

RETRANSLATIONS IN THE AGE OF DIGITAL REPRODUCTION

Kaisa Koskinen

University of Tampere

kaisa.a.koskinen@uta.fi

Outi Paloposki

Academy of Finland Sörnäisten Rantatie

outi.paloposki@kotus.fi

Abstract

In the present article, we continue our earlier discussion on retranslations, started at the EST (European Society for Translation Studies) 2001 Congress in Copenhagen (see Paloposki and Koskinen, *forthcoming*). This present article builds on the conclusions of the earlier one, which, in brief, are as follows: contrary to what the so called Retranslation Hypothesis claims, the textual profiles of translations are not determined simply by their chronological order of appearance, but respond to a number of different reasons and settings. In Section II, we will develop this point more, giving an overview of the Retranslation Hypothesis, of the study of retranslations, and historical data examining some of the earlier ideas on retranslation. We then approach retranslation from the present-day perspective, pointing out the relevance of retranslation and different modes of reproduction in the digital age of new technologies.

Keywords: Retranslation, Reprints, Publishing industry, Technological advances.

I. Introduction

In the present article, we continue our earlier discussion on retranslations, started at the EST (European Society for Translation

Studies) 2001 Congress in Copenhagen (see Paloposki and Koskinen, *forthcoming*). This present article builds on the conclusions of the earlier one, which, in brief, are as follows: contrary to what the so called Retranslation Hypothesis claims, the textual profiles of translations are not determined simply by their chronological order of appearance, but respond to a number of different reasons and settings. In Section II, we will develop this point more, giving an overview of the Retranslation Hypothesis, of the study of retranslations, and historical data examining some of the earlier ideas on retranslation. We then approach retranslation from the present-day perspective, pointing out the relevance of retranslation and different modes of reproduction in the digital age of new technologies.

It is our intention to interpret the changing contemporary scene of book publishing and attempt to make a prognosis for the future. The motor behind our enterprise is the evident fact that during the last few decades, technological advances have dramatically affected the working conditions of translators. It is no understatement to claim that “[e]xcept for the Gutenberg decade never was there so much effective innovation in so brief a time” (Kilgour 1998, p. 150). The changes have thus far been more drastic in fields outside literary translation, but the book markets for fiction have not remained untouched by this revolution that has changed the practicalities of translating, editing, printing, distributing and reprocessing books. Will this technology-driven revolution affect the ways in which we perceive translation (or has it already done so)? Are the changes purely pragmatic, or do they bring about a change in attitudes? Do they change the essence of translation, or our understanding of it? Retranslations (in comparison with reprints) would seem an obvious point to start analyzing these (potential) changes, since they form the very site where both technological advances of today and the changing attitudes towards translating are visible.

II. Historical overview of retranslations

Retranslations are a fascinating object of study. Why are new translations made out of texts which have already been translated, and how do these retranslations differ from first translations? One possible answer, posited by the so called Retranslation Hypothesis (RH), is that retranslations mark a return to the source text, after an alleged assimilation carried out by first translations. Yves Gambier (1994, p. 414) formulates it as follows: “[...] une première traduction a toujours tendance à être plutôt assimilatrice, à réduire l’altérité au nom d’impératifs culturels, éditoriaux [...] La retraduction dans ces conditions consisterait en un *retour* a texte-source.” (“[...] a first translation always tends to be more assimilating, tends to reduce the otherness in the name of cultural or editorial requirements [...] The retranslation, in this perspective, would mark a *return* to the source-text”, emphasis in the text).¹ Implied in this statement is the idea that first translations are inherently assimilative and therefore somehow lacking; hence, source-oriented translations are *needed* after the initial translation.

In our earlier article we took issue with this hypothesis, testing it against various Finnish cases of retranslations. Our analysis confirmed that even if there are cases that conform to the claims of the Retranslation Hypothesis, the picture is more complicated. In addition to assimilating first translations and source-oriented retranslations, there are all manner of variants in first and retranslations. Let us briefly recap our observations from the earlier article:

The intuitive appeal of RH has most obviously risen from the many cases that support it. Such cases are not difficult to find in Finland either. For example, the first translation of Shakespeare into Finnish was a rendering of *Macbeth* into Finnish settings, Finnish folk poetical metre, Finnish mythology and Finnish history. Subsequent translations have certainly adhered more strictly to Shakespeare’s textual form.

Yet, there are also very different cases: Oliver Goldsmith's *The Vicar of Wakefield* was first translated into Finnish in 1859 (by Gustaf Erik Eurén), with a retranslation in 1905 (by Samuli Suomalainen), and of these two, the first translation is the much more closer one to the original, syntactically, structurally and lexically – despite the fact that it was based on the Swedish translation of 1788 (which was also extremely literal). As to audience expectations, the latter translations replaced the earlier ones as far as the audience was concerned for both *Macbeth* and the *Vicar of Wakefield* – but not so with the Finnish *Struwwelpeter*: the first, literal and archaizing translation of 1869 was *not* forsaken when the new, more domesticated translation in the 1920s appeared: after the failure of the marketing efforts to sell the new translation, the earlier version was reprinted (Brummer-Korvenkontio 1991, p. 49).

In addition to these contrasting examples, there is the case of the translation of the Gospel of St. Matthew by Pentti Saarikoski into Finnish in 1969; a case where the sequential order of different translations seems insignificant, as the determinants of the translation's profile come from contemporary, personal and political circumstances of the translator's surroundings. The translation (which of course is a retranslation) is a domesticating version, meant to be easily readable, but is also impinged with the translator's (then) Marxist ideology.

Another level to the analysis is presented by the case of Lewis Carroll's *Alice in Wonderland*. The first Finnish translation is from 1906, and the subsequent retranslations from 1972, 1995 and 2000. Of the two latter translations, the first is the more source-text oriented and the latter the more assimilating. Moreover, there are two recent reprints of the earlier translations so that there are currently available several different versions, of different degrees of assimilation to the Finnish audience. This brings to fore the concept of the *supplementarity* of different translations: the targeting of different versions to different sections of the audience, and of

categorizing the text either as a classic or as children's literature. It may well be that, as suggested in RH, first translations are found lacking, but the perceived need for a supplement may take different forms. Rather than a matter of gradual completion, retranslation is a result of shifting needs and changing perceptions. Similar supplementarity is evident in the profusion of the different versions of *The Thousand and One Nights*, in itself a work with no definite original which could more or less closely be adhered to. The real, the original *Thousand and One Nights* is elusive: it does not exist in a one-and-only true version. There are different layers, different oral and written versions, different manuscripts, and the true nature of the tales cannot be captured in any one of these. Instead, it exists in the different functions assigned to the tales throughout the times, with the different versions supplementing each other: the scholarly, the erotic, the romantic; the violent and the tame.

The supplementary nature of retranslations suggests a positive attitude towards difference: variation is a facet of supplementarity. Different, varying interpretations need not be locked into a continuum of assimilation–source-text orientedness (or any other binary division: free/literal, domesticated/foreignized, etc.), where the researchers' particular viewpoint is seen as that of determining faithfulness or assimilation. Instead, texts and their interpretations function simultaneously on several layers, denying easy classification into assimilative first and source-text oriented new translations.

III. The Brave New World of Factory Translation

Our introduction has brought us up to the present day. But how do the concerns of retranslation fit in the business of translation and book production as they are today?

In many companies, translation agencies and industrial and administrative settings, translators now work in a digitalized environment. Not only may source texts and translations never

materialize on paper, both texts may also be in part or entirely construed of previous material digitally archived and administered by electronic translation memories (Trados, Déjà Vu etc.). One obvious example of such a work place is the institutions of the European Union. In order to administer and control the multilingual text flow, their translation services utilize numerous computer aids. In addition to standard word-processing software (with access to other ongoing translations of the same text), the translators' PCs are equipped with access to numerous databases and memory banks of terminology and previously translated material (See Wagner et al. 2002, pp. 88–91).

In a setting like this, the task of the translator is fundamentally different from the traditional idea (best at home in literary translation) of an individual mind creating a unified interpretation of the source text. Rather than a creator, the translator is a compiler, putting together text fragments to construct a textual *bricolage*.² The actual translation process is streamlined to avoid repetition, but (cost-) efficiency in translation requires directing ample resources to segmenting and alignment of texts, and, most importantly, maintenance and supervision of the database (by translators themselves, or by someone else).

The philosophy behind translation memory technology regards retranslation as an evil best to be avoided. Why repeat a task that has already been performed? To quote Brian McCluskey, the former acting Director-General of the Translation Service of the European Commission: “[t]ranslators can concentrate on their ‘core business’, searching for the right word - without the drudgery of having to perform repetitive tasks.” (*Tools and Workflow at the Translation Service of the European Commission* 2002, p. 2) In dire opposition to our cases of literary translation above, the aim is not to produce difference, or variation, but similarity. If a previous translation exists, it is to be used, even if it is found wanting (see Wagner et al. 2002, p. 47). Consistency and efficiency outweigh stylistic innovation.

This, of course, makes perfect sense in an administrative setting where a large amount of translated material repeats the same

formulae, and texts are intertextually linked with previous documents. It may also make sense for those worrying about translation costs. The aim is to “deliver finished language products to the European Commission as quickly, as accurately and cheaply as possible” (McCluskey in *Tools and Workflow at the Translation Service of the European Commission* 2002, p. 2). The idea of translations as ‘products’ to be ‘delivered’, together with the image of translation as construction work, or *bricolage*, creates an image of an automatized assembly line. Translating in the European Commission is a perfect example of factory translation as described by John Milton (2001): anonymous and collective, standardized, and cost-effective. Deadlines are all-important: “the product must be released on time even if it has a few flaws” (*ibid.*, p. 61). There is little idealism here about translators working on unique texts: the idea of texts as products that can and should be standardized in the name of cost-efficiency is in complete opposition to the view held by for example Brian Mossop (2000, p. 46) that “translation would seem to be an occupation where standardization is not applicable to products or to work procedures but rather to skills”. In contrast to this view, standardization clearly exists.

One might argue that the mass-production of translations in settings such as the EU institutions is a unique example, but is it safe to assume that other fields of translation remain untouched? Is the coinage of the term ‘language industries’ just a coincidence? It is worth noticing that Milton’s concept of factory translation was actually formulated within the context of literary translation. His case is the *Clube de Livro*, a Brazilian book club, which translated classic fiction for mass markets from 1943 to 1989. During this period there still existed a comparatively clear-cut division between popular or popularized fiction and highbrow literature. Since then, the line has become increasingly blurred: popular genres have become respectable, and ‘serious’ literature borrows material and models from popular culture. The division between ‘high’ and ‘low’ has always been a construct, but the distinction is proving

increasingly difficult to maintain (Lehtonen 2001, p. 119 et passim.).

The contemporary cultural scene of hybridized and banalized cultural artefacts hardly accommodates the paternalistic and condescending attitude of the Clube de Livro of the 1950s or 60s, and its zeal to educate their readers appears to be a nostalgic echo from a completely different era. But the driving force behind factory translation is valid: the aim of commercial success. Book publishing has never been able to ignore commercial interests; in addition to being cultural artefacts, books have always been marketable products, and it has been the task of the publisher to balance cultural values and financial interests. It has been argued, however, that since the 1990s, this balance has been lost, and market forces now often dictate publishing decisions (Lehtonen 2001, p. 173).

One obvious strategy for reducing publishing costs is *recycling*, a feature of factory translation. As Milton (2001, p. 62) points out, it is often cheaper to recycle an existing translation than to commission a new one. Technological advances have greatly facilitated recycling. The digital format makes it both cheaper and faster to reproduce a text for different purposes (reprints, new editions, book club editions etc.). It seems plausible to expect that this ease will have repercussions on retranslation. The question is: will the value of variation and the need for supplementary versions outweigh the financial benefits of recycling an existing translation? In the following sections we look at contemporary evidence, trying to locate indications of future developments.

IV. The State of the Art

Technological advances have not (yet) brought about a true revolution of the book business. The old structures of book publishing have been resistant, and unsolved issues such as copyright questions have stalled developments. Even though practically all books have for at least a decade been produced in digital format, the end product

is still nearly always a traditional printed book. But digitalized text processing, electronic books, internet bookshops and print-on-demand technology offer possibilities that might lead to radical changes.

To a significant extent, the transition is economic: digitalization cuts production costs. This has already given birth to a wide variety of small (specialized) publishing houses. An optimistic scenario would be to assume that this would enable resources to be allocated more democratically than before and that there would thus be a wider variety of translations available. In Finland, the small publishers have certainly had a positive influence on the field of translation: many have focused on translations from a certain linguistic or cultural area (such as Eastern Europe, or Spanish and Portuguese literature), a particular genre (such as poetry, science fiction, or crime), or ideology (such as Third World literature, or women's literature). In addition to this synchronic widening of perspective, experiments on print-on-demand technology have added to the diachronic aspect, giving a chance to a new life to a number of old translations that had not been otherwise available.

This diversification process, however, takes place simultaneously with a centralization process. Some of the above-mentioned new publishers proved short-lived and no longer exist, and even though new ones start up, the publishing industry worldwide is also going through a phase of extensive centralization. Publishing houses merge into bigger units, ultimately into international conglomerates that control most of the book markets – the five biggest in USA control 80 % of the sales. In Finland the figures are similar: five biggest control 75 % of the sales, and eight biggest 80 % (Lehtonen 2001, pp. 171–172; Stockmann, Bengtson & Repo 2002). Smaller publishing houses may be purchased by big ones, or they continue on a non-profit line of book production, where often only governmental or institutional grants given to translators keep the process going. Giant corporations are slow to move and dependent on immediate profits. It has been diagnosed that this

commercialization has resulted in a “bestsellerization” process (Lehtonen 2001, p. 141). As a consequence, most translated fiction in Finland is of Anglo-American origin³, and the publication of the translation as synchronous with the original as possible.

In other words, there are two simultaneous but oppositional processes: one of diversification and another of centralization. How, then, do retranslations fit in this scenario? Has digitalization reduced the popularity of retranslation, leading to recycling older versions? Or are retranslations included in the diversification trend, leading to increasing variation not only in translated titles but also in the number of retranslated versions? To obtain a coherent picture of the present situation, we surveyed the figures of translated prose published (in Finnish) in Finland during the year 2000.⁴

In the year 2000, the ten publishers brought out 359 titles of fiction translated into Finnish. Out of these, 261 were totally new titles, 89 were reprints of older translations, and 9 were new/retranslations of works that had been translated earlier. Considering the small markets (the population of Finland is around 5 million), the amounts of both retranslations and reprints are unexpectedly high. As one publisher pointed out, retranslations are very seldom done, and even reprints are not a regular feature of publishing.

The retranslations were of classics: *Gilgamesh* (previously translated in 1943), Franz Kafka's *Der Verschollene* (1965), Colette's *Chéri* (1946), Jerome K. Jerome's *Three Men in a Boat* (1949), Tolstoy's *Hadzi Murat* (1946), Lewis Carroll's *Alice* (1906, 1972 and 1995), Edgar Rice Burroughs' *Tarzan*, H.G. Wells' *The Time Machine* (1917, 1979), and Daniel Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (a number of previous translations e.g. 1847, 1905, 1911). Classics were also reprinted in earlier translations: e.g., Dante Alighieri's *Divina Commedia* (translated in 1912–1914), Giovanni Boccaccio's *Fiammetta* (1952), Jane Austen's *Mansfield Park* (1954), Charlotte Brönte's *Jane Eyre* (1973), Tolstoy's *Anna Karenina* (1979)⁵, Italo Calvino's *Se una notte d'inverno un viaggiatore* (1983), Michel Tournier's *Vendredi* (1980) and *Anne Frank's diary* (1955). The list

of titles reflects the, rather unsurprising, finding that in order to be resurrected from the past, either in the form of a reprint or as a new translation, the work typically needs to have acquired the status of a “classic”. But why are some classics reprinted while others are retranslated? The two lists do not seem to be giving an easy answer. The decision cannot depend on the amount of previous translations (i.e. the need for variation having been already fulfilled), since there are cases such as *Alice* or *Robinson Crusoe* where a number of previous versions exist and a retranslation has still been commissioned. Nor can one conclude that the need for retranslation arises when older versions get dated: even though there is variation, both retranslations and reprints tend to be of books the previous versions of which date from the mid 19th century.

A listing by publishers gives some indication of possible explanations:

Publisher	New translations	Retranslations	Reprints	Total
Basam Books	4	3	-	7
Desura	4	1	-	5
Gummerus	51	1	4	56
Karisto	36	-	7	43
Kääntöpiiri	3	-	-	3
Loki	3	-	-	3
Like	13	1	-	14
Otava	48	3	10	61
Tammi	45	-	9	54
WSOY	54	-	59	113
Total	261	9	89	359

The table shows a divided scene: there are publishers that concentrate on new titles and do not have any reprints or

retranslations (Kääntöpiiri, Loki); there are others who favour retranslations over reprints (Basam Books, Desura, Like); and there are those who tend to favour reprints (WSOY, Karisto and Tammi exclusively, Gummerus and Otava to a great extent). This division correlates with the total volume of translated fiction: the smaller (and newer) the publishing house, the less likely it is to use reprints and vice versa.⁶ *All* reprinted versions of earlier translations are published by the five big publishing houses, whereas half of the retranslations originate from small publishers. Among the big ones, Otava seems to have a policy that favours retranslations; among the small ones, a significant contribution comes from Basam Books, an independent publisher whose explicit aim is to offer new, fresh translations to the public. The overall production of Basam Books can be characterized as versatile: among their selection appear books from several languages that have not been extensively translated into Finnish before (e.g. Slovenian and Turkish), from lesser known or historically distant cultures (Gilgamesh; Indian, Chinese and Japanese texts), and old classics such as works by Tolstoy and Dickens. Diversification and difference are thus a feature of this publishing house.⁷

The numbers also show that there are clearly more reprints than retranslations, and three big publishers (WSOY, Karisto and Tammi) have opted exclusively for reprints. This supports the claim that big publishers, who dominate the markets, base their decisions on commercial interests (it *is* cheaper to use reprints), and the 'will to culture', i.e., the cultural driving force has been shifted from institutions such as major publishing houses (partly helped by governmental subsidies) to individuals: both translators working for small independent publishers and these publishers themselves often live from hand-to-mouth (see Lehtonen 2001, p. 187). While big publishing houses are still occasionally credited with goodwill gestures in the name of culture when translating or retranslating classics, this goodwill has sometimes been criticized exactly

because it is so rare: it should be normal practice to publish good literature, not an occasional show of goodwill.

It would, however, be a simplification to claim that the choice to use reprinted versions is merely financial. For example, the publishing house Karisto was in 2000 celebrating its centenary, and the reprinted translations were one way of paying homage to the past. Since its current policy is dominated by science fiction, romance and crime, the reprinted classics in fact represent the *least* commercial subsection of its production. Again, four of the nine reprints by Tammi were published in a paperback series of classics, making available a number of translations (such as Calvino's *Se una notte d'inverno un viaggiatore*) that had been out of print for quite some time (the five others are paperback versions of earlier bestselling translations such as Irving's *Cider House Rules*, or Bret Easton Ellis's *American Psycho*). Otava also has a paperback series (*Seven*) which publishes classics in new editions, in addition to new translations and original works in Finnish. In 2000, seven new editions of older translations were published in this series. WSOY's paperback series (*Laatukirjat*) also offer reprints of classics.⁸ In a way, however, all these reprints of earlier translations can be seen as goodwill gestures, and digitalization has certainly facilitated this.

But big publishers also commission new translations. Why? One possible answer can be found by going through criticisms of retranslated and reprinted fiction in Finnish newspapers in 2000. The collected reviews by fourteen major newspapers (*Kirjallisuusarvosteluja 2000*) contain 16 articles on our data.⁹ They are:

Defoe: <i>Robinson Crusoe</i>	5
<i>Gilgamesh</i>	3
Colette: <i>Chéri</i>	3
Kafka: <i>Der Verschollene</i> (America)	4
Donleavy: <i>The Ginger Man</i>	1
Tournier: <i>Vendredi</i>	1 (jointly with Defoe)

The numbers show a clear difference in visibility: retranslations (4/8) are reviewed in 15 texts, while reprints (only 2/30) are only reviewed twice. A new translation is often noticed, while reprints seldom draw the attention of the media.¹⁰ Media coverage is also typically positive: the new translations are described as “more complete”, “more accurate”, “closer to the original”, “modern”, “fresh”, and “enjoyable”, and the publishers get praise for treating the Finnish readers with these improved versions. The reviewers follow the logic of the Retranslation Hypothesis: the new translation is said to be more source-text oriented (more accurate, more reliable and thus better) than the previous version(s). This, however, may be more a mindset, a rationale, than a feature of retranslations. This is particularly evident in Defoe reviews, which all follow this logic, focusing on the fact that the new translation is an unabridged version. Two out of five mistakenly claim it to be the first of the kind, while the three others indicate that the previous complete translation from 1911 is outdated (“It was high time!”). A contrastive analysis of these two translations (among three other translations), however, concludes that the two versions are rather similar with each other (Lahtinen 2002). A similar tendency of forced logic is indicated in the one Kafka review that goes against the grain: while the others praise the new translation for accuracy, fidelity to the author, modernised language (while acknowledging in passing that the previous translation was not “badly outdated” and that differences are “small but significant”), the dissident review claims that the new version is not a proper retranslation but a brushed-up version of the previous translation. This is the only case in our material where the publisher’s judgement is questioned, and the reviewer openly criticises the decision to retranslate this particular text, making the claim that there would have been other classics in need of first- or retranslation, and putting forth an important point that old translations can have their own peculiar charm, “comparable only to Madelaine pastries or Ford Cortina -69”.¹¹

V. Prospects

The findings of our survey prove that our original hypothesis of digitalization giving impetus to reprints rather than retranslations, with its underlying value judgement that favoured retranslations for the assumed variation and supplementarity that they bring to the cultural scene, was, if not totally wrong, too simplistic. First of all, reprints of earlier versions add to the variety both in bringing to the markets texts that have been unavailable and also by adding a historical perspective (diachronic variety both linguistically and culturally). Second, the supplementary nature of retranslations is open to some doubt: the new version does not necessarily always add that many new interpretations. There are cases, though, that definitely supplement each other: we would not want to be without any of the *Alices*, for example. Retranslations in any case highlight our attitudes to the original, to fidelity, and to variation.

The data also brings a new perspective to the alleged postmodern secularization of culture, and the blurred division of high and low. It seems that both retranslations and reprints function as guardians of that division: their status as “classics”, either functioning as the impetus for or acquired by the act of retranslation, underlines their difference with respect to the bulk of translated literature. This is particularly evident in some cases, such as *Karisto* or *Gummerus*, where the retranslations and reprints stand out among the bestselling romances, detective stories and fantasy literature. The publishers, then, both produce and reproduce the canon of classic literature. In some cases, such as *Robinson Crusoe* or *Alice*, the status is rarely disputed (and is further reinforced in reviews); in some others, it is open to some negotiation. The retranslation of Colette’s *Chéri*, for example, was very favourably reviewed, but one of the reviewers expressed her puzzlement as to why the novel was to “return”.

In a small country like Finland this rather extensive recycling business that supports the existing canons of “good” literature has an unfortunate side effect of directing the limited resources

conservatively. Together with the dominance of Anglo-American fiction, it contributes to the trend of further narrowing down the choice of available translations. The cultures, genres, and writers who used to be underrepresented are likely to remain so.¹²

A survey of one year's production cannot give answers to questions of continuing trends and diachronic changes. An extensive historical survey spanning several decades is, however, outside the scope of the present paper. A cursory look at this year's publications (*Vuoden kirjat 2002*¹³) confirms that our findings are not isolated cases, and gives indications of the directions the publishing industry might be inclined to take in the near future. The figures for the year 2002 are roughly similar to 2000: there are some retranslations of classics (notably *Moby Dick* by Otava), and numerous reprints (e.g., Woolf, Camus, Faulkner, Grass, Huxley, Colette (again!)). Some of the reprints (the *Lord of the Ring* series, L.M. Montgomery's books) are clearly intermedial, i.e., interrelated with events in other mediums, responding both to renewed interest and to marketing strategies. As anticipated in our hypothesis, recycling of the classics seems to be a thriving trend, but some publishers still see it as valuable and necessary to also issue retranslations¹⁴. The force behind the decision to retranslate is probably rather cultural than financial, but one reward for retranslation is favourable publicity for the publisher, and this, no doubt, is not bad for the business.

Notes

1. Translations of quotations are ours.

2. Interestingly enough, one of the terms for such practice is *single sourcing*: the storing of 'ready-made' blocks of text in the computer's memory to be

reproduced and reused whenever necessary in assembling documents (Koikkalainen 2002).

3. There has been a steady growth in the percentage of books being translated from English: in 1980, the figure was 46,6 % of all translated books; in 2000, it had steadily risen to 68,0 % (Stockmann, Bengtsson and Repo 2002).

4. For practical reasons we concentrated on ten central publishers, the five big ones, and five others that offer a significant contribution in translated literature (Gummerus, Karisto, Otava, Tammi, WSOY; and Basam Books, Desura, Kääntöpiiri, Like, Loki). It must be borne in mind that coming up with accurate figures in book publishing is not a matter of simple calculation and classification. First, statistical sources use different classification criteria, and, partly following from this, information needs to be collected from different sources in order to build a comprehensive picture of book production. Secondly, reprints are not always listed in *Fennica* (the Helsinki University Library database of Finnish literature), the most comprehensive of all databases, and not at all in the publishers' association's catalogue. Publishers do advertise reprints in some cases, most notably if they are classics or otherwise familiar books – obviously for the reason that it is felt that these would merit a renewed interest. We ended up calculating the numbers of books from publishers' own catalogues, cross-checking these with *Fennica*, and contacting publishers for corroboration (very few of these had any ready statistics to offer). The obvious choice for a database – Index Translationum – did not yet include figures for the year 2000; and check-ups with the situation of previous years has only brought up a number of flaws in the database. - A particular problem is genre classification: how to deal with borderline cases that are listed in children's literature. We have included in our data Robinson Crusoe, Alice in Wonderland and Tarzan. Yet another problem arose with the changing role of reprints. These were formerly only made occasionally and with intervals of several years, but today a normal feature of the publishing scene: it is cheaper for the publisher to run a small print and take reprints (often during the same or following year) following demand than to keep repositories of books. Thus, reprints do not always tell about a renewed or a constant interest in a work but are rather a feature of short-lived books that is accounted for by concerns of economy. In reprints we thus chose to include only those that are made five years or more after the initial date of publishing so that the figures would show long-term developments.

5. The 1979 translation is a retranslation.

6. Logically, young publishing houses do not yet have a stock of older translations for easy reprinting.

7. Obviously, we cannot draw any definite conclusions on the basis of evidence from one year only.

8. In Finland, the large-scale appearance ('boom') of paperbacks is a recent phenomenon, from the 1990's.

9. The volume of 2001, once available, may contain more reviews, but the general trend is unlikely to change.

10. The only reprinted translation to have individual coverage in the newspapers is Donleavy's *Ginger Man*, and the article reports the fact that this translation was previously claimed to be by Pentti Saarikoski, but was in fact written by a less famous translator Erkki Haglund. This "scandal" is now revealed. In other words, the reprint itself is not news.

11. An interesting case outside our material is the retranslation of *Moby Dick* from 2002. A reviewer praised both translations, the earlier one from 1956 and the retranslation. The differences in these two were not assumed to be of quality but of style which in both translations was the specific quality of the translator. For the reviewer, both translations deserve to exist, which can be seen as supplementarity *par excellence*.

12. In 1980, the total amount of translations (both fiction and other translations) from peripheral European languages, Asian and African languages was 100 titles (out of 959 titles in all); in 1997 it was merely 54 titles out of 1372. In contrast, less than half of the titles in 1980 were from English, in 1997 two thirds. (Lehtonen 2001, pp. 186–187.) Thus, despite the variety that the small publishers bring onto the scene, the gap seems to be still widening.

13. This publication gives a rough idea of new books, but it does not include all the publishers included in our survey, and is thus not a comparable reference to our data.

14. There are no retranslations by Basam Books in 2002, and this shows in the figures drastically. This indicates both how one actor in the field can make a difference, and how essential the "undergrowth" of small publishers is for the diversity of the cultural scene, even if their amount of titles is small.

References

- Brummer-Korvenkontio, Markus, 1991. *Jörö-Jukka ja sen historia*. WSOY, Porvoo.
- Gambier, Yves, 1994. 'La Retraduction, retour et détour'. *Meta* 39 (3): pp. 413–417.
- Kilgour, Frederick G., 1998. *The Evolution of the Book*. Oxford UP, New York and Oxford.
- Kirjallisuusarvosteluja, 2000. Parts B and C, BTJ Kirjastopalvelu Oy.
- Koikkalainen, Tanja, 2002. *Single sourcing: a system for reusing information in documentation*. Unpublished pro gradu, University of Tampere, Department of Modern Languages and Translation Studies.
- Lahtinen, Johanna, 2002. *Viisi Robinsonia, viisi perjantaita. Ideologia eri kohdeyleisölle suunnatuissa Robinson Crusoe -suomennoksissa*. Unpublished pro gradu, University of Tampere, Department of Modern Languages and Translation Studies.
- Lehtonen, Mikko, 2001. *Post scriptum. Kirja medioitumisen aikakaudella*. Vastapaino, Tampere.
- Milton, John, 2001. 'Translating Classic Fiction for Mass Markets. The Brazilian Clube do Livro', *The Translator* 7 (1): pp. 43–69.
- Mossop, Brian, 2000. 'The Workplace Procedures of Professional Translators'. In Chesterman, Andrew, Natividad Gallardo San Salvador and Yves Gambier (eds.) *Translation in Context*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, pp. 39–48.
- Paloposki, Outi and Kaisa Koskinen, forthcoming. 'Thousand and One Translations. Revisiting Retranslation'. In Gyde Hansen, Kirsten Malmkjaer and Daniel Gile (eds.) *Claims, Changes and Challenges*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam.

Stockmann, Doris, Niklas Bengtsson and Yrjö Repo, 2002. *Kirja Suomessa. Tekijöistä lukijaan – kirja-alan tukitoimet ja kehittäminen*. <http://www.minedu.fi/opm/kulttuuri/kirja-suomessa.html>

Tools and Workflow at the Translation Service of the European Commission, 2002. http://europa.eu.int/comm/translation/reading/articles/tools_and_workflow_en.htm. Viewed 18.12.2002.

Vuoden kirjat 2002. Suomen kustannusyhdistys ry, Helsinki.

Wagner, Emma, Svend Bech and Jesús M. Martínez, 2002. *Translating for the European Union Institutions*, St Jerome, Manchester and Northampton.