

## **The Ghost at the Banquet: Apparitions of Paavo Cajander and Yrjö Jylhä in the Editorial Work on Contemporary Finnish Shakespeare Translations**

**Nestori Siponkoski  
University of Vaasa**

### **Abstract**

This article examines how Paavo Cajander's and Yrjö Jylhä's canonised translations are represented in the editorial comments contained in the manuscripts of six contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translations. The method involves locating all direct references to these canonised translations in the editorial comments and categorising them into positive and negative according to their function. The theoretical framework makes use of Marvin Carlson's (2006) concept of *ghosting*, which is here understood as an encounter between the translator's draft and the editor's memory. Such an encounter may evoke "ghosts" of previous similar encounters, that is, the translator's solutions may be intertextually interpreted by the editors in the light of previous translation solutions, most notably those in the canonised translations. The article concludes by assessing the canonised translators' visibility in and significance for the production process and, more generally, draws attention to the role of various kinds of *authorities* (e.g. previous translations) that are present in the editing process and therefore have the potential to affect translation production alongside the source text.

**Keywords:** William Shakespeare, Paavo Cajander, Yrjö Jylhä, drama translation, intertextuality, editing, ghosting

### **1 Introduction**

In one of the most memorable scenes in Shakespeare's dramatic writing, Macbeth has treated his entourage to a banquet on the occasion of his recent coronation as the King of Scotland. At this point in the play, Macbeth has two murders on his conscience, that of the previous and rightful king, Duncan, and that of one of his closest military companions, Banquo. In the midst of this spectacular display of the "new order", Macbeth suddenly spots the latest victim of his lust for power, Banquo, sitting at the table, silent and motionless. Whether the apparition is interpreted as part of the strong supernatural side of *Macbeth* or as the protagonist's hallucination brought about by his psychological attrition, the ghost's dramaturgic function is clear: to bring the past into the present and to very graphically show that attempting to disregard what is left behind only brings it back as a haunting "ghost".

This article deals with the way in which previous Finnish Shakespeare translations make an appearance in the production processes of contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translations. Concentrating on the interplay of translators and editors in these production processes, this study sets out to examine whether the two previous Finnish translators of Shakespeare, Paavo Cajander (1846–1913) and Yrjö Jylhä (1903–1956), appear in the editorial comments (1) as "revered authorities" that the editors refer to in order to set a

positive example for the translators to follow or (2) as “unwanted relics” that the editors evoke in order to show the translator that his or her solution is too similar in a negative sense.

The motivation behind this kind of question is both Cajander’s and Jylhä’s positions as the producers of *canonised* Finnish Shakespeare translations, meaning that their translations have been accepted among the most esteemed works within the Finnish literary system. Cajander translated 36 of the 37 plays in the Shakespeare canon (*Pericles* was not translated) between 1879 and 1912. Cajander’s efforts resulted in the first nearly-complete set of Shakespeare’s plays in Finnish translation which can be considered influential for this reason alone. Yrjö Jylhä, in turn, retranslated seven of the plays between 1936 and 1956; these retranslations pay close attention to Cajander’s work and have been criticised for their similarity with it. The canonised position of Cajander and Jylhä is further, and perhaps most importantly, highlighted by the fact that they are explicitly represented in my material (i.e. the editors refer to them by name), whereas other Finnish Shakespeare translators are not mentioned, except for some rare references to, for example, Matti Rossi’s translation solutions.

Cajander’s and Jylhä’s translations must be considered important from the point of view of the development of Finnish literature and society. However, at the same time they represent a *poetics* that is obsolete from a contemporary point of view and whose influence on the contemporary Shakespeare translations might therefore be unwanted (cf. André Lefevere’s [1992] views on how translations are manipulated according to society’s dominant poetics). I argue that this results in a *tension* between the canonised translations and the contemporary project. This article aims to discover how this tension becomes visible in the editing process, and more specifically in the editorial comments.

The tension between the canonised translations and the contemporary project, as well as the manifestations of this tension in the editing process, is studied by applying the concept of “ghosting” in the context of translation. Originally, the concept of “ghosting” (Carlson 2006) emphasises the role of memory as a device of intertextual interpretation in the context of theatrical performance and dramatic texts. From the point of view of editorial work, “ghosting” is here understood as an encounter between the translator’s draft and the editor’s memory; such an encounter potentially evokes “ghosts” of previous encounters of similar translation solutions. In short, this study is interested in the “ghosts” of Cajander’s and Jylhä’s translation solutions that manifest themselves in the form of editorial comments, and which therefore have the potential to affect the editing process and, ultimately, the published translation.

## 2 Material and method

Within the production processes of translations, the phenomenon of “ghosting”, as defined above, is difficult or even impossible to study by traditional textual materials used in Translation Studies. This is because the phenomenon is so essentially involved with the receiver’s memory; in order to study the subjective memories of the individuals taking part in the production process, verbalisation or other documentation accounting for the content of those memories is needed. Such explicit comments cannot usually be found in completed and published translations, except for some paratextual elements

such as forewords and footnotes that may account, for example, for the translator’s or the editor’s choice of particular translation solutions or strategies. However, the phenomenon becomes researchable with the aid of *unpublished* translation manuscripts (i.e. drafts) that contain editorial commentary. Editorial comments are here approached as written documents of the editors’ agency, that is, “willingness and ability to act” (Kinunen & Koskinen 2010: 6) which in published texts mainly remains invisible.

The material consists of the commented manuscripts of six contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translations, the published versions of which were released between 2004 and 2009.<sup>1</sup> These manuscripts originated in the contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translation project launched in the beginning of the 2000s by WSOY, one of the largest publishers in Finland. The aim of the project is to publish the whole canon of Shakespeare’s plays as contemporary Finnish translations. At the time of writing this article, the project is drawing to a close with only a few plays to be translated. I currently have access to these six manuscripts only, and I have included all of them in the material so that the whole extent of the translation project is represented in the best possible way. Table 1 below gives the details of the material.

**Table 1.** Material

PLAY	TRANSLATOR	EDITORS
<i>Kuningas Henrik IV, osa 1</i> [ <i>King Henry IV, part 1</i> ] (2004)	Matti Rossi	Päivi Koivisto-Alanko & Matti Rissanen
<i>Macbeth</i> (2004)	Matti Rossi	Alice Martin & Matti Rissanen
<i>Juhannusyön uni</i> [ <i>A Midsummer Night’s Dream</i> ] (2005)	Matti Rossi	Alice Martin & Matti Rissanen
<i>Romeo ja Julia</i> [ <i>Romeo and Juliet</i> ] (2006)	Marja-Leena Mikkola	Päivi Koivisto-Alanko & Matti Rissanen
<i>Coriolanus</i> (2008)	Lauri Sipari	Päivi Koivisto-Alanko & Matti Rissanen
<i>Troilos ja Cressida</i> [ <i>Troilus and Cressida</i> ] (2009)	Anna-Maija Viitanen	Alice Martin & Matti Rissanen

The manuscripts and the editorial comments in them represent the *editing process* related to the contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translations. This process is characterised by *textual interaction* between translators and editors; during the process the editors

read and comment on the translators' first drafts, and these comments are then submitted back to the translator to be taken into consideration when s/he works on the second draft which also serves as the final draft. During the editing process, the editors directly and indirectly refer to various *authorities* (e.g. source-text editions, previous translations and other source and target-oriented material) in order to justify their comments, for example. The present article concentrates on direct references to two previous Finnish Shakespeare translators, Paavo Cajander and Yrjö Jylhä, and on the way in which they function as authorities in the editorial comments. As my research aims to shed light on the production process, the influence of these translators and their work on the final, published contemporary translations lies beyond the scope of this article.

Because the appearances of the previous translations are studied not from the point of view of the translator's agency but that of the editors, this study approaches translation and the production of translations as co-operation between multiple individuals. By editors I refer to two types of editors: (1) a copyeditor, who represents the publisher, and (2) an independent consultant. There are two copyeditors (Alice Martin and Päivi Koivisto-Alanko) who have been responsible for editing the plays. In addition, the drafts have also been read by Professor Emeritus Matti Rissanen, a Shakespeare expert who has commented on the drafts from an academic point of view. Therefore, each manuscript contains textual input from three different individuals: the translator, the copyeditor and the consultant.

The analysis method was based on tracing the textual interaction that takes place between these three individuals, and it involved analysing all editorial comments in all six manuscripts in order to locate all *direct references* to Paavo Cajander and Yrjö Jylhä. Each manuscript contained hundreds of editorial comments which were scanned through, and closer attention was paid only to comments that contained either of the names or both names. The editors may also have referred to Cajander and Jylhä by citing their translations without using their names, but as the present study emphasises these translators' canonised position that derives from their importance in the history of Finnish Shakespeare translation, it is necessary to concentrate on the comments that identify them.

### **3 Past and present of Finnish Shakespeare translation**

Particularly when compared with the history of original Finnish literature, the history of Finnish Shakespeare translation is extensive. Whereas the starting point of original Finnish literature is marked by the publication of Aleksis Kivi's novel *Seitsemän veljestä* (1870), the first Finnish Shakespeare translation, J. F. Lagervall's adaptation of *Macbeth* titled *Ruunulinna*, was completed as early as in 1834. This renders the history of making Shakespeare's works available in Finnish currently 178 years long. The first actual Finnish translation of Shakespeare's play, *Macbeth* by Kaarlo Slöör-Santala, was published in 1864.

In this article I am interested in two of the most influential Finnish Shakespeare translators, namely Paavo Cajander and Yrjö Jylhä, who can be regarded as the producers of "canonised Finnish Shakespeare" and whose translations are arguably among the most influential ones as "facts" of past Finnish society. Cajander translated the whole Shake-

speare canon (except for *Pericles*) between 1879 and 1912 in close co-operation with the newly-established Finnish Theatre (see Aaltonen 1999: 150). At the time when Cajander was working on his translations, Shakespeare was considered a “test” for the Finnish language and theatre: if the plays could be successfully translated into Finnish, this would prove that the Finnish language was “fit” for fine arts. (Keinänen 2010: 15). Another aim was to *develop* the Finnish language and literature; in the 1870s, when Cajander’s first translations were published, Finnish was barely taking its first steps as a consciously regulated and promoted national language (Lehto 2005: 191). As Paloposki (2009: 194) describes the situation, “[t]he task now was to transfer world literature to the language of the young nation which was eager to ‘become civilized’, to build its cultural capital”. The prevailing social circumstances thus provided a fertile ground for Cajander’s translations to become influential.

Two of Yrjö Jylhä’s translations (*Kuningas Lear* [*King Lear*]) and *Macbeth*) were published first in 1936, and all seven followed later between 1955 and 1956 in the form of a three-volume set.<sup>2</sup> Aaltonen (1999: 148) places Jylhä in the Romantic phase of Finnish Shakespeare translation, thus demonstrating his proximity to Cajander. In this sense Jylhä’s translations can be said to observe a poetics similar to Cajander’s translations, even though they were intended to satisfy the theatre’s need for modernised versions of Shakespeare (ibid.: 151). Indeed, Jylhä’s translations (as well as the work of some of the later translators) have been criticised for their tendency to greatly rely on Cajander’s canonised work (see Rissanen 2007: 204). Be that as it may, Jylhä’s translations must be considered influential for the fact alone that they constitute the only “set” of serially published Shakespeare translations in Finnish that was completed between Cajander’s set and the launch of the contemporary set. It should be noticed that Jylhä translated only three of the plays included in the material (*Macbeth*, *Romeo and Juliet* and *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*), and therefore the editors can directly refer to his translation solutions only in the case of these plays.

Apart from Cajander and Jylhä, the history of Finnish Shakespeare translation has been fragmentary. After the publication of Jylhä’s translations in 1955, new translations have been made almost solely for the needs of theatre productions, and during this modern phase only a few of these translations have been published in print (Aaltonen 1999: 152–156). Therefore, in addition to their canonised position, Cajander’s and Jylhä’s translations constitute the main body of Finnish Shakespeare translations that have been published in print prior to the contemporary translations, and therefore they make the most obvious ones for the editors to refer to because they *can* be referred to easily. Referring to stage translations would be much more difficult because they do not usually exist in a published form that is readily available.

All in all, as mentioned in the Introduction, Cajander’s and Jylhä’s translations of Shakespeare’s plays have played a substantial role in the development of Finnish literature and society, but at the same time they represent a poetics that is obsolete. As a result, a certain kind of *tension* emerges between the canonised translations and the contemporary project. This study aims to discover how this tension becomes *visible* in the textual documentation of the editing process and, more specifically, in the editorial comments.

#### 4 “Ghosting” as a mechanism of intertextual interpretation

The tension between the canonised translations and the contemporary project is studied by applying the concept of *ghosting* in the context of the *production* of these translations and, particularly, the *editing process* within it. The concept of ghosting was introduced by Marvin Carlson (2006), and its original function was to emphasise the role of *memory* as a device of interpretation in the context of theatrical performance and dramatic texts. According to Carlson (2006: 6),

[the] process of using the memory of previous encounters to understand and interpret encounters with new and somewhat different but apparently similar phenomena is fundamental to human cognition in general, and it plays a major role in the theatre, as it does in all the arts.

Carlson distinguishes the phenomenon of ghosting from the recognition of genres: whereas individuals’ recognition of different genres is based on their memory of particular kinds of texts with similar properties (e.g. tragedies and comedies, or novels, short stories and academic articles), the reception that goes with the phenomenon of ghosting “presents the identical thing they have encountered before, although now in a somewhat different context” (Carlson 2006: 7). Therefore, unlike the recognition of genres which is based on an instant feeling of familiarity, ghosting can be said to operate much more subtly and indirectly (*ibid.*: 6–7). As a matter of fact, ghosting is more closely related to the concept of intertextuality which, according to the term’s creator Julia Kristeva (1980: 36), relates to the way in which a text is actually “a permutation of texts, an intertextuality in the space of a given text” in which “several utterances, taken from other texts, intersect and neutralize one another”.

When placed in the context of the editorial work related to the contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translation project, the phenomenon of ghosting can be understood in terms of an encounter between the translator’s draft and the editor’s memory. Such an encounter may potentially evoke “ghosts” of previous similar encounters, that is, the translator’s solutions may be intertextually interpreted by the editors in the light of other, previously encountered translation solutions. As Carlson argues in the vein of Kristeva, all literary texts are intertextual in that they are involved in the processes of recycling and memory by combining elements of previously existing and previously read texts, but “[...] the dramatic text seems particularly self-conscious of this process, particularly *haunted* by its predecessors” (2006: 8, my emphasis).

In other words, if the editors are acquainted with the translations by Cajander and Jylhä, they may be able to draw conscious or subconscious parallels between the translator’s solution and a solution in a previous translation. In such a case, a given solution in the translator’s draft seems, from the editor’s perspective, to be “haunted” by a previous translation to such a great degree that this results in an editorial comment that makes the connection explicit by directly referring to Cajander or Jylhä.

As the contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translation project is actively trying to distinguish itself from Cajander’s translations and the poetics it represents, Cajander’s translations do not have an “official” position within the project and the translators are not expected to pay attention to Cajander (Koivisto-Alanko & Martin 2009). Nevertheless,

as became apparent in an interview with Rissanen (2009), the editors have sometimes consulted Cajander's translations. Therefore the conditions are favourable to ghosting and, in particular, documentation of ghosting to take place.

The pending question, then, is in which way the "ghosts" of Cajander and Jylhä are referred to, that is, what their *function* is: are they regarded as "revered authorities" or "unwanted relics"?

### 5 The "ghosts" of Cajander and Jylhä: revered authorities or unwanted relics?

Altogether 15 "apparitions" of Cajander and Jylhä could be found in the research material. As can be seen from Table 2 below, the distribution of these references between the categories was very even. There were 6 references to Cajander and 6 to Jylhä, as well as 3 references mentioning both Cajander and Jylhä. Seven of the references were positive, eight negative.

**Table 2.** Findings

	Cajander	Jylhä	Cajander and Jylhä	Total
"Revered authority" (positive)	3	3	1	7
"Unwanted relic" (negative)	3	3	2	8
<b>Total</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>15</b>

The numbers given above are based on editorial comments found in *Romeo ja Julia* (7 references), *Juhannussyön uni* (5 references), *Troilos ja Cressida* (2 references) and *Kuningas Henrik IV, osa 1* (1 reference). No direct references to Cajander and Jylhä were found in *Macbeth* and *Coriolanus*.

In what follows, I shall discuss the ways in which Cajander, Jylhä or both of them are referred to by the editors in more detail through six examples. The examples have been selected on the basis of their representativeness of the categories involved. The original context of the examples will be explained in the discussion. No back-translations into English are provided, but the meaning of the Finnish translations and of the editors' comments will be explicated as necessary. The references at the end of the examples point to the page numbers in the translator's draft.

In example 1 below, Cajander is referred to in a **positive** sense in an editorial comment on *King Henry IV, part 1*. In the context of a heated conversation between Prince Henry

and Falstaff that takes place towards the end of the second act of the play, Falstaff slanders Prince John by calling him, among other things, a “bowcase”. The translator (Rossi) has in his initial draft rendered this as “miekantuppi”:

- |     |                                 |   |
|-----|---------------------------------|---|
| (1) | Translator:<br>(Matti Rossi)    | <i>[...] annas kun vedän henkeä niin<br/>kerron mikä olet! Kynnäräkeppi,<br/>miekantuppi, peltoon lyöty heinähanko!</i> |
|     | Consultant:<br>(Matti Rissanen) | <i>”bow-case”<br/>Cajander: ”jousenkotelo”</i>  |

(King Henry IV, part 1: 18)

Even though the metaphorical sense suggested by “sword sheath” and “bowcase” is very similar, the consultant still chooses to comment on the translator’s solution. In his comment, the consultant (Rissanen) first refers to the equivalent word in an unidentified source text edition (“bow-case”) and then to Cajander’s translation solution “jousenkotelo” [literally ‘bow’s case’]. Even though “jousenkotelo” is a literal translation of “bow-case”, Cajander seems to be identified as an *authority* that validates or, at least, provides grounds for the editorial suggestion.

Example 2 presents a situation in which Cajander is referred to in a **negative** sense. In a dialogue between Cressida and Pandarus taking place in the second scene of *Troilus and Cressida*’s first act, the copyeditor (Martin) challenges the translator’s (Viitanen) solution by suggesting her own translation for a longer passage. However, after presenting the translation, the copyeditor admits that her proposal “viinurinkin laskutaito” (“tapper’s arithmetic” [Shakespeare 2008a: 61]) in Cressida’s line is too similar with Cajander’s translation which has almost exactly the same wording (“viinurin laskutaito”), and might therefore be too “old-fashioned”.

- |     |                                      |  |
|-----|--------------------------------------|--|
| (2) | Translator:<br>(Anna-Maija Viitanen) | <i>Aivan, se mitä hänestä saa kokoon<br/>on pian laskettu yhden käden sormilla.</i>  |
|     | Copyeditor:<br>(Alice Martin)        | <i>Aivan, niiden ynnäämiseen riittää<br/>viinurinkin laskutaito (-hm.<br/>Cajanderillakin ”viinurin laskutaito” -<br/>olenko jotenkin vanhanaikainen?)</i> |

(Troilus and Cressida: 18)

Example 2 could thus be interpreted as an instance of self-censorship on the part of the copyeditor. The editorial comment suggests that Cajander’s translation has been consulted after the comment was made, and that the similarity was not noticed until at this point. The result is, interestingly, that the copyeditor, in a sense, “hedges” her comment by referring to Cajander in a negative sense (i.e. by wondering if the similarity makes the solution sound old-fashioned), and seems to trust the translator with the final choice.

Example 3 presents a case in which Jylhä is referred to in a **positive** sense. In Helena’s line at the end of the second act’s first scene in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, the copyeditor (Martin) criticises the wording “kuolen käsivarsillesi” [literally ‘I will die in



your arms’] in the translator’s (Rossi) draft and refers to the corresponding passage in Jylhä’s translation:

- |     |                               |   |
|-----|-------------------------------|---|
| (3) | Translator:<br>(Matti Rossi)  | Seuraan sinua, teen helvetistä taivaan;<br>kuolen käsivarsillesi lemmen vaivaan.  |
|     | Copyeditor:<br>(Alice Martin) | <i>Jylhä:</i> ”hornakin on taivas varmaan,<br>jos mulle kuoleman tuo käsi armaan”.<br>die upon the hand... ”by means of the hand” |

(A Midsummer Night’s Dream: 21)

Here the copyeditor seems to present Jylhä’s solution to the translator as an example of how to convey the idea of the original source-text passage. Whereas in the translator’s initial solution Helena proclaims to die of ‘love’s trouble’ in Demetrius’ arms, the source text’s equivalent expression “die upon the hand” should, according to the copyeditor, be interpreted as ‘by means of the hand’. To emphasise this point, the copyeditor directly cites Jylhä’s solution in which ‘the loved one’s hand brings death’ and which therefore conveys the source text’s meaning more accurately.

Jylhä is also referred to in a **negative** sense, as demonstrated by example 4. The following passage is delivered by Father Laurence in the fourth act of *Romeo and Juliet* when he offers Juliet the potion that could make her appear dead to Paris:

- |     |  |   |
|-----|--|---|
| (4) | Translator:<br>(Marja-Leena Mikkola)   | <i>Kun olet vuoteessasi, ota tämä pullo<br/>ja juo sen sisältämä yrttiuute;<br/>heti kylmä unettava huuru<br/>valahtaa suoniisi, ne eivät syki enää [...]</i> |
|     | Copyeditor:<br>(Päivi Koivisto-Alanko) | <i>Huuru myös turhan tuttu Jylhästä</i>   |

(Romeo and Juliet: 115)

Here the copyeditor (Koivisto-Alanko) criticises the translator’s (Mikkola) way of incorporating the word “huuru” [‘vapour’] in her solution by pointing out that the word is too familiar from Jylhä’s translation. On the lexical level, Jylhä’s style is quite recognisable, and in this case the copyeditor’s comment might be motivated by the translator’s word-choice that is too archaic for the contemporary translation or too strongly associated with Jylhä’s style and therefore unwanted.

Interestingly, both Cajander and Jylhä are referred to simultaneously on three occasions. This is most likely caused by the close relationship between Cajander’s and Jylhä’s translations, and goes to further emphasise their canonised position. In example 5, both Cajander and Jylhä are referred to in a **positive** sense. It is, again, a matter of a single word in the translator’s first draft, namely “este” which appears in Demetrius’ line to Lysander towards the end of the third act of *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*:

- (5) Translator: *Olisipa minullakin moinen este.*  
(Matti Rossi) *Hento kahle, mutta riittää sinulle.*  
*En luota sanaasi.*
- Copyeditor: *bond ei ole este / Caj. + Jylhä tulkitsevat*  
(Alice Martin) *”saanko sen kirjallisena”*

(A Midsummer Night’s Dream: 44)

First, the copyeditor (Martin) states that “bond ei ole este” (‘bond is not an obstacle’), thus questioning the translator’s (Rossi) solution to use the word “este”. In addition, the copyeditor points out that both Cajander and Jylhä interpret Demetrius’ “I would I had your bond” (Shakespeare 2008b: 202) as “saanko sen kirjallisena” [‘may I have in it writing’] which seems to be presented here as an example to be followed.

Finally, in example 6 both Cajander and Jylhä are referred to in a **negative** sense. The following passage is from Quince’s line in *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*’s third act in which the famous “play within a play” is being prepared:

- (6) Translator: *Kun olet sanottavasi sanonut,*  
(Matti Rossi) *menet tuonne pensaan taa.*  
*Ja niin tekee jokainen vuorollaan.*
- Copyeditor: *Ja jokainen pitää vaarin iskustaan tms.*  
(Alice Martin) *according to his cue – so tuskin*  
*”jokainen menee puskaan” vaan*  
*ennemmin viittaa iskuun – eihän*  
*muuten ole järkeä, vaikka Cajander ja*  
*Jylhäkin ovat käsittäneet niin!*

(A Midsummer Night’s Dream: 30)

Here the copyeditor (Martin) criticises the translator’s (Rossi) solution “menet tuonne pensaan taa” [‘you’ll go behind the bush over there’], emphatically arguing that the source text probably does not contain this meaning. The copyeditor then uses Cajander and Jylhä as examples in a negative sense: they have both interpreted the passage as the translator has, but according to the copyeditor this does not validate the translator’s solution. Instead, it seems that the copyeditor wishes to rectify the previous misunderstandings.

All in all, perhaps the most surprising finding is that only fifteen direct references to Cajander’s and Jylhä’s translations could be found in the research material. As their translations are canonised and therefore influential within the target culture, they could have been expected to be more visible in the editing process. On the other hand, the fact that in practice only these two translators are identified in the material does highlight their position as canonised, influential ones. Furthermore, as the analysis showed, the editors refer to Cajander and Jylhä almost as many times, and neither one of them seems to emerge as the more important one. Above all, neither Cajander nor Jylhä appears as more “exemplary” or “authoritative” as the other in the editorial comments.

## 6 Conclusions

The central finding of the present study is that the editors' main focus in the comments identifying the two canonised translators, Cajander and Jylhä, seems to be the way in which they have *interpreted* the source text. The editors can present these previous interpretations to the translators as examples to be either followed or avoided. This finding emphasises the significance of not only the “invisible” individuals (e.g. editors) that take part in the translation process alongside the translator, but also of the earlier translators whose texts and textual solutions are already present in the intertextual context of the target culture. The role of the earlier translators may become important through the agency of editors and through the phenomenon of ghosting, as has been argued in this article. It also seems that the concept of ghosting can be relevant to studying the editing process, especially as one possible explanatory frame for the way in which translations or other texts already present in the target culture affect the production of translations through the memories of the agents involved.

Indeed, what deserves more attention is the indirect influence of the various *authorities* that affect translation production alongside the source text, as well as the mechanisms by which the influence of these authorities functions. Written documents that originate in editing processes, such as the commented manuscripts employed in this study, constitute a material type that can provide answers to the abovementioned questions, and they can also lead to new ways of understanding, from the point of view of culturally oriented Translation Studies, how the past and the present of the target culture and society may intertwine in the production of translations.

The way in which the ghosts of Cajander and Jylhä come into play in the editing process naturally represents only one possible perspective for studying their influence on the contemporary translations. For example, it would be interesting to examine in which exact circumstances the previous translations are drawn into the process and, finally, how their influence is visible in the published translations. A further fascinating subject would also be the way the canonised translations enter the editing process *indirectly*, that is, without being explicitly referred to with the translator's name.

*Macbeth* ends with a line suggesting that the sons of Banquo, the ghost at the banquet, will reign after the protagonist's death: similarly, the legacy of Cajander and Jylhä still seems to be present in the production of contemporary Finnish Shakespeare translations. However, their influence is likely to be mainly covert, and for the receiving audience they will appear—as they have for the editors—as ghosts of other texts haunting the contemporary reader from time to time.

## Research material

A Midsummer Night's Dream = Shakespeare, William 2005. *Juhannusyön uni*. (A Midsummer Night's Dream, translated by Matti Rossi). Unpublished translation manuscript with editorial comments by Alice Martin and Matti Rissanen.

King Henry IV, part 1 = Shakespeare, William 2004. *Kuningas Henrik neljäs. Osa 1.* (*King Henry IV, part 1*, translated by Matti Rossi). Unpublished translation manuscript with editorial comments by Päivi Koivisto-Alanko and Matti Rissanen.

Romeo and Juliet = Shakespeare, William 2006. *Romeo ja Julia.* (*Romeo and Juliet*, translated by Marja-Leena Mikkola). Unpublished translation manuscript with editorial comments by Päivi Koivisto-Alanko and Matti Rissanen.

Shakespeare, William 2004. *Macbeth.* (*Macbeth*, translated by Matti Rossi). Unpublished translation manuscript with editorial comments by Alice Martin and Matti Rissanen.

Shakespeare, William 2008. *Coriolanus.* (*Coriolanus*, translated by Lauri Sipari). Unpublished translation manuscript with editorial comments by Päivi Koivisto-Alanko and Matti Rissanen.

Troilus and Cressida = Shakespeare, William 2009. *Troilos ja Cressida.* (*Troilus and Cressida*, translated by Anna-Maija Viitanen). Unpublished translation manuscript with editorial comments by Alice Martin and Matti Rissanen.

### Works cited

Aaltonen, Sirkku 1999. *La Perruque* in a rented apartment. Rewriting Shakespeare in Finland. *Ilha do Desterro* 36, 141–159.

Carlson, Marvin 2006. *The Haunted Stage. The Theatre as Memory Machine.* Michigan: The University of Michigan Press.

Keinänen, Nely 2010. Suomalaisen Shakespeare-perinteen syntyvaiheista [On the birth of Finnish Shakespeare tradition]. In: Nely Keinänen (ed.) *Shakespeare Suomessa [Shakespeare in Finland]*. Helsinki: WSOY, 7–33.

Kinnunen, Tuija & Kaisa Koskinen 2010. Introduction. In: Tuija Kinnunen & Kaisa Koskinen (ed.) 2010. *Translators' Agency.* Tampere: Tampere University Press, 4–10.

Koivisto-Alanko, Päivi & Alice Martin (2009). Unrecorded interview. Department of Foreign Literature of WSOY, Helsinki 26.3.2009.

Kristeva, Julia 1980. *Desire in Language. A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Lefevere, André 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame.* London: Routledge.

Lehto, Leevi 2005. Varjot korvissamme – näkökohtia runouden kääntämisestä [Shadows in our ears – points of view into translation of poetry]. In: Kristiina Rikman (ed.) *Suom. huom. Kirjoituksia kääntämisestä [Suom. huom. Writings on translation]*. Helsinki: WSOY, 182–205.

Paloposki, Outi 2009. Limits of freedom. Agency, choice and constraints in the work of the translator. In: John Milton & Paul Bandia (eds.) *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 189–208.

Rissanen, Matti 2007. Paavo Cajander (1846–1909). In: H. K. Riikonen, Urpo Kovala, Pekka Kujamäki & Outi Paloposki (eds.) *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia I [History of literature in Finnish translation I]*. Helsinki: SKS, 201–205.

Rissanen, Matti 2009. Unrecorded interview. The Research Unit for Variation, Contacts and Change in English (VARIENG), Helsinki 26.3.2009.

Shakespeare, William 2008a. *Troilus and Cressida*. Edited by Kenneth Muir. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Shakespeare, William 2008b. *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. Edited by Peter Holland. Oxford World's Classics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

---

<sup>1</sup> All translators included in the study have given a permission to use their manuscripts as research material, and the copyeditors and the consultant have also given their consent to having their work investigated.

<sup>2</sup> Volume 1: *Romeo and Juliet* [*Romeo ja Julia*], *A Midsummer Night's Dream* [*Kesäyön unelma*] and *Macbeth*; Volume 2: *Hamlet* and *Othello*; Volume 3: *King Lear* and *The Merchant of Venice* [*Venetsian kauppias*].