

Beware the source text: five (re)translations of the same work, but from different source texts

Laura Ivaska and Suvi Huuhtanen

Volume 65, Number 2, August 2020

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1075838ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1075838ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Les Presses de l'Université de Montréal

ISSN

0026-0452 (print)

1492-1421 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Ivaska, L. & Huuhtanen, S. (2020). Beware the source text: five (re)translations of the same work, but from different source texts. *Meta*, 65(2), 312–331. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1075838ar>

Article abstract

Source text (ST), although a central concept in translation studies, has remained vaguely defined. This complicates the identification of a translation's ST, which in turn creates problems for research. Associating translations with the incorrect ST(s) leads to questionable conclusions and categorizations, especially when dealing with the types of translation that are defined and theorized with reference to their relationship with their ST(s), such as retranslation, indirect translation, pseudotranslation and self-translation. Our case study of five Finnish translations of Jules Verne's *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* demonstrates that these assumed retranslations have different STs. We adopt the notions of *work* and *text* to establish the relationships among the translations and STs involved: *texts* are representations of a *work*, and a *work*, in turn, is a literary creation implied by its various *texts*. Although the five Finnish translations have different source *texts*, they are all – as are their STs – *texts* of the same *work*. In other words, if *source text* is understood to be a *text*, the five translations are not, strictly speaking, retranslations; however, if *source text* is understood to be a *work*, then they are all retranslations of the same *work*. Therefore, the categorization of these translations – and thus also the points of view from which they can be studied – depends on whether *source text* is defined as a *text* or as a *work*.

Beware the source text: five (re)translations of the same work, but from different source texts

LAURA IVASKA

University of Turku, Turku, Finland

laura.ivaska@utu.fi

SUVI HUUHTANEN

*no affiliation**

suvi.huhtanen@gmail.com

RÉSUMÉ

Le *texte source*, bien qu'un concept central en traductologie, reste un terme défini de manière vague. Ceci rend difficile l'identification du texte source des traductions, ce qui crée des problèmes pour la recherche. Associer les traductions aux faux textes sources mène à des conclusions et catégorisations douteuses, surtout lorsqu'on traite les types de traductions définis et théorisés en référence à leurs liens avec leurs textes sources, tels que la retraduction, la traduction indirecte, la pseudo-traduction et l'auto-traduction. Notre étude de cas de cinq traductions finnoises de *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* de Jules Verne démontre que ces retraductions supposées ont différents textes sources. Nous adoptons les concepts *œuvre* et *texte* afin d'établir les relations parmi les traductions et les textes sources concernés : *textes* sont des représentations d'une *œuvre*, et une *œuvre*, à son tour, est une création littéraire qui est impliquée par divers *textes*. Bien que les cinq traductions finnoises aient des *textes* sources différents, elles sont toutes – et leurs textes sources également – *textes* de la même *œuvre*. En d'autres termes, si le *texte source* est un *texte*, les cinq traductions ne sont pas, au sens strict, des retraductions ; cependant, si le *texte source* est une *œuvre*, ils sont des retraductions de la même *œuvre*. Par conséquent, la catégorisation de ces traductions – et donc aussi les points de vue à partir desquels ils peuvent être étudiés – dépend de la définition du *texte source* comme un *texte* ou comme une *œuvre*.

ABSTRACT

Source text (ST), although a central concept in translation studies, has remained vaguely defined. This complicates the identification of a translation's ST, which in turn creates problems for research. Associating translations with the incorrect ST(s) leads to questionable conclusions and categorizations, especially when dealing with the types of translation that are defined and theorized with reference to their relationship with their ST(s), such as retranslation, indirect translation, pseudotranslation and self-translation. Our case study of five Finnish translations of Jules Verne's *Vingt mille lieues sous les mer* demonstrates that these assumed retranslations have different STs. We adopt the notions of *work* and *text* to establish the relationships among the translations and STs involved: *texts* are representations of a *work*, and a *work*, in turn, is a literary creation implied by its various *texts*. Although the five Finnish translations have different source *texts*, they are all – as are their STs – *texts* of the same *work*. In other words, if *source text* is understood to be a *text*, the five translations are not, strictly speaking, retranslations; however, if *source text* is understood to be a *work*, then they are all retranslations of the same *work*. Therefore, the categorization of these translations – and thus also the points of view from which they can be studied – depends on whether *source text* is defined as a *text* or as a *work*.

RESUMEN

Aunque consiste en un concepto central en traductología, el *texto fuente*, ha quedado un término definido de manera vaga, lo que dificulta la identificación del texto fuente de las traducciones et por ende acarrea problemas para la investigación. Asociar las traducciones a textos fuentes erróneos lleva a categorizaciones y conclusiones poco confiables, sobre todo cuando se estudian los tipos de traducción definidos y teorizados con referencia a sus textos fuentes, tales como la retraducción, la traducción indirecta, la pseudo-traducción y la autotraducción. Nuestro estudio de caso de cinco traducciones fineses de *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* de Jules Verne demuestra que estas supuestas retraducciones tienen diferentes textos fuentes. Adoptamos los conceptos *obra* y *texto* con el fin de determinar las relaciones entre las traducciones y los textos fuentes estudiados: *textos* son representaciones de una *obra*, y una *obra*, a su vez, es una creación literaria implicada por sus diversos *textos*. A pesar de tener *textos* fuentes diferentes, las cinco traducciones fineses son, al igual que sus textos fuentes, *textos* de la misma *obra*. En otras palabras, si el *texto fuente* es un *texto*, lea cinco traducciones no son, en sentido estricto, retraducciones; sin embargo, si el *texto fuente* es una *obra*, son retraducciones de la misma *obra*. Por consiguiente, la categorización de estas traducciones, así como los puntos de vista a partir de los cuales se pueden estudiar, dependen de la definición del *texto fuente* como *texto* o como *obra*.

MOTS-CLÉS/KEYWORDS/PALABRAS CLAVE

texte source, texte et œuvre, retraduction, traduction indirecte, traduction compilative
source text, text and work, retranslation, indirect translation, compilative translation
texto fuente, texto y obra, retraducción, traducción indirecta, traducción compilativa

1. Introduction

The concepts of *source text* and *target text* are central in translation studies, yet they seem to have remained undertheorized – just like the adjacent concept of the *original* (Baer 2017). If translation is a text for which “there is another text, in another language/culture, which has both chronological and logical priority over it” (Toury 1995/2012: 29; see also Apter 2005), it may become necessary to locate this other text – the source text (ST). If STs are not correctly identified, the comparison of translations with their assumed STs is on shaky ground (see, for example, Toury 1995/2012: 100-101; Shengyu 2018: 38) and, by consequence, so are the theories derived from such comparisons. One problem is that the ST does not necessarily equal what is commonly understood as “the original text.”

Our initial idea was to compare Otto Joutsen’s 1916 indirect Finnish translation of Jules Verne’s *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* (1869/1870)¹ with four (direct) Finnish (re)translations of the novel to see if translating indirectly really results in “a lesser degree of precision and an increasing number of deviations” (Edström 1991: 12; see also Dollerup 2000: 23) as compared with translating directly. However, the five translations are so different from each other that comparison was difficult. This observation led us to question whether these translations really were based on the same ST – even if they are all translations of the same novel. As Paloposki and Koskinen (2010: 41) put it, “categorization and labeling may be misleading” and in fact our initial categorization of the four translations as direct translations proved questionable.

As Toury (1995/2012: 94) points out, “there will always be the possibility that the assumed translation under study will be found not to have been derived from a particular assumed ST after all, or not from it alone.” In fact, although “[t]he standard Western model of translation posits a kind of exclusive, binary and unidirectional relationship between source text and target text” (Delabastita 2008: 239), the reality is often more complicated (see also Meylaerts 2006). Unfortunately, the information regarding the source text(s)/language(s) of translations on title pages and bibliographies may be inaccurate, incomplete or even lacking (Toury 1995; Poupaud, Pym, *et al.* 2009; Paloposki and Koskinen 2010; among others), and therefore it can be easy to arrive at wrong conclusions. The careful assessment of the ST(s) of a translation, however, could lead to the discovery that the translation has no ST and that it is actually a pseudotranslation, “a text that is presented as a translation while it is in fact not a translation” (Du Pont 2005: 328; see also Toury 1995; Popovič 1976). Or, it could turn out that the ST is not in the language in which the text was first written, as is the case of indirect translation, which is understood as “a translation based on a text (or texts) other than (only) the ultimate source text” (Ivaska and Paloposki 2018: 43, note 1), or that it is based on several STs (Rizzi 2008; Ivaska and Paloposki 2018), in which case it could be labeled a compilative translation. Similarly, retranslations, defined as “second or later translation[s] of a *single source text* into the same target language” (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 294; emphasis added), could be established to actually have different STs (see, for instance, Paloposki and Koskinen 2010), leading to the conclusions that they are, strictly speaking, not retranslations.

The importance of identifying the ST(s) of translations, however, does not lie only in being able to correctly categorize them. Rather, this is also important because, just as “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” (Toury 1995/2012: 19, note 2), identifying the wrong ST(s) can also lead into invalid conclusions. For example, thinking that *Janina* (1847/1882), Emilia Dobrzańska’s Polish translation of Charlotte Brontë’s *Jane Eyre* (1847), was based (solely) on an English ST, Hadyna (2016: 79) first attributed “one of the most notable errors [...] to the translator’s misunderstanding of the original.” However, she later found out that the passage in question had actually been translated from a French mediating text and that the Polish translation renders the meaning of the French – the *de facto* ST of the passage – correctly. In other words, there is no translation error, but Hadyna could reach this conclusion only after carefully reassessing what is – or, in this case, are – the translation’s STs.

In this article, we discuss the difficulty of identifying and defining source texts and present a case study of five assumed (re)translations of one novel, of which the (re)translations nevertheless have different source texts. We adopt the notions of *work* and *text* to be able to discuss such complex textual relationships and to show how the source text does not (always) correspond to the “original text.” In addition, we show how the categorizing of translations and the kind of questions one can ask change depending on how *source text* is defined.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. Definitions of source text

How does translation studies define *source text*? Rather vaguely, if at all, it seems. For example, the *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies* (Baker and Saldanha 1998/2009), the *Handbook of Translation Studies* (Gambier and van Doorslaer 2010–2014), The *Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies* (Malmkjær and Windle 2011) and *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies* (Millán and Bartina 2013) all lack an article on *source text*, and even on *text* in general. The focus on the target culture/text in recent years may explain this (see Baer 2017), but it is nevertheless surprising considering how central a concept *source text* is for translation studies.

Palumbo (2009: 108) defines *source text* succinctly, yet not very successfully, as “[t]he text to be translated, sometimes also called ‘foreign text’.” The introduction of the term *foreign text* does not lead to a better understanding of what a *source text* is. Also, we could debate whether Palumbo’s choice of tense is correct: is a text already a *source text* before any translating takes place – even if the text is prepared with translation in mind (see Dollerup 2000) – or does it become one only *after* translating takes place (see Emmerich 2011; Littau 1997)?

A more extended definition of *source text* can be found in Shuttleworth and Cowie’s *Dictionary of Translation Studies* (1997):

The text (written or spoken) which provides the point of departure for translation. Except in the case of INTERSEMIOTIC and INTRALINGUAL translation, the source text will be in a different language (SOURCE LANGUAGE) from the translation (or TARGET TEXT) which the translator produces from it. The source text will typically be an original text written in SL; however, in the case of INDIRECT TRANSLATION [...], it may itself be a translation of another text in another language. (Shuttleworth and Cowie 1997: 157–158)

This definition views a ST as a singular, unified entity (“*the text*”; “*the source text*”; “*a translation of another text*”). Although translating from a translation is acknowledged, the possibility for a *compilative translation*, defined as “a translation which makes use of a number of source texts” (Toury 1995/2012: 100, note 4; see also Assis Rosa, Pięta, *et al.* 2017; Crisafulli 1999; Ivaska 2021), is not considered, and the same applies to *support translation*, which entails translators checking other translations of the text “in order to see whether colleagues have found satisfactory solutions to certain problems” (Dollerup 2000: 23).² According to the above definition, the ST and the translation are in the same language only in cases of intersemiotic and intralingual translation. Thus, a retranslation using a previous translation into the same language as a (supporting) source would not count as interlingual (re)translation.³

Another problem with this definition is that ST and original text are considered equal (“The source text will typically be an original text”). This relationship is problematic, as Pym discusses in his *Translation Research Terms: A Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute*, in which he defines *source text* as the “[s]tandard term for the text that you translate from” (Pym 2011: 92). He also notes that “[t]he theoretical problem is that all texts incorporate elements from previous texts, so in principle no text can be a primal ‘source.’ Common parlance refers more readily to ‘the original,’ which promotes the same illusion of primacy” (Pym 2011: 92). Pym seems to be suggesting that no text is ever truly original within the universe of all

the texts in the world because some level of (unintended) intertextuality is unavoidable (see also Littau 1997; Bassnett 1998; Paloposki 2001; Scott 2006). This illusion of originality exists also on the level of an individual work. Novels, for example, can exist simultaneously in several forms, such as editions and (re)translations in various languages. Sometimes there might even be small differences between the hardback and the paperback – because someone has spotted typos or because the translator has changed their mind – like Emily Wilson, who in 2017 translated Homer’s *Odyssey* into English, recently disclosed on Twitter.⁴ In such situations, which version is the “original”? Complexities of this and similar kinds make equating (*source*) *text* with *original* an oversimplification: sometimes it can be difficult – if not impossible – to pinpoint one version that is more “original” than the others.

2.2. *The multiple, unstable (source) text*

There are often several candidates for a ST from which the translator – or whoever is responsible for the choice of the ST(s) (see for instance Emmerich 2017) – needs to choose (Crisafulli 1999; see also Frei 2012; Kothari 2005; Wu and Fernández Díaz 2017). This can make it difficult to identify the correct ST(s) of translations, which in turn complicates the categorization of the translations. For example, Virginia Woolf’s novels were “typeset and printed in both the U.K. and the U.S. from two separate sets of proofs” (Emmerich 2017: 2), and naturally either version can serve as a ST. What if one translation is done from the U.K. and another from the U.S. version – are they translations of the same novel? Or if the first translation into language A is from the U.K. and the second from the U.S. version – is the latter a retranslation?⁵ What if one part of a translation is based on the U.K. and another on the U.S. version (see Wu and Fernández Díaz 2017)? Or what if the author revises a published text (see Baer 2017; Toury 1995/2012; van Hulle 2015) or self-translates⁶ their works – which version should be used as a ST, and what if different translators use different versions (see Woods 2006)?

Because novels sometimes exist simultaneously in several forms, establishing the exact ST(s) may require extensive detective work (see, for instance, Fernández Muñiz 2016). However, as “the published text is but one phase in the text’s evolution” (Cordingley and Montini 2015: 2), an evolution that begins before the text’s publication, we need to ask: does a text become a text only once it is published, or already in manuscript form – can an unpublished text serve as a ST? And what should we do about the fact that “behind every manuscript there lurks other, lost manuscripts and any number of unrecorded hours of mental activity” (Scott 2006: 108) – can a ST exist in oral or other non-physical form (see Apter 2005; Hung 2005)?

When the possibility of a non-physical ST is taken into account, establishing what served as the ST(s) of a translation might become outright impossible. For example, the ST may have existed only in the mind of the translator, without ever taking any tangible form, when they were producing a pseudotranslation (see Apter 2005) or a compilative translation (see Shengyu 2018; Ivaska 2021).⁷ Locating the ST may also be challenging if the ST is “one of a kind, [...] utterly unique” (Emmerich 2017: 6), such as Karen Emmerich’s ST for her English translation of Vassilis Vassilikos’ novel *Γλαύκος Θρασάκης* (1974), translated as *The Few Things I Know About Glafkos Thrassakis* (2002). Since the publisher of the translation demanded

that the book be shortened, the author himself tore out 150 pages of a Greek version, leaving the translator with a “physically altered copy of an out-of-print edition of a novel that had already appeared in numerous other versions in Greek” (Emmerich 2017: 6) as her ST. In fact, sometimes the translator may be the only one with access to and/or knowledge on what the ST(s) of a particular translation were, and the researcher may, unfortunately, have “no way, let alone a foolproof one, to distinguish between texts whose sources have simply vanished and texts which never had a single-text source” (Toury 1995/2012: 48).

In other words, identifying the exact ST(s) may be difficult because there can be several candidates, because the translator may have used a unique copy, or because the text never had a physical form. However, picking up *a* version and comparing it with the translation might lead to incorrect conclusions. Dedner, for example, has observed one such instance:

Earlier scholars compared Büchner’s translation with Hugo’s original [of the plays *Lucrèce Borgia* and *Marie Tudor*] and were amazed at the liberties the translator Büchner had allowed himself. Their amazement was ill-founded since it was they who had taken the liberty of comparing Büchner’s translation from 1835 with a much later and much changed version of the French text. (Dedner 2012: 125-126)

To avoid this kind of missteps, the ST(s) should be carefully established before making comparative analyses. This seems especially important when dealing with phenomena like retranslation, pseudotranslation, indirect translation, revision, back-translation, adaptation and self-translation, as these categories are defined and distinguished from each other at least partly on the basis of their relationship with their ST(s) (see Gambier 1994, among others).

2.3. *The work, the (source) text, the translation*

If, for research purposes, it is necessary to identify the ST(s) of a translation, how to confront the fact that a text may exist in multiple forms, and how to conceptualize the connections between the various translations of a novel that were done from different STs? In other words, how to describe the relationship between different texts that stem from the same root? Or what to do if one is unable to locate the exact ST(s) of a translation – does it mean that research becomes impossible? One approach to dealing with such situations can be found in textual scholarship,⁸ in which a literary product can be described with two distinct terms, *text* and *work*: “From the receiver’s perspective, a *work* is the imagined whole implied by all differing forms of a *text* that we conceive as representing a single literary creation” (Shillingsburg 1984/1996: 43; emphasis added). In other words, a *text* is one form of a *work* – or, the other way round, *texts* are different representations of a *work*.

The evolution of a *work* may begin as a non-physical *text* (an idea) and may then transform into various physical *texts* – in one or several languages. Then, the “process of textual transformation continues [...] after the work’s publication through its re-editions, its retranslations and its different reception by heterogeneous communities of readers” (Cordingley and Montini 2015: 2; emphasis in the original). In brief, *works*, whether translated or not, often exist in several forms – *texts* – none of which is necessarily the last or the definitive version. Similarly, trying to locate the first or the original version is difficult. Even authors themselves can create multiple *texts* of their *works*.

For example, as van Hulle (2015) explains, Beckett self-translated his *L'innommable* (1953) from French into English (*The Unnameable*, 1958) adding a phrase to the ending – thus making “the original less complete” (van Hulle 2015: 46) – and later, when the French version was republished, this additional phrase was also included in that language-version. In other words, the relationship between a ST and a target text is not always as straightforward as it may seem: translations can cause their STs to evolve (see also Emmerich 2017) or they can even function as STs for further (indirect) translations, implying that the relationship between STs and translations is not unidirectional and binary (see Dollerup 2004; Delabastita 2008). However, both the French and the English versions of Beckett’s novel are *texts* of the same *work*. Similarly, in the case of the Virginia Woolf novel whose U.K. typesetting and printing differ from those of the U.S. version, the story Woolf imagined is the *work*, whereas both the U.K. and the U.S. print versions are its *texts*. Regardless of which of these versions is used as a ST, all subsequent translations are representations of the same *work*.⁹

3. The five Finnish translations of *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*

Jules Verne’s *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* was originally published between 20 March 1869 and 20 June 1870 in *Magasin d’Éducation et de Récréation*, a periodical aimed at young readers. It has since been published in several versions (*texts*), including new editions and translations.¹⁰ For this case study, we have identified five book-length translations into Finnish (see Table 1). We will study these translations to see if they have the same source text. The aim is to understand whether they really are retranslations of the same source text, keeping in mind the definition of retranslation as a “second or later translation of a *single source text* into the same target language” (Koskinen and Paloposki 2010: 294; emphasis added).

The first Finnish translation, Otto Aleksanteri Joutsen’s *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri* [Around the globe in a submarine], came out in 1916, forty-seven years after the story was first published in French. The title page does not mention Joutsen’s source language/text. The translation, published by WSOY, is abridged, at 400 pages and approximately 79,000 words. It was reprinted in 1918 and 1934.

In 1926, Verne’s novel was published in a (re)translation by another publisher, Karisto. This version was initially published in two parts: *Merten alitse* [Crossing under the seas], translated by Väinö Hämeen-Anttila, and *Kapteeni Nemo* [Captain Nemo], translated by Urho Kivimäki. The title page explicitly states that the translations were done from French. There were no reprints in this two-volume format, but in 1968 the translations were published in a second revised edition. The revisions were done by an anonymous reviser – both Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki had passed away – and the novel was turned into a trilogy, the parts being titled *Merten alitse*, *Kapteeni Nemo*, and *Nautilus*. The trilogy was reprinted in 1969 and 1977, whereas the fifth edition in 1991 was published in one volume under the name *Kapteeni Nemo ja Nautilus* [Captain Nemo and the Nautilus]. The sixth and latest reprint appeared in 1998, again in one volume. In any format, the translation by this duo, with approximately 530 pages and about 105,000 words, is the longest of the Finnish translations.

A Finnish translation of the novel also appeared in the USSR in 1934–1935, published by Valtion Kustannusliike Kirja. The publisher was based in Petrozavodsk, the current capital of the Republic of Karelia in the modern-day Russian Federation. At

the time of the translation's publication, Finnish was one of Soviet Karelia's official languages, which explains why a Finnish translation was published there. The translation consisted of two parts, *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri I* [Around the globe in a submarine I] (1934) and *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri II* [Around the globe in a submarine II] (1935). No translator is mentioned on the title page, but the names of the editors, H. Mäkelin (Part I) and Aune Rautio (Part II), are given. Length-wise, this version, having 406 pages and about 79,000 words, seems slightly abridged.

The publishing house WSOY, which had published Joutsen's translation in 1916, released the novel in a new translation in 1955. This translation, by Martta Tynni, carries the same title as Joutsen's translation, *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri* [Around the Globe in a Submarine]. Tynni's translation is 317 pages and about 67,000 words long (whereas Joutsen's is 400 pages and around 79,000 words) and, according to the title page, it has been slightly abridged. Tynni's translation has been reprinted six times (1957, 1964, 1970, 1976, 1995, and 2000).

Lastly, *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* was translated into Finnish by Kristina Haataja and published by Minerva in 2008. Haataja's translation, titled *Kapteeni Nemo: Merten syvyyksissä* [Captain Nemo: in the depths of the seas], is the shortest of all with only 287 pages and roughly 57,000 words, and it is also the only one with no illustrations. According to the title page, the book was translated from French. At the time of writing, the translation has been reprinted once, in 2011.

TABLE 1

Bibliographic information of the Finnish translations of the novel

1. Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri [Around the globe in a submarine]	
First Published	1916
Publisher	Porvoo: WSOY
Translator(s)	Otto Aleksanteri Joutsen
Translation Info	Translated into Finnish by O. A. Joutsen. ("Suomentanut O. A. Joutsen.")
Pages	400 (ca. 79,000 words)
Source Language	Not mentioned
Illustrations	Yes
Reprints	1918; 1934
2a. Merten alitse* + Kapteeni Nemo ^o [Crossing under the seas + Captain Nemo]	
2b. Merten alitse* + Kapteeni Nemo ^o + Nautilus ^o (2nd revised ed.) [Crossing under the seas + Captain Nemo + Nautilus]	
2c. Kapteeni Nemo ja Nautilus ^o (5th ed.) [Captain Nemo and Nautilus]	
First Published	2a. 1926 2b. 1968 2c. 1991
Publisher	Hämeenlinna: Karisto
Translator(s)	Väinö Hämeen-Anttila* and Urho Kivimäki ^o
Translation Info	2a. Translated from the French language into Finnish by V. Hämeen-Anttila ("Ranskankielestä [sic] suomentanut V. Hämeen-Anttila") + Translated from the French language into Finnish by Urho Kivimäki ("Ranskankielestä [sic] suomentanut Urho Kivimäki") 2b. Translated by Väinö Hämeen-Anttila, revised 1968 ("Suom. Väinö Hämeen-Anttila, tark. 1968") + Translated by Väinö Hämeen-Anttila and Urho Kivimäki, revised 1968 ("Suom. Väinö Hämeen-Anttila ja Urho Kivimäki, tark. 1968") + Translated by Urho Kivimäki, revised 1968 ("Suom. Urho Kivimäki, tark. 1969") 2c. Last reprint in 1998: Translations into Finnish, revised in 1968 ("Suomennokset tarkistettu vuonna 1968")

Pages	2a. 247+286=533 (ca. 105,000 words) 2b. 188+172+178=538 2c. 526
Source Language	French
Illustrations	Yes
Reprints	2a. none 2b. 1969; 1977 2c. 1998
3. Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri I + II [Around the globe in a submarine I + II]	
First Published	1934 (part I); 1935 (part II)
Publisher	Petrozavodsk (USSR): Valtion Kustannusliike Kirja
Translator(s)	Anonymous
Translation Info	Part I: Editor in chief H. Mäkelin (“Отв. редактор Х. Мякелин”); Part II: Editor in chief Aune Rautio (“Отв. редактор Ауне Раутио”)
Pages	156+250=406 (ca. 79,000 words)
Source Language	Not mentioned
Illustrations	Yes
Reprints	No ¹¹
4. Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri [Around the globe in a submarine]	
First Published	1955
Publisher	Helsinki: WSOY
Translator(s)	Martta Tynni
Translation Info	From the original work 20.000 lieues sous les mers slightly abridged and translated into Finnish by Martta Tynni (“Alkuteoksesta 20.000 lieues sous les mers hieman lyhentäen suomentanut Martta Tynni”)
Pages	317 (ca. 67,000 words)
Source Language	French
Illustrations	Yes
Reprints	1957; 1964; 1970; 1976; 1995; 2000
5. Kapteeni Nemo: Merten syvyyksissä [Captain Nemo: in the depths of the seas]	
First Published	2008
Publisher	Helsinki: Minerva
Translator(s)	Kristina Haataja
Translation Info	Translated from French into Finnish by Kristina Haataja (“Ranskan kielestä suomentanut Kristina Haataja”)
Pages	287 (ca. 57,000 words)
Source Language	French
Illustrations	No
Reprints	2011

4. Methods

To identify the source text(s)/language(s) of each Finnish translation, we ask: Is the ST in French? If not in French, then what language(s)? We first looked for clues on the source texts/languages in materials, such as correspondence, found in the translators’ archives. Joutsen discusses the translating of *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* in letters to the publisher, archived at the National Archives of Finland (NAFI). Hämeen-Anttila’s archives at NAFI and the Finnish Literature Society Archives, like Kivimäki’s archives at NAFI, do not contain any mentions of translating Verne. As

for Tynni, we have been unable to locate her archives, and the same applies to Haataja (who is still alive). We looked for additional information on the translators' lives in various sources to find further clues as to their possible source texts/languages and to contextualize their translations.

Textual comparison of the translations with their possible STs is another way to identify the source text(s)/language(s), and it forms the core of our analysis. To enable a rich analysis, we analyze four chapters from different parts of the novel that deal with different themes: one is the first chapter ("Un écueil fuyant" in the original), two are from the middle ("Une forêt sous-marine" and "La foudre du capitaine Nemo") and one from the end ("Les poulpes"). The comparison builds on Huuhtanen (2016). When the analysis requires comparison with a French version, we refer to a version that was easily accessible: the 40th, illustrated edition published in 2010 by Librairie Générale Française.

5. Uncovering the source text(s)/language(s) of the five Finnish translations

Otto Joutsen's correspondence with his publisher reveals that he translated the novel indirectly from English and Swedish. It was common to translate French literature indirectly in that era (Suomela-Härmä 2007), and according to online database *Fennica*,¹² the National Bibliography of Finland, at least two other novels by Verne from the late 1800s are indirect translations.¹³ In a letter, Joutsen explains how he had – without success – tried to get a copy of *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* in French because he was not happy with using the English version he had at his disposal:¹⁴ he feared that converting measurements back from the English system into the metric system would not result in the same numbers that Verne had used, especially since the numbers were often preceded by the word "about" in the English translation.¹⁵ Therefore, the publisher sent Joutsen a Swedish translation, but because Joutsen suspected that it had also been translated from English, he concluded that it was best to use both translations side by side.¹⁶ Thus, Joutsen's translation is not only indirect, but also compilative. However, Joutsen refers to the English as "the original"¹⁷, which suggests that he might have used it as his primary ST – or perhaps the English version was "original" for him because it was chronologically his first ST.

Väinö Hämeen-Anttila worked at the Karisto publishing house as an editor and CEO (Simojoki 1950), wrote and edited books, and translated English and French authors such as Defoe, Kipling, and Dumas. Urho Kivimäki also worked at the Karisto publishing house (Simojoki 1950) and translated literature, mostly from German and French. Comparison of Kivimäki's and Hämeen-Anttila's translations with a French version of the novel has produced no evidence suggesting that they did *not* translate *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* from French. Of course, it is difficult to ascertain that they did *not* use any other language-version(s) as their ST(s). In any case, the most interesting aspect of their translation, from the point of view of this study, is that it was successively recycled, as will be discussed next.

The anonymous 1934-1935 USSR translation appropriates Joutsen's and Kivimäki's translations. Comparison makes evident that the first part of *Sukellus-laivalla maapallon ympäri* is an almost exact copy of the first 192 pages of Joutsen's translation, except that it has been shortened from about 38,000 to approximately

30,000 words and a few words have been changed, apparently to modernize the style (see Examples 1a, Joutsen's translation, and 1b, the USSR translation; texts in square brackets are our glosses of the examples that are being analyzed). The second part of the translation is not a copy of Joutsen's translation, but a slightly revised and shortened (from approximately 57,000 to around 49,000 words) version of Kivimäki's *Kapteeni Nemo* with the wording being overall very similar (see Examples 2a, Kivimäki's version, and 2b, the anonymous Soviet translation). In other words, this version is some kind of intralingual compilative plagiarism or revision.

- 1) Mais, en ce moment, le Nautilus, soulevé par les dernières ondulations du flût, quitta son lit de corail à cette quarantième minute exactement fixée par le capitaine.

[But, at that moment, Nautilus, lifted by the last waves of the tide, left its coral bed at that fortieth minute exactly set by the captain.]

(Verne 1869-1870/2010: 268)

- a) Mutta samassapa jättikin **vuoksen** viimeisten maininkien **irtitempaama** Nautilus rosoisen korallivuoteensa täsmälleen 2,40 iltapäivällä, kuten kapteeni oli luvannut.

[But in that instant, wrenched by the last swells of the **high tide**, Nautilus left its rough coral bed exactly at 2,40 in the afternoon like the captain had promised.]

(Verne 1869-1870/1916: 175, translated by Joutsen)

- b) Mutta samassapa jättikin **nousuveden** viimeisten maininkien **irti tempaama** Nautilus rosoisen korallivuoteensa täsmälleen 2,40 iltapäivällä, kuten kapteeni oli luvannut.

[But in that instant, wrenched by the last swells of the **high water**, Nautilus left its rough coral bed exactly at 2,40 in the afternoon like the captain had promised.]

(Verne 1869-1870/1934: 143, translator anonymous)

- 2) Ce combat avait duré un quart d'heure. Les monstres vaincus, mutilés, frappés à mort, nous laissèrent enfin place et disparurent sous les flots.

[That battle had lasted for a quarter of an hour. The defeated, mutilated, beaten-to-death monsters finally left us and disappeared under the waves.]

(Verne 1869-1870/2010: 545)

- a) Taistelua oli kestänyt viisitoista minuuttia. Masennetut, ruhjotut, kuolemaa tekevät kummitukset luovuttivat **tanteren** ja katosivat aaltoihin.

[The battle had lasted for fifteen minutes. The discouraged, mutilated, dying ghosts ceded the ground and disappeared in the waves.]

(Verne 1869-1870/1926: 239, translated by Kivimäki)

- b) Taistelua oli kestänyt viisitoista minuuttia. Masennetut, ruhjotut [*sic*] kuolemaa tekevät kummitukset luovuttivat **meille tantereen** ja katosivat aaltoihin.

[The battle had lasted for fifteen minutes. The discouraged, mutilated dying ghosts ceded the ground to us and disappeared in the waves.]

(Verne 1869-1870/1935: 209, anonymous translator)

According to *Fennica*, Martta Tynni's translation career was short (1955-1961) with three works by Verne, a novel by another French author, Paul Berna, and six children's books by the French writer Madeleine Grize, which Tynni translated together with L. Aro. Tynni was also a lecturer of French at the University of Helsinki from 1971 to 1973;¹⁸ she must have had an excellent command of French at least by

the 1970s. Considering that Tynni's translation has the same publisher and title as Joutsen's, one might expect for it to be a revision, but it is not. Joutsen used English and Swedish STs, but the textual analysis of Tynni's translation of *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* suggests that she used a French ST, as Examples 3a (Joutsen) and 3b (Tynni) demonstrate. It also shows that Joutsen was rightly worried about converting measurements from the English system back into the metric system:

- 3) [...] une tôle de **quatre** centimètres [...] [a metal sheet **four** centimeters thick]

(Verne 1869-1870/2010: 38)

- a) [...] 3½ sm. vahvuisissa rautalevyissä [...] [in iron sheets 3½ centimeters thick]

(Verne 1869-1870/1916: 13, translated by Joutsen)

- b) [...] **neljän** senttimetrin vahvuisen teräslevyn [...] [of a steel sheet **four** centimeters thick]

(Verne 1869-1870/1955: 9, translated by Tynni)

The title page of Tynni's translation states that the translation is abridged. Milton (2001) observes that there are several ways to abridge a translation, the easiest being to translate an existing abridged version. Tynni's ST may have been an abridged French version or a full-length version. In the latter case, the ST could be the same as Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's, but considering how heavily Tynni's translation is abridged (it has about 67,000 words, as compared to the approximately Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's 105,000), it becomes difficult – if not impossible – to compare her version to Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's to verify similarities and differences, let alone to compare Tynni's translation to French versions in order to figure out the exact ST. In any case, we can say with certainty that her ST is different at least from Joutsen's and the USSR version.

Kristina Haataja is a translator, language teacher, and journalist who has spent most of her life in Paris. Prior to translating *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* in 2008 – as well as Verne's *Le tour du monde en 80 jours* (1872) under the title *Maailman ympäri 80 päivässä* (2008) and *Cinq Semaines en ballon* (1863), titled *Kuumailmapallolla Afrikan halki* (2009) in Finnish – she had already translated other French authors, such as Marguerite Duras, Virginie Despentes, and Emmanuel Carrère. She has also written fiction both in French and in Finnish, and hence we have no reason to suspect that she could not have translated Verne directly from French. However, comparison with the other Finnish translations reveals that Haataja's translation draws on Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's translation. Even if Haataja's abridged translation is much shorter than Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's (57,000 as compared to 105,000 words), her translation is divided into paragraphs following Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's example, the syntax is very similar, and some word choices are duplicated so systematically that the source of influence is indisputable, such as in the case of the not-so-common and poetic word *lakkapää* (see Example 4):

- 4) [J]'apercevais même les «moutons» écumeux que leur crête brisée multipliait sur les eaux.

[I even noticed foamy "sheep" which their breaking crests multiplied in the water.]

(Verne 1869-1870/2010: 200)

- a) Olinpa huomaavinani myöskin ”**lakkapäitä**,” joita murtuneesta aallosta pärskähteli pinnalle.
[I think I even noticed foamy “**whitecaps**” that from the broken wave bursted to the surface.]

(Verne 1869-1870/1926: 169, translated by Hämeen-Anttila)

- b) Olin huomaavinani myös **lakkapäitä**, joita pärskähteli pinnalle murtuneista aalloista.
[I think I even noticed foamy **whitecaps**, that bursted to the surface from the broken waves.]

(Verne 1869-1870/2008: 110, translated by Haataja)

However, some passages suggest that Haataja used also a French ST:

- 5) Il était probable qu’ils venaient des îles voisines ou de la **Papouasie** proprement dite.
[It was likely that they came from the neighbouring islands or from the actual **Papua**.]

(Verne 1869-1870/2010: 257)

- a) Heitä saapui tietenkin lähisaarilta tai itse **Uudesta Guineasta**.
[They were of course arriving from the near-by islands or from the actual **New Guinea**.]

(Verne 1869-1870/1926: 215, translated by Hämeen-Anttila)

- b) On mahdollista, että he olivat saapuneet naapurisaarista tai varsinaisesta **Papuasiasta**.
[It is possible that they had arrived from the neighbouring islands or from the actual **Papua**.]

(Verne 1869-1870/2008: 134-135, translated by Haataja)

It remains unclear why, instead of translating simply from a French ST, Haataja ended up making what Alvstad and Assis Rosa (2015: 17) would call a compilative inter- and intralingual retranslation, which they define as the “use of the source text and of one or several previous translations into the target language,” or what Washbourne (2013: 619) calls a comparison-revision/retranslation, in which “the most successful parts are retained, the weaker parts shored up.”¹⁹ Perhaps Haataja was familiar with Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki’s translation as a reader, and their version thus represents for her the canonical translation from which she did not want to deviate too much;²⁰ or, it might have been simply the publisher’s decision or demand that Haataja should stay close to Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki’s translation. Milton (2001) suggests that it can be cheaper to recycle an existing translation rather than translate from scratch, but as Şahin, Duman, *et al.* (2015: 197) note, retranslations that recycle previous translators’ work have not been discussed in detail “partly due to the complexity of the problem and partly because of the vulnerability of the situation.” Şahin, Duman, *et al.* presumably refer to the fact that phenomena such as editing, revising, and recycling raise the question of “how much change can there be in the revision process for the translation still to be the same, i.e. under the name of the previous translator, and where is the line to be drawn to a new translation?” (Paloposki and Koskinen 2010: 44). Whatever the motivations behind the choice to use a French version and a previous Finnish translation as the STs, Haataja’s translation presents an interesting case of yet another type of a (combination of) ST(s) that

can be found behind a translation. What makes it particularly interesting for this study is that following Shuttleworth and Cowie's (1997) definition of *source text*, this translation would need to be categorized as an intralingual translation because one of the STs is in the same language as the translation itself.

To sum up the findings (also presented in Table 2), we can conclude that Joutsen's translation is an indirect, compilative translation: his correspondence reveals that the STs are an English and a Swedish translation, and that he had no access to a French version. As for Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's translation, we have found no evidence suggesting that it is anything but a direct translation, whereas the anonymous USSR translation is some sort of an intralingual compilative plagiarism/revision that appropriates Joutsen's and Kivimäki's translations. Two interpretations are possible when it comes to the fourth translation, by Tynni, which is done directly from French like Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's translation, but is abridged: either Tynni used an abridged French version as her ST, in which case her ST is different from Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's, or she had a full-length French version as her ST which she translated only partly in her Finnish translation, in which case the ST Tynni had at her disposal might be the same version of the novel as Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's. Finally, the fifth translation, by Haataja, is perhaps the most interesting as it shows use of both a French version and a previous Finnish translation as its sources; it evades clear-cut categorizations and could be described as a compilative inter- and intralingual retranslation, or as a comparison-revision/retranslation.

This careful assessment of each translation's source texts has made new qualities of the source and target texts become evident, which translates into new research opportunities: we could compare Joutsen's, the USSR and Haataja's versions as they are all compilative in nature, or we could study Tynni's and Haataja's translations, which are both abridgements, or examine closer the USSR and Haataja's versions, which both make explicit reference to earlier Finnish translations. Similarly, delving deeper into the forms of source texts and the categorization of translations can help notice new research avenues to further our understanding of what *source text* is. In this case study, some of the topics that could be further explored include: How to hypothesize compilative retranslations which draw from previous translations into the same language, that is, what hypotheses should one apply to Haataja's translation, for example: the ones regarding retranslation, those formulated on indirect translation or something else, such as hypotheses on intralingual translation? How much can a translator rely on previous translations before their translation becomes compilative? Where is the line between retranslation and revision? What to do with the cases where one part of a retranslation/plagiarism is based on one and the other part on another text, like the anonymous USSR translation?

TABLE 2

The STs and translation types of the Finnish translations

Translation	Source Text(s)	Type of Translation
Joutsen	English translation + Swedish translation	Indirect, compilative translation
Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki	French version	Direct translation
Anonymous USSR	Joutsen's translation + Kivimäki's translation	Intralingual compilative plagiarism/revision
Tynni	(Abridged?) French version	Direct (abridged) translation
Haataja	(Abridged?) French version + Hämeen-Anttila and Kivimäki's translation	Abridged compilative inter- and intralingual retranslation? Abridged comparison-revision/ rettranslation?

6. Conclusions

The concept of *source text* remains undertheorized. As this study shows, it is not sufficient to conceptualize *source text* as equal to an “original” – in fact, “the concept of the original [...] is a modern invention, belonging to a materialist life, and carries with it all kinds of commercial implications about translation, originality and textual ownership” (Bassnett 1998: 38; see also Hung and Wakabayashi 2005; Baer 2017). Adopting the notions of *work* and *text* helps in establishing the relationships between the different versions – editions, (re)translations; in the first language or in translation – of a novel, for example: a *work* is represented by the different *texts*, that is, its different versions. If *source text* is considered equal to “original,” the existence of different *texts* is neglected. Such a discourse seems to liken *source text* with *work*, although the *work*, as Shillingburg's (1996: 43) definition states, exists only through the texts that represent it.

Although identifying the source texts of translations is not always easy, it can be crucial in order to reach meaningful conclusions when dealing with topics where the source text-target text relationship is central, such as retranslation. The analysis of the five Finnish (re)translations of Jules Verne's *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* makes evident that the five translations have different source *texts* (see Table 2). This raises the question whether it is meaningful to compare them to learn something about retranslation, at least if we adopt Koskinen and Paloposki's (2010: 294) definition of retranslation as a “second or later translation of a single source text into the same target language.” Another way to look at the situation is to acknowledge that the five Finnish translations are all *texts* of the same *work* – Jules Verne's *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*. This means that these translations could be compared among them to see what kind of elements the different *texts* of a *work* share or how they differ from each other. In this case, the comparison could also include versions in languages other than Finnish, as they are also *texts* of the same *work* by Verne. In other words, the points of view from which the five translations can be studied depends on whether *source text* is defined as a *text* or as a *work*.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank Katja Vuokko for sharing with us the letters in which Joutsen writes about translating *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* indirectly. We would also like to thank Katja Vuokko, Outi Paloposki, Kristiina Taivalkoski-Shilov, and the anonymous reviewers for their feedback on our manuscript. Laura Ivaska's research was funded by a grant from the Kone Foundation.

NOTES

- * Suvi Huuhtanen graduated with a MA in French translation studies from the University of Tampere in 2016.
- 1. See the Appendix for the bibliographic information of the different versions of the novel consulted in this study
- 2. In Dollerup's (2000: 23) definition, support translation entails translators checking "translations into languages other than their own target language," but Washbourne (2013: 617) argues that "other same-target translations should be considered support translations as well."
- 3. However, it is sometimes difficult to differentiate retranslations and edited versions, which puts the category of retranslation into question; "the actual categorizing of translations into first and subsequent translations, which has formed the basis for almost all theorizing about retranslations, is ultimately misleading – unless we accept the claim that retranslation can be anything, from a slight editing of a previous translation to a completely different text. [...] even if two separate translators were mentioned in bibliographies as having translated the same source text, was it really a question of two different translations?" (Paloposki and Koskinen 2010: 37; see also Tarvi 2005).
- 4. Wilson wrote: "People fairly regularly ask me about changes between the paperback and hardback of my *Odyssey* translation. I made a number of small changes, mostly for metrical reasons, to improve the rhythm and flow. A few were for other reasons, eg typos, or changing my mind." Wilson, Emily (22 August 2019): Twitter. Consulted on 20 October 2019, <<https://twitter.com/EmilyRCWilson/status/1164512553487257600>>.
- 5. The fact that (assumed) retranslations might have different STs has not been sufficiently addressed. Similarly, "[t]he discussion on retranslations thus far have not taken into account cases where parts of the text have been retranslated, perhaps more than once, whilst other parts have only been translated once, and some parts have been edited, reprinted or abridged" (Paloposki and Koskinen 2010: 39).
- 6. Self-translation is here understood as "the translation of an original work into another language by the author himself" (Popović 1976: 19).
- 7. If translation is understood to involve just one ST – a claim subject to debate – then the process of making a compilative translation can be seen to consist in first comparing several texts and creating a new (source) text that did not exist previously and then translating this text. The *de facto* ST of the compilative translation might never take a physical form, but materials in the translator's archives, such as translation drafts, and textual comparison of the versions involved in the process can offer clues to understanding how the translator created the *de facto* ST and what it was like (see van Hulle 2015; Fernández Muñiz 2016; Solberg 2016; Shengyu 2018; Ivaska 2021).
- 8. Textual scholarship deals with "describing, transcribing, editing or annotating texts and physical documents" (Katajamäki and Lukin 2013: 8) and comprises disciplines such as textual criticism and genetic criticism.
- 9. It is another discussion where one work ends and another begins (for instance, adaptations: texts or works?).
- 10. For example, UNESCO's *Index Translationum* holds 4836 records of Verne's works, making Verne one of the world's most translated authors. Among UNESCO's records, 399 are translations of *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*, but the list is incomplete; for example, it lacks the first Finnish translation. Similarly, the *Fennica* database of the National Library of Finland returns 250 hits with the key word Jules Verne (28 January 2018).
- 11. *Fennica* does not list reprints. However, the National Bibliography of Finland cannot be expected to have information on books published outside of Finland.
- 12. *Fennica* (2020): National Library of Finland. Consulted on 28 April 2020, <<https://fennica.linneanet.fi>>.
- 13. According to *Fennica*, *Voyage au centre de la Terre* (1864) was translated via Swedish by B. Lagus under the title *Matkustus maan keskipisteeseen* (1879) and *Le Tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours*

- (1872) from W. Christian's German by Martti Humu under the title *Matka maan ympäri 80:ssa vuorokaudessa* (1895).
14. This is perhaps no surprise considering that "the early English translations of Verne's *Voyages Extraordinaires* were extremely shoddy [...] and abridged [...] (often from 20 to 40% of the original)" (Evans 200: 80).
 15. JOUTSEN, Otto (24 February 1915): *Letter to WSOY*. WSOY Archives, National Archives of Finland.
 16. JOUTSEN, Otto (27 March 1915): *Letter to WSOY*. WSOY Archives, National Archives of Finland.
 17. JOUTSEN, Otto (28 April 1915): *Letter to WSOY*. WSOY Archives, National Archives of Finland.
 18. JOUTSEN, Otto (28 April 1915): *Letter to WSOY*. WSOY Archives, National Archives of Finland.
 18. Helsingin yliopiston opettaja- ja virkamiesluettelo 1918–2000. Visited on January 26, 2018, https://www.helsinki.fi/sites/default/files/atoms/files/helsingin_yliopiston_opettaja_ja_virkamiesmatrikeli_1918_2000_0.pdf.
 19. See also, for example, Zhang and Ma's (2018) discussion on *intertextuality in retranslation* and Washbourne's (2016) discussion on the line between retranslation, revision, and plagiarism.
 20. In an article about her experience translating Verne, Haataja (2018: 9) analyzes Verne's style and concludes how it is "difficult to imagine anything more timeless than an adventure story aimed at young readers and nostalgia aimed at adults. Both can be found in Jules Verne's novels [...] The translator must choose their words wisely to make sure that they are valid for the next one hundred years or so" (our translation).

REFERENCES

- ALVSTAD, Cecilia and ASSIS ROSA, Alexandra (2015): Voice in Retranslation: An Overview and Some Trends. *Target*. 27(1):3-24.
- APTER, Emily (2005): Translations with no original: Scandals of textual reproduction. In: Sandra BERMANN and Michael WOOD, eds. *Nation, Language, and the Ethics of Translation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 159-174.
- ASSIS ROSA, Alexandra, PIĘTA, Hanna, and BUENO MAIA, Rita (2017): Theoretical, methodological and terminological issues regarding indirect translation: An overview. *Translation Studies*. 10(2):113-132.
- BAER, Brian James (2017): De-sacralizing the origin(al) and the transnational future of Translation Studies. *Perspectives*. 25(2):227-244.
- BAKER, Mona and SALDANHA, Gabriela, eds. (1998/2009): *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*. 2nd ed. London/New York: Routledge.
- BASSNETT, Susan (1998): When is a translation not a translation? In: Susan BASSNETT and André LEFEVERE, eds. *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 25-40.
- CORDINGLEY, Anthony and MONTINI, Chiara (2015): Genetic translation studies: An emerging discipline. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies*. 14:1-18.
- CRISAFULLI, Edoardo (1999): The translator as textual critic and the potential of transparent discourse. *The Translator*. 5(1):83-107.
- DEDNER, Burghard (2012): Intertextual layers in translations: Methods of research and editorial presentation. *Variants*. 9:115-131.
- DELABASTITA, Dirk (2008): Status, origin, features: Translation and beyond. In: Anthony PYM, Miriam SHLESINGER, and Daniel SIMEONI, eds. *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 233-246.
- DOLLERUP, Cay (2000): Relay and support translations. In: Andrew CHESTERMAN, Natividad Gallardo SAN SALVADOR, and Yves GAMBIER, eds. *Translation in Context*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 17-26.
- DOLLERUP, Cay (2004): The vanishing original. *Hermes*. 32:185-199.
- DU PONT, Olaf (2005): Robert Graves's Claudian novels: A case of pseudotranslation. *Target*. 17(2):327-347.
- EDSTRÖM, Bert (1991): The transmitter language problem in translations from Japanese into Swedish. *Babel*. 37(1):1-14.

- EMMERICH, Karen (2011): The afterlives of C. P. Cavafy's unfinished poems. *Translation Studies*. 4(2):197-212.
- EMMERICH, Karen (2017): *Literary translation and the making of originals*. New York: Bloomsbury.
- EVANS, Arthur B. (2005): Jules Verne's English translations. *Science Fiction Studies*. 32(1):80-103.
- 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: Turo RAUTAOJA, Tamara MIKOLIĆ JUŽNIČ, and Kaisa KOSKINEN, eds. *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education 4*. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland, 115-132.
- FREI, Charlotte (2012): A obra literária a tradução directa e a tradução indirecta ou a importância da arqueologia critic-textual [Direct or indirect translation of literary works, or the importance of critical-textual archeology]. In: Juan J. LANERO FERNÁNDEZ and José Luis CHAMOSA, eds. *Lengua, traducción, recepción: En honor de Julio César Santoyo*. Vol. 2. León: Universidad de León, 195-222.
- GAMBIER, Yves (1994): La retraduction, retour et détour. *Meta*. 39(3):413-417.
- GAMBIER, Yves and VAN DOORSLAER, Luc (2010-2014): *Handbook of translation studies*. Vol. 1-4. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- HAATAJA, Kristina (2018): Jules Vernen kertomusten ajattomuus kääntäjän näkökulmasta [The timelessness of Jules Verne's stories from a translator's point of view]. *Synteesi*. 2(2018):7-9.
- HADYNA, Dagmara (2016): A relayed translation: Looking for the source text of the first Polish translation of Charlotte Brontë's *Jane Eyre*. *Studia Litteraria Universitatis Jagellonicae Cracoviensis*. 11(2):73-81.
- HUNG, Eva (2005): Translation in China – An analytical survey: First century B.C.E. to early twentieth century. In: Eva HUNG and Judy WAKABAYASHI, eds. *Asian Translation Traditions*. London/New York: Routledge, 67-107.
- HUNG, Eva and WAKABAYASHI, Judy (2005): Introduction. In: Eva HUNG and Judy WAKABAYASHI, eds. *Asian Translation Traditions*. London/New York: Routledge, 1-16.
- HUUHTANEN, Suvi (2016): Kotouttaminen, vieraannuttaminen ja uudelleenkääntäminen Jules Vernen *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers* -teoksen suomennoksissa [Source- and target-oriented translation in the Finnish (re)translations of Jules Verne's *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*]. Master's thesis, unpublished. Tampere: University of Tampere.
- IVASKA, Laura (2021): The genesis of a compilative translation and its *de facto* source text. In: Ariadne NUNES, Joana MOURA, and Marta PACHECO PINTO, eds. *Genetic Translation Studies: Conflict and Collaboration in Liminal Spaces*. London: Bloomsbury, 71-87.
- IVASKA, Laura and PALOPOSKI, Outi (2018): Attitudes towards indirect translation in Finland and translators' strategies: Compilative and collaborative translation. *Translation Studies*. 11(1):33-46.
- KATAJAMÄKI, Sakari and LUKIN, Karina (2013): Textual Trails from Oral to Written Sources: An Introduction. *RMN Newsletter*. 7:8-17.
- KOSKINEN, Kaisa and PALOPOSKI, Outi (2010): Retranslation. In: Yves GAMBIER and Luc VAN DOORSLAER, eds. *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Vol. 1. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 294-298.
- KOTHARI, Rita (2005): The fiction of translation. In: Eva HUNG and Judy WAKABAYASHI, eds. *Asian Translation Traditions*. London: Routledge, 263-273.
- LITTAU, Karin (1997): Translation in the age of postmodern production: From text to intertext to hypertext. *Forum for Modern Language Studies*. 33(1):81-96.
- MALMKJÆR, Kirsten and WINDLE, Kevin, eds. (2011): *Oxford Handbook of Translation Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MEYLAERTS, Reine (2006): Heterolingualism in/and translation: How legitimate are the other and his/her language? An introduction. *Target*. 18(1):1-15.
- MILLÁN, Carmen and BARTRINA, Francesca, eds. (2013): *The Routledge Handbook of Translation Studies*. London/New York: Routledge.
- MILTON, John (2001): Translating classic fiction for mass markets. *The Translator*. 7(1):43-69.
- PALOPOSKI, Outi (2001): Originality and the defence of translation. *The Translator*. 7(1):71-89.

- PALOPOSKI, Outi and KOSKINEN, Kaisa (2010): Reprocessing texts: The fine line between retranslating and revising. *Across languages and Cultures*. 11(1):29-49.
- PALUMBO, Giuseppe (2009): *Key Terms in Translation Studies*. London: Continuum.
- POPOVIĆ, Anton (1976): *Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation*. Edmonton: University of Alberta.
- POUPAUD, Sandra, PYM, Anthony, and TORRES SIMÓN, Esther (2009): Finding translations: On the use of bibliographical databases in translation history. *Meta*. 54(2):264-278.
- PYM, Anthony (2011): Translation research terms: A tentative glossary for moments of perplexity and dispute. In: Anthony PYM, ed. *Translation Research Projects 3*. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group, 75-110.
- RIZZI, Andrea (2008): When text is both a pseudotranslation and a translation. In: Anthony PYM, Miriam SHLESINGER, and Daniel SIMEONI, eds. *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies: Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 153-162.
- ŞAHİN, Mehmet, DUMAN, Derya, and GÜRSER, Sabri (2015): Big business of plagiarism under the guise of (re)translation: The case of Turkey. *Babel*. 61(2):193-218.
- SCOTT, Clive (2006): Translating the literary: Genetic criticism, text theory and poetry. In: Susan BASSNETT and Peter BUSH, eds. *The Translator as Writer*. London: Continuum, 106-118.
- SHENGYU, Fan (2018): The lost translator's copy: David Hawkes' construction of a base text in translating *Hongluomeng*. *Translation Review*. 100(1):37-64.
- SHILLINGSBURG, Peter L. (1984/1996): *Scholarly Editing in the Computer Age: Theory and Practice*. 3rd ed. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- SHUTTLEWORTH, Mark and COWIE, Moira (1997): *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- SIMOJOKI, Aukusti (1950): *Arvi A. Karisto osakeyhtiö 1900-1950: Kerrontaa 50-vuotiselta toimikaudelta* [Anonymous society Arvi A. Karisto from 1900-1950: the story of a 50-year term]. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- SOLBERG, Ida Hove (2016): Finding the X factor: Support translation and the case of *Le deuxième sexe* in Scandinavia. In: Turo RAUTAOJA, Tamara MIKOLIČ JUŽNIČ, and Kaisa KOSKINEN, eds. *New Horizons in Translation Research and Education 4*. Joensuu: University of Eastern Finland, 86-114.
- SUOMELA-HÄRMÄ, Elina (2007): Ranskan kirjallisuus [French literature]. In: Hannu Kalevi RIIKONEN, Urpo KOVALA, Pekka KUJAMÄKI, et al., eds. *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia 1-2* [History of literature translated into Finnish 1-2]. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 104-118.
- TARVI, Ljuba (2005): The problems of managing the 'translation stock': Freelancing vs. freebooting. *Norwich Papers*. 13:125-140.
- TOURY, Gideon (1995): *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- TOURY, Gideon (1995/2012): *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Rev. ed. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- VAN HULLE, Dirk (2015): Translation and genetic criticism: Genetic and editorial approaches to the 'untranslatable' in Joyce and Beckett. *Linguistica Antverpiensia*. 14:40-53.
- WASHBOURNE, Kelly (2013): Nonlinear narratives: Paths of indirect and relay translation. *Meta*. 58(3):607-625.
- WASHBOURNE, Kelly (2016): Revised Translations: Strategic Rationales and the Intricacies of Authorship. *Translation and Literature*. 25:151-170.
- WOODS, Michelle (2006): *Translating Milan Kundera*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- WU, Yuanqiong and FERNÁNDEZ DÍAZ, Natalia (2017): Translating the fluid texts of Hong Lou Meng. *Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies*. 4(3):236-252.
- ZHANG, Huanya and MA, Huijian (2018): Intertextuality in retranslation. *Perspectives*. 26(4):576-592.

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Bibliographic information of the different versions of the novel consulted in this study

- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/2010): *Vingt mille lieues sous les mers*. Paris: Librairie Générale Française.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1916): *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri* [Around the globe in a submarine]. (Translated from English and Swedish by Otto JOUTSEN) Porvoo: WSOY.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1926): *Merten alitse* [Crossing under the seas]. (Translated from French by Väinö HÄMEEN-ANTTILA) Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1926): *Kapteeni Nemo* [Captain Nemo]. (Translated from French by Urho KIVIMÄKI) Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1934): *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri I* [Around the globe in a submarine I]. (Translated anonymously from French) Petrozavodsk: Valtion Kustannusliike Kirja.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1935): *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri II* [Around the globe in a submarine II]. (Translated anonymously from French) Petrozavodsk: Valtion Kustannusliike Kirja.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1955): *Sukelluslaivalla maapallon ympäri* [Around the globe in a submarine]. (Translated from French by Martta TYNNI) Helsinki: WSOY.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1968): *Merten alitse* [Crossing under the seas]. (Translated from French by Väinö HÄMEEN-ANTTILA) Rev. ed. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1968): *Kapteeni Nemo* [Captain Nemo]. (Translated from French by Urho KIVIMÄKI) Rev. ed. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1968): *Nautilus*. (Translated from French by Urho KIVIMÄKI) Rev. ed. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/1991): *Kapteeni Nemo ja Nautilus* [Captain Nemo and the Nautilus]. (Translated from French by Väinö HÄMEEN-ANTTILA and Urho KIVIMÄKI) Rev. ed. Hämeenlinna: Karisto.
- VERNE, Jules (1869-1870/2008): *Kapteeni Nemo: Merten syvyyksissä* [Captain Nemo: in the depths of the seas]. (Translated from French by Kristina HAATAJA) Helsinki: Minerva.

Appendix 2: Bibliographic information for other literary works

- BECKETT, Samuel (1953): *L'Innommable*. Paris: Éditions de Minuit.
- BECKETT, Samuel (1953/1958): *The Unnameable*. (Translated from French by Samuel BECKETT) New York: Grove Press.
- BRONTË, Charlotte (1847): *Jane Eyre: An Autobiography*. London: Smith, Elder & Co.
- BRONTË, Charlotte (1847/1882): *Janina: powieść* [Janina: a novel]. (Translated from English by Emilia DOBRZAŃSKA) Warsaw: Gebethner i Wolff.
- HOMER (ca. 700 BCE/2017): *The Odyssey*. (Translated from Ancient Greek by Emily WILSON) New York: Norton.
- VASSILIKOS, Vassilis (1974): *Γλαύκος Θρασάκης* [Glafkos Thrassakis]. Athens: Πλειάδες [Pleiades].
- VASSILIKOS, Vassilis (1974/2002): *The Few Things I Know About Glafkos Thrassakis*. (Translated from Greek by Karen EMMERICH) New York: Seven Stories Press.
- VERNE, Jules (1863): *Voyage au centre de la Terre*. Paris: Pierre-Jules Hetzel.
- VERNE, Jules (1864): *Cinq Semaines en ballon*. Paris: Pierre-Jules Hetzel.
- VERNE, Jules (1872): *Le Tour du monde en quatre-vingts jours*. Paris: Pierre-Jules Hetzel.
- VERNE, Jules (1863/1879): *Matkustus maan keskipisteeseen* [Travel to the center of the Earth]. (Translated from Swedish by B. LAGUS) Helsinki: Edlund.
- VERNE, Jules (1872/1895): *Matka maan ympäri 80:ssä vuorokaudessa* [Travel around the Earth in 80 days]. (Translated from German by Martti HUMU) Helsinki: Edlund.
- VERNE, Jules (1872/2008): *Maailman ympäri 80 päivässä* [Around the world in 80 days]. (Translated from French by Kristina HAATAJA) Helsinki: Jyväskylä Minerva.
- VERNE, Jules (1863/2009): *Kuumailmapallolla Afrikan halki* [With a hot air balloon across Africa]. (Translated from French by Kristina HAATAJA) Helsinki: Jyväskylä Minerva.