Tracing the Editor’s Voice: on Editors’ Autobiographies
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This article traces the editor’s voice in translation by examining research material that has not been much used in Translation Studies before: editors’ autobiographies. The three autobiographies studied here, by renowned Finnish editors-publishers Jalmari Jäntti (1965), Jarl Hellemann (1996), and Erkki Reenpää (2003) indicate that the translation process is much more complex than one could expect by simply concentrating on translators.
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Introduction

When a translated text has already been published, it is often difficult to distinguish the explicit marks of the translator’s presence in the target text (what Barbara Folkart calls the “translator’s voice”\(^2\)) from those of the editor. By editor, following the *Oxford English Dictionary*, I mean: “One who prepares the literary work of another person, or number of persons for publication, by selecting, revising, and arranging the material; also, one who prepares an edition of any literary work.”\(^3\) Sometimes one can trace the editor’s voice by examining different editions of the same translation: the editor may have added footnotes, for instance, commenting on the translation.\(^4\) However, most often the translator’s and the editor’s voices merge, and we simply have to accept that: “Even in the case of the most prestigious translators, whose translational products may well have been tampered with least of all, one can never be sure just how many hands were actually involved in the establishment
of the translation as we have it [...]” as Gideon Toury puts it. Consequently, a comparative translation analysis of the source and target texts is often not enough for defining the respective influence of the translator and the editor on the target text. Paratexts and other sources (manuscripts, correspondences, publishers’ archives) are necessary for studying the editor’s role in the translation process.

My paper will explore another possible source for research on editors of translated literature: *life writing*. I have read the autobiographies (or ‘memoirs’) of three renowned Finnish publishers or literary managers who also worked as editors – Jalmari Jäntti (Werner Söderström Oy), Jarl Hellemann (Tammi Publishers), and Erkki Reenpää (Otava Publishing Company) – focusing on what they write about translating and translators. My main aim is to shed light on the editor’s point of view of the translation process. How do they describe the translators they worked with? Who was involved besides the translator? What kind of image do these editors want to give of themselves with regard to translated literature?

Before presenting the results of my analysis, I will briefly describe autobiography as a (sub)genre, and outline the ethical problems that are related to life writing – an umbrella term that covers autobiographies, memoirs, biographies, interviews, diaries, web pages etc. Unsurprisingly, these problems have to be taken into consideration when using autobiographies as research material.

“The Self Who Writes is Written” ¨: Autobiographies as Texts and as Research Material

For Philippe Lejeune, writing in 1975, any text that fulfilled the following criteria was an autobiography:

1. *Form of language*
   a. narrative
   b. in prose
2. Subject treated: individual life, story of a personality
3. Situation of the author: the author (whose name refers to a real person) and the narrator are identical
4. Position of the narrator
   a. the narrator and the principal character are identical
   b. retrospective point of view of the narrative.

Lejeune subsequently refined his definition several times, recognising that it was too narrow: for example, autobiographies can be written in verse, they need not be retrospective, and the limits between autobiographies and other (sub)genres, such as autobiographical novels are often fuzzy. What seems to be essential about autobiographies is that they are written and read as autobiographies. Lejeune calls this the “autobiographical pact.” The reader accepts the text, proposed by the author, as an autobiography, and the author tells more or less transparently how s/he became who s/he is. Moreover, autobiographies are as much “stories” of their author’s “personality” as ways of establishing a self “that would not otherwise exist.” By publishing an autobiography the author (re)creates a public image that does not have one-to-one correspondence to the author as a real person. This is true also of the well-known publisher-editors who are the subjects of my study. By writing their autobiography they all seem to have answered the question “how and why did I choose book-editing as my career?” but at the same time their autobiographies are a form of public relations for themselves and for their publishing houses. They reveal secrets and rewrite Finnish publishing history. Here the question is: how accurate and truthful is the image that they give?

According to Paul John Eakin, central ethical issues related to life writing are questions of truthfulness, the balance between the writer’s freedom of speech and other individuals’ moral and legal right to privacy, ownership of shared experiences (whom do they belong to? who has the right to tell about them?) and the genre’s potential for harm vs. its potential for good. Life writers can be criticized “for not telling the truth – personal and historical – but
also for telling too much truth.” Not telling the truth violates the conventions of nonfiction as a genre and, more seriously, breaks moral imperatives. Telling too much truth might harm the reading audience, as well as those whose secrets are exposed.\textsuperscript{13}

How should these ethical aspects be taken into account, when using editors’ autobiographies as research material in translation studies? First of all, it is important to bear in mind that autobiographers are not necessarily telling the truth and that their texts always embody several interests. Editors’ autobiographies can be considered as reliable, as research material, as translators’ prefaces and correspondences. All these texts are subjective and must be compared to other data as well. Prefaces and autobiographies may even have been written or vigorously modified by other persons than those to whom they are attributed. This is potentially the case of the earliest autobiography belonging to my corpus: Jalmari Jäntti’s \textit{Kirja oli elämäni. Jälkeenjääneitä muistelmia} [Books Were My Life: Posthumous Memoirs], published in 1965. Jäntti’s “memoirs” – which fit Lejeune’s definition of autobiography – were published posthumously by his children Eija Särkilähti and Lauri Jäntti, on the basis of an unfinished manuscript that was found in his drawer after his death in March 1960. As André Lefevere has shown, family members are not always the most objective editors of posthumous texts.\textsuperscript{14} It is therefore possible that even if it was not intended, some sort of manipulation has taken place, especially since Jäntti’s memoirs were published to celebrate the 60\textsuperscript{th} birthday of his firstborn child, Yrjö Jäntti, who followed Jalmari Jäntti as managing director at Werner Söderström Oy (henceforth WSOY).

\textbf{Jalmari Jäntti (1876-1960) and \textit{Kirja oli elämäni} [Books Were My Life]}

WSOY is one of the oldest and most prestigious publishing houses in Finland. The company, which was sold to Bonnier in 2011, was founded by Werner Leopold Söderström in 1878. His very first publication was a Finnish translation from Swedish of J. O. Åberg’s short story
“Romantiserade bilder” (translator: J. F. Hagfors). Jalmari Jäntti started working for WSOY as Werner Söderström’s literary assistant in 1899. In 1904 he was made managing editor, and after Werner Söderström’s early death in 1914, managing director of the whole publishing house. He retired at the end of 1951. Jalmari Jäntti, who had studied humanities and economics in Helsinki and later in Munich, was business-minded in his editing policy but also desirous of spreading learning in Finland. He paid special attention to efficient book marketing and chose books that sold well. However, he also followed Werner Söderström’s guidelines by continuing to publish unprofitable translated literature. In addition, in 1942, he set up a fund named the WSOY literature foundation to increase funding opportunities for Finnish authors.¹⁵

Jäntti edited manuscripts even after his retirement,¹⁶ but naturally he was most directly involved with editing at the beginning of his career, while working as Söderström’s literary assistant. In his autobiography he quotes Söderström’s written instructions concerning his tasks at that time. Jäntti was expected to supervise the revising of all texts to be published and to correct the most difficult ones himself, to plan new publications and to read submitted manuscripts, to prepare new editions of existing works and to write advertisements, subscription lists, order forms and texts for book covers. He was also expected to take care of the company’s correspondence, keep track of reviews of all books published by WSOY and eventually use the reviews in advertising. If he had time, he also translated some shorter texts.¹⁷ Indeed, Jäntti mentions that already on his very first working day he continued translating a zoological catalogue, apparently from Swedish, that someone had started earlier. Jäntti sought foreign books for possible translation by reading catalogues and brochures that he ordered from abroad at his own expense.¹⁸

Jäntti tells more about authors and other people in the publishing business than about translators but his few anecdotes related to translating are illuminating. One of his earliest
translation editing tasks took a whole year. Jalmari Aalberg had just finished his Finnish translation of Leo Tolstoi’s *Воскресение* (*Resurrection*), and WSOY was ready to print, when their competitor Otava announced that another translator, the young author Arvid Järnefelt, had translated the same novel for them from an uncensored original. Jäntti immediately ordered a fresh English translation of Tolstoi’s novel from Great Britain and spent quite some time modifying Aalberg’s translation with the help of the English translation, even though he indicates that his English was not very good. In the end the book came out in ten leaflets and met with a satisfactory success.¹⁹ The Finnish National Library’s catalogue *Fennica* confirms that both Järnefelt’s and Aalberg’s translations came out between 1899 and 1900. According to the catalogue Järnefelt’s translation had several re-editions and Aalberg’s none.²⁰ In his posthumous autobiography Jäntti uses the verb *korjata* [to correct] to describe what he did to Aalberg’s translation. However, since he was also adding material that was censored from Aalberg’s Russian source text, he was not only editing but translating. Admittedly he was translating indirectly from the original but we must bear in mind that indirect translation was still quite common in Finland those days. So, if the story is true, it shows that the strict demarcation between translators and editors can be quite arbitrary. Editors can translate and translators can edit; publishers can be former, part- or full-time translators. And, more generally, quite a few people in the publishing business have done translations at least on occasion.

Andrew Chesterman uses the term “amateur translators” to describe people who do translations (sometimes).²¹ This term would seem to apply to Jäntti as well. In his autobiography he talks about his Finnish translation (1901-1902) of Selma Lagerlöf’s *Jerusalem* (1901-1902), and the catalogue *Fennica* also mentions his translation of another text by Lagerlöf, *Herr Arnes penningar* (*The Treasure*) from 1903.²² Jäntti volunteered as *Jerusalem*’s translator even though he had to do the translation on his free time. The text
contained a major translation problem: the dialect used by Lagerlöf that Jäntti tried to recreate by imitating Finnish farmers’ way of speaking. He used as models (parallel texts) Finnish authors whose language had been praised for its richness. His aim was to improve the language used in Finnish translated literature at that time, of which he did not have a high opinion. The feedback he got on his translation from the author Maila Talvio was quite discouraging: she told Jäntti she had not bothered to read it because it was reputedly so ill translated. However, half a century later Jäntti did receive some recognition when the poet and professor of literature V.A. Koskenniemi praised the translation in strong terms.

The image of literary translators communicated by Jäntti’s autobiography is quite amateur-like and corresponds to observations by Outi Paloposki, Ilkka Mäkinen and Unto Kovala concerning early Finnish translators: translation was a side-line job for priests, poets, teachers and other educated people or a suitable hobby for young ladies. Translators were freer to suggest texts to be translated than in today’s Finland but literary translation was not profitable for most of them. Strictly speaking, there were almost no professional literary translators yet, and translators’ lack of professionalism could naturally multiply Jäntti’s working load as editor.

The most difficult editing process Jäntti describes in his autobiography concerned the project undertaken between 1901 and 1906 to translate some of Johan Ludvig Runeberg’s (1804-1877) – the Finnish national bard’s – most famous poems from Swedish into Finnish. WSOY engaged two very different kinds of poets for this task: the bohemian Eino Leino, who became one of the pioneers of Finnish poetry, and the pedant Otto Manninen, who later translated several classics, including Homer, into Finnish. The problem with Eino Leino, according to Jäntti, was that he did not respect deadlines. Once he even replied to Jäntti’s pressing enquiries about the status of his overdue translation “that he had been too busy drinking lately.” Otto Manninen, on the other hand, was a perfectionist who could easily
revise his and Leino’s translations more than four times. He could even come to the printing house and make last minute revisions, causing mortification to the technical manager. Jäntti admits that after Manninen’s revisions it is impossible to say how much of Leino’s hand can be seen in the final version of the translation.28 So, if this anecdote has any truth in it, we can see again how many hands can be involved in a printed translation – the translator, the editor, the co-translator/editor – and also how difficult working partners some translators can be from the editor’s point of view.

To sum up, the few anecdotes concerning translating and translators in Jäntti’s autobiography shed interesting light on the translation process at WSOY. We can see that the so-called translator’s voice – explicit or implicit – in the printed text can be a mixture of different and not always unanimous voices. And even if everything in Jäntti’s anecdotes is not necessarily accurate, they still seem to corroborate the idea of the translation process as something non-linear.29

**Erkki Reenpää (1925-2004) and his “travelling logbook”**

Erkki Reenpää was the descendant of a Finnish publishing dynasty influential in Finnish cultural life. The Renquist-Reenpää family is closely involved in the history of the Otava Publishing Company, founded by Hannes Gebhard and Eliel Aspelin-Haapkylä in 1890. Erkki Reenpää’s grandfather Alvar Renqvist and father Heikki Reenpää were both managing directors of Otava, the former from 1892 to 1938 and the latter from 1938 to 1956. Subsequently, Otava was led by Erkki Reenpää’s uncle Kari Reenpää (1956-1968), followed by Erkki’s brother Heikki A. Reenpää (1968-1978). Today, Otava is still partly owned by the Reenpää family and the chairman of the board is Olli Reenpää, Kari Reenpää’s son. Erkki Reenpää started working for Otava in 1951. His first position seems to have been that of an editor (1952-1970), after which he was appointed head of department (1970-1972) before
becoming assistant director in 1972. He was responsible mainly for the department of translated literature but also worked with Finnish authors. Erkki Reenpää knew many languages and was both an anglophile and a lover of Spanish and South American literature. It is noteworthy that Otava’s literary translation prize, which is given every other year for an excellent Finnish translation of fiction, bears his name.  

Of the three autobiographies that are part of my corpus, Erkki Reenpää’s travelling logbook is closest to the memoir form because it is less focused on the author’s individual life. In addition to sketching events that marked Reenpää’s personality, it is a collection of juicy anecdotes concerning Finnish and foreign authors whom he met during his career, from Frans Emil Sillanpää to Claude Simon. Reenpää’s logbook and other related material paint a picture of the autobiographer as a literary ambassador connecting people, getting publishing rights and making Finnish literature known abroad. Reenpää’s close friend, the literary journalist Juha Virkkunen, remembers “Don Rosso” (Reenpää had red hair) from cigar smoke filled, informal, multilingual gatherings that took place in his office and from his elegant pinstripe suit and large hat. Reenpää was also an efficient networker on the international level and managed to invite several Nobel Prize winners to Finland. He was the head of Lahden kansainvälinen kirjailijakokous (the Lahti International Writers’ Reunion) for twelve years from its beginning in 1963. The Lahti reunion was an important annual meeting for authors from East and West and depended first heavily on Reenpää’s personal charm and contacts. And it was thanks to Reenpää that many important South American authors were translated into Finnish.

The overwhelming image that emerges is not that of an editor who spends all his time polishing texts but of someone who mainly deals with people. The travelling logbook, which is not very detailed and concentrates on authors, not on translators, hints that Reenpää was often an initiator and a mediator in the translation process. He was a keen reader and
followed the foreign literary scene by reading publications such as the *Times Literary Supplement* and the *New York Review of Books*. He was also in charge of Otava’s foreign correspondence. He met interesting authors and publishers during his travels and obtained publishing rights by charming them over a drink. Then he found the right people to do the translations. He mentions respectfully the names of such translators as Matti Rossi, whom he managed to engage as the Finnish translator of Federico García Lorca’s poems and Mario Vargas Llosa’s *La Ciudad y los perros* (*The Time of the Hero*), Jukka Mannerkorpi, who translated Claude Simon’s *Les Géorgiques* (*The Georgics*) and Maija Westerlund, who translated José Maria Gironella’s best-seller *Los cipreses creen en Dios* (*The Cypresses Believe in God*). This respect for good professional translators is visible in the following quote, where he mentions how he found a translator for another bestseller, Henri Charrière’s *Papillon*: “The original is written in a very difficult slang; I managed to get it translated by Matti Brotherus, who knows both French and Spanish slang!” Reenpää chose both entertaining best-sellers, such as *Papillon*, and more sophisticated literary works for publication; he financed the publication of the latter by publishing the former. Clearly, Reenpää cared about translation quality in both cases.

Significantly, Reenpää’s second wife Sulamit Hirvas-Reenpää was a literary translator. There is a brief mention in the travelling logbook that she rendered into Finnish Vargas Llosa’s *La tía Julia y el escribidor* (*Aunt Julia and the Scriptwriter*), after which the author came to visit Finland as Reenpää’s guest. Not much more is written about Sulamit’s work as a translator and one could get the impression that this was because she was an amateur translator. However, the catalogue *Fennica* mentions twenty-seven works translated into Finnish by Hirvas and nine re-editions of her translations. She was among the few translators and authors to whom the Finnish Ministry of Education and Culture granted a life pension as artists in May 2011. She translated from Spanish (including seven translations of works by
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Vargas Llosa and six translations of works by Isabel Allende) and from French (three translations of works by Françoise Sagan, Luis Buñuel’s autobiography, other life writing texts, as well as detective stories). Most of her translations were published by Otava, first ones dating from 1976, the last ones from 2011.\textsuperscript{38} In the travelling logbook, Sulamit does appear in the interesting anecdotes concerning Reenpää’s meetings with authors, suggesting that Reenpää chose in his autobiography to highlight the couple’s social life rather than their work as editors. If at first glance Reenpää does not seem to have dealt so much with texts as with people, it may simply be that he did not communicate much about that side of his work. He does not write anything about his wife’s work either, even though she translated books for Otava that he must at least have accepted for publication, or perhaps even selected for translation.

Reenpää does describe in greater detail one difficult translation process, on-going for fifty-one years when he was writing his logbook, namely the translation into Finnish of Marcel Proust’s \textit{A la recherche du temps perdu}. Reenpää had heard about the original and its English translation by Scott Moncrieff. When reading Moncrieff’s version, he had underlined excellent passages and made a firm decision to have the book translated into Finnish. However, the process became tediously long because it was difficult to find a proper translator for the job (at least four translators participated in this long translation process) and another publisher was also trying to obtain the publishing rights. Reenpää did manage to acquire the rights, thanks to knowing Claude Gallimard personally, but the translation process was still advancing very slowly at the beginning of the third millennium. Reenpää writes: “The translation is still partly unfinished and in between [the translator’s name] has done other translations. \textit{Pourquoi?} I keep asking myself.” The only thing that Reenpää could do while waiting was to choose the book covers for the different parts of the Finnish translation
that did come out. The whole translation process was completed in the spring of 2007 when the last part was published in Finnish.

What can we conclude about an editor’s work on the basis of Reenpää’s logbook? While he does not reveal much about editing (or translating), he does show clearly that much of an editor’s work depends on others: authors, translators, publishers and other people in the business.

**Jarl Hellemann (1920-2010) and Lukemisen alkeet [The Basics of Reading]**

Tammi Publishers, now also owned by the Bonnier group, is the third biggest publishing house in Finland, founded in 1943. Jarl Helleman was the creator of Tammi’s prestigious Yellow Library series, launched in 1954, and specializing in translations of world literature. Hellemann was born in Copenhagen to a Danish-German family that moved to Finland when Jarl was in his early teens. He started his career as a journalist for an economic review (Kauppalehti), where he also wrote book reviews. He mentions that since he was a novice, he was given mainly translated literature that no one else wanted, but that he found particularly interesting. Hellemann was hired by Tammi as an editor in 1945, and was promoted to head of department in 1950 and to assistant director in 1955. From 1963 to 1968 he was Tammi’s executive vice president and from 1968 to 1982, the managing director. Known for his excellent connections and for his gentlemanly manner, Hellemann was highly committed to bringing the publisher’s point of view to a larger audience. He published several texts on publishing and on Finnish literary history. This may be due in part to the fact that his name is closely linked to a literary scandal that took place in 1974, when he made the decision not to publish Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn’s *Архипелаг ГУЛАГ* (The Gulag Archipelago) in Finnish. The case became a symbol of Finlandization, largely discussed also in the foreign press.

Hellemann was also particularly interested in translation per se and contributed to the substantial Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia [History of Literary Translation into Finnish], edited by H.K. Riikonen, Urpo Kovala, Pekka Kujamäki and Outi Paloposki, where he wrote chapters on team translations, Finnish publishing history, and Hitler’s Mein Kampf in Finland.

Hellemann’s main contribution to Finnish cultural life was the establishment of the Yellow Library, for which he remained responsible as a “gate-keeper” even after his retirement. The Yellow Library produced more than 310 translations during Hellemann’s time. According to his autobiography Lukemisen alkeet [The Basics of Reading], Hellemann was very active in the whole translation process during the Yellow Library’s first years: “I sought the books from different corners of the earth, got the publishing rights, had the translations made, ordered the book covers, wrote the dust cover texts and presentations, wrote printing orders to production managers.” Later, as his responsibilities grew in the company, he did not have time for “proper editing” (which presumably also means re-reading and revising translations) but only sought and chose books for the series. Hellemann had his share of translator problems when he tried to get Jun’ichirō Tanizaki’s The Makioka Sisters published in the Yellow Library. The process took twenty-two years. A first attempt, an indirect translation, was made by the Finnish poet and translator Eeva-Liisa Manner in 1969, after which the text was proposed to several translators. It was not until a translator mastering Japanese, Kai Nieminen, was found that the translation came out in 1991.

One anecdote in The Basics of Reading is of particular interest for the purposes of this study. Hellemann gives a concrete example of his textual intervention when editing a translation, motivated by his personal history. The story goes like this. On his first summer in Finland in the thirties the young Jarl was sent to Lake Päijänne to the summer cottage of a family named L., in order to improve his Finnish. He had a crush on their fifteen-year-old daughter.
Pauliina, who would rather have been a boy and wanted to be called by a shorter name Paula. Pauliina teased her young admirer and did not take him seriously. Her older brother Leo did not spend much time with him. The eldest brother Hannes did even worse. After having witnessed that Jarl (accidentally) saw their mother naked by the lake when she came from her morning swim, he accused the “Swedish schoolboy” at dinner of being a peeping Tom and demanded that everyone wear a swimming suit from that day on. Jarl was not given an opportunity to defend himself. More than twenty years later, when Hellemann was revising the first Finnish translation of Enid Blyton’s Famous Five series (*Five on a Treasure Island*, the Finnish title is *Viisikko aarresaarella*, 1956), he wondered what to do with the names of the main characters. Back then the norm in Finland was to domesticate characters’ names, especially in children’s books. Ann and Dick were still acceptable in Finnish and he kept them unchanged but something had to be done with Julian and of course Georgina. Then Hellemann remembered his summer by the lake Päijänne and the editing (or translation) problem was solved: Georgina/George became Paula/Pauli and Julian Leo.50

This story, where some of the details (omitted here) recall the ethical problems concerning life writing, is of course interesting from the translational point of view. Characters’ names play quite an essential part in a literary work. Hellemann does not indicate whether he discussed these names with the translator. According to the catalogue *Fennica* the translator’s name was Lea Karvonen, 51 which interestingly turns out to be a pseudonym. Pekka Kujamäki writes that this pseudonym, as well as that of “Lea’s” “husband, Leo Karvonen” were created by Hellemann and Tammi’s senior language reviser to serve multiple purposes: hiding translators’ identities if needed, offering translators of the prestigious Yellow Library possibilities to gain easy money by doing minor works for a change, camouflaging indirect translations when the translator’s language competences were known: “Lea Karvonen” has the authorship of more than 160 translations of less canonical literature, secretly done by
well-established Finnish authors, renowned translators, translator teams and amateurs. Approximately thirty translators have used this pseudonym from the late forties until the year 2000.52

In theory, it is possible that Hellemann used the name and translated *Five on a Treasure Island* himself. It would not have been the first time that he used a pseudonym. For instance, he published a guide for home winemaking under a false name.53 But would he have had the time to translate this text? At this point, it is not possible to investigate further the mystery of this translation. What we can suppose is that the translator/team of translators left the names unchanged – and thus the translation partly unfinished according to the translation norms of the time – because s/he or they did not take full responsibility for the target text. After all, it was Lea Karvonen’s name that was written on the translation. As to Hellemann, there is a scent of vengeance in this story, and perhaps renaming the characters was also some sort of compensation for the humiliations that young Jarl experienced in the family L. I have elsewhere proposed that sometimes translating seems to be some sort of therapy for (ill-treated) translators: they can release their aggression through the text.54 The same seems to apply to (ill-treated) editors as well, in some conditions.

**Conclusion**

The editors’ autobiographies or memoirs studied here have proven to provide meaningful research material. Even if the editor-publishers in question offer few specifics about translating and translators, a point which is perhaps significant in itself, their texts nonetheless reveal that the whole translation process is much more complicated than one could expect by simply concentrating on translators. Editors can modify and even partly translate the texts that they ‘edit’ and, at times, they may even be much more personally involved in the translation process than the translator. The three editors of my corpus all had
considerable influence on what was translated in their publishing houses. They were often the ones who chose the texts and felt committed to these texts even when translators stopped co-operating. They had a vision of what literary works from other languages should be available to Finnish readers. They purposely endeavoured to improve the quality of Finnish literary translations.

On the basis of this study, it seems that strict demarcations between translators and editors are not necessarily functional. First of all, editors can do much more than edit and translators can do much more than translate. The material used in this study suggests that the translation process tends to consist of team work. Indeed several apparently ‘external’ comments (such as those in the paratext) or implicit traces in the printed translation do not come from the translator alone. What should be done with this multitude of voices and traces? Methodologically it might be difficult to separate them all, as Toury points out, nor may this be meaningful in all cases. But let us bear in mind that editors also have voices. Has anyone written yet about the editor’s invisibility?

Notes

1 I would like to thank Andrew Chesterman and the anonymous reviewers of my article for their helpful comments regarding my text. I am also grateful to Outi Paloposki for her support during the whole research process and to Pekka Kujamäki for the fascinating information concerning “Lea Karvonen.”


4 See Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, La tierce main. Le discours rapporté dans les traductions françaises de Fielding au XVIIIe siècle (Arras: Artois Presses Université, 2006), pp. 96-103.


Andrew Chesterman writes about the difference between amateur and professional translators: “When we speak of an ethics of translation, do we mean to include amateurs as well as ‘professionals’? One way of answering this question would be to distinguish between someone ‘who is a translator’ and someone ‘who does translations (sometimes).’” Andrew Chesterman, “Proposal for a Hieronymic Oath,” *The Translator*, vol. 7, no. 2 (2001), p. 146.


Quoted in Jäntti, *Kirja oli elämäni*, p. 97.

Quoted in Jäntti, *Kirja oli elämäni*, pp. 97-98.


The reason why our national bard wrote in Swedish is that in the nineteenth century Finnish was the main language of administration and culture in Finland. Since 1922 Finland, which was declared independent in 1917, has had two national languages, Finnish and Swedish. Finnish is the native language of more than 90 per cent of the current Finnish population. See Pirkko Nuolijärvi, “Suomen kielet ja kielelliset oikeudet,” in *Monikielinen Eurooppa. Kielipolitiikka ja käytäntöä*, ed. Marjut Johansson and Riitta Pyykkö (Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 2005), pp. 284, 288. For the linguistic situation in Finland in the nineteenth century see Outi Paloposki, *Variation in Translation. Literary Translation into Finnish 1809-1850* (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2002), pp. 36-39.

Jäntti, *Kirja oli elämäni*, p. 93, translation mine.

Christiane Nord writes about the translation process: “In my opinion translation is not a linear, progressive process leading from a starting point S (=ST) to a target point T (=TT), but a circular, basically recursive process comprising an indefinite number of feedback loops, in which it is possible and even advisable to return to earlier stages of the analysis.”


For Lejeune, the difference between memoirs and autobiography lies in the subject treated. Memoirs do not narrate the story of the author’s personality. See Lejeune, *On Autobiography* , p. 4.


Reenpää, *Vaeltava lokikirja*, p. 186.


Reenpää, *Vaeltava lokikirja*, p. 108.


Reenpää, *Vaeltava lokikirja*, p. 43-44, translation mine.


*Suomenkoskirjallisuuden historia*, vol. I, pp. 242-245.


*Suomenkoskirjallisuuden historia*, vol. I, pp. 397-400.

Hellemann, *Lukemisen alkeet*, p. 147; Petäjä, “Jarl Hellemann.”

Hellemann, *Lukemisen alkeet*, p. 147, translation mine.


Hellemann, *Lukemisen alkeet*, pp. 50-64.

*Fennica*. Website consulted 13 April, 2012.


Hellemann, *Kustantajan näkökulma*, pp. 270-278.
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