you join me?

In the DVD version of episode 5, Tom and Sarah exchange mutual T, while in the TV version they still exchange V. The TV translator has based the pronominal address on Tom and Sarah’s horizontal distance, which has not had an opportunity to shorten as the two have not seen each other. Furthermore, though Sarah is not addressed nominally by any of the characters, she is always referred to as Miss Bunting in the ST. The DVD translator has possibly based their interpretation of the characters’ horizontal distance on this episode only. If one has not seen the previous episodes, it is easy to miss the fact that Tom and Sarah has not known each other for very long. This sudden switch to mutual T might give the viewers a slightly wrong impression of the characters’ relationship.

4.2.5 Upper class

Since most of the upper-class characters in the series are members of the Crawley family, there is not much variation in address pronouns among them. There are, however, some more problematic cases, which will be examined in this chapter.

Tom Branson, originally a chauffeur but now a member of the family after marrying one of the daughters, does not feel like he belongs to Downton. He is on first name terms with the daughters but still refers to the earl with his title (see e.g. Example 10). The TV translation stresses his vertical distance to the Crawleys by making him
address Robert with V. In the DVD version, there is no consistency in his pronoun use: in episodes 1 and 4 he addresses Robert with T, and in episodes 2 and 5 with V. Tom addresses Cora with T in episode 4 of the DVD version, but there is no address pronoun use between them in the TV version.

Example 54, drawn from episode 1, exemplifies pronoun use between Tom and Robert.

*Example 54*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 04:11–04:14</th>
<th>DVD 04:01–04:04</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tom</td>
<td>Tomorrow. Will you go?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Huomenna. Osallistutko?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The DVD translator has possibly based their use of T on the characters’ horizontal distance. As the husband of Robert’s daughter and a resident of the Abbey, Tom is seen as a part of the family.

Tom addresses Isobel Crawley with V in the TV version and with T in the DVD version. Isobel, who used to be a nurse and who is not blood-related to the Crawleys, is in many ways in the same position as Tom. As can be interpreted from their conversation in Example 3, the horizontal distance between Tom and Isobel is not long. In the TV translation, however, he addresses her with V, as he does all the other Crawley family members except for the daughters. This reflects the TLN form he uses in the ST when referring to Isobel. Isobel addresses Tom with his FN.

Isobel is constantly seen together with the dowager countess, having tea or discussing the latest happenings in the house. Even though they cannot actually be said to like each other, they are on very informal terms, as can be inferred from the fact that they are quite frank with each other. Example 55 from episode 1 is a typical conversation between the two women.
### Example 55

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Isobel</strong></td>
<td>Say what you like. But I know you care about these things as much as I do.</td>
<td>Tiedän, että välitäte näistä asioista yhtä paljon kuin minä.</td>
<td>Sano mitä haluat. Mutta tiedän, että välität yhtä paljon kuin minä.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violet</strong></td>
<td>Oh! Nobody cares about anything as much as you do.</td>
<td>Kukaan ei välitä mistään yhtä paljon kuin te.</td>
<td>Kukaan ei välitä mistään yhtä paljon kuin sinä.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Violet is making fun of Isobel’s tendency to try and fix everyone else’s problems. Even though the women spend a fair amount of time in each other’s company, defining their horizontal distance is not easy. In the TV version, they exchange mutual V and in the DVD version mutual T. From the pronoun choices can be inferred that the TV translator has interpreted the distance to be longer than the DVD translator.

Violet is Cora’s mother-in-law. They do not spend much time together in the series, but Cora still addresses Violet as *mama* in the ST. In the TV version, Cora addresses Violet with V, and in the DVD version with T. Example 56 is from episode 4.

### Example 56

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>TV 02:53–02:57</th>
<th>DVD 06:48–06:54</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cora</strong></td>
<td>Stay and have dinner, mama. You needn’t change.</td>
<td>Jääkää illalliselle, äiti. Ei teidän tarvitse pukeutua. - Ei kiitos.</td>
<td>Jää illalliselle. Ei tarvitse laittautua.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Violet</strong></td>
<td>No, no. Thank you, my dear, but no.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Eije. Kiitos vain, mutta ei.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Combining the KT äiti with V address is not very common in Finnish. As mentioned in 3.5, however, it was more common in the time period the series takes place in, and is therefore acceptable in this context. The TV translator might have interpreted the horizontal distance between Cora and Violet to be longer than the DVD translator.

Harold Levinson and Madeleine Allsopp have never met before episode 5. In the TV translation, they exchange reciprocal V until the end of the episode, but in the DVD version the pronoun use varies more. Example 57 is drawn from the first scene in which the two are seen together.

*Example 57*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>You needn’t if you don’t want to.</td>
<td>Ei ole pakko <em>ellette</em> halua.</td>
<td>Sinun ei ole pakko tulla.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine</td>
<td>Are you determined to put me off?</td>
<td><strong>Haluatteko</strong> päästä minusta eroon?</td>
<td><strong>Torjutteko</strong> minut?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold</td>
<td>Okay. Well, if that’s what you want.</td>
<td>No, jos todella <strong>tahdotte</strong>.</td>
<td>Hyvä on, jos kerran <strong>haluat</strong>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the TV version Harold and Madeleine exchange reciprocal V, but in the DVD version Madeleine addresses Harold with V but receives T from him. One reason for this asymmetry could be the fact that Madeleine is clearly younger than Harold. After this scene, however, Harold starts to address Madeleine with V in the DVD version as well.
Madeleine
You are strange.
You invite me here
today as an apology
and now you seem bent on offending
me again.

Olette omituinen. Halusitte
hyvittää loukkauksen ja
loukkaatte taas.

Te olette merkillinen.
Haluatte pyytää anteeksi,
mutta sitten yritätte loukata uudelleen.

Harold
Oh, no, I hope not.
Because I like you
very much, Miss
Allsopp.

Toivottavasti en.
Pidän teistä hyvin paljon, neiti
Allsopp.

Toivottavasti en.
Sillä pidän teistä kovasti, neiti
Allsopp.

In this example, Harold addresses Madeleine with TLN in the ST and both
translations. It is possible that both translators, also the DVD version, have followed
this nominal address form by the V pronoun. The characters exchange mutual V until
their last conversation:

Harold
Ah. Well, thank you

Kiitos rehellsyydestä.

In this example, Harold addresses Madeleine with TLN in the ST and both
translations. It is possible that both translators, also the DVD version, have followed
this nominal address form by the V pronoun. The characters exchange mutual V until
their last conversation:

Harold
Madeleine

Original
TV 01:13:27–01:14:53
DVD 01:15:26–01:16:47

Oh, Miss Allsopp…
Madeleine. And
please don’t think
too harshly of us.
Father is frightened.
You see, he doesn’t
know how to live
without money.

Neiti Allsopp…
Sanokaa Madeleine.
Älkää tuomitko muitakaan.
Isä on peloissaan. Hän ei osaa
elää ilman rahaa.

-Neiti Allsopp…
-Sano minua Madeleineksi.
Älä tuomitse meitä liikaa.
Isä on peloissaan.
Hän ei osaa elää ilman varoja.

Ah. Well, thank you

Kiitos rehellsyydestä.

Kiitos rehellsyydestä.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harold</th>
<th>Will you write, tell me how things are going… Madeleine?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Madeleine</td>
<td>I should be delighted… Harold.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Example 60**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Martha</td>
<td>Oh… Oh, off to bed, are we? Well, that’s very sensible. A woman your age needs her rest.</td>
<td>Menemmekö nukkumaan? Lepo onkin tarpeen tuossa iässä.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the TV version the women exchange mutual T and in the DVD version mutual V. The TV translator might have based her choice of pronouns on the ST’s use of Violet’s FN, while the DVD translator might have prioritised the women’s horizontal distance. The women rarely meet and are unlikely to keep in contact between their encounters, so their horizontal distance is supposedly long. However, their mutual dislike might make them less willing to follow the social norms. It is quite interesting to observe that Violet and Isobel, who meet much more frequently than Violet and Martha but exchange mutual V in the TV version.
5 Discussion and Conclusion

After analysing both translations, it seems very probable that there have been several translators working on the DVD version. The translations of the nominal address and reference terms and pronouns of address are not consistent between the episodes of the study material. In some episodes, the strategies applied to pronouns vary even within scenes, which could mean that the translators did not have much time to work on the translation solutions.

The TV translation was mainly logical and consistent in its way of treating the forms of address and reference. The use of T and V followed the address terms in the original dialogue: for the most part, the use of FNs had been substituted with T and the use of titles, TLNs, and LNs with V, the only exception being the valet Ethan Slade addressing the kitchen maid Daisy with the V pronoun.

In the TV translation, the characters’ way of using T and V to address each other does not change without a clear change in their horizontal or vertical distance or their way of addressing each other in the ST. This can be seen in the relationship of Miss Baxter and Thomas Barrow (see Examples 32 to 34), and lady Mary and Charles Blake (see Example 46). In the DVD translation, the changes in the pronouns of address happen before they do in the TV translation and without any clear stimulus in the ST.

Both translations have sometimes replaced a pronominal reference to a person not present in the speech situation with a nominal reference. When the two versions differ (see e.g. Example 17), the TV translation stays closer to the way the speaker would address the referent on the grounds of their horizontal and vertical distance. From this, it can be inferred that the TV translator has been more familiar with the collocutors and their relationship than the DVD translators.

On the basis of my analysis, it seems that in the DVD translation, translation solutions have been based on the situation; if two characters in a scene appear to be close, they exchange T. The level of formality also affects the pronoun use. This strategy often results in completely acceptable results: Mrs Hughes and Mr Carson, for instance, have worked together quite a long time, and therefore they could
exchange reciprocal T even though they address each other with their TLNs. However, this situation-based strategy leads to inconsistent translation solutions, as collocutors can appear more distant in some scenes than in others (see e.g. Examples 49 and 50).

By following the ST’s nominal address forms, the TV translator has been able to keep the pronouns of address consistent. At least in the study material, there are no inconsistencies in the use of T and V. Since the same translator has been working on the series since its beginning, she must be quite familiar with the characters and the horizontal and vertical distance between them. Furthermore, since she knows the series, she most likely does not need to spend large amounts of time seeking information – as suggested by Tarmo Hietamaa’s study mentioned in the Introduction chapter – so she has more time to spend on details such as pronouns and terms of nominal address and reference. Furthermore, when the translator is familiar with the characters of the series, the changes in their vertical and horizontal distance are easier to notice and therefore easier to convey to the viewers in the subtitles.

The nominal address forms of the ST might also have affected the DVD translators’ solutions, though possibly unconsciously. When the pronouns of address vary within an episode, the most likely explanation seems in many cases to be the nominal address forms in the English dialogue (see e.g. Examples 16 and 37). Mrs Patmore, who does not look like an upper servant, is the person whose address forms vary the most in the DVD translation. As mentioned in chapter 3, the address and reference forms people use are often easily affected by forms used by other people as well as the appearance of the addressee. The DVD translators do not seem to have been aware of this effect, since they have not followed the ST’s forms consistently.

This seems to prove my hypothesis. In the Introduction chapter, I suggested that there will be differences between the translations. The differences I found were partly in the strategies applied in the translations, but mainly in the translations’ inner coherency: the TV version was significantly more consistent in following the chosen strategy than the DVD version. Naturally, the differing forms of nominal and pronominal address and reference might affect the viewers’ impression of the characters and their relations, especially if the viewer does not understand the source
language. However, without further studies it is impossible to say for certain, how significant the subtitles’ effect on the viewers’ experience really is.

It is also worth considering whether it is important to be coherent in address and reference forms in subtitles, if people are do not use them coherently in real life. In the ST, however, the collocutors are very consistent in their use of nominal address and reference, and the translations can be expected to strive for the same.

In the Introduction chapter, I hypothesised about the effects of the outer dimensions of quality on the quality of the translation product. I cannot, of course, say anything certain about the two outer dimensions after analysing only product quality. However, I stated in my hypothesis that I assume that the translators strive for the best product quality that can be achieved within the two outer dimensions, and even though I cannot know this for certain without interviewing the translators themselves, I see no reason to change my view of translators’ work ethics. It is more probable that the translator working for Yleisradio had better working conditions than the unnamed translators of the DVD version, than that the DVD translators were for some reason less interested in the consistence of their translation solutions.

In order to bring about a change in the outer dimensions of quality, one would have to prove not only that they affect product quality, as e.g. Hietamaa has shown, but also that the product quality matters to the viewers. Even though I was able to find several inconsistencies from the DVD translation, it does not mean that a regular viewer of the series would notice them. If one would discover that the product quality has no importance to the viewers, it is worth considering if the translators even need to go through much trouble for a perfect translation, when the outer dimensions of quality make it difficult. However, if one would discover that the consistence of details such as pronouns of address and terms of nominal address and reference do matter to the viewers and that inconsistencies in the translation make the series less enjoyable, one would have solid evidence that process quality and social quality must be improved.

The present study, though being a thorough analysis of the study material, leaves several questions unanswered. It proves that there are significant differences in the consistence of the address and reference forms in the TV and DVD translations of
Downton Abbey, but it does not prove that the reason for the differences is in the working conditions of the translators or that the differences have any effect on the amount of enjoyment that viewers get from the series. On the grounds of previous research, it does seem probable, though, that the working conditions of translators are at least part of the reason behind the differences.

Therefore, in subsequent research, the connection between the dimensions of quality should be studied further. Furthermore, in order to truly affect the outer dimensions, the studies should address the question of whether or not the details of the subtitles matter to the viewers. In such studies, one could, for instance, use two differing translations of same audiovisual product and compare the viewers’ opinions and experiences of them. One such study could include showing different groups of viewers differently subtitled versions of same scene and ask them questions about the relationship of the collocutors.

Another, not directly connected to the present study but still relevant question is the effect of the omission of proper names in subtitles to the enjoyableness of the series. Since, at least in my study material, the proper names used in nominal address were more often omitted in the TV translation than in the DVD translation, the foreign names of the characters might be more difficult to memorise for the viewers of the TV version. Whether or not this makes the series more difficult to follow could be a question worth looking into.

Though the present study did not directly address the connection between the dimensions of quality, it did discover noteworthy differences in the two translations analysed. Even though address and reference forms in subtitles may not be the first thing a translator, let alone a viewer, considers in subtitles, they are an important part in conveying the horizontal and vertical distance, as well as the changes in them, in a periodical drama such as Downton Abbey.
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Suomenkielinen lyhennelmä

1 Johdanto

Tutkimukseni aiheena on pronominaalisen ja nominaalisen puhutteluun käyttö brittisarjan Downton Abbeyyn suomenkielisissä ruututeksteissä. Vertailen kahta eri ruututeistikäännöstä, tästä eteenpäin TV-versio ja DVD-versio, keskittyen eroihin kääntäjien käyttämisissä strategioissa sekä strategioiden noudattamisen johdonmukaisuuteen käänöönsi versioiden sisällä. Tarkoituksena ei ole asettaa käänööksiä paremuusjärjestykseen vaan miettiä erojen syitä ja seurauksia.


Luvussa 2 esittelen Downton Abbey-televisiosarjan ja selitän tutkimukseni metodin. Luvussa 3 esittelen käyttämäni teoriakehyksen ja luvussa 4 käytän sitä materiaalini analysoimiseen. Luvussa 5 kerron johtopäätökseen analyysin pohjalta ja teen muutamia ehdotuksia jatkotutkimusta varten.

2 Materiaali ja metodi


Englanninkielisessä dialogissa hahmon luokka vaikuttaa merkittävästi näiden puhutteluun.

3 Teoriakehys

Kolmessa ensimmäisessä alaluvussa kerron pronominaalisen ja nominaalisen puhuttelusta ja referenteihin viittaamisesta. Kahdessa viimeisessä alaluvussa käytän malleja englannin ja suomen puhuttelukäytäntöjen kuvaamiseen.

3.1 Pronominaalinen puhuttelu


Kuva 1: Semanttiset ulottuvuudet

Mitä enemmän henkilöiden välillä on statuseroja eli vertikaalista etäisyyttä koordinaatistossa, sitä todennäköisempää on yksipuolinen teitittely. Jos taas henkilöt ovat vieraita toisilleen eli näiden välillä on horisontaalista etäisyyttä koordinaatistossa, on molemminpuolinen teitittely todennäköisempää.

3.2 Nominaalinen puhuttelu


**3.3 Nominaalinen viittaaminen**


**3.4 Puhuttelu ja viittaaminen englannin kielessä**


### 3.5 Puhuttelu ja viittaaminen suomen kielessä

Suomen kielessä on T-pronomini *sinä* ja V-pronomini *te*. Toinen merkittävä ero englantiin on suomen kolmannen persoonan pronomini *hän*, joka viittaa molempiin sukupuoliin, toisin kuin englannin *he* ja *she*.


### 4 Analyysi

Analyysi on jaettu nominaaliseen ja pronominaaliseen alalukuun.

#### 4.1 Nominaalinen puhuttelu ja viittaaminen

Alaluvussa käsitellään arvonimet, sukulaisuussanat, etun- ja sukunimet sekä lempinimet ja hellittelynimet.

##### 4.1.1 Arvonimet

YLÄluokan arvonimiä on DVD-versiossa käännetty hyvin vaihelevalla tavalla: vaikka tiettyä arvonimen käänöstä käytetäänkin johdonmukaisesti jaksojen sisällä,
jaksojen välillä käänynnöset poikkeavat selvästi toisistaan. Tämä voi merkitä sitä, että jaksot ovat erti henkilöiden kääntämiä.

Lähtötekstissä jaarlin vaimoon viitataan arvonimellä *lady Grantham* ja jaarlin äitiin arvonimellä *old lady Grantham*. DVD-käännöksessä myös jälkimmäinen on tekstityksissä toisinaan *lady Grantham*, jolloin ei ole täysin selvää, kumpaan henkilöhahmoon ruututeksteissä viitataan. TV-käännöksessä ensin mainittu arvonimi on joko *lady Grantham* tai *rouva kreivitär* ja jälkimmäinen *lesikreivitär*, jolloin sekannuksen vaaraa ei ole.

Molemmissa käänynnössä TLN-rakenteiden arvonimet on usein jätetty pois, monissa tapauksissa oletettavasti ruututekstien pituusrajojen vuoksi. Toisinaan poisjätöt voivat vääristää hahmojen suhteita katsojan silmissä. DVD-versiossa arvonimistä suurempi osa on säilytetty, mikä taka hahmojen vertikaalisen etäisyden esille.

**4.1.2 Sukulaisuussanat**


DVD-versiossa lähtötekstin *cousin* on kahdessä kohtauksessa jätetty pois ruututeksteistä. Lähtötekstissä *cousin* käytetään silloin, kun puhujan horisontaalinen tai vertikaalinen etäisyys puhuteltavaan tai referentiin ei ole tarpeeksi lyhyt FN:n käyttämiseen. Tämä vääristää hahmojen välisiä suhteita ja voi häämentää katsoja, mutta toisaalta suomen kielelle epäidiomaattisen KT:n poissijätö on myös ymmärrettävää.

**4.1.3 Etunimet ja sukunimet**

Etu- ja sukunimien käytössä on käännyösversioiden välisiä eroja silloin, kun lähtötekstin kolmannen persoonan yksikön pronomini on korvattu tarkemmalla
nominaalisella viitatusmuodolla. TV-version käyttämät viitatusmuodot ilmaisevat poikkeukssetta hahmojen vääristä horisontaalista etäisyyttä johdonmukaisemmin kuin DVD-version viittaukset, ja joissakin kohtauksissa vaikuttaa jopa siltä, että DVD-kääntäjä ei ole ollut tietoinen hahmojen sosiaalisista suhteista. Joissakin kohtauksissa viitatusmuodot on mahdollisesti valittu muiden hahmojen käyttämien muotojen perusteele.

4.1.4 Lempinimet ja hellittelynimet

Kummassakin käännosversiossa hellittelysanat kuten dear on suurimmaksi osaksi jätetty pois ruututeksteistä, elleivät ne ole jollakin tapaa oleellisia keskustelun kannalta. DVD-versiossa hellittelysanoja kuitenkin käytetään enemmän kuin TV-versiossa, mikä saa hahmojen välisen horisontaalisen etäisyyden välillä näyttämään lyhyemmältä kuin mitä se todellisuudessa on. Eräissä kohtauksissa poissa olevaan henkilöön viitataan lähtötekstitällä attribuutilla poor, joka on TV-versiossa käännetty paraksi mutta jätetty pois DVD-versiosta. Attribuutin poisjättö tekee dialogista vaikeammin ymmärrettävän.

4.2 Pronominaalinen puhuttelu

Alaluvussa käsitellään sinuttelua ja teitettelyä ylempien palvelijoiden keskuudessa, ylempien ja alempien palvelijoiden välillä, yläluokan ja ylempien palvelijoiden välillä, ylä- ja keskiluokan välillä sekä yläluokan keskuudessa.

4.2.1 Ylemmät palvelijat


Jaksoissa 4 suurin osa ylemmistä palvelijoista puhuttelee toisiaan V:llä myös DVD-versiossa, mutta siinä on kolme kohtausta, joissa käytetään sen sijaan T:tä. Yhdessä
kohtauksessa syynä voisi olla vertikaalinen etäisyys, toisessa horisontaalinen etäisyys, kolmannessa taas vertikaalisen etäisyyden puute.

Jaksossa 5 ylempien palvelijoiden keskinäinen puhuttelu on johdonmukaisempaa ja siinä käytetään pääasiassa V:tä. Yksi hahmo kuitenkin tulee puhutelluksi vaihtelevasti sekä T:llä että V:llä, ja todennäköisimmältä syyltä vaikuttaa se, että kääntäjä on tulkinnut hahmon sosiaalisen statuksen eri tavoin eri kohtauksissa.


4.2.2 Ylemmät palvelijat ja alemmat palvelijat


Jaksossa 5 DVD-käännös ei noudata mitään selkeää strategiaa ja sekä T- että V- puhuttelua esintyy suurin piirtein yhtä paljon. Jotkin hahmot puhuttelevat V:llä hahmoja, joita ovat aiemmissa jaksoissa puhutelleet T:llä. TV-käännös poikkeaa

4.2.3 Yläluokka ja ylemmät palvelijat

TV-versiossa yläluokka puhuttee ylempiä palvelijoita Annaa lukuun ottamatta V:llä. DVD-versiossa strategia vaihtelee sekä jaksojen välillä että niiden sisällä. Monissa kohtauksissa vaikutaa todennäköiseltä, että TV-kääntäjä on perustanut T:n ja V:n käytön lähtötekstin nominaaliseen puhutteluun ja DVD-kääntäjät hahmojen vertikaaliseen ja horisontaaliseen etäisyyteen.


4.2.4 Yläluokka ja keskiluokka


Isobel Crawley on kylän lääkärin hyvä ystävä. TV-versiossa he puhuttelevat toisiaan V:llä, mutta DVD-versiossa pronomini vaihtelee tilanteen mukaan. Hahmot käyttävät...
T:tä jutellessaan epämuodollisesti, mutta V:tä huolehtiessaan sairaasta naisesta lääkärinä ja sairaanhoitajana (ainakin lääkäri käyttää; ruututeksteistä ei ilmene, onko käyttö molemminpuolista). Lääkärin horisontaalinen etäisyys muuhun perheeseen on pitenpi, mutta mennessään tapaamaan leskikreivitärtä yhdessä Isobelin kanssa mies puhuttelee tätä T:llä DVD-käännöksessä.


4.2.5 Yläluokka

Jaksossa 3 Tom Branson tapaa naisen, joka työskentelee kylällä opettajana, ja molemmissa käännöksessissä hahmot puhuttelevat toisiaan aluksi V:llä. DVD-käännössä kuitenkin siirtyy jaksossa 5 moleminpuoliseen T:hen, vaikka hahmot ovat ensitapaamisensa jälkeen kohdanneet vain kerran eikä näiden horisontaalisella etäisyydessä ole ollut tilaisuutta lyhentää.

Jaksossa 3 Tom Branson tapaa naisen, joka työskentelee kylällä opettajana, ja molemmissa käännöksissä hahmot puhuttelevat toisiaan aluksi V:llä. DVD-käännössä kuitenkin siirtyy jaksossa 5 moleminpuoliseen T:hen, vaikka hahmot ovat ensitapaamisensa jälkeen kohdanneet vain kerran eikä näiden horisontaalisella etäisyydessä ole ollut tilaisuutta lyhentää.

4.2.5 Yläluokka


Tom puhuttelee myös Isobelia TV-versiossa V:llä huolimatta hahmojen lyhyestä horisontaalisesta etäisyydestä, mikä voi johtua TLN-muodosta, jolla hän lähtötekstissä viittaa Isobelin. DVD-versiossa hahmot käyttävät molemminpuolista T:tä.

Isobel ja leskikreivitär viettävät paljon aikaa yhdessä, mutta näiden horisontaalisen etäisyyden määrittely on vaikeaa. TV-versiossa he puhuttelevat toisiaan V:llä ja DVD-versiossa T:llä. On siis mahdollista, että TV-kääntäjä on tulkinnut horisontaalisen etäisyyden pitemmäksi kuin DVD-kääntäjät.


Crawleyn tytärten kaksi isoäitiä tapaavat harvoin toisiaan eivätkä pidä toisistaan, joten hahmojen välinen horisontaalisen etäisyyden voi määritellä pitkäksi. DVD-versiossa hahmot käyttävät molemminpuolista V:stä ja TV-versiossa molemminpuolista T:stä, joka johtuu todennäköisesti toisen isoäidin käyttämästä FN:stä.

5 *Loppupäätelmät*

Analyysin perusteella näyttää todennäköiseltä, että DVD-versiolla on ollut useampi kuin yksi kääntäjä. TV-versiossa pronominaalinen puhuttelu perustuu pääasiassa lähtötekstin pronominaalisiin puhuttelumuotoihin, DVD-versiossa kääntäjän hahmojen horisontaalisesta ja vertikaalisen etäisyyden tekemään havaintoihin, jotka vaihtelivat jakson ja kohtauksen toiseen. Lähtötekstin pronominaaliset puhuttelumuodot ovat mahdollisesti vaikuttaneet myös DVD-käännöksen pronominaaliseen puhutteluun, mutta kääntäjät eivät ole seuranneet niitä tietoisesti.