

Attitudes towards indirect translation in Finland and translators' strategies: compilative and collaborative translation

Laura Ivaska and Outi Paloposki
Department of English, University of Turku, Finland
*Email: laura.ivaska@utu.fi

In Finland, indirect translation (ITr) played an important role as early as the sixteenth century in the formation of literary language. In the late nineteenth century, first signs of critics condemning ITr began to appear. The stigma of ITr and the focus on the original have cast into obscurity the agency of translators and publisher, but archival material since the nineteenth century shows that publishers gave a free hand to translators doing ITr, who resorted to compilative translation.

Kyllikki Villa, an important mediating agent and a translator of Modern Greek literature into Finnish during the second half of the twentieth century discussed ITr as both translator and critic. Her archival material offers a rich insight into how her attitude towards ITr changed with her role: as a critic, she was wary of ITr; as a translator, she used and advocated compilative and collaborative translation as strategies for dealing with ITr.

Keywords: indirect translation; compilative translation; collaborative translation; agency; archival material; paratexts

Introduction

Indirect translation (ITr)¹ has been the subject of increased scholarly attention of late, as evidenced, for example, by the recent special issue of *Translation Studies*. In the present article, we take our lead from the rich and promising perspectives within that volume and the editors' recommendation to bring forth findings from different contexts that can then be elaborated into general hypotheses about ITr (Assis Rosa, Pięta and Maia 2017, 127). We map the history of ITr and attitudes towards it in Finland, after which we add a new voice to the discussion, that of the "indirect" translator. We examine the thoughts and attitudes about ITr expressed by translators in dialogue with other agents of literary translation, namely publishers and critics. In the latter part of the article we shed light on translatorial agency in ITr through the hitherto unexploited archives of the Finnish translator, literary critic and author Kyllikki Villa (1928–2010), who wrote about ITr both as a literary critic and as a translator, demonstrating clearly how attitudes towards ITr change with point of view. We thus combine socio-historical and individual perspectives (Assis Rosa, Pięta and Maia 2017, 125; Marin-Lacarta 2017, 145).

If translators are sometimes considered to be “in-between” or “meddling”, this is all the more a concern for indirect translators, as they are seen as further removed from the ultimate source text (ST), and so the stigmatizing discourse may be even more damning. As Alvstad (2017) shows, ITr has been a controversial topic, not just among practitioners and readers but among researchers as well. Perspectives on ITr range from it being “evil” (Radó 1975) and “a major source of deviations” (Dollerup 2000, 23) to its role as an important means of gaining access to otherwise inaccessible texts (e.g. Hekkanen 2014; Alvstad 2017), especially when dealing with languages of lesser diffusion (e.g. Pięta 2012; Ringmar 2007; Pokorn 2013; Leppänen 2013). However, the two views—one focusing on the textual level of ITr and the other on the accessibility of texts in different languages—are not necessarily compatible, and sometimes it is difficult to distinguish between opinions and research findings. In our data, it is translators who focus on questions of availability, whereas the negative claims concerning the textual level seem to come more from other agents of translation.

A new way of conceptualizing the degree of derivation in ITr is presented by Hadley (2017) who calls it the “concatenation effect”. A meta-study comparing three cases by different scholars and involving different SLs and TLs, his article develops the idea of ITr tending to move further away from the original. The hypothesis calls for more data from different situations. Studying the wide variety of different textual strategies in ITr, some of which may actually be used to preempt criticism, might be a way to encompass both textuality and accessibility. We discuss collaborative and compilative ITr as potential ways to diminish the proposed concatenation effect.

The decision to collaborate or to use more than one ST seems to come directly from translators dealing with ITr, which highlights their agency. Thus, we draw on the framework of agency studies in translation (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010) and, more specifically, on paratexts (Genette 1991) as a window on agency in translation. Agency is defined as “willingness and ability to act” (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010, 6), which, to us, characterizes the translators’, critics’ and publishers’ ways of voicing their ideas and thus influencing attitudes on indirectness.

The agentive, translator-centered view is also important in connection with Alvstad’s (2017) study on the framing of ITr. Alvstad’s account of the collaborative effort in translating literature from the Indian sub-continent into Swedish indirectly can, perhaps, be seen as a way to manage audience reactions to ITr, and to preempt some of the criticism towards it. In our

case, Villa's discourse may similarly have been intended to fend off criticism. Moreover, her strategies for dealing with ITr are the same as those discussed in Alvstad's article: collaboration and the use of multiple sources.

Research material

Our material consists of data drawn mostly from translators' archives. Although an "indispensable resource for the investigation of the conditions, working practices and identity of translators and for the study of their interaction with other participants in the translation process" (Munday 2014, 64), archives have not, as yet, been fully exploited in the study of ITr. This is partly due to limited access to archival data (Marin-Lacarta 2017, 141; Munday 2014, 71–72). We have been fortunate in our research, as there is ample material available in translators' archives in Finland. Kyllikki Villa (1928–2010), especially, left a plethora of archival material behind: manuscripts, letters, photographs, newspaper clippings, as well as video and audio recordings relating to her career as author, translator and journalist. The Villa Archives, housed at the Finnish Literature Society in Helsinki, yield rich and varied information on ITr, among other issues.

Through Villa's archival documents, the connection between translation practice and translation discourse becomes manifest: the almost simultaneous commentary she provides on her work gives us an account of the practice of ITr and how she—in her various roles—reacted to demands or opinions about it.

ITr in nineteenth- and twentieth-century Finland

In Finland, the practice of ITr has followed the patterns established elsewhere (e.g. Ellis 2008, 2; Montgomery 2000; Toury 2012, 168–172). In the sixteenth century, ITr played an important role in the emergence of the Finnish literary language. One of the first books published in Finnish was Mikael Agricola's 1548 translation of the Bible, based on six versions of the Bible in four different languages (Itkonen-Kaila 1997). Translating—directly and indirectly—earned Agricola the honor of being called the father of written Finnish. The second wave of increased translation activity including ITr was the nineteenth century, the heyday of Romanticism and nationalism, during which the Finnish literary language was established.

The indirectness of nineteenth-century Finnish translations is not marked bibliographically. Often there is no mention of the translational status of the text, or even of the original author.

This lack of bibliographical information may sound astounding to today's readers, but standardization of cataloguing and book information was only introduced gradually throughout the nineteenth century, and bibliographical information may be incomplete or inaccurate even today. It has been suggested that hiding the indirect nature of translations may be a sign that they were accorded inferior status (Marin-Lacarta 2017, 135; 140), but the lack of information may also be a sign that indirectness was non-marked and default. When bibliographical data are incomplete, other tools need to be used to determine ITr, such as information on language teaching and language skills, on book imports and sales, and textual comparison.

In the nineteenth century, important works of literature spread across Europe in ITr. For example, the Hungarian poet Sándor Petőfi was translated into English, French and Swedish through Károly Kertbeny's German versions (Wichmann 2015, 68); Serbian folk poems spread into several languages through Herder's German versions; and the stories of the *Thousand and One Nights* travelled—as they still do—across Europe through ITr (Paloposki 2003). Finland was no exception, and literature was imported mainly through German and Swedish newspapers, books and series.

Finland had previously been part of Sweden, and Swedish was still the main literary language and the mother tongue of most of the literati even after annexation to Russia in 1809. Swedish translation practice provided a readily available model in book choices and textual strategies, but also in its acceptance of indirectness.

The default languages in education and in translation were Latin, Classical Greek, Swedish and German, which is reflected in the MLs used and confirmed by textual comparison. The first Finnish Shakespeare rendition, *Ruunulinna (Macbeth)*, bears traces of both Schiller's German and Geijer's Swedish translations of the play (Donner 1950, 7–8; Paloposki 1998, 315). The first *Robinson Crusoe* followed a Swedish version based on a German adaptation (Taivalkoski-Shilov 2015, 63). Alexandre Dumas's *Wilhelm Tell* was translated through the Swedish version. The same applies to non-fiction: Benjamin Franklin's *Poor Richard's Almanac* and Bunyan's *The Pilgrim's Progress* both appeared in several ITr's during the century (Paloposki 2013; Lauerma 2012). Religious literature was the most translated genre until the mid-nineteenth century, and it, too, was largely the result of ITr (Laine 2000).

The first direct translations of English and French originals started to appear during the second half of the nineteenth century, but still a number of works, from these and other languages—*Comte de Monte Cristo*, *Les Misérables*, *The Vicar of Wakefield*, *Uncle Tom's Cabin*, *Don Quijote*, *Gulliver's Travels*—and a large number of non-fiction and religious books were translated through MLs well into the twentieth century.

Today, it is especially, though not exclusively, literature from languages of lesser diffusion that is translated into Finnish indirectly. The MLs have included at least French (for Brazilian Portuguese, Romanian and Turkish), Spanish (for Basque), Swedish (for Turkish), and English (for Yiddish and Georgian) (Riikonen 2007a). Compilative translations have also been identified: for example, the poems by the Turkish Nazim Hikmet were translated by comparing their German, English and Estonian translations (Riikonen 2007a). Riikonen (2007a) contends that ITr takes place most likely because of a lack of translators who can translate from the original languages, whereas Leppänen (2013, 54–55) suggests that a sudden increase in the demand for translations from a less translated language (her case study is Japanese) may lead to a (temporary) shortage in translators.

ITr enters the discussion

Despite the large number of texts translated indirectly in Finland during the early nineteenth century, we have found no discussion concerning ITr, nor any apparent desire for direct translating expressed in newspaper reviews and articles of the period. This finding seems to suggest that indirectness was not stigmatized. However, halfway into the century, comments on indirectness started to appear in literary reviews and other texts. This change coincided with an increased focus on authors' style and originality, coupled with the wider language skills of new and potential translators.

The first remark about ITr that we have been able to locate appeared in the minutes of the meeting of the Finnish Literature Society on December 7, 1859 (*Suomi* 1860, 312–314). The Society had taken a lead role in Finnish-language publishing and translating and, arguing that ITr would “significantly lessen” the value of the book, the Society rejected a manuscript of John Abbott's *The Path of Peace* translated indirectly via Swedish. In issuing guidelines for translating in 1870, the Society recommended that the translation respect the original (*Suomi* 1876, 300). ITr was not explicitly mentioned, but “respecting the original” may have meant translating directly.

Apart from the Finnish Literature Society, there are hardly any preserved records of manuscript rejection or acceptance from nineteenth-century publishers. Thus, we need other sources to get a clearer picture of attitudes towards ITr. Critical reviews started to appear in newspapers and journals towards the end of the century. For example, a new Bunyan translation via Swedish by B. Lagus was commented upon in 1880 in the literary journal *Kirjallinen Kuukauslehti* by Yrjö Koskinen, who stated ironically that had Bunyan written a guidebook on cheese-making, it would not matter how it was translated, but with literary works of art the translator must understand the writer's language. Further criticisms, such as reprimanding the translator for not being honest enough to let it be known that the translation was indirect, were voiced in another literary journal, *Valvoja*, on several occasions (see Riikonen 2007b, 430–431; Tuominen 2004, 358). The non-markedness of ITr, which may earlier have been a sign of a default practice, now began to draw criticism: hidden ITr irritated critics and made them think there was something wrong in the text. It needs to be remembered here, too, that this was the time when bibliographical standardization was increasing.

Translating directly sometimes drew praise from critics, as in August Ahlqvist's review in *Kieletär* (1871) of Julius Krohn's translation in the same year of Sir Walter Scott's *Ivanhoe*. Likewise, Helmi Setälä thanked Maila Talvio for translating two works by Henryk Sienkiewicz directly from Polish (*Valvoja* 1901). Perhaps this very review gave the Finnish publisher of Sienkiewicz's *Quo Vadis* the idea to interrupt Otto Joutsen's ITr after only about twenty pages and give the work to Talvio who could translate directly from Polish (letter from Joutsen to WSOY, December 10, 1901).

Translators, too, commented on indirectness. K. F. Ridderström, who translated the Hungarian poet Petőfi into Swedish in Finland in 1879, wrote in his preface that the translation was made through German and that he understood that some people might find the indirectness unforgivable (Wichmann 2015, 68–70). Ridderström tried to preempt this criticism by stating that directness in poetry is not as important as in prose translation: poetry is not about words or metrics but about the general feeling, and if the translator does not succeed in transmitting the feeling, even a direct translation is poor. In other words, what Ridderström valued most was to be qualified for the translating task (poetically, presumably). These arguments notwithstanding, Ridderström was criticized for the indirectness—the criticism, however, hardly ever spelled out exactly why indirectness was considered negative. The underlying idea of the original may have been at play here (cf. especially comments by the Finnish Literature Society and Yrjö-Koskinen above).

Translators' agency and compilative translations

As Ridderström's preface exemplifies, translators seemed to be aware of the possible problems with ITr. One strategy they employed in addressing the situation was compilative translation. For example, Karl Gustaf Samuli Suomalainen's extensive correspondence with his publishers gives information about books he translated using several versions, both originals and translations, including Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe*, Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* and Verne's *L'Île mystérieuse*. The publisher would help him acquire copies of the books he needed.

Similarly, Otto Joutsen's letters to the publisher in 1915, when he was translating Jules Verne's *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* into Finnish, reveal that he initially used an English translation as his ST, but soon concluded that it was best to make a compilative translation using a Swedish translation alongside the English one. The main reason was that he wanted to ascertain the accuracy of measurements, important for the plot: metric units had been converted and rounded to English measurements in the English translation. He was unable to obtain a copy of the French original, but the publisher helped him acquire the Swedish translation.

As these cases demonstrate, publishers at times provided translators with MTs, either spontaneously or when asked. Sometimes the publisher might even have had prior inside information on the quality of the MTs. Correspondence between the publishing house WSOY and translator Juho Tervonen in 1928 reveals that when the publisher first asked Tervonen to translate Ivan Naživin's book Дедушка Толстой (1911) on Tolstoy, they provided him with the Swedish translation, *Cor ardens* (1927), promising to send a Russian version as soon as possible. Later, the publisher informed Tervonen not only that they would mail him the Russian manuscript, but also that they had heard from the author that the Swedish translation deviated from the original in some places. The publisher did not give an opinion on the matter, and the decision about which version to follow was left to the translator.

The cases of Tervonen, Joutsen and Suomalainen suggest that translators and publishers were aware of the complications of ITr. In all cases, ultimately the choice of ST/MT(s) was left to the translators, who sometimes resorted to compilative translation even though it would increase their workload. It was thus part of the translators' agency to act as they saw fit in these situations. The reasons behind this agentic action can only be guessed: To please the

publisher and to get more work? To produce a satisfying text? To do their best? All of these, most likely.

As for contemporary practices, Petra Niiranen found in her 2016 master's thesis that nowadays publishing houses differ in their stances towards ITr. While some publishers prefer direct translation, others regard ITr as the only feasible way to translate otherwise inaccessible literature. However, some of the publishers interviewed also suggested that ITr might be acceptable if done compilatively or in collaboration with someone who knows the ultimate SL. Previous studies and experience in translation seemed—as one might expect—to have had an influence on some publishers' opinions as one of Niiranen's (2016, 30) informants disclosed: “During my studies a horror towards ITr was planted and I shudder even to think about it. [...] We make quality books [...] Quality always suffers if translating indirectly. We are not ready for that” (our translation).

In our data publishers, critics and translators all expressed their opinions on ITr. Thus far, it seems that publishers are indifferent regarding which ST/MT(s) translators use—unless they have training in TS, in which case they may denounce ITr, which suggests that TS has normative authority—whereas critics are dubious about whether ITr is a good practice, and translators find strategies to overcome the pitfalls of translating indirectly, also trying to preempt some of the criticism they know they will face. Such diversity in attitudes towards ITr can also be detected in our case study, which focuses on how Kyllikki Villa wrote about ITr depending whether she was in her role as reader, translator or literary critic.

Translator Kyllikki Villa and ITr's from Modern Greek to Finnish

Translation from Modern Greek to Finnish presents an opportunity to study ITr and also illustrates one of the most often-cited contexts for ITr, as both are languages of lesser diffusion. A central figure in this language pair, especially around the 1960s, was translator, author and literary critic Kyllikki Villa. She wrote reports on Greek literature for publishers, gave speeches, reviewed translations, wrote in newspapers, and published travel stories from her trips to Greece. In her writings, she often touched upon indirectness in Finnish translations of Modern Greek literature, and she translated two novels from Modern Greek herself, indirectly (Prevelakis 1963; Kazantzakis 1967). Her role as a cultural ambassador for Modern Greek literature in Finland, coupled with her professional translating career (some 200 translations from a number of languages) highlight her agentive position. Villa knew many languages—Scandinavian languages, German, French, Spanish and English (Tuusvuori 2004,

64)—and some Modern Greek, too, albeit not well enough to translate directly (Villa and Villa 2013, 53). However, she collaborated with other people and made compilative translations to make up for some of the shortcomings of ITr.

We analyse Kyllikki Villa’s writings on ITr in the context of Finnish translations of Modern Greek literature. The overall translation figures in this language pair are rather low: the Finnish National Bibliography database Fennica (28 July 2017) reports 135 published works from Greek to Finnish, a figure that includes also some reprints and Ancient Greek works. For our purposes, the list has been narrowed down to prose translations from Modern Greek into Finnish and compared with a list compiled by the Finnish Institute at Athens (2015). The result is twenty-two translations published between 1952 and 2004.

The SL/ML(s) for thirteen of the twenty-two books can be gleaned from bibliographic information: there are two direct translations and eleven indirect, two of which compilative. No SL is mentioned for nine books. However, as Marin-Lacarta (2017) has also found, bibliographic information cannot be taken at face value, and thus a research project uncovering the SL/ML(s) with the help of paratexts is being carried out by Ivaska (see Table 1 for results to date). Thus far, the ST(s) for four more translations have been determined, and two more have been identified as compilative (see also Ivaska 2016). The results will be complemented and confirmed through textual comparison. However, these preliminary findings already highlight the unreliability of bibliographic information regarding the SL(s) of (indirect) translations.

Table 1

Source or Mediating Language(s)	Number of translations according to Fennica	Number of translations according to ongoing research
Direct from Modern Greek	2	5
SL/ML not mentioned/unknown	9	5
Indirect (of which compilative)	11 (2)	12 (4)
<i>French</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>German</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>English</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Swedish</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Swedish and German</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>French, Modern Greek, and English</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>1</i>
<i>Danish, German, and Modern Greek</i>	–	<i>1</i>

Table 1. The source and mediating languages of Finnish prose literature translations from Modern Greek. Based on bibliographic information from Fennica and ongoing research by Ivaska.

Kyllikki Villa as a cultural ambassador: thoughts on ITr

Villa was an admirer and active mediator of Greek literature even before she began translating it. She seemed wary of ITr, but without condemning it—perhaps because it was the only means of getting Modern Greek literature translated into Finnish. For example, in her notes for a public speech on Greek literature dated April 20, 1955 (Villa Archives), when two Finnish ITr's of Kazantzakis's works had been published, Villa commented: "It has been said of Kazantzakis's style that it is very melodic, nuanced, and compact. It must be, because something of it is visible even in translations of translations" (our translation). The comment is intriguing: there is an underlying suggestion that something of the author's style may get lost in ITr, while at the same time something stays true to it. It is as though Villa is sitting on the fence.

In a manuscript, perhaps notes for a public speech, on Modern Greek authors (dated November 30, 1963; Villa Archives), Villa again touches upon indirectness:

Sometimes I stop perplexed and also a little horrified to think what happens to a book when it is translated from the original language into another language, and thence even into a third language. Notwithstanding or perhaps because of the fact that I have done it myself... (our translation)

However, she does herself read Greek prose in ITr, because, "then again, have these imperfect translations not conveyed something of the spirit and ambience of these great works?" (ibid; our translation). Again, there is zigzagging between being apologetic and being defensive, perhaps as a preemptive response to criticism—Villa had been producing ITr's since the beginning of her translation career and her first ITr from Greek was published in 1963, the same year she made these comments.

Much later in her career, Villa voiced her frustration with the fact that Modern Greek literature was being translated indirectly into Finnish. In an interview in the Finnish journal *Suomen kuvalehti* on August 19, 1983, Villa lamented that *Tilinteko El Grecolle* (1966, tr. Aarno Peromies; original *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο*, 1961), translated via German, lacked one third of the content. Villa added that she had hoped that there would, by this time, be translators who could translate directly from Greek. After all, thirty years had passed since Modern Greek literature was introduced to Finnish readers. For her, ITr may have been an interim solution.

As a critic, Villa's stance towards ITr seems even more negative. In a 1968 literary review of two novels translated indirectly, she discussed how she found ITr "always unfortunate". She

may have been influenced by earlier critics. For example, in *Kuluttaja* 48/1957, Kauko Kula commented on the indirectness of Kazantzakis's *Viimeinen kiusaus* (1957; original *Ο τελευταίος πειρασμός*, 1955), translated by Elvi Sinervo, by stating that it would “always be beneficial” if such high-class works were translated from the original, although he admitted that the translation is good both stylistically and with regards to word choices. Villa, too, balanced her negative comment with another statement, which she made from the point of view of a translator:

I know from my own experience that when comparing two translations one always exposes surprising, even unbelievable discrepancies (because every translator makes mistakes). In such cases it is good if one can, for example, try and read the original with the help of a dictionary or ask help from someone who knows the language. (Villa 1968; our translation.)

Unlike many other critics, Villa did not demand direct translations, but instead proposed two strategies—compilative and collaborative translation—which she also employed herself when translating Greek literature.

Kyllikki Villa and strategies for ITr: compilative and collaborative translation

Villa's first translation from Greek was Pandelis Prevelakis's *Ikuinen aurinko* (1963; original *Ο ήλιος του θανάτου*, 1959). According to bibliographic information, the novel is translated from German. However, in a newspaper article Villa (11 November 1966) mentions that she also used the Danish translation as a source and that she had been corresponding with the author in order to clarify, for example, some names of plants that she could not find in dictionaries. It transpires elsewhere (*Suomen kuvalehti*, October 20, 1993) that Villa would collaborate with authors even when translating directly to minimize the number of possible errors.

The second Greek work that Villa translated was Nikos Kazantzakis's *Veljesviha* (1967; original *Οι αδερφοφάδες*, 1963 [posthumous]). Bibliographic information marks it as a compilative translation, listing French, Modern Greek and English as the SLs. Additional evidence of the translation's SLs/MLs, and how they were used, can be found in Villa's archives. In September 1966, Villa wrote an enthusiastic report on the book for the publishing house Tammi, recommending its translation (Villa Archives). The report was based on the French translation *Les frères ennemis*. Similarly, in the publishing contract, signed October 19, 1966 (Villa Archives), it is the French version that is mentioned, suggesting that French was here Villa's primary SL/ML.

Furthermore, in a grant application to the Finnish Ministry of Education that Villa filed on September 15, 1967 (Villa Archives), after she had finished the translation, she disclosed having translated *Veljesviha* by comparing the French and American translations to the Greek original. She also mentioned that during the translation process she corresponded with Eleni Kazantzaki, Nikos Kazantzakis's widow, and with his close friend Pandelis Prevelakis, the author whose novel Villa had also translated in 1963.² From the grant application it further transpires that for Villa, compilative translation entailed extra work: she justified her need for a grant by writing that the 3,000 Finnish Marks that the publishing house had paid her for *Veljesviha* was not a “terribly large sum” for four months of compilative and collaborative translation. In an interview with Hilikka Lippu from 1987 (AB3040, 25, Villa Archives), Villa disclosed that most likely it would not have been possible to translate “more difficult” books without grants—perhaps referring to the fact that she would sometimes have recourse to compilative and/or collaborative translation, which is more time-consuming.

Villa, however, went the extra mile, presumably because she wanted her translation to do justice to an author she admired. Interestingly, at least two critics paid attention to the compilative nature of *Veljesviha*. In a review published in *Kansan uutiset* on 30 September 1967, the critic writes: “the work of the translator is smooth and clear; however, perhaps due to the multiple sources, sometimes somewhat sterile” (our translation). Another critic in *Vihuri* 2, 1968 is perhaps more positive, stating that the translation is well executed and noting that it is based on two sources as well as the original. Neither of the reviews criticizes indirectness as such, perhaps because it is openly acknowledged in the publication.

Looking back at her career in circa 1977, Villa seems to have had a pragmatic attitude towards her own ITr. In a manuscript entitled “Suomentajan työstäni” (Thoughts on my career as a translator; Villa Archives), she wrote that in the 1940s, when still a student at the University of Turku, she translated indirectly through Swedish, and that she did so “ruthlessly”. According to Villa, the publishing company Nide had commissioned translations from the Swedish versions of works by authors such as Dumas, Agatha Christie, Kipling, and Herczeg, and “a student translating to keep body and soul together did not have a chance to moralize or to choose” (our translation). In other words, Villa translated (indirectly) to make a living.

Nonetheless, this sentiment about ITr seems to have stuck with her to the degree that she still felt the need to explain the issue thirty years later. Changes in norms and attitudes towards ITr

may have created the need to explain past actions that contemporary readers might find conflicting. In 2013, Kyllikki Villa's daughter Saara Villa, who is also a translator, commented on her mother's work by stating that in the 1960s ITr was a rather common practice and not really stigmatized, and further mentions that her mother had to translate Greek literature indirectly because she had studied only the basics of the language but she would, nevertheless, also try to read the original (Villa and Villa 2013, 53). Saara Villa seems to be aware of the criticism towards ITr, and perhaps this is the reason she defends her mother's translation strategies.

Conclusions

Since the birth of Finnish as a literary language in the sixteenth century, translating indirectly and compilatively has played an important role. Following European models, the practice has continued until the twentieth century. The first Finnish literary translations in the nineteenth century were ITr's via Swedish and German, the default languages in education. Today, ITr mostly occurs with literature in languages of lesser diffusion, such as Modern Greek. It often takes place because of a lack of competent translators in these languages or because there has been a sudden increase in the demand for translations from a particular language.

In Finland, the first comments about ITr—mostly negative—appeared halfway into the nineteenth century, alongside a shift in ideas about literature and authorship. The literati, including critics, suggested that translators should know the author's language, and if ITr's were done, they should be done overtly. Translators, for their part, sometimes resorted to prefaces to preempt criticism.

Strategies to tackle the problematics of ITr included collaboration and compilative translation. When it came to acquiring several STs in different languages, publishers sometimes helped translators in getting the books, signalling thus their approval, although nothing suggests that they would insist on compilative translation. Today, interestingly, it seems that academic training in TS may lead a publisher to reject ITr, but also possibly to accept it if it is compilative or done collaboratively.

The archives of translator, literary critic and author Kyllikki Villa give us clues about the role and status of ITr in Finland in the latter half of the twentieth century. A friend—and also translator—of Greek literature, Villa paid close attention to the problems of ITr. When she was in the role of a literary critic, she found ITr “always unfortunate” if it was based on only

one ST. However, she did not completely condemn ITr because of its necessity and her own first-hand experience of it. In translating indirectly from Modern Greek, she went the extra mile to translate compilatively with the original ST on the side, and collaborated with someone who knew the ultimate SL. She suggested that others should also use these strategies when undertaking ITr. Furthermore, one of her Greek translations is overtly compilative, a fact noted in two newspaper reviews, neither of which criticizes the indirectness, in contrast with earlier critics reprimanding translations whose indirect nature was hidden.

Compilative translation is a translation strategy often used in connection with ITr but seldom acknowledged or studied. If ITr is often hidden in bibliographic information, this is even more the case with compilative translation. As demonstrated in this article, materials for studying discourses on and practices of ITr and compilative translation include interviews and other newspaper articles, literary reviews, biographical writings and other archived documents such as grant applications and correspondence (see also Munday 2013, 2014). Similarly, research into translators' footnotes (see Vuokko 2014) promises to shed new light on translators' agency as well. This kind of material may also yield further information on collaborative ITr (see also Cordingley and Manning 2016; Alvstad 2017). Research on compilative translation practices also necessitates textual and comparative analyses and could benefit methodologically and theoretically from textual and genetic criticism, for example (Greetham 1994; Cordingley and Montini 2015). Further research on ITr could give a more nuanced picture of the phenomenon and perhaps also provide translators and publishers with strategies for producing translations, as well as critics and readers with tools for reading indirect translations.

Note on contributors

Laura Ivaska is a doctoral candidate interested in the phenomenon of indirect translating. She incorporates methods from textual studies in her analysis of the genealogies of translations and also works with archival material. The provisional title of her dissertation is *(In)direct translations of Modern Greek prose literature into Finnish (1952–2004)*.

Outi Paloposki is professor of English. She has written on translators' agency, on retranslations, and on the linguistic profiles and role of translations in the changing cultural scene of Finland during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. She was co-editor of the two-volume history of literary translation into Finnish (*Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia I–II*), published by the Finnish Literature Society (SKS) in 2007, and of its companion

volume, the history of non-fiction translation into Finnish (*Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia*, 2013). Methodology in translation studies, especially historical studies, figures as one of her teaching priorities.

Notes

¹ In this article, we follow the terminological choices of Assis Rosa, Pięta and Maia (2017): indirect translation (ITr) denotes a translation based on a text(s) other than (only) the ultimate source text (ST). We, too, understand ITr as the “convenient umbrella term” (ibid., 115) that covers several types of indirect translation and that does not impose restrictions on the various types of indirectness, which may stem, for example, from the different number and type of mediating texts (MTs) and languages (MLs) (see also Washbourne 2013). Thus, ITr also includes *compilative translation*, a term originally coined by Popovič (1976), which refers to “using more than one mediating text” (Assis Rosa, Pięta and Maia 2017, 119). We also use the abbreviations ST/MT/TT for source, mediating and target text, respectively and SL/ML/TL for the languages.

² Some letters to Villa from Kazantzaki and from Prevelakis are preserved in the Villa Archives, but they are not currently available to the public. Once they become accessible, they will hopefully reveal more about Villa’s translation process.

References

- Alvstad, Cecilia. 2017. “Arguing for Indirect Translations in Twenty-First-Century Scandinavia.” *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 150–165. doi: 10.1080/14781700.2017.1286254.
- Assis Rosa, Alexandra, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia. 2017. “Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues Regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview.” *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 113–132. doi: 10.1080/14781700.2017.1285247
- Cordingley, Anthony, and Céline Frigau Manning, eds. 2016. *Collaborative Translation: From the Renaissance to the Digital Age*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Cordingley, Anthony, and Chiara Montini. 2015. “Genetic Translation Studies: An Emerging Discipline.” *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies* 14: 1–18.
- Dollerup, Cay. 2000. “Relay and Support Translations.” In *Translation in Context*, edited by Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador and Yves Gambier, 7–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Donner, H. W. 1950. *Svenska översättningar av Shakespeares Macbeth* [Swedish Translations of Shakespeare’s *Macbeth*]. Akta Akademiae Aboensis, series A:20.1. Helsinki: Åbo Akademi.

Ellis, Roger. 2008. Preface. In *The Oxford History of Literary Translation in English*, Vol 1, edited by Roger Ellis, 1–4. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fennica, The National Bibliography of Finland. <https://fennica.linneanet.fi/>.

Finnish Institute at Athens. 2015. “Kreikkalainen kirjallisuus Suomessa” [Greek literature in Finland]. Accessed 15 December 2015. <http://finninstitute.gr/sites/default/files/documents/Kreikkalainen%20kirjallisuus%20Suomessa.pdf/>.

Genette, Gérard. 1991. “Introduction to the Paratext.” *New Literary History* 22 (2): 261–272.

Greetham, D.C. 1994. *Textual Scholarship: An Introduction*. New York: Garland Publishing

Hadley, James. 2017. “Indirect Translation and Discursive Identity: Proposing the Concatenation Effect Hypothesis.” *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 183–197. doi: 10.1080/14781700.2016.1273794.

Hekkanen, Raila. 2014. “Direct Translation: Is It the Only Option? Indirect Translation of Finnish Prose Literature into English.” In *True North: Literary Translation in the Nordic Countries*, edited by B. J. Epstein, 47–64. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Itkonen-Kaila, Marja. 1997. *Mikael Agricolan Uusi Testamentti ja sen erikieliset lähtötekstit* [Mikael Agricola’s New Testament and its Several Source Texts in Different Languages]. Helsinki: SKS.

Ivaska, Laura. 2016. *Uncovering the Many Source Texts of Indirect Translations: Indirect Translations of Modern Greek Prose Literature into Finnish 1952–2004*. Poster presented at the 8th European Society for Translation Studies Congress. Aarhus, Denmark, 15–17 September. https://www.academia.edu/28664155/Uncovering_the_Many_Source_Texts_of_Translations_Indirect_Translations_of_Modern_Greek_Prose_Literature_into_Finnish_1952_2004_poster

Joutsen, Otto. Correspondence. WSOY Archives. National Archives of Finland.

Kazantzakis, Nikos. 1967. *Veljesviha*. Translated by Kyllikki Villa. Helsinki: Tammi.

Kinnunen, Tuija and Kaisa Koskinen. 2010. “Introduction.” In *Translators’ Agency*, edited by Tuija Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen, 4–9. Tampere Studies in Language, Translation and Culture, series B4. Tampere: Tampere University Press. <http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:978-951-44-8082-9>.

Laine, Tuija. 2000. *Ylösherätys suruttomille: Englantilaisperäinen hartauskirjallisuus Suomessa Ruotsin vallan aikana* [English Devotional Literature in Finland during the Swedish Era]. Helsinki: SKS.

Lauerma, Petri. 2012. *Kristityn vaellus varhaisnykysuomen merkinnässä: Jakob Johan Malmbergin suomennosten kielellinen kehitys 1800-luvun kirjasuomen murroksessa*.

[*Pilgrim's Progress* and the Evolution of the Finnish Text in the 19th Century]. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten keskus.

Leppänen, Saara. 2013. "A Case in Translation Archaeology: Explanatory Peritexts in Finnish Translations of Japanese Literature." In *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education* vol. 1, edited by Nike E. Pokorn and Kaisa Koskinen, 45–59. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.

Marin-Lacarta, Maialen. 2017. "Indirectness in Literary Translation: Methodological Possibilities." *Translation Studies* 10 (2): 133–149. doi: 10.1080/14781700.2017.1286255

Montgomery, Scott L. 2000. *Science in Translation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Munday, Jeremy. 2013. "The Role of Archival and Manuscript Research in the Investigation of Translator Decision-Making." *Target* 25 (1): 125–139. doi: 10.1075/target.25.1.10mun.

Munday, Jeremy. 2014. "Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns." *The Translator* 20 (1): 64–80. doi: 10.1080/13556509.2014.899094.

Niiranen, Petra. 2016. "Välikielen kautta kääntäminen suomalaisissa kustantamoissa 2010-luvun taitteessa" [Indirect Translating in Finnish Publishing Houses around the year 2010]. Master's diss., University of Turku.

Paloposki, Outi. 1998. "How *Macbeth* Became 'Bunulinus'." In *Compare or Contrast? Current Issues in Cross-Language Research*, edited by W. R. Cooper, 309–327. Tampere English Studies 6. Tampere: University of Tampere.

Paloposki, Outi. 2003. "1800-luvun *Tuhat ja yksi yötä* suomalaisittain" [Thousand and One Nights in 19th-Century Finland]. *Sananjalka* 45: 140–162.

Paloposki, Outi. 2013. "'Wanhan Rikhardin' neuvot" [How to become rich and successful – Benjamin Franklin and *Poor Richard's Almanac* in Finnish]. In *Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia* [History of Non-Fiction Translation in Finland], edited by Outi Paloposki and H. K. Riikonen, 554–556. Helsinki: SKS.

Pięta, Hanna. 2012. "Patterns in (In)directness: An Exploratory Case study in the External History of Portuguese Translations of Polish Literature." *Target* 24 (2): 310–337. doi:10.1075/target.24.2.05pie.

Pokorn, Nike K. 2013. "Experience Through Translation—The Translated Experience: The Turkish Presence in Slovene Literature and Translation." *Across Languages and Cultures* 14 (2): 167–181.

Popovič, Anton. 1976. *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton: University of Alberta.

Prevelakis, Pandelis. 1963. *Ikuinen aurinko*. Translated by Kyllikki Villa. Provo: WSOY.

Radó, György. 1975. "Indirect Translation." *Babel* 21 (2): 51–59.

Ridderström, Knut Fredinand. 1879. “Förord” [Preface]. In *60 Dikter af Alexander Petöfi* [60 poems by Alexander Petöfi]. Åbo: Wilen & Co.

Riikonen, H. K. 2007a. “Suomennosten täydentyvä maailmankartta” [Additions to the World Map of Translations into Finnish]. In *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia* vol. 2 [History of Translated Literature in Finland], edited by H.K. Riikonen, Urpo Kovala, Pekka Kujamäki, and Outi Paloposki, 308–313. Helsinki: SKS.

Riikonen, H. K. 2007b. “Suomennoskritiikin vaiheita” [Translation Criticism in Finland]. In *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia* vol. 2 [History of Translated Literature in Finland], edited by H.K. Riikonen, Urpo Kovala, Pekka Kujamäki, and Outi Paloposki, 425–442. Helsinki: SKS.

Ringmar, Martin. 2007. “Roundabout Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations.” In *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*, edited by F. Mus. <https://www.arts.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/files/ringmar.pdf/>.

Suomalainen, Karl Gustaf Samuli. Personal archives. The National Library of Finland.

Suomi. 1860. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Suomi II:11. 1876. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Tervonen, Juho. Correspondence. WSOY Archives. National Archives of Finland.

Taivalkoski-Shilov, Kristiina. 2015. “Friday in Finnish: A Character’s and (Re)translators’ Voices in Six Finnish Retranslations of Daniel Defoe’s *Robinson Crusoe*.” *Target* 27 (1): 58–74. doi:10.1075/target.27.1.03tai.

Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Revised edition. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Tuominen, Laura. 2004. “Ranskalainen kirjallisuus *Valvojassa* 1800-luvun lopulla” [French Literature in *Valvoja* at the End of the Nineteenth Century]. In *Yhteistä kieltä tekemässä* [Searching for a Language in Common], edited by Katja Huomo, Lea Laitinen and Outi Paloposki, 341–371. Helsinki: SKS.

Tuusvuori, Jarkko S. 2004. “Kyllikki Villan käänösbibliografia: poimintoja.” [Kyllikki Villa’s selected translation bibliography]. *Niin ja näin* 4/2004: 64–65.

Villa, Kyllikki. Archives. The Literature Archives of the Finnish Literature Society.

Villa, Kyllikki. 1966. “Me rimpuilemme samassa langassa: Pandelis Prevelakisia haastattelemassa” [We Struggle to Hold to the Same Thread: Interview with Pandelis Prevelakis]. *Uusi Suomi*, 11 November.

Villa, Kyllikki. 1968. “Balkanilaista proosaa ja kääntäjän mietteitä” [Balkan Prose and Translator’s Thoughts]. *Maaseudun tulevaisuus*, 18 July.

Villa, Kyllikki and Saara Villa. 2013. *Äidin lokikirja* [Mother’s Logbook]. Helsinki: Like.

Vuokko, Katja. 2014. "Klassikosta lukuromaaniksi: käännösstrategioiden vertailu Dickensin *David Copperfield* -suomennoksissa" [From a Classic to a Popular Classic: Comparison of Translation Strategies in the Finnish Translations of *David Copperfield*]. *Avain* 4/2014: 35–47.

Washbourne, Kelly. 2013. "Nonlinear Narratives: Paths of Indirect and Relay Translation." *Meta* 58 (3): 607–625. doi:10.7202/1025054ar

Wichmann, Irene. 2015. *Unkarin kirjallisuus 1800-luvun Suomessa Petőfin ja Jókain teosten valossa* [Hungarian Literature in Finland in the 19th Century with a Focus on Petőfi and Jókai]. PhD diss., University of Helsinki. <https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/157429>.