On how to Uncover the *de facto* Source Languages/Texts of (Indirect) Translations

Laura Ivaska

1 Introduction

The topic of my PhD dissertation is indirect translation[1] of prose literature. Whereas translation in general involves a source text (ST) and a target text (TT), *indirect translation* is more complex; according to Ringmar's (2012, 141) definition, an indirect translation is "a chain of (at least) three texts, ending with a translation made from another translation: (original) ST > intermediate text (IT) > (end) TT". At the heart of my research lies the urge to better understand what indirect translation is and how translators do it. In other words, on textual level I wish to discover what different types of indirect translations there are, but at the same time I am also interested in the agency of the translators who produce these different kinds of indirect translations.

As for why indirect translation occurs in the first place, Washbourne (2013, 611–612) enumerates several reasons that previous research has identified, ranging from the lack of translators competent in the right language pairs to the prestige of the languages involved, and from economic motives to practicing censorship by dictating what source texts are used. For indirect translations into Finnish, Riikonen (2007, 308) suggests that they are being done because there are few people competent in some of the more distant languages (see also Leppänen 2013). Similarly, many of the Finnish translations of Modern Greek prose literature that I study in my dissertation were done indirectly, most likely so because there were simply no translators proficient in Modern Greek, as the language is not widely taught on an advanced level in Finland.

[1] Other scholars may refer to indirect translation also with terms such as *pivot translation*, *relay translation* and *second-hand translation* (see e.g. Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 115–118).

Because studying the reasons behind the indirectness of the Finnish translations of Modern Greek literature seems unlikely to add much to the previous research on the contexts of indirect translation, I focus on identifying the different ways in which indirect translations have been done. For example (as reported in Ivaska and Paloposki 2018), I have been examining the collaborative aspect of indirect translation – that is, with whom and why translators collaborate – as well as the so-called *compilative translation*, the product of which Toury (2012, 100n4) defines as "a translation which makes use of several source texts". While research on collaborative translation is debunking the myth of translating as solitary work (see e.g. Cordingley and Frigau Manning 2016; Alvstad 2017), uncovering the practices of compilative translation highlights textual instability and challenges the idea of translations as secondary to the so-called originals (see e.g. Cordingley and Montini 2015; Emmerich 2017). However, perhaps because the practices of both collaborative and compilative translation deviate from the contemporary prototype of translation (that is, translation entailing one source text, one target text, and one translator), these aspects of translation are seldom made explicit.

In fact, the indirect nature of translations remains often hidden in the contemporary Western culture, which might be due to the fact that the general attitude towards indirectness seems to be negative (St. André 2009; Alvstad 2017, 151–152; Ivaska and Paloposki 2018; for positive attitudes in China, see Hung and Wakabayashi 2005), as it is thought to distort the message that the translation is supposed to convey (Edström 1991; Dollerup 2000). Because of the covertness, one of the central questions I tackle in my PhD dissertation is: What are the *de facto* source text(s)/language(s) of the translations I am studying?

The hidden nature of indirect translation poses a challenge and an opportunity for research: indirect translations and their *de facto* source texts/languages are difficult to identify, which means that researchers are required to – or get to – use their imagination to come up with new methodologies for uncovering the *de facto* source texts of translations. In this essay, I will describe some of the methodological difficulties I have encountered in my research as well as my attempts to overcome them. I begin by discussing why I have come to form my own definition of indirect translation, and will then describe how I settled on the case study as my research design and what difficulties were entailed in the choice of the translations that I study. In the second half of the essay, I will delineate the methods that I use to uncover the *de facto* source text of translations. In the discussion that ends the essay, I will reflect on the pitfalls of my methodology, on what kind of new methodological approaches could be developed, and on why being able to pinpoint the *de facto* source texts of (indirect) translations matters.

2 Defining indirect translation

Choosing what definitions or terminology to use – or coming up with new ones – is of central importance to research because, in a sense, definitions dictate the object of study. The object of study is determined, described and delimited with the help of definitions. One can choose to use existing definitions and choose the research data accordingly, or one can form definitions from the basis of the regularities and patterns observed in a set of data that seems interesting. My approach to defining indirect translation is to infer a definition by observing the phenomenon in its different forms. I have chosen to do so because many of the definitions proposed by other researchers (for an overview, see Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 119–121) do not encompass all the aspects of the phenomenon that could – or should – be taken into account. For example, some of the definitions do not explicitly address the possibility for many source texts; such is the case, for example, with Ringmar's definition presented in the introduction. This might be due to the fact that other researchers did not encounter translations that are based on several source texts, but based on my personal experience as literary translator, I know for a fact that indirect translations may have several sources.[2]

Kittel and Frank's definition (1991, 3) takes into account the possibility of using multiple source texts. They suggest that "any translation based on a source (or sources) which is itself a translation into a language other than the language of the original, or the target language" can be labeled as indirect. Unfortunately, though, their definition explicitly states that the source text(s) of an indirect translation have to be in a language "other than the language of the original, or

[2] At the beginning of my master's studies I was asked to translate a collection of short stories by the Maltese Oliver Friggieri from Italian into Finnish. However, at some point I discovered that the Italian text I had been given to use as my source text was actually a translation from Maltese (in which the short stories had originally been written.) Like so many other students of translation, I had been inculcated with the idea that indirect translation should be avoided (cf. Niiranen 2016, 30). Notwithstanding this, I had to deliver a translation, and because the stories had originally been written in a language I knew nothing of, translating directly was not an option. Thus, I ended up compiling the *de facto* source text of my translation by comparing an Italian and an English translation of the short stories.

the target language”. Thus, if we take Kittel and Frank’s definition strictly, Kyllikki Villa’s Finnish translation, *Veljesviha* (1967), of Nikos Kazantzakis’ *Οι αδερφοφάδες* (1963), would not count as an indirect translation because it lists as its source texts/languages not only French (*Les frères ennemis*, 1965; tr. Pierre Aellig) and English (*The fratricides*, 1966, tr. Athena Gianakas Dallas), but also Modern Greek – which is the language in which the novel was originally written.[3] However, archival material strongly suggests that Villa used the French translation as the primary source text and from her published travel diary it becomes apparent that she had a limited knowledge of Modern Greek (Villa and Villa 2013, 53). Therefore, I would consider her translation as essentially an indirect one. One could, of course, argue that translations like *Veljesviha* that are based on many source texts constitute a category independent of indirect translation, but I consider them part and parcel of the phenomenon. Namely, one of the several source texts is always necessarily something other than the “original”, and thus – if *direct* translations are characterized by being based exclusively on an “original” source text, and considered the antonym of indirect translations – any translation made using more than one source text must be an indirect translation. Consequently, there is a need for a definition of indirect translation that not only encompasses translations that have several source texts, but that also allows for one of the many sources to be in the language in which the text was first written.[4]

I currently define indirect translation as “a translation based on a text (or texts) other than (only) the ultimate source text” (Ivaska and Paloposki 2018, 43n1). This definition allows explicitly for the use of one or more source texts, which is one of the aspects of indirect translation that I want to focus on in my research. Also, the definition does not exclude the possibility for using the ultimate source text – that is, the first text in the chain of indirect translation: ST>TT=ST>TT (cf. Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 115) – as one of the sources of an indirect translation. That being said, indirect translation can be

[3] Another example on the difficulty categorizing translations is provided by retranslations – understood here as “second or later translation[s] of a *single source text* into the same target language” (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010, 294) – that are based (at least partly) on consulting or even appropriating a previous translation of the same text into the same language: should they be categorized as retranslations, revisions or indirect translations, or do they constitute a category of their own (see e.g. Paloposki and Koskinen 2010)?
[4] The version in the language in which a text was first written is sometimes referred to as the original, but because this term is problematic (see e.g. Emmerich 2017), it is being avoided in this essay or placed in quotation marks.

broken down into (at least) two distinct categories: a) what could be called prototypical, simple or straightforward indirect translation, where there is one ultimate ST, one mediating ST and one TT; and b) compilative (indirect) translation, which has from two to an infinite number of source texts. Compilative translation, in turn, has different subcategories based on, for example, the manner and extent in which the translator uses the different source texts (see e.g. Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 122; Washbourne 2013; Dollerup 2000).[5]

3 Deciding on the research design

Although I had a pretty clear idea of my doctoral research's topic – the complex ways in which indirect translations are done –, coming up with the research design, the right research questions and data was less straightforward. For example, I could have chosen to test whether an existing hypothesis holds true, and this was actually my initial idea. Namely, when I was writing my Master's Thesis, I noticed that a lot of the previous research seemed to be painting a negative picture of indirect translation: some researchers spoke of indirectness resulting in "a lesser degree of precision and in increasing number of deviations" (Edström 1991, 12); others asserted that, although the main idea would stay the same, the style and spirit would lose something in the process (Jianzhong 2003, 198); or suggested even that indirect translation "is indeed a major source of deviations in written translation" (Dollerup 2000, 23). Back then I was thinking of performing experiments to see whether such claims hold true.

The plan was to choose texts and ask one group of people (e.g. students of translation) to translate them directly and then have another group of people translate the same texts indirectly or compilatively. I could then have compared these sets of translations to see whether the effect of "something getting lost in translation" was greater in indirect translation than in direct translation. However, it soon dawned to me – thanks to my supervisor – that in such a research it might be difficult to control the variables. For example, how does one discern the

[5] Translations done using more than one mediating text have also been called eclectic (e.g. Pięta 2012; Kittel 1991, 32). Similarly, Dollerup (2000, 23) points out that sometimes "translators check translations into languages other than their own target language" in what he calls support translation (cf. Graeber 1991, 6: polyglot translators). He has also proposed that indirect translations, in general, could be categorized according to whether they have their own audience or whether they are made only so they can serve as a source text for a further (indirect) translation (Dollerup 2000, 17).

differences in the two groups of translations caused by the mode of translation (direct or indirect) from those caused by something else, such as the translators' personal style or language proficiency? Therefore, I decided to abandon the idea of doing experiments and decided to use existing translations as my data. Although this did not eliminate variables per se, it changed the way in which I had to deal with them: if I had done experiments, I would have needed to design the data collection so that I could control the variables, whereas using existing data meant that all I could do was to take the variables into account in my analysis (cf. Saldanha and O'Brien 2013, 207).

I then decided to look for a suitable case study or studies that would allow me to explore the compilative and collaborative practices of indirect translation. For Susam-Sarajeva (2009, 40),

> a case is a unit of translation or interpreting-related activity, product, person, etc. in real life, which can only be studied or understood in the context in which it is embedded. A case can be anything from a translated text or author, translator/interpreter, etc. to a whole translation institution or source/receiving system.

In other words, a case can be pretty much anything. However, building on previous literature, Susam-Sarajeva (2009, 44) suggests that the choice of a case is justified only in three instances: if 1) it can serve to test a well-grounded hypothesis; 2) it is extreme or unique in some way; or 3) it opens up a new discussion on a topic that has not been addressed previously. A further option is a multiple-case study, which can be based on the principle of similarity or on how well the sample represents a greater number of similar cases (Susam-Sarajeva 2009, 43–44).

However, when doing research on indirect translation, the problem is not always so much whether one is able to find a justifiable case or cases, but rather whether one is able to find indirect translations to begin with. Namely, the indirectness of translations is often – though not always (cf. Alvstad 2017, 150, 155) – hidden or simply left unacknowledged (e.g. Ivaska and Paloposki 2018), which means that even locating indirect translations may require extensive amounts of work. Luckily previous research has identified contexts in which indirect translations are done, which helps narrow down options.

For example, indirect translation has been found to occur in the context of less translated languages[6] (see e.g. Perdu Honeyman 2004; Pięta 2012; Riikonen 2007) or between peripheral languages (see e.g. Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 114; Heilbron and Sapiro 2007, 96). In the case of Finnish, in recent years indirect translations have been made from languages such as Japanese (Leppänen 2013), Basque, Brazilian Portuguese, Georgian, Romanian, Turkish and Yiddish (Riikonen 2007). Ideally the researcher should have knowledge of the ultimate source language, the mediating language(s) and, of course, the ultimate target language in order to be able to confirm, by means of textual comparison, which source texts/languages were used for which translation. In other words, it may be difficult to find case studies that match the language skills of the researcher – although, as will be discussed below, the very difficulty of finding indirect translation, in general, may impose an even bigger hurdle.

4 Building a corpus from a bibliographic database

Having settled on a case study it was time to build the corpus. I wanted to study prose translations although indirect translation could be studied just as well in other genres or within the domain of interpretation. The problem was to find a case that fulfills the criteria for a justified case study, as discussed by Susam-Sarajeva (2009), all the while reassuring that I would be able to read the ultimate source and target text, as well as the mediating translations. I concluded that my best bet was Finnish translations from Modern Greek, as the other languages in which I had proficiency – English, French, Italian and Swedish – seemed less likely to be subject to indirect translation; they do count as less translated languages, nor are they in a peripheral position from the point of view of Finnish.

Bibliographic databases – such as *Fennica*, the database of the National Bibliography of Finland, or UNESCO's *Index Translationum* – offer a good starting point for charting what has been published both in original language and in translation. However, they are not always reliable (cf. Poupaud, Pym, and Torres Simón 2009; Ivaska 2016; Marin-Lacarta 2017). The information in the databases may be simply copied from the title page texts of the novels, which do not necessarily contain any mention of the (*de facto*) source language(s)/text(s)

[6] According to Branchadell's definition (2004,1), the term *less translated languages* "applies to all those languages that are less often the source of translation in the international exchange of linguistic goods, regardless of the number of people using these languages."

of translations, perhaps because the general attitudes towards the practice are negative – at least in Finland (Ivaska and Paloposki 2018)[7] – or maybe because such information is thought to be of no importance. Even when the de *facto* source text(s) of a translation are mentioned in a bibliography, the information might not be readily available. For example *Fennica* does not usually catalogue the source language (although the language of the "original" is most of the time mentioned); rather, the information needs to be scoured from an explanation following the title of the book or from a separate note.

In any case, the bibliographic information regarding source languages/texts cannot be taken at face value unless the objective of the research is to study only the translations that are overtly indirect.[8] In the most extreme case a bibliography might not even contain mentions of indirect translations whatsoever. That, however, is not sufficient proof to conclude that there are no indirect translations. If there is no evidence of indirectness, more research needs to be done to either identify indirect translations or to prove that no indirect translations exist. The latter – proving that something does *not* exist – may be difficult, if not impossible.

To build the corpus for my dissertation research, I turned to *Fennica* to see what had been translated from Modern Greek into Finnish. Luckily many of the Finnish translations from Modern Greek are explicitly marked as indirect in the *Fennica* database. My keyword search in *Fennica* (28 January 2014) with *gre* (for Greek) as the "Original language" – with additional advanced search settings where "Place of publication" was *Finland*, the "Type" was *book* and the "Language" *suomi (fin)* – returned some hundred results. However, many of the titles were of religious nature or translations from Ancient Greek, so I narrowed the list down to contain only Modern Greek prose literature and then cross-checked it with a list of Finnish translations of Modern Greek literature compiled

[7] However, these attitudes can also be found outside of Finland. Namely, the current Western prescriptivist idea of translation seems to suggest that translators *should* translate directly from the original text into their first language (see e.g. Pokorn 2011; St. André 2009) and indirect translation is implicitly forbidden in many contexts; for example, the UNESCO *Recommendation on the Legal Protection of Translators and Translations and the Practical Means to improve the Status of Translators* (1976) V(c) states that "as a general rule, a translation should be made from the original work, recourse being had to retranslation only where absolutely necessary". Similarly, at least in the Nordic countries, bodies supporting literary translation economically oppose indirect translation (Alvstad 2017, 151; Hekkanen 2014, 53).

[8] This applies not only to indirect translation, but also to retranslation, pseudotranslation, compilative translation, self-translation, and so forth.

by the Finnish Institute at Athens (2015).[9] Finally 22 books remained. Two of the 22 books were marked as direct translations from Modern Greek, whereas the bibliographic information of 11 others contained a mention that they had actually been translated from a language (or languages) other than Greek. Therefore, there were 9 novels for which the *de facto* source languages needed to be uncovered in addition to confirming the source language(s) of the 11 overtly indirect ones.

Although bibliographic information cannot be trusted to reveal all indirect translations, I would argue that when a translation *is* marked as indirect, the information is more likely to be correct than false (cf. Boulogne 2015, 194). The attitudes towards indirectness naturally vary between languages/cultures and with time, but in the contemporary Finland, where indirect translations are valued negatively (see Ivaska and Paloposki 2018; Niiranen 2016), it seems unlikely that someone would deliberately want to compromise the reception of a translation by marking it as indirect if it had been done directly. The same applies to when several source texts are mentioned; this practice is so marginal – to some perhaps even completely unthinkable – that I find it improbable that the bibliographic information would list more than one source text/language if that did not reflect the reality.

Therefore, the corpus of the Finnish translations of Modern Greek prose literature compiled on the basis of information retrieved from *Fennica* seems to provide a corpus suitable for doing research on indirect translation. Together, the 22 translations form a multiple-case study, which is not only representable, because the idea is to include all the Finnish translations of Modern Greek prose literature into my dissertation research, but also new, as, at least to my knowledge, these translations have not been previously studied from any angle. As for taking language skills into consideration when deciding whether the case study is doable, the mediating languages include French, German, English and Swedish – all languages I have studied for at least a minimal amount, so the choice of the case seems both justifiable and feasible. Furthermore, two of the 11 indirect translations are marked as having more than one source text. Since compilative translation has previously been addressed mostly in passing, these two translations provide, on their own, the opportunity for a case study (or two case

[9] The cross-check revealed another way in which bibliographic databases may be unreliable: the original language of two of the translations (Pandelis Prevelakis' *Ο ήλιος του θανάτου*, 1959, in Finnish *Ikuinen aurinko*, 1963, trans. Kyllikki Villa; and *Αναφορά στον Γκρέκο*, 1961, in Finnish *Tilinteko El Grecolle*, trans. Aarno Peromies) from Modern Greek were erroneously coded as *grc* instead of *gre*, and these titles had therefore not appeared in my keyword search.

studies) that can be justified because they bring up new aspects of (indirect) translation. The kind of methods that can be used for uncovering and/or confirming the *de facto* source languages/texts of the translations will be discussed next.

5 Uncovering the *de facto* source texts of indirect translations

Since the aim of my research is to study indirect translation – and especially the compilative and collaborative practices of translating indirectly – in depth and detail, it is crucial to devise a methodology to uncover and/or confirm the *de facto* source texts of translations in order to be able to validate (or refute or complement, depending on what the bibliography says about the source text/language) the information drawn from a bibliographic database. For example, according to the information retrieved from *Fennica*, the Finnish translation, *Ikuinen aurinko* (1963, trans. Kyllikki Villa), of Pandelis Prevelakis' *Ο ήλιος του θανάτου* (1959) was translated from German (*Die Sonne des Todes*, 1962, trans. Isidora Rosenthal-Kamarinea). However, the Finnish translator mentions in a newspaper article that her translation was based not only on the German, but also on a Danish translation (*Dødens sol*, 1962, trans. Ole Wahl Olsen) and a Greek version of the novel.[10] These two source texts/languages are not mentioned in *Fennica* – in this case, the information in the bibliographic database is correct, but partial, and needs to be complemented.

Naturally, it would also be possible to settle with the information available in bibliographies and therefore avoid the trouble of uncovering the *de facto* source texts; this could be done by framing the research so that it addresses questions of the type "what can we learn about indirect translation based on what bibliographic and title page information tell us", for example. However, I believe that it is more useful to identify all the indirect translations, or at least as many of them as possible, so as to be able to draw more accurate conclusions regarding the frequency of the phenomenon which otherwise tends to remain covert. Identifying the exact source language(s)/text(s) can help to cast light on practices of indirect translation – such as compilative and collaborative translation in their different forms – that have previously remained unnoticed.

In order to figure out how translators do indirect translations – what source language(s)/text(s) they use, whom they collaborate with, what other aids they

[10] For more details, see Ivaska (2016); Ivaska and Paloposki (2018).

have at their disposal – one can triangulate different evidence. The material can be divided into internal and external evidence, that is, into what is found in the texts themselves and what is located outside of them in other material found, for example, in translator archives. However, it is often a matter of luck whether one is able to find suitable external research material. A translator's papers are not often conserved, perhaps because they have been considered mundane, marginal or unimportant, or because translations are thought to be secondary to the original works written by authors (see e.g. Paloposki 2001). Because of this, there may be little or no material available, save maybe for translators who are also authors (cf. Munday 2013; Cordingley and Montini 2015, 7).

However, drawing evidence from several directions is not important only in order to gather as much of it as possible. Rather, even if my focus is on *how* indirect translations are done, answering other questions – such as "who translated what, […] where, when, for whom, and with what effect?" (Pym 1998, 5) – helps to contextualize the individual translations under study. Namely, as Toury (2012, 19n2) points out, contextualization is important because ”any account of an instance of translation that is wrongly located in space and time […] is bound to be misleading and result in shaky or wrong accounts"; for example, in certain place and time indirect translation may be the norm rather than the exception. Triangulation – that is, the use different methods and materials – not only helps in contextualization, but is also a means to gain analytical depth (Susam-Sarajeva 2009, 40) and, therefore, it makes it possible to draw stronger and more convincing conclusions.

5.1 External evidence: Paratexts

External evidence, found in translation paratexts, may yield information on what the source text(s) are, as well as on what kind of translational difficulties translators were faced with when translating and how they overcame them (cf. Marin-Lacarta 2017, 138; Munday 2014, 64). Genette (1991) identifies two types of paratexts: *peritexts* are usually located "around the text, in the space of the same volume, like the title or the preface, and sometimes inserted into the interstices of the text, like the titles of chapters or certain notes" (Genette 1991, 263), whereas *epitexts* are typically found outside the physical book, and include elements such as interviews, conversations and other public media, as well as correspondence, journals and other private communications (Genette 1991, 264).

Some peritexts that play an important role in translation studies may often be taken for granted. Namely, at least when copyright law protects literary products – including translations – certain epitexts can be expected to appear in the physical object (the book) or the digital file that embodies the text. This includes information such as the name of the author, the translator, the publisher, and so forth. These pieces of basic information help to identify the text as a translation and guide the researcher to contact the people involved in the production process for interviews and/or to study their archives in search for more information on the source texts/languages used for the particular translation. However, peritexts are not always reliable; consider, for example, pseudotranslations, which purport – for example on the title page – to be translations although no translating ever took place (see e.g. Apter 2005), such as "Cervantes's *El ingenioso hidalgo Don Quixote de la Mancha*, which is presented as the Spanish translation from an Arabic original by El Cid Benegali" (Du Pont 2005, 331). Similarly, the *de facto* source texts/languages of indirect translations are not necessarily given on the title page, but instead there may be only a mention of the ultimate source text, which may be interpreted, erroneously, to mean that the translation was done directly from the ultimate source language.

Different types of epitexts, then, can be found in different places, and collecting them may require extensive efforts that might, in the end, prove fruitless. Published peritexts – such as translator and author interviews and translation reviews – may be in textual or audiovisual format in newspapers, magazines, blogs, and so forth. Private communications, like correspondences and diaries, will normally be held at archives along with possible unpublished manuscript versions of the translations, which can equally provide clues on the source texts for example in the form of marginalia or other notes that reveal what the translator's source languages/texts were.

Working with archival material often entails applying for a permission to consult the material relevant to one's research and traveling to the archives, which may complicate research in a very practical way (cf. Marin-Lacarta 2017, 141; Munday 2014, 71–72). Furthermore, the archival material relating to translations may be scattered in several locations; for example, the translator's archives may be in Helsinki and the author's archives in Rethymno, Crete, like in the case of *Ikuinen aurinko*. Despite these complications, and the need for a careful assessment of the reliability of the materials, "such sources offer valuable testimony and more direct access to the working practices of the translator and can give crucial insights into both historical circumstance and translation" (Munday 2014, 66).

Whether one is able to find relevant archival material seems to be a matter of luck, as some authors, publishers and translators leave a plethora of documents behind while others leave nothing. I consider myself lucky, as one of the Finnish translators of Modern Greek literature, Kyllikki Villa, left so much archival material – comprising of manuscripts, biographical records, correspondence, newspaper clippings, photographs, and so forth, relating to her career as translator, journalist and author – at the Finnish Literature Society's (SKS) archives that they occupy 13 meters of shelves. Abundant translators' archives, like Villa's, seem to be more often an exception than the norm. However, if there is no archival material, similar evidence can also be acquired by interviewing the agents of translation – the translator, the author, the publisher, and so forth – provided that they are alive, can be found and are willing to be interviewed. In any case, whatever the sources for external information on the (*de facto*) source texts are, the conclusions drawn from it should be corroborated – or refuted – by means of internal evidence.

5.2 Internal evidence: Textual comparison

If external evidence may sometimes be difficult to find, the internal evidence – which is obtained through the comparison of the translation with its possible source texts (cf. Pięta 2012, 316–317; Solberg 2016) – should often be more easily available, at least if the research deals with translations that have been published and are thus available in bookstores and libraries. In theory, however, any version of the text (or several of them) – either in the language of the original or in translation – that was published before the translation was completed could have served as the translator's source. If there are many candidates for a source text, external evidence may provide useful in narrowing down options. For example, biographical information on the translator may help to exclude the source languages in which the translator had no proficiency, or one might even be able to find explicit mentions of the source text(s) in, for example, the translator's personal diaries.

The textual comparison of the ultimate source and target text together with the mediating text(s) can be carried out on structural and semantic level. The layout of the text, such as division into chapters and paragraphs, may help to identify what sources the translator used. Similarly, differences and similarities in punctuation may lead the researcher on the trail of the most likely source text(s), and yet more evidence may be found by observing whether the peritexts – such as blurbs or introductions especially by writers other than the author – of the different versions match. On a semantic level, additions and omissions, odd word choices and sentence structures, as well as (mis)matches in proper names are often easy to spot and are likely to provide key evidence on the relationship of the translation with the possible source texts.

The biggest shortcoming of textual comparison is that it is time consuming and may provide futile (e.g. Dedner 2012, 125–126), especially if there are no prior thoughts on the possible source text(s). There might be even hundreds of translations and original-language versions of a text, any (combination) of which may have served as a source text (e.g. Crisafulli 1999, 85); for example, Fernández Muñiz (2016) compares 16 versions of Ibsen's *Et Dukkehjem* (1879) in seven languages in an attempt to figure out the source language/text of one Spanish translation of the play. Furthermore, because the possibility of a compilative translation needs to be taken into account, the different combinations of the possible source texts also need to be tested, which adds to the workload.

The textual comparison may sometimes also prove unsuccessful because translators have at least some degree of artistic freedom over the translation, which may result in significant changes to the text. In other cases, there might be no copies of the source text available for comparison because they have all been destroyed or because the translator's source text was a unique version of the text; for example, Karen Emmerich (2017, 6) recounts not only how her publisher required her to shorten the translation of a Vassilis Vassilikos' novel from 750 pages to 500 pages, but also how "Vassilikos decided that one large section of the book wasn't of a piece with the rest, and carefully tore that chunk of roughly 150 pages out of the copy", therefore leaving Emmerich with a *de facto* source text that "was a physically altered copy of an out-of-print edition of a novel that had already appeared in numerous other versions in Greek." In this case, it would be impossible to figure out the exact source text without the translator's account of it.

Although textual comparison is time consuming and does not necessarily lead to certainty about the source texts/languages of translations, it is a reliable way to identify indirect translations and their sources (cf. Boulogne 2015, 194; Assis Rosa, Pięta, and Maia 2017, 124). It is also useful as such because bibliographic and title page information may give false ideas regarding the source texts, and because other paratextual evidence may be untruthful. Nonetheless, the triangulation of both internal and external evidence is perhaps still the most reliable way to uncover the *de facto* source text(s) of (indirect) translation (see e.g. Ringmar 2007, n9).

6 Discussion

The covertness of indirect – as well as collaborative and compilative – translation practices means that methods for uncovering the *de facto* source texts of translations are needed. Because the candidates for the source text(s) may be numerous, paratextual material – including peritexts found between book covers, as well as epitexts, such as translator's interviews and private correspondence – may help in narrowing down the list of possible source texts/languages. Ultimately, the translation, the ultimate source text and the plausible mediating texts should be compared. The internal evidence thus gained complements the conclusions drawn from external evidence and helps to confirm the (*de facto*) source text(s). This kind of triangulation of evidence enriches the analysis and affirms the conclusion.

However, this twofold methodology is neither flawless nor trouble free. Firstly, external evidence may be difficult to find or even nonexistent, not to mention the possible problems with reliability. Secondly, textual comparison may be time consuming, especially if there are no prior ideas on the possible source texts/languages or if there are hundreds of source text candidates. Textual comparison may also prove futile: in some cases it might be impossible to locate the source text because the translator had a unique copy of the text at their disposal. Finally, there may also be practical complications: insufficient resources may impede travel to archives, and lacking language skills on the part of the researcher may forbid the comparison of the ultimate source and target texts with the candidates for the mediating texts.

Therefore, more efficient and foolproof methods for identifying indirect translations and uncovering their source texts would be welcomed warmly. Textual and genetic criticism (e.g., Greetham 1994; Cordingley and Montini 2015) seem to be promising directions for locating new methodological (and theoretical) tools that assist in analyzing the relationships between translations and their (*de facto*) source texts, as well as the relationships between the different translations of one novel, for example. Another possible avenue to explore, as discussed also by Marin-Lacarta (2017, 142–143), is to see whether (or how) corpus-based approaches (e.g. Zubillaga, Sanz, and Uribarri 2014) and automatic source language detection (e.g. Klaussner, Lynch, and Vogel 2014) could be used to identify indirect translations and their source texts/languages. Computational methods, especially, could have the potential to enhance also the study of phenomena such as pseudotranslation and retranslation, which are both defined in terms of their relationship to their (*de facto*) source text and/or other translations of the same work – just like indirect translations are. Coming to grips with the fact that there are many (types of) translations that do not obey the stereotype of one ST and one TT, in turn, would force us to rethink whether the current Western model of translation, which "posits a kind of exclusive, binary and unidirectional relationship between source text and target text" (Delabastita 2008, 239; see also Bassnett 1998), is justified to begin with.

References

Alvstad, Cecilia. 2017. "Arguing for Indirect Translations in Twenty-First-Century Scandinavia." *Translation Studies* 10, no. 2: 150–165.

Apter, Emily. 2005. "Translation with No Original: Scandals of Textual Reproduction." In *Nation, Language and the Ethics of Translation*, edited by Sandra Bermann and Michael Wood, 159–174. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Assis Rosa, Alexandra, Hanna Pięta, and Rita Bueno Maia. 2017. "Theoretical, Methodological and Terminological Issues Regarding Indirect Translation: An Overview." *Translation Studies* 10, no. 2: 113–132.

Bassnett, Susan. 1998. "When is a Translation Not a Translation?" In *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 25–40. Clevendon: Multilingual Matters.

Boulogne, Pieter. 2015. "Europe's Conquest of the Russian Novel: The Pivotal Role of France and Germany." In *IberoSlavica. Special Issue*: *Translation in Iberian-Slavonic Cultural Exchanges and Beyond*, edited by Teresa Seruya and Hanna Pięta, 179-206. Lisbon: Compares.

Branchadell, Albert. 2004. "Introduction: Less Translated Languages as a Field of Inquiry." In *Less Translated Languages*, edited by Albert Branchadell and Lovell Margaret West, 1–23. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Cordingley, Anthony, and Céline Frigau Manning, eds. 2016. *Collaborative Translation: From the Renaissance to the Digital Age*. London: Bloomsbury.

Cordingley, Anthony, and Chiara Montini. 2015. "Genetic Translation Studies: An Emerging Discipline." Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies 14, special issue: Towards a Genetics of Translation, edited by Anthony Cordingley and Chiara Montini: 1–18.

Crisafulli, Edoardo. 1999. "The Translator as Textual Critic and the Potential of Transparent Discourse." *The Translator* 5, no. 1: 83–107.

Dedner, Burghard. 2012. "Intertextual Layers in Translations: Methods of Research and Editorial Presentation." In *Variants* 9, special issue: *Texts beyond Borders: Multilingualism and Textual Scholarship*, edited by Wout Dillen, Caroline Macé, and Dirk Van Hulle, 115–131. Amsterdam: Brill | Rodopi.

Delabastita, Dirk. 2008. "Status, Origin, Features: Translation and Beyond." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, edited by Anthony Pym, Miriam Shlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni, 233–246. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Dollerup, Cay. 2000. "Relay and Support Translations." In *Translation in Context*, edited by Andrew Chesterman, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador, and Yves Gambier, 17–26. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Du Pont, Olaf. 2005. "Robert Graves's Claudian Novels: A Case of Pseudotranslation." *Target* 17, no. 2: 327–347.

Edström, Bert. 1991. "The Transmitter Language Problem in Translations from Japanese into Swedish." *Babel* 37, no. 1: 1–14.

Emmerich, Karen. 2017. *Literary Translation and the Making of Originals*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Fennica. The National Bibliography of Finland. Accessed 13 January 2016. 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/.

Fernández Muñiz, Iris. 2016. “Tracking Sources in Indirect Translation Archaeology: A Case Study on a 1917 Spanish Translation of Ibsen’s *Et Dukkehjem* (1879).” In *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education* 4, edited by Turo Rautaoja, Tamara Mikolič Južnič, and Kaisa Koskinen, 115–132. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.

Genette, Gérard. 1991. “Introduction to the Paratext.” *New Literary History* 22, no. 2: 261–272.

Graeber, Wilhelm. 1991. “German Translators of English Fiction and Their French Mediators.” In *Interculturality and the Historical Study of Literary Translations*, edited by Harald Kittel and Armin Paul Frank, 5–16. Berlin: Eric Schmidt.

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

Heilbron, Johan, and Gisèle Sapiro. 2007. “Outline for a Sociology of Translation: Current Issues and Future Prospects.” Translated by Susan Emanuel. In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari, 93–107. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

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.

Hung, Eva, and Judy Wakabayashi. 2005. “Introduction.” In *Asian Translation Traditions*, edited by Eva Hung and Judy Wakabayashi, 1–16. Manchester: St. Jerome.

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.

Ivaska, Laura, and Outi Paloposki. 2018. “Attitudes towards Indirect Translation in Finland and Translators’ Strategies: Compilative and Collaborative Translation.” *Translation Studies* 11, no. 1: 33–46.

Jianzhong, Xu. 2013. “Retranslation: Necessary or Unnecessary.” *Babel* 49, no. 3: 193-202.

Kittel, Harald. 1991. “Vicissitudes of Mediation: The Case of Benjamin Franklin’s *Autobiography*.” In *Interculturality and the Historical Study of Literary Translations*, edited by Harald Kittel and Armin Paul Frank, 25–35. Berlin: Eric Schmidt.

Kittel, Harald, and Armin Paul Frank. 1991. ”Introduction.” In *Interculturality and the Historical Study of Literary Translations*, edited by Harald Kittel and Armin Paul Frank, 3–4. Berlin: Eric Schmidt.

Klaussner, Carmen, Gerard Lynch, and Carl Vogel. 2014. “Following the Trail of Source Languages in Literary Translations.” In *Research and Development in Intelligent Systems XXXI*, edited by Max Bramer and Miltos Petridis, 69–84. Cham: Springer.

Koskinen, Kaisa and Outi Paloposki. 2010. ”Retranslation.” In *Handbook of Translation Studies* 1, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 294–298. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Leppänen, Saara. 2013. "A Case in Translation Archaeology: Explanatory Peritexts in Finnish Translations of Japanese Literature." In *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education* 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, no. 2: 133–149.

Munday, Jeremy. 2014. "Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns." *The Translator* 20, no. 1: 64–80.

———. 2013. "The Role of Archival and Manuscript Research in the Investigation of Translator Decision-Making." *Target* 25, no. 1: 125–139.

Niiranen, Petra. 2016. "Välikielen kautta kääntäminen suomalaisissa kustantamoissa 2010-luvun taitteessa" [Indirect Translating in Finnish Publishing Houses Around the Year 2010]. MA Thesis, University of Turku.

Paloposki, Outi. 2001. "Originality and the Defence of Translation." *The Translator* 7, no. 1: 71–89.

Paloposki, Outi, and Kaisa Koskinen. 2010. "Reprocessing Texts: The Fine Line between Retranslating and Revising." *Across languages and Cultures* 11, no. 1: 29–49.

Perdu Honeyman, Nobel. 2004. "From Arabic to Other Languages through English." In *Less Translated Languages*, edited by Albert Branchadell and Lovell Margaret West, 67–74. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Pięta, Hanna. 2012. "Patterns in (in)Directness: An Exploratory Case Study in the External History of Portuguese Translations of Polish Literature (1855–2010)." *Target* 24, no. 2: 310–337.

Pokorn, Nike K. 2011. "Directionality." In *Handbook of Translation Studies* 2, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 37–39. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Poupaud, Sandra, Anthony Pym, and Ester Torres Simón. 2009. "Finding Translations: On the Use of Bibliographical Databases in Translation History." *Meta* 54, no. 2: 264–278.

Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Riikonen, H. K. 2007. "Suomennosten täydentyvä maailmankartta" [Additions to the World Map of Translations into Finnish]. In *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia* 2 [History of Translated Literature in Finland], edited by H. K. Riikonen, Urpo Kovala, Pekka Kujamäki, and Outi Paloposki, 308–317. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.

Ringmar, Martin. 2012. "Relay Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies* 3, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

———. 2007. "Roundabouts Routes: Some Remarks on Indirect Translations." In *Selected Papers of the CETRA Research Seminar in Translation Studies 2006*, edited by Francis Mus. http://www.kuleuven.be/cetra/papers/papers.html.

Saldanha, Gabriela, and Sharon O'Brien. 2013. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. London: Routledge.

Solberg, Ida Hove. 2016. "Finding the X Factor: Support Translation and the Case of *Le deuxième sexe* in Scandinavia." In *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education* 4, edited by Turo Rautaoja, Tamara Mikolič Južnič, and Kaisa Koskinen, 86–114. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland.

St. André, James. 2009. "Relay." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, 2nd ed., edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 230–232. London: Routledge.

Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem. 2009. "The Case Study Research Method in Translation Studies." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 3, no. 1: 37–56.

Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, rev. ed. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

UNESCO Recommendation on the Legal Protection of Translators and Translations and the Practical Means to improve the Status of Translators. 22 November 1976. http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13089&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html.

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

Washbourne, Kelly. 2013. "Nonlinear Narratives: Paths of Indirect and Relay Translation." *Meta* 58, no. 3: 607–625.

Zubillaga, Naroa, Zuriñe Sanz, and Ibon Uribarri. 2014. "Building a Trilingual Parallel Corpus to Analyse Literary Translations from German into Basque." In *New Directions in Corpus-Based Translation Studies*, edited by Claudio Fantinuoli and Federico Zanettin, 61–81. Berlin: Language Science Press.