

Expressing possibility in English and Norwegian¹

Berit Løken
University of Oslo

1 Background

English and Norwegian have a range of means of expressing modality. These include lexical verbs, adverbs (and in Norwegian modal particles), adjectives, comment clauses and, of course, modal verbs. In both languages the modal verbs have status as auxiliaries, although the criteria for auxiliaryity are different. In English the modals expressing the meanings covered by the modal operator possibility are *can*, *could*, *may* and *might*. In Norwegian these meanings are covered by one modal, KUNNE. The question that will be investigated in this paper is: What consequences does this asymmetry have for the expression of possibility in the two languages? To answer this question, I turned to a parallel corpus of English and Norwegian texts.

2 Material

The material consists of all instances of *can*, *could*, *may* and *might* in 17 original English texts in the English-Norwegian Parallel Corpus (Johansson and Hofland 1994; Johansson, Ebeling and Hofland 1996) together with their Norwegian translations, and all instances of the four forms of KUNNE (infinitive, present, preterite and past participle) in 17 original Norwegian texts together with their English translations². All 34 texts are short stories or excerpts from novels, ie fictional texts.

The first step in the sifting of the material was to discard irrelevant examples, viz instances of the nouns *can* and *May*, and sentences with no counterpart in the translated version. Secondly, I chose to discard the sentence pairs where the proposition had been altered, making the comparison of modal expressions difficult or irrelevant, as in (1)³:

- (1) He could recall a conversation only this morning. (PDJ3.1.6.s221)
De hadde snakket om det så sent som i morges.

After the material had been sifted, the English-Norwegian material consisted of 369 instances of *can*, 630 instances of *could*, 55 instances of *may*, and 164 instances of *might*, a total of 1,218 sentence pairs. The Norwegian-English material consisted of 499 instances of *kan*, 474 instances of *kunne* (24 instances of the infinitive, 450 instances of the preterite), and 9 instances of *kunnet*⁴, a total of 982 sentence pairs.

3 Classification

The material was analysed syntactically and semantically, the syntactic analysis being used partly as a support in the semantic analysis, partly to reveal possible patterns as to sentence type, polarity, form and thematic role of the subject, etc. In an attempt to reduce the impact of the translator as a variable, all instances of unique translations, ie forms found in only one text, were discarded. This resulted in the loss of instances like (2):

- (2) 'You **might** be right, Bev,' said Tony. (ST1.1.4.s91)
«Jeg **trur jaggu** du har rett, Bev,» sa Tony.

The remaining correspondences were sorted according to formal category. The following categories were found:

a) Modal verb corresponding to modal verb

- (3) Selv den minste svakhet **kunne** koste en fanger livet. (MN1.1.s40)
Even the slightest weakness **could** cost a hunter his life.

This category is divided into two sub-categories according to the form of the modal, present or (formally) past tense.

b) Modal verb + adverb/modal particle corresponding to modal verb

- (4) Together with her dowry, Saskia brought to this promising bourgeois marriage a patrician social cachet that Rembrandt cherished and **might** not otherwise have attained. (JH1.3.1.s18)
Foruten medgiften tok Saskia med inn i dette lovende borgerlige ekteskapet en patrisisk sosial prestisje som Rembrandt satte pris på og som han **kanskje** ikke **kunne** ha oppnådd på annet vis.

c) Adverb corresponding to modal verb

- (5) You **may** not know about this one: it 's a modern sin. (FW1.1.s291)
Du kjenner **kanskje** ikke til den, det er en moderne synd.

d) Modal auxiliary equivalent corresponding to modal verb

- (6) Plutselig går døren opp og en konstabel hinker ut, han **kunne** sikkert gå helt fint da han kom. (LSC1.4.s71)
Suddenly the door opens and a policeman hobbles out. Surely he **was able to** walk just fine when he came in.

e) Loss of modality (no item corresponding to the modal verb)

- (7) I **can** just about **remember** my own, but I don't rack up the angst if I have to extract the address book and look up Oliver Russell in it. (JB1.1.s203)
Jeg **husker** såvidt mitt eget, men jeg blir ikke fra meg av engstelse om jeg må finne frem katalogen og slå opp Oliver Russell i den.

Other categories of correspondences, which will not be dealt with in any detail, are modal verb + lexical verb, modal verb + modal verb, lexical verb, lexical verb + adverb/particle, modal verb + modal verb + adverb, modal verb + modal auxiliary equivalent.

The semantic analysis of the modals made use of the traditional categories 'epistemic possibility', 'root possibility', 'permission' and 'ability'. In addition, pragmatic categories like 'request' and 'suggestion' were used. There were, however, relatively few instances that fitted the pragmatic categories, possibly because the material consists of written language.

4 Findings

In Table 1, correspondences are sorted according to formal category. The table specifies only those categories that are numerically important and/or show marked differences between the languages.

Table 1: Correspondences by category, expressed in per cent

	<i>can</i> n=369	<i>could</i> n=630	<i>may</i> n=55	<i>might</i> n=164	<i>kan</i> n=499	<i>kunne</i> n=450
present tense modal	68.8	4.4	38.2	6.7	82.8	
past tense modal	0.5	66.7		37.2	6.6	86.6
modal + adv/particle		1.5		15.1		
adverb/particle		0.8	34.5	9.1		
modal aux. equiv.					1.0	2.9
Ø	14.6	10.8			4.0	4.0
other categories	7.3	7.8	5.5	3.0	1.2	1.8
unique corresp.	8.7	8.1	21.8	28.7	4.4	4.9
total	99.9	100.1	100	99.8	100	100.2

4.1 Correspondences of *can*

The majority of the Norwegian items corresponding to *can* are present tense modals. Within this category, *kan* is by far the most frequent, accounting for 66 per cent of the instances of *can*. *Kan* most frequently corresponds to *can* expressing ‘root possibility’ (8) and ‘ability’ (9):

- (8) The most trifling thing **can** cause an explosion. (ABR1.1.1.s1068)
 Selv de minste ting **kan** føre til en eksplosjon.
- (9) How much **can** you read, Matilda? (RD1.7.s167)
 Hvor mye **kan** du lese, Matilda?

The other modals corresponding to *can* are *må* and *skal*.

Loss of modality is the second most important ‘correspondence’ of *can*. This typically occurs when *can* denotes ‘ability’ and co-occurs with a verb of perception or cognition (10), ie in cases of aspectual *can* (Coates 1983:90). Zero correspondence is relatively more frequent in negative (11) than in positive environments:

- (10) I **can** just about **remember** my own, but I don't rack up the angst if I have to extract the address book and look up Oliver Russell in it. (JB1.1.s203)
Jeg **husker** såvidt mitt eget, men jeg blir ikke fra meg av engstelse om jeg må finne frem katalogen og slå opp Oliver Russell i den.
- (11) I **can't get** all the snarls out. (TH1.1.s273)
Jeg **får ikke** ut alle flokene.

Other categories corresponding to *can* include lexical verb (typically denoting 'ability') (12), and modal + modal (13). The co-occurrence of two or more modals in the same verb phrase is one of the features that are not shared by the English and the Norwegian modals:

- (12) 'S a wonder they **can** wipe their own bums. (ST1.1.9.s292)
Et under atte dem **greier** å tørke seg sjæl i ræva.
- (13) Can I sleep with you? (TH1.5.s226)
Kan jeg **få** ligge sammen med deg?

4.2 Correspondences of *could*

As was the case with *can*, the most frequent category of correspondence of *could* is the one which has the same formal characteristics. The past tense modal verb *kunne* accounts for the overwhelming majority of the instances in this category. The other items in this category, *skulle* and *ville* represent only 1.6 of the 66.7 per cent. *Kunne* most frequently corresponds to *could* expressing 'root possibility' (14) or 'ability' (15):

- (14) **Could** you really drive a car without reversing? (AT1.2.s280)
Kunne man virkelig kjøre bil uten å rygge?
- (15) Or else it was that Arthur **could** read her mind? (FW1.2.s62)
Eller var det slik at Arthur **kunne** lese tankene hennes?

The category present tense modal consists of *kan* corresponding to *could*. This typically occurs when *could* expresses 'root possibility', but there are interesting cases where *could* expresses 'suggestion' (16):

- (16) We **could** caretake, see that no one squats. (PDJ3.1.6.s15)
Vi **kan** holde den i orden, passe på at ingen slår seg ned der.

The categories adverb and modal + adverb are of minor importance as correspondences to *could*. It may, however, be worth noting that none of the correspondences of *can* belong to these categories.

The zero correspondences of *could* resemble those of *can* in that they typically occur where the main verb is a verb of perception or cognition (17):

- (17) Inside **could be seen** a kind of outer hall, an orangery with bay trees and lilies in tubs on the mottled white marble floor. (RR1.3.s143)
Innenfor **så** man en slags ytre hall, et oransjeri med laurbærbusker og liljer i kar på det melerte, hvite marmorgulvet.

They differ in that the vast majority are found in positive environments, and in that there are nearly as many instances of loss of modality where *could* denotes 'root possibility' as where it denotes 'ability'.

Other categories include lexical verb (*klarte*, *greide* and *rakk*) (18) and modal + modal (*skulle kunne*) (19):

- (18) Not even Paul, I think, **could** appreciate the urgency with which I had allowed the idea to take possession of me. (ABR1.1.1.s71)
Selv ikke Paul, tror jeg, **klarte** å fatte hvor sterkt jeg hadde latt denne tanken få taket på meg.
- (19) How **could** he ever eat again? (ST1.1.9.s184)
Hvordan **skulle** han **kunne** få ned en matbit igjen?

4.3 Correspondences of *may*

The most frequent single correspondence of *may* is *kanskje*, which is the only item in the adverb category. All instances of *may* in this group express 'epistemic possibility' (20):

- (20) You **may** not know about this one: it 's a modern sin. (FW1.1.s291)
Du kjenner **kanskje** ikke til den, det er en moderne synd.

The items in the modal verb category are *kan*, *må*, *får* and *tør*. *Kan* is the most frequent item in this group (25 of the 38 per cent), and corresponds to *may* expressing ‘epistemic possibility’ (21) and, less frequently, ‘root possibility’, ‘permission’ and ‘suggestion’:

- (21) Only a little; but it **may** be the thin edge of the wedge, the crack in the wall that will open, later, onto what? (MA1.1.2.s55)
Litt bare; men det **kan** være begynnelsen, sprekken i muren som siden åpner seg, mot hva?

The modals *må*, *får* and *tør* correspond to *may* expressing ‘permission’, as in (22):

- (22) ‘What’s wrong with watching the telly, **may** I ask?’ the father said. (RD1.2.s104)
«Hva er det for noe galt med å se på TV, om jeg **tør** spørre?» sa faren.

This use of *må* and *tør* is relatively rare in present-day Norwegian, and survives in a limited set of contexts (Faarlund et al 1997: 599).

The correspondences labelled ‘other categories’ are the instances of the modal + modal-combination *kan få*, which correspond to *may* in its ‘permission’ sense (23):

- (23) ‘**May** I come in?’ (ST1.1.6.s37)
«**Kan** jeg **få** komme inn?» spurte hun.

4.4 Correspondences of *might*

There is one correspondence in the category present tense modal: *kan*. The instances of *might* with this correspondence express (with one exception) ‘epistemic possibility’, as in (24):

- (24) Looking back, it **might** actually have helped that I was a bit blue. (JB1.3.s196)
Når jeg ser tilbake, **kan** det faktisk ha hjulpet at jeg var litt nedfor.

The majority of modals corresponding to *might* are the preterite forms *kunne*, *ville* and *skulle*, as in (25), (26) and (27) respectively:

- (25) No one considered that one **might** be open. (RR1.3.s139)
Ingen tenkte på at en av dem **kunne** stå åpen.
- (26) I think I **might** enjoy writing end-of-term reports for the stinkers in my class. (RD1.1.s18)
Jeg tror faktisk jeg **ville** likt å skrive meldinger hjem til foreldrene ved skoleårets slutt.
- (27) He only knew that in his anxious and over-concerned life his second greatest fear was that she **might** leave. (PDJ3.1.6.s91)
Han visste bare at hans nest største frykt i sitt bekymringsfylte liv var at hun **skulle** reise.

Kunne occurs more frequently than the other two (29.9 versus 4.3 and 3.0 per cent), and corresponds to *might* expressing ‘root’ as well as ‘epistemic possibility’. *Skulle* and *ville* almost exclusively correspond to epistemic *might*.

The category modal verb + adverb includes the items *kunne kanskje*, *kunne nok*, *kunne muligens* and *kunne like gjerne*. *Kanskje*, *muligens* and *nok* express the same modal meaning as *kunne*, and in these instances the two modal elements might be expected to reinforce each other:

- (28) Together with her dowry, Saskia brought to this promising bourgeois marriage a patrician social cachet that Rembrandt cherished and **might** not otherwise have attained. (JH1.3.1.s18)
Foruten medgiften tok Saskia med inn i dette lovende borgerlige ekteskapet en patrisisk sosial prestisje som Rembrandt satte pris på og som han **kanskje** ikke **kunne** ha oppnådd på annet vis.

(28) demonstrates, however, that *kunne kanskje* may be more than an expression of weaker possibility than either *kanskje* or *kunne* on their own. The combination is necessary to express the hypothetical element of *might*. Note that this category is not represented among the correspondences of *may* (cf also *can* and *could* above).

The adverb category consists of one correspondence, *kanskje*. In most of the instances the finite verb in the Norwegian version is marked for the preterite, as in (29):

- (29) For it had never, really, inevitably, been ‘for good’, even if I **might** have thought so. (ABR1.1.1.s222)
For det hadde aldri, egentlig, uunngåelig vært «for godt», selv om jeg **kanskje hadde** trodd det.

The correspondences in the ‘other’ category (*kunne komme til å* and *kom kanskje til å*) both contain KOMME TIL Å, which is the most neutral way of referring to future time in Norwegian (Lie 1991:71):

- (30) I told her we **might** be moving, and she said she’d ask her mom to see if I could stay with them until the school year ends. (TH1.2.s178)
Jeg sa at vi **kanskje kom til å** flytte, og hun sa at hun skulle spørre moren sin om jeg kunne bo hos dem inntil skoleåret er slutt.

The use of *kunne* (*kunne flytte*) would have indicated present possibility at the time of utterance.

4.5 Correspondences of *kan*

The majority (80 per cent) of the instances of *kan* in the material are rendered as *can* (31):

- (31) Du **kan** sikkert låne hår av Ruby. (LSC1.5.s76)
I’m sure you **can** borrow Ruby’s hair.

There are a few instances with *may* as correspondence, mainly in cases where *kan* expresses ‘epistemic possibility’ or ‘permission’, and also a couple of instances of *will’ll*.

The English past tense modals corresponding to *kan* are *could*, *might* and *would*, ie the preterite forms⁶ of those found in the present tense category.

In the category modal auxiliary equivalent, we find forms of BE ABLE TO, corresponding to *kan* expressing ‘ability’ (32):

- (32) Hvor lett hun må ha for å le, som **kan** le av en liten bemerkning om været! (KF1.1.5.s85)
What a gift for laughter she must have, **being able to** laugh at a little remark about the weather!

The instances of zero correspondence of *kan* differ from those of *can*. In some instances, the modal is replaced by another non-factive category, as in (33), where *kan* expressing 'permission' is rendered by an imperative construction:

- (33) Nå **kan** du vaske hendene dine, ikke søl med såpen. (BV2.1.1.s105)
Now **wash** your hands, and don't splash.

In other instances, however, the zero option truly results in a loss of modality, ie a factive sentence, as in (34):

- (34) Der er vilt i massevis og krigerne som kommer dit, **kan vinne** store seire over fienden. (SH1.1.8.s129)
There is game in abundance and the braves who go there **win** great victories over their enemies.

The remaining 1.2 per cent of the instances of *kan* have *know* as correspondence. In all these instances, *kan* is the only verb in the Norwegian sentence, and hence is not strictly an auxiliary at all:

- (35) Jeg forstår at hun **kan** lite eller ingenting engelsk. (TB1.2.s89)
I realize she **knows** very little English.

4.6 Correspondences of preterite *kunne*

The correspondences of *kunne* resemble those of *kan* to a remarkable degree. The modal verbs are *could* (74% of the instances), *would* and *might* (just over 5% and 7% respectively). *Could* corresponds to *kunne* in most of its meanings, but typically when it expresses 'root possibility' (36) and 'ability' (37). *Might* most often corresponds to *kunne* in its epistemic use (38). *Would* has a number of meanings, but 'occasional behaviour' is found most frequently (39):

- (36) Lente jeg meg langt nok ut og så den andre veien, **kunne** jeg få et glimt av pissoaret nedenfor Fagerborg kirke. (LSC2.3.s75)
If I leaned out far enough and looked the other way, I **could** get a glimpse of the urinals down by Fagerborg Church.

- (37) Han **kunne** egentlig ikke utstå Elie Wiesels sindige og kloke kommentarer, men han hadde gledet seg til å lese noe han egentlig ikke likte. (OEL1.1.s180)
 He really **could** not endure Elie Wiesel's careful and judicious comments, but he had been looking forward to reading something he did not really like.
- (38) Han **kunne** ha blitt henrette for det. (SL1.2.s90)
 He **might** have been executed for that.
- (39) Når det dunket ekstra lenge, **kunne** Maria si at det var da svært da, eller Jenny mumlet bevare meg vel. (BV1.3.s80)
 When the bumping went on for an especially long time, Maria **would** say that it was a bad business, or Jenny would mutter 'God preserve us.'

The category modal auxiliary equivalent consists of the instances of BE ABLE TO that correspond to *kunne*. All instances in this group express some degree of 'ability', and all except one (an infinitive) are in the preterite (40):

- (40) Plutselig går døren opp og en konstabel hinker ut, han **kunne** sikkert gå helt fint da han kom. (LSC1.4.s71)
 Suddenly the door opens and a policeman hobbles out. Surely he **was able to** walk just fine when he came in.

The instances of loss of modality involving *kunne*, like those involving *kan*, differ from those found for *can* and *could*. Loss of modality occurs more frequently with both 'epistemic' and 'root possibility' than with 'ability'. In some of the instances, like (41), there are other modal elements in the sentence, but there are also instances where this is not the case (42):

- (41) På den annen side var hun gravid i tredje måned, og **det var mulig** at det **kunne** ha en slags forbindelse med mordet, som etter politiets oppfatning var uvanlig brutalt. (FC1.2.s139)
 On the other hand, she was three months' pregnant, and **possibly** that had some connection with the murder, which in the opinion of the police was unusually brutal.

- (42) Jeg **kunne** trenge... (GS1.3.s27)
I need...

The remaining correspondences (other categories) are *would be able to* and *knew*. The first of these are similar to the instances of *was able to*, but carry an element of hypothetical meaning. The instances of *knew* all correspond to *kunne* functioning as the only verb in the sentence (43):

- (43) Ja, han **kunne** et utall av oppskrifter på desserter og syltetøy som han hadde lært ved hoffet. (SL1.2.s113)
Yes, he **knew** dozens of recipes for desserts and preserves, he had learned them at court

4.7 Comparison English – Norwegian, Norwegian – English

There are some noticeable differences between English and Norwegian correspondences. The categories adverb and modal + adverb are found in Norwegian translations only, and they are particularly frequent as correspondences of *may* and *might* expressing ‘epistemic possibility’. The frequency of modal corresponding to modal is higher in the English translations than in the Norwegian ones, close to 90 per cent for *can* and *could* versus about 70 per cent for *kan* and *kunne*.

As seen above, *may* and *might* have relatively low frequencies of modals as correspondences. The reasons for this should be apparent from Table 2, which shows the frequencies of modal verb corresponding to modal verb according to the meaning expressed by the original:

Table 2: Percentages of the instances that have been translated by the nearest formal equivalent, (figures in brackets include all Norwegian modals)

	epistemic poss.	root poss.	ability	permission
English transl.	72.2	89.7	88.6	74.4
Norwegian transl.	49.5 (54.7)	73 (77.6)	61.7 (62.3)	48.6 (65.7)

Table 2 shows that the forms of KUNNE account for just half of the instances of the English epistemic modals in the material. Even if all

the Norwegian modals corresponding to this meaning are included, the percentage is still only 55 compared with 72 in the English translations. It thus appears that categories other than modal verb, particularly adverb and modal verb + adverb, play an important role in the expression of epistemic possibility in Norwegian. The gap between English and Norwegian in the category 'ability' reflects the tendency mentioned earlier to loss of modality when *can* and *could* occur with verbs of perception and cognition. The last column shows that, in Norwegian, 'permission' is quite frequently expressed by a modal other than KUNNE – particularly FÅ:

- (44) She was there and she **couldn't** go home. (TH1.5.s266)
Hun var der, og så **fikk** hun **ikke** gå hjem.

The combination *kunne få* (cf (23) above) is also a common means of expressing this meaning.

In the category zero correspondences, too, there are notable differences both between the correspondences of *can/could* and *may/might* and between correspondences of English and Norwegian originals. For *may* and *might* zero correspondence does not occur. For *can* and *could*, it is the second most frequent category. The majority of the instances of loss of modality with *can* and *could* are instances of the aspectual use of these two modals. Among the instances of loss of modality involving *kan* and *kunne*, it is hard to find any pattern. The distribution seems to be random, depending more on translation strategies than on linguistic norms.

The direction of tense shift, where it occurs, is also different in the two parts of the material. In Norwegian translations there are instances of present tense modal corresponding to English past tense modal, whereas in the English translations there are no instances of tense shift in this direction. Rather, there are instances of English past tense modal corresponding to Norwegian present tense modal. The different tense choices may be a result of different politeness strategies in the two languages.

5 Conclusion

Most of the differences between English and Norwegian found in the corpus material may be results of the differing degrees of grammaticalisation of the two sets of modals, the Norwegian modals being less

grammaticalised than the English ones. The difference in status is particularly noticeable in sentences like (35) and (43), where KUNNE functions as a main verb. This ability to function as the only verb in the sentence is a feature shared by all the central Norwegian modals. The difference in degree of grammaticalisation may account for the fact that Norwegian modals are less frequent than the English ones, particularly in epistemic uses where they frequently are supported by an adverb, and the adverb sometimes replaces the modal altogether. The difference in grammaticalisation is also reflected in the fact that Norwegian modals do not easily express future time. We thus find correspondences like the one in (30), where *kom til å* is added as a future marker.

Because of the limited size of the material and the facts that all the texts are fiction texts and that half of the material is translated, there is a need for caution when it comes to drawing conclusions. There are strong indications, however, that English and Norwegian differ considerably in the distribution of expressions of possibility. As regards the question asked at the beginning, it seems that Norwegian expresses just as many nuances of modal meanings as English does, but with different means.

These results do, of course, need to be tested against a material consisting of original texts in both languages. Another factor that must be taken into consideration is whether the original sentences contain modal elements other than the modal verbs; this was disregarded in the present study, which focussed on the modal verbs. Hence I did not look at the number of original sentences containing combinations of modal verb and adverb, and there is no reason to believe that expressions like *might perhaps* and *could possibly* do not occur in English in the same way as *kunne kanskje* does in Norwegian.

Notes

- 1 This article is based on my MA thesis (Løken 1996). The work on this project was supported by a grant from the Norwegian Research Council.
- 2 For a list of the texts used, see Appendix.
- 3 In the examples from the corpus the original text is given first, followed by the translation. For an explanation of the text codes, see Appendix.

- 4 The non-finite forms of KUNNE will be disregarded in the present discussion.
- 5 The term ‘correspondence’ rather than ‘equivalent’ is used to refer to the forms chosen by the translators in order to emphasise that the relationship is on the parole level and that no judgement is made as to the adequacy of the translations.
- 6 It is important to bear in mind that ‘preterite form’ here does not necessarily imply that the forms have past tense meaning.

References

- Coates, Jennifer. 1983. *The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries*. London: Croom Helm.
- Faarlund, Jan Terje, Svein Lie and Kjell Ivar Vannebo. 1997. *Norsk referansegrammatikk*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Johansson, Stig and Knut Hofland. 1994. Towards an English–Norwegian Parallel Corpus. In U. Fries, G. Tottie and P. Schneider (eds) *Creating and Using English Language Corpora*. Amsterdam and Atlanta, GA: Rodopi. 25-37.
- Johansson, Stig, Jarle Ebeling and Knut Hofland. 1996. Coding and Aligning the English – Norwegian Parallel Corpus. In K. Aijmer, B. Altenberg and M. Johansson (eds) *Languages in Contrast*. Lund Studies in English 88. Lund: Lund University Press, 87–112.
- Lie, Svein. 1991. *Innføring i norsk syntaks*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Løken, Berit. Expressing Possibility in English and Norwegian. Unpublished *hovedfag* thesis. Department of British and American Studies, University of Oslo.

Appendix: List of texts

English original, Norwegian translation

- MA1 Atwood, Margaret (Gjelsvik, Inger) *Cat's Eye* / *Katteøyet*.
- JB1 Barnes, Julian (Ofstad, Knut) *Talking It Over* / *En trekanthistorie*.
- ABR1 Brink, André (Malde, Per) *The Wall of the Plague* / *Pestens mur*.
- AB1 Brookner, Anita (Jahr, Mette-Cathrine) *Latecomers* / *Etternølere*.
- RD1 Dahl, Roald (Dahl, Tor Edvin) *Matilda* / *Matilda*.
- LD1 Deighton, Len (Hoff, Truls) *Berlin Game* / *Høyt spill i Berlin*.
- DF1 Francis, Dick (Kolstad, Henning) *Straight* / *Dødelig arv*.
- NG1 Gordimer, Nadine (Bang, Karin) *My Son's Story* / *Min sønns historie*.
- TH1 Hayden, Torey (Nergaard, Jan) *The Sunflower Forest* / *Solsikkeskogen*.
- JH1 Heller, Joseph (Risvik, Kari og Kjell) *Picture This* / *Se det*.
- PDJ3 James, P.D. (Greiff, Aud) *Devices and Desires* / *Intriger og begjær*.
- DL1 Lessing, Doris (Roald, Bodil) *The Fifth Child* / *Det femte barnet*.
- DL2 Lessing, Doris (Halling, Kia) *The Good Terrorist* / *Den gode terroristen*.
- RR1 Rendell, Ruth (Tønnesen, Birgit) *Kissing the Gunner's Daughter* / *Brent barn*.
- ST1 Townsend, Sue (Larsen, Dag Heyerdahl) *The Queen and I* / *Dronninga og Jeg*.
- AT1 Tyler, Anne (Roald, Bodil) *The Accidental Tourist* / *Tilfeldig turist*.
- FW1 Weldon, Fay (Aase, Wivi) *The Heart of the Country* / *Landets hjerte*.

Norwegian original, English translation

- KA1 Askildsen, Kjell (Lyngstad, Sverre) *En plutselig frigjørnede tanke / A Sudden Liberating Thought.*
- TB1 Brekke, Toril (Born, Anne) *Jakarandablomsten / The Jacaranda Flower.*
- FC1 Carling, Finn (Muinzer, Louis A.) *Under aftenhimmelen / Under the Evening Sky.*
- LSC2 Christensen, Lars Saabye (Nordby, Steven Michael) *Jokeren / The Joker.*
- LSC1 Christensen, Lars Saabye (Nordby, Steven Michael) *Herman / Herman.*
- KF1 Faldbakken, Knut (Lyngstad, Sverre) *Adams dagbok / Adam's Diary.*
- THA1 Haugen, Tormod (Jacobs, David R.) *Zeppelin / Zeppelin.*
- TTH1 Hauger, Torill Thorstad (Paulsen, Marlys Wick) *Røvet av vikinger / Captured by the Vikings.*
- SH1 Holmås, Stig (Born, Anne) *Tordensønnen / Son-of-Thunder.*
- SL1 Lie, Sissel (Born, Anne) *Løvens hjerte / Lion's Heart.*
- OEL1 Lønn, Øystein (McDuff, David) *Tom Rebers siste retrett / Tom Reber's Last Retreat.*
- CL1 Løveid, Cecilie (Christensen, Nadie) *Sug / Sea Swell.*
- MN1 Newth, Mette (Nunally, Tiina & Murray, Steve) *Bortførelsen / The Abduction.*
- GS1 Staalesen, Gunnar (McDuff, David) *I mørket er alle ulver grå / At Night All Wolves Are Grey.*
- BV1 Vik, Bjørg (McDuff, David) *En håndfull lengsel / Out of Season and Other Stories.*
- BV2 Vik, Bjørg (Garton, Janet) *Kvinneakvariet / An Aquarium of Women.*
- HW1 Wassmo, Herbjørg (Simpson, Allen) *Huset med den blinde glassveranda / The House With the Blind Glass Windows*

