TURUN
YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY
OF TURKU

EXPLORING AGENCY IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF A TRANSLATED CHARACTER NARRATIVE

A Multiple-Case Study on Early Sibelius-Related Translations into Finnish

Turo Rautaoja

TURUN YLIOPISTON JULKAISUJA – ANNALES UNIVERSITATIS TURKUENSIS
SARJA – SER. B OSA – TOM. 628 | HUMANIORA | TURKU 2023

TURUN
YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY
OF TURKU

EXPLORING AGENCY IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF A TRANSLATED CHARACTER NARRATIVE

A Multiple-Case Study on Early Sibelius-Related Translations into Finnish

Turo Rautaoja

TURUN YLIOPISTON JULKAISUJA – ANNALES UNIVERSITATIS TURKUENSIS
SARJA – SER. B OSA – TOM. 628 | HUMANIORA | TURKU 2023

University of Turku

Faculty of Humanities
School of Languages and Translation Studies
Department of English
Doctoral Programme in Languages and Translation Studies (Utuling)

Supervised by

Professor Outi Paloposki
University of Turku
Turku, Finland

Professor Emeritus Yves Gambier
University of Turku
Turku, Finland

Reviewed by

Professor Nike Pokorn
University of Ljubljana
Ljubljana, Slovenia

Professor Heidi Grönstrand
Stockholm University
Stockholm, Sweden

Opponent

Associate Professor Anne Lange
Tallinn University
Tallinn, Estonia

ISBN 978-951-29-9319-2 PRINT
ISBN 978-951-29-9320-8 PDF
ISSN 0082-6987 (Print)
ISSN 2343-3191 (Online)
Painosalama, Turku, Finland 2023

UNIVERSITY OF TURKU
Faculty of Humanities
School of Languages and Translation Studies
Department of English
TURO RAUTAOJA: Exploring Agency in the Construction of a Translated Character Narrative: A Multiple-Case Study on Early Sibelius-Related Translations into Finnish
Doctoral Dissertation, 158 pp.
Doctoral Programme in Languages and Translation Studies (Utuling)
May 2023

ABSTRACT

This dissertation explores the application of the sociological narrative theory in Translation Studies, with a focus on the Finnish translations of texts related to Finland's national composer, Jean Sibelius. Drawing on Mona Baker and the scholars upon whom she bases her theory, the study first critically examines the premise of the approach and then aims to throw light upon how the theory can be used in the analysis of narratives focussing on an individual. For this purpose, particular attention is paid to translators' agency and translatorship.

In the dissertation, I conduct a multiple-case study on 12 Sibelius-related texts published in Finland and translated into Finnish from Swedish, English and German between 1916 and 1965. A three-part contextual framework is introduced to elucidate some of the relational settings from which the literary materials examined emerged and to provide an understanding of the overall literary genre of non-fiction texts. The texts are then studied with the help of various paratextual sources to uncover different narrative strands and the agencies involved in creating and promoting the nationally significant Sibelius narrative.

The results of the study suggest that combining the sociological narrative theory in Translation Studies with agential considerations can provide valuable insights into the mechanisms of narrative construction and help to examine translators' role in social developments that may have a considerable lifespan. At the same time, it acknowledges that further research into the underlying principles and history of the theory is needed to truly solidify the narrative approach as an academically viable option within Translation Studies.

The findings of the study also suggest that questions concerning narrative construction extend beyond the technicalities and structural aspects of the building process. Based on the multiple-case study conducted, I argue that narrative construction needs to be considered more broadly if the aim is to gain a more comprehensive understanding of the narrative examined.

KEYWORDS: translation, narrative theory, agency, translatorship

TURUN YLIOPISTO
Humanistinen tiedekunta
Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos
Englannin kieli
TURO RAUTAOJA: Exploring Agency in the Construction of a Translated Character Narrative: A Multiple-Case Study on Early Sibelius-Related Translations into Finnish
Väitöskirja, 158 s.
Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden tohtoriohjelma (Utuling)
Toukokuu 2023

TIIVISTELMÄ

Väitöskirja tarkastelee käännöstieteessä sovellettua sosiologista narratiiviteoriaa ja keskittyy erityisesti Suomen kansallissäveltäjään, Jean Sibeliukseen, liittyviin suomeksi käännettyihin teksteihin. Tutkimus pohjautuu Mona Bakerin ja tämän hyödyntämien tutkijoiden teoreettisiin havaintoihin. Tutkimuksessa Bakerin lähestymistavan perusteita tarkastellaan ensin kriittisesti, minkä jälkeen tapaustutkimusten avulla selvitetään, miten teoriaa voidaan hyödyntää analysoitaessa yksilöön keskittyviä narratiiveja. Erityistä huomiota kiinnitetään kääntäjien toimijuuteen ja kääntäjyyteen.

Väitöskirja sisältää tapaustutkimusten sarjan, jossa keskitytään tarkastelemaan 12:ta Sibeliukseen liittyvää vuosien 1916 ja 1965 välillä julkaistua ja suomeksi ruotsista, englannista ja saksasta käännettyä tekstiä. Tapauksia tarkastellaan suhteessa kolmiosaiseen kontekstuaaliseen kehykseen, joka valaisee niitä relationaalisia puitteita, joissa kirjalliset materiaalit syntyivät. Tämän jälkeen tekstejä tarkastellaan paratekstuaalisten lähteiden avulla pyrkimyksenä tunnistaa erilaisia narratiivijuonteita sekä kansallisesti merkittävän Sibelius-narratiivin luomiseen ja ylläpitämiseen vaikuttaneita toimijuuksia.

Tutkimuksen tulosten perusteella esitän, että käännöstieteessä hyödynnetyn sosiologisen narratiiviteorian ja toimijuuden tarkastelun yhdistäminen voi tarjota arvokasta tietoa narratiivien rakentumisesta ja auttaa tutkimaan kääntäjien roolia pitkän aikavälin yhteiskunnallisissa kehityskuluissa. Tutkimus paljastaa myös, että narratiiviteorian taustaperiaatteet ja historia vaativat lisätutkimusta ja selvennystä, jos sen halutaan pysyvän elinvoimaisena osana käännöstiedettä.

Tutkimuksen löydökset osoittavat, että narratiivien rakentumista koskevat kysymykset eivät rajoitu vain narratiivien synnyn mekaniikkaan ja teknisiin kysymyksiin. Tehtyjen tapaustutkimusten perusteella esitän, että narratiivien rakentumista on tarkasteltava laajemmalla perspektiivillä, jos tavoitteena on syvällinen ymmärrys tarkasteltavasta narratiivista.

ASIASANAT: kääntäminen, narratiiviteoria, toimijuus, kääntäjyys

Acknowledgements

My first Master's thesis taught me that LIFE IS A JOURNEY while my second reminded me that I had 'More Trees to Climb'. What the present project made me realise, however, was that both travelling and tree-climbing are activities best shared with other like-minded people. This dissertation would not have seen the light of day without the help, friendship and support of the following people and funders.

First and foremost, I want to extend my sincerest thanks to my thesis supervisors, Professor Outi Paloposki and Professor Emeritus Yves Gambier, for their guidance, support and encouragement throughout this long journey. Their invaluable feedback, insightful comments and expert advice have been instrumental in shaping my research and helping me achieve my academic goals. I feel privileged to have received my induction into the academic community through such exceptional individuals, who have not only always been interested in hearing my thoughts and ideas but who have also challenged them and provided food for thought in equal measure.

I am also deeply grateful to my pre-examiners, Professor Nike Pokorn (University of Ljubljana) and Professor Heidi Grönstrand (University of Stockholm), for their thoughtful and constructive feedback. Their insightful comments and suggestions helped me to refine my arguments and present my findings in a more convincing and coherent manner. I also wish to thank Associate Professor Anne Lange (Tallinn University) for acting as my opponent in the public defence.

My exploration of academic idiosyncrasies would not have been the same without my peers and friends at the semi-formal research group TSOLSI. This support network, including Laura Ekberg, Laura Ivaska, Anna Missilä, Damon Tringham and Katja Vuokko, offered me encouragement and motivation, provided an essential source of inspiration and helped me to stay focussed and motivated during challenging times. My heartfelt thanks for all the discussions, travels and game nights – not to mention laughs – over the past decade or so. To borrow the immortal words of someone we all know and cherish, I do not know what I have done to deserve you all.

I am also grateful to my parents, Taina and Tapio, for their encouragement, solace and love throughout my academic journey, as well as life in general. Their unwavering support and belief in me continue to be a driving force in my life.

I should not forget the Department of English and people of Translation Studies across languages for providing me with my academic home and an inspiring work environment during my years as a Doctoral Candidate and University Teacher at the University of Turku. Their role in my growth as an aspiring academic and the completion of my dissertation was substantial.

My research trips and participation in conferences and summer schools would not have been possible without the generous grants provided by the Department of English, the UTULING doctoral programme, the Langnet network and the Finnish Association of Translators and Interpreters (SKTL). Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to the Varsinais-Suomi Regional Fund of the Finnish Cultural Foundation and the University of Turku School of Languages and Translation Studies for financial support. The trust they showed in my research enabled me to pursue my academic goals and complete this thesis.

15 May 2023
Turo Rautaoja

Table of Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Background

Narratology, "the study of the logic, principles, and practices of narrative representation", has a long history dating back as far as Greek antiquity and philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, who formulated many of the principles of this field of study (Meister 2009, 329). As a discipline in its own right, narratology was first recognised by Tzvetan Todorov (1969, 10), who coined the French term *narratologie* (in English, *narratology*) to refer to the investigation of literary narratives as understood by him and his fellow French scholars, such as Roland Barthes, Gérard Genette and A. J. Greimas (Introduction 2010, n.p.; Meister 2009, 337). This French structuralism, which has also been called the classical phase of narratology, dominated the study of narratives until the 1980s, when Barthes's call for interdisciplinarity was heeded and the scope of narratology gradually broadened beyond literary narratives (Introduction, 2010, n.p.; Ryan & van Alphen 1992, 112).

As the concepts and ideas of narratology began to influence other disciplines, many areas of enquiry witnessed a so-called narrative turn (Meister 2009, 339). In the 1990s, numerous disciplines began reflecting upon the significance of narration for their respective domains and the spreading of these narratological ideas resulted in an onslaught of methodologically heterogeneous approaches, so-called *new narratologies*, which, discarding the text- and product-centred approach of the structuralist tradition, focussed instead on the context and process of narrative construction (Meister 2009, 339–341; Herman 1999; Nünning 2003). According to Nünning (2003, 240), this development has resulted in the term 'narratology' being used in two differing ways: in the stricter sense of the structuralist paradigm of the 1960s and early 1970s and in the broader sense of 'narrative studies', encompassing approaches "many of which arguably represent other forms of narrative theory, analysis or application […]" (ibid.). Commenting on these approaches, Herman (1999, 16) argues that these new approaches have an "abiding concern with the process and not merely the product of narratological enquiry; […] properties of the object being investigated, narrative, are relativized across frameworks of investigation, which must themselves be included in the domain under study".

In Translation Studies, this type of approach to narratology entered the discipline's collective consciousness in 2006, when Mona Baker introduced the sociological approach to narratives in her book *Translation and Conflict – A Narrative Account*. The book examined the role of translation in the construction of narratives in conflict situations and drew on a selection of sources and disciplines to outline a theory in which narratives are understood as socially motivated. The theory relied particularly heavily on the social-historical studies of Somers (1992, 1994, 1997) and Somers and Gibson (1994) in its definition of narrative categories and features which formed the foundation of the approach. Baker's theory quickly gained popularity and has since its publication been applied and typically further elaborated in numerous theses and studies. The academically most weighty of these, such as Boéri (2008) and Harding (2012a, 2012b; see also Harding & Ralarala 2017), have followed in Baker's footsteps and discussed narratives in various situations of conflict, but the theory has also been modified in several studies to fit the requirements of each specific research question and material (see Section 2.1.3).

1.2 Research questions and objectives of the study

The purpose of this doctoral thesis is to investigate the use of Baker's narrative theory and to explore its possibilities – particularly its potential for tackling matters of agency and translatorship (see Section 2.2) – through a set of early literal material concentrating on Finland's national composer, Jean Sibelius (1865–1957). This basic research frame is motivated by three lacunae, observed in the theoretical approach, the type of narratives previously studied and knowledge about the primary material: First, although Baker's theory has been applied to a multitude of different genres, no notable endeavours have been dedicated to questions of agency. This can be considered remarkable keeping in mind that, to exist, narratives need to be told by someone – doubly so when it comes to narratives that are translated. Second, the present study seeks to explore the construction of a particular kind of narrative, here named 'character narrative', which has thus far received no attention in Translation Studies literature. This narrative type concentrates on a particular individual and has been mentioned by Baker as one potentially fruitful avenue of research (Baker 2006, 33–34). These first two aspects are combined and examined by conducting an embedded multiple-case study (Susam-Sarajeva 2009, 41–44) on 12 Sibelius-related texts translated into Finnish between 1916 and 1965, with these years marking the publication of the first Sibelius biography and the release of the first instalment of Erik Tawaststjerna's seminal, five-part Sibelius biography, which marks the beginning of modern Sibelius Studies. The texts investigated were involved in both the creation and sustainment of what this study calls the 'Sibelius narrative' in Finland (see Section 3.4) but, to date, no particular attention has been paid to the fact

these texts were in fact translated into, not originally written in, Finnish. The final lacuna, then, concerns making this aspect of the Sibelius-related literature visible and investigating the translation-based construction of this nationally significant narrative.

Before addressing these points of interest, this study conducts a critical review of Baker's theory. The diversity of genres to which the model has been applied has proved the theory to be a flexible tool for diverse topics but also raises concern regarding the potential inconstancy of the approach. Considering the popularity of Baker's theory and the fact that *Translation and Conflict* was published over 15 years ago, it can be considered somewhat surprising that the approach has prompted few commentaries examining it with a critical eye. The theory has thus far been largely considered a given, and subsequent literature has paid little attention to its socio-historical foundations (consider, e.g., Valdeón 2008; Aaltonen 2009; Boéri 2010). To date, the only critique on the narrative theory appears to be Anthony Pym's scathing review of Baker's and Venuti's works from 2016, which, although raising several valid points, such as the lack of empiricism in Baker's argumentation (Pym 2016, 291), also seems to somewhat miss its mark by misconstruing some of the principles of Baker's theory (see Section 2.1.4).

A more in-depth evaluation of the theory is therefore still needed to truly advance the paradigm. The present study contributes to this by considering the theory in relation to the key studies on which Baker's theory is based. Even though Baker's theory is criticised in Chapter 2, the objective of the present study is not to propose a new model of analysis *per se* but to bring forth questions and particularities on the types of matters that should be considered when investigating translated narratives.

As has already become apparent above, this study distances itself from the conflictual aspects of Baker's approach and, instead, addresses the significance of translation for the construction of stories surrounding public figures. The translations of Sibelius-related works represent ideologically slanted depictions of the composer and thus provide interesting vistas into the motivations and methods of narrative construction. In the late 19th and early 20th century, Sibelius's music had had a prominent role in Finland's nationalist aspirations, and the early books on him often continued promoting his significance as a national hero. How the composer was perceived ceased to be about the person and instead concentrated on the phenomenon, legend and image. Sibelius once expressed his exasperation with this shift, saying "There will yet come a man who will write a proper book on me," as recorded in an anecdote by Jussi Jalas (1981, 72). While the quotation implies that Sibelius did not recognise himself in the depictions of early Sibelius-related literature which, to him, were not 'proper books' (*kunnon kirja*), the general public regarded

these texts as valid depictions of the composer, his works and his life.[1] However, what has rarely been considered is the contextual complexity of these texts. Although the texts contributed to a phenomenon that has been understood as markedly Finnish and that often revolved around questions of Finnish national identity, the texts themselves were products of both domestic and international intercultural exchange and, thus, embedded in a network of developments far beyond the confines of a monolithic national culture. These texts, which promoted and developed a construction that was to a large extent considered a Finnish cultural narrative, were imports from Swedish-, English- and German-language texts carried over to the Finnish-language context. While this fact is by no means unknown, it has thus far been left undiscussed, inviting an investigation into the role of translation in the construction of the Finnish Sibelius narrative.

As fascinating as this premise is, without further delimitation, the topic is far too broad and raises more issues than this study is able to address. To avoid this problem, the present study will consider a number of different viewpoints, formulated into questions as follows:

1. Why was the early literature on Sibelius translated into – rather than originally written in – Finnish?
2. Where did the texts come from? Which texts were translated, and which were perhaps left untranslated?
3. Who translated the works, and what motivated their translational activity?
4. What does the texts' identity as translations signify with regard to the Sibelius narrative?

These questions will help to construct a frame for the topic at hand by revealing translation-related avenues for the study: The first two questions address issues related to the material itself, while the third question, which will also be further elaborated in Section 2.2.3 of the present study after the discussion on agency, charts the agential aspects of the study. The fourth question refocuses on the principles behind the construction of the character narrative. The questions also largely correspond to Pym's (1998) notion of translation archaeology as well as the translation-historical questions proposed by D'hulst ([2010] 2016). The first sub-question aims at uncovering the historical and linguistic context of the translations: asking why the texts were translated will delve into the history of music literature,

[1] "Vielä tulee mies, joka kirjoittaa minusta kunnon kirjan" is Jalas's formulation of the quotation. The word *kunnon* is an undeclinable adjective, defined in the Finnish dictionary *Kielitoimiston sanakirja* as "kunniallinen, kunnollinen, kelpo, hyvä" (honourable, proper, decent, good).

its authors and its translators in Finland. The second question addresses the routes through which the texts reached the Finnish-speaking audience. Furthermore, it helps to uncover what the narrative that the texts were attempting to construct was, as it also takes into consideration those texts that were not thought worthy of translation. The third question explores translators and their agency (see Section 2.2), understood as their "*willingness* and *ability* to act" (Koskinen 2010, 165; emphases in original) in the construction of the Sibelius narrative. The question will investigate not only individual translators involved in the translation of Sibelius-related literature but also the figure of the translator in general as it considers the translators' role and translatorship. Finally, the last question concerns the significance of translation *vis-à-vis* non-translation (i.e., original texts) as well as the larger implications of the multiple-case study both for the analytical and methodological framework of narrative theory and for the discipline of Translation Studies.

While the purpose of these questions is to throw light upon the Sibelius narrative as a whole, many important questions will not be explicitly presented or extensively discussed in the present study. Among them are, for instance, the role of the publishers in the dissemination of the texts, translations of the texts into languages other than Finnish and any quantitative approach to the material at hand. The texts will also not be subjected to systematic textual analysis. Rather, this study assumes a more encompassing and open-ended view, in which the texts in their entirety are thought of as historical expressions of the Sibelius narrative, and passages from the texts are examined only when they shed light upon other aspects of narrative construction, such as the translators' or authors' agency or phenomena connected to the Sibelius narrative. Even though a thorough comparison of the source and target texts would undoubtedly provide fascinating insights about the topic, as has been shown by Hartama-Heinonen in her 2017 case study on the Finnish translation of Sibelius's 1909–1944 journal (see also Hartama-Heinonen 2018), it has relatively little to offer to the socio-historical narrative approach adopted in this study. Therefore, the task of systematically addressing the textual features of these texts needs to be assigned to potential later studies.

Another limitation is the decision to take the *translated* Sibelius texts as a point of departure. I readily acknowledge that the Sibelius narrative(s) discussed in this study were built not solely on the basis of the texts considered in this piece of research but on a vast array of both textual and non-textual material circulating in people's lives in the course of several decades. The narratives were shaped by, for instance, newspaper articles, concert reviews, images and radio programmes as well as other narratives – in other words, the limitless number of human actions which could hardly all be covered within the scope of this thesis, or any other study for that matter. Therefore, it is accepted that a delimitation of the material is necessary and that it will also lead to an unavoidably restricted view of the whole.

Finally, this research is hardly an attempt to claim that one narrative is primary in relation to other competing narratives. As will become apparent, the theory of sociological narratives recognises the heterogeneous, evolving and contextual nature of narrative construction, making the analysis of the chosen material relevant only with regard to a defined set of conditions, which will be specified in Chapter 3.

1.3 Structure of the study

In an endeavour to present a multifaceted picture of the subject at hand, this thesis will address and bring together a number of issues and conflate several viewpoints in the triangulation of the subject matter. In Chapter 2, I begin with an introduction to the two core concepts, narrative and agency, which will provide a theoretical backdrop to the case studies. Conducting a dissection of Baker's theory in Section 2.1, I argue that certain aspects of the narrative theory in Translation Studies need to be reconsidered in order to ensure the future viability of the approach. The theory is thus stripped down to its bare minimum, that is, to a relational approach drawing on Somers and Somers and Gibson. This skeletal model is complemented by considerations on agency and translatorship, the premise of which is introduced in section 2.2.

Chapter 3 establishes the contextual frame of this study and describes the societal changes that were influential in the shaping and elaboration of the Sibelius narrative. As I aim to show that the translations in my material were rooted in linguistically and culturally complex developments which in various ways came to be reflected in the material, this chapter will present an overview of the historical contexts from which the materials of the ensuing multiple-case study began to emerge. Chapter 3 will also include a section that considers the fact that the texts in my material represent non-fiction literature. By contextualising the material in this manner, I add one more layer to this study and create a three-part approach to the topic: I seek to account for the texts themselves (non-fiction), the phenomenon that they helped to create (the Sibelius narrative) and the people who were integral in the production process (translators' agency).

Chapter 4 advances to investigate the material texts and their contextual features. The chapter examines the cultural import of early Sibelius-related literature, in which all the 12 texts in my research material will be subjected to a narrative-agential analysis by conducting 10 case studies. The findings and common features of these case studies and their relevance to the further development of the narrative approach and, in particular, character narratives will be considered in the Discussion in Chapter 5. Finally, Chapter 6 sets out the Conclusion, which will summarise the overall significance of the project and offer prospective research paths.

2 Theoretical framework

This chapter consists of two main subsections which outline and discuss the theoretical premise of this study. Section 2.1 focusses on the narrative theory in Translation Studies. It first introduces the basic narrative categories and features (2.1.1–2.1.2), after which it provides examples of how the theory has thus far been applied in various studies (2.1.3). Subsection 2.1.4 considers the reviews written on Baker's work and delves deeper into the theoretical thinking of Somers, simultaneously critically relating it to Baker's interpretation. The final subsection (2.1.5) explains how the present study will make use of the narrative theory.

Section 2.2 examines the concept of agency, to which Baker frequently refers but which she does not discuss in detail. A working definition of agency will be presented in 2.2.1 and then connected to the idea of translators' authorship, or translatorship, in 2.2.2 with the objective of providing a frame of reference for the investigation of translators in the material under study. The section ends with a refocussing on the translator-related research question (2.2.3) initially presented in the Introduction.

2.1 The narrative paradigm in Translation Studies

As mentioned in the Introduction, narratives have a strong standing in a wide array of disciplines, including literary studies, psychology, semiotics and, of course, narratology, to name but a few, but the definition adopted in this study relies on the theoretical framework put forward by Mona Baker in 2006 and constructed upon a sociological understanding of the paradigm. The approach belongs to the so-called new narratologies, which from the 1990s onward distanced themselves from the earlier structuralist tradition and began to focus on text-external factors of narratives, such as context and process (see, e.g., Herman 1999, Nünning 2003). Baker's view stresses the social embeddedness of narratives, their dynamic nature and their character as entities which form no set of stable stories. This approach differs from definitions that view narratives as sequential stories with a structure comprising a definite beginning, a middle and an end (see, e.g., the sociolinguistic definition in Thornborrow and Coates 2005, 3–5). Instead, rather than local stories, they are seen as indeterminate and scattered conformations which elaborate wider narratives in

society. By operating at both micro and macro levels of narration, this approach allows for narrative analysis to transition between various levels, for instance, from textual analysis to the examination of socio-historical events and agency. This flexibility makes it a versatile tool for investigating translational issues within a broader context.

Baker's narrative theory is primarily based on the sociological understanding of narratives proposed by Somers (1992, 1994, 1997) and Somers and Gibson (1994), but Baker extends Somers' and Gibson's ideas to include matters pertinent to translation and interpreting in political conflict situations. The following subsections will introduce Baker's typology and then reassess the model, which in research literature has been rather uncritically heralded – save for one notable exception – as a tool for dealing with the sociological side of translated narratives. With particular interest paid to the topic of the present study, the resulting revision will also foreshadow a discussion on the narratives of public figures. This addition is partly necessitated by the fact that Baker bases her analysis on political discourse, whereas the present research will apply the theory to the previously unexamined area of public image construction. While this study has its political dimension as well, it nevertheless needs to be considered in somewhat different terms in the light of the following subsections, which render apparent some of the problematic features of the previously proposed categorisation.

2.1.1 Basic narrative categories

Baker's typology divides narratives into four groups based on the dimensions of narrativity originally outlined by Somers and Somers and Gibson: *ontological narratives, public narratives, meta-narratives* and *conceptual* or *disciplinary narratives*.

In Baker's typology, *ontological* narratives are stories about the self, personal narratives that people use to make sense of their roles in life (2006, 28–29). They are understandable in relation to the outside world, that is, to a wealth of shared symbols, linguistic practices etc., which Baker gathers under the contrastive umbrella term collective narratives. The relationship of ontological and collective narratives is therefore reciprocal: ontological narratives are constructed within the collective ones, but the collective narratives are also shaped by the roles individuals assume within them. In her 2014 presentation of the narrative model, Baker switches the term *ontological narrative* to *personal narrative*, simultaneously changing the emphasis of the category from internal to external, from "narratives *of* the self" (Baker 2006, 28; my emphasis) to narratives *by* the self.

For Baker, the widely used term 'collective narrative' refers to a rather indistinct group of narratives, whose defining characteristics are that they have "currency in a

given community" and that they are used rather freely in academic discourse "outside any specific model" (Baker 2006, 33). This apparent non-specificity is why Baker draws on Somers' and Gibsons' model and uses the term *public narrative* in order to discuss narratives that are "elaborated by and circulating among social and institutional formations larger than the individual" (ibid.) and to distinguish it from other types of collective narrative, that is, from conceptual and meta-narratives.

Baker's third category takes Somers and Gibson's *conceptual narrative* and redefines it to include narratives in and about any discipline in any field of study. Baker explains that a conceptual or, as she prefers to call it, *disciplinary* narrative is "a product of inquiry, the representations elaborated by researchers" in their respective fields of study (2006, 39).

Lastly, Baker's fourth narrative type, the *meta-narrative*, encompasses stories which have a considerable temporal and physical span and to which we, as historical beings, are partial. Meta-narratives comprise such ideas as the Enlightenment, Progress or Globalisation, in other words, concepts which through their "inevitability and inescapability" (Baker 2006, 45) define the eras in which we find ourselves.[2] Meta-narratives gain their standing partly through powers which hold economic and political dominance, but other factors play a role as well. Meta-narratives are also used to justify emerging public or meta-narratives (ibid., 46–47), but the associations they evoke can never be fully predicted or controlled as audiences interpret them from their own perspectives.

2.1.2 Features of narrativity

Having established her typology of narratives, Baker (2006, 50–78; see also Baker's glossary on pages 165–172) draws on the defining features of narratives outlined by Somers, Somers and Gibson, and Bruner to present a model which can be used to analyse translational narratives. Baker first proposes four main features by Somers (1992, 1994, 1997) and Somers and Gibson (1994) and then complements them with four additional features adopted from Bruner's (1991) psychological approach to narratives. The main narrative features are identified as *temporality*, *relationality*, *causal emplotment* and *selective appropriation*. The supplementary features include *particularity*, *genericness*, *normativeness* and *narrative accrual*. It should be noted that Bruner's altogether ten features to some extent overlap with Somers' and Somers and Gibson's categories. These will be also referred to below when relevant.

[2] A critical and widely discussed view on meta-narratives, contesting, among other things, the teleological notions closely connected to them, has been provided by Jean-François Lyotard in his book *The Postmodern Condition*: *A Report on Knowledge* ([1979] 1984).

Temporality, called *narrative diachronicity* by Bruner (1991, 6), refers to the fact that narratives are always constructed around events that are placed in a durative sequence and that the order in which the elements are placed carries meaning (Baker 2006, 50–51), thus affecting the interpretation of the story being told. The temporal placement is done not solely in order to make sense of the past and present but also to project a future, "a moral end, a purpose, a forecast, an aspiration" (ibid., 54), which then influences our actions.

*Relationality (*Baker 2006, 61–66), Bruner's (1991, 7–11) *hermeneutic composability,* acknowledges that a narrative is comprised of constituent parts and that those parts in turn are given meaning by the overall narrative, thus effectively creating a hermeneutic circle. This feature also binds translations to their cultural and social setting, as they can only make sense when interpreted according to the principles of those settings. As Baker (2006, 62) points out, "[e]ach new configuration modifies or reinterprets the narratives that went into its making". In other words, as far as translation is concerned, translating a narrative always entails a change in the narrative and "results in a form of 'contamination', whereby the original narrative itself may be threatened with dilution or change" (ibid.).

Compared to Baker's definition of relationality, Bruner's hermeneutic composability is revealed as a somewhat more encompassing concept. Bruner's discussion of the term extends to the mechanics of its operation as he writes that the

> act of constructing a narrative […] is considerably more than 'selecting' events either from real life, from memory, or from fantasy and then placing them in an appropriate order. The events themselves need to be *constituted* in the light of the overall narrative […] to be made 'functions' of the story (Bruner 1991, 8; emphasis in original).

To put it differently, events need to acquire significance with regard to the narrative in order to be meaningful parts of it. What Bruner refers to here corresponds to Baker's third feature, namely, *causal emplotment*. In Baker's words, causal emplotment "allows us to *weight* and *explain* events rather than simply list them" (2006, 67; emphasis in original), which results in individual events beginning to have particular meaning within a set of events. Hence, it also introduces a moral dimension into the narrative, as the same set of events can be interpreted in several, even opposing ways, depending on the story that one wishes to convey by bringing meaning to certain events rather than others. For Somers (1992, 602), causal emplotment is what enables us to give significance to our network of relationships instead of merely listing events one after another in the vein of chronicles or annals. The emplotment is often conducted through temporal ordering (Baker 2006, 68), which brings it close to *temporality*. As Baker (ibid., 103) remarks, all narrative

features overlap and are interdependent, thus making their presentation as separate categories a somewhat artificial, yet practical, solution.

The last of Baker's main features is *selective appropriation*, which refers to the manner in which narratives emphasise certain events over others. The selection of events included in a narrative is partly conducted thematically (Baker 2006, 72) to lend coherence to the narrative. In addition, selective appropriation is guided by a sense of significance, which is based on our temporal and spatial location and consequent exposure to certain public, conceptual and meta-narratives (ibid.). For Somers (1992, 602), selective appropriation is based on our ability to use evaluative criteria that enable us to make "distinctions among the infinite variety of events, experiences, characters, institutional promises and social factors that impinge on our lives" (1992, 602). Finally, selective appropriation is also influenced by the values to which individuals and institutions subscribe and by whether those values are supported or undermined by the elements of the narrative (Baker 2006, 76).

The four supplementary features of narrative adopted from Bruner begin with *particularity* (Bruner 1991, 6–7), which refers to the manifestations of distinct plot elements within generic plot constructions. To put it more simply, particularity pertains to the specific details that set a story apart from other stories of the same general plot line. The significance of familiar storylines lies in their relatability and reusability (Baker 2006, 82). However, these storylines are not to be confused with genres – literary and non-literary text types – which are covered by Bruner's *genericness*. Genericness also involves the idea of power relations and participant roles (ibid., 86) since the use of genres reflects the roles which various actors assume in society. For instance, to borrow Baker's example, a petition would be issued only by a somehow weaker party trying to elaborate a narrative in which it is seen as marginalised but morally superior.

Bruner (1991, 11–13, 15–16) discusses 'normativeness' and 'canonicity and breach' as two separate features of narrativity, whereas Baker treats them as different facets of the same phenomenon. For Baker (ibid., 98), the umbrella term is *normativeness*, which operates in policing cultural legitimacy: operational norms create canonicity, which can then be breached for the desired effect. However, in order to be effective, the breach must be done with reference to the norm, otherwise the breach will not be intelligible.

Finally, narratives consist of multiple stories, which together create a whole that we perceive as a narrative. This is what Baker (2006, 101) calls *narrative accrual* after Bruner (1991, 18), defining it as "the outcome of repeated exposure to a set of related narratives, ultimately leading to the shaping of culture, tradition or history" in all types of narratives. Public narratives are mainly maintained by the prevailing powers and institutions, but narrative accrual also occurs through dissident

narratives, which contribute to the formation of a broader narrative (Baker 2006, 102).

To summarise, I shall refer to Boéri (2008, 27) who provides a concise description of the features of narrativity:

> [N]arratives are constructed through a careful selection and weighting of events and people (selective appropriation), and by placing these in relation to each other along a temporal and spatial dimension (temporality) and within a plot that projects a specific outcome (causal emplotment). Although each element is unique to any given narrative (particularity), every narrative is constructed along a conventionalized storyline (generic storyline) or script which can either conform with the canon (canonicity) or contest it (breach). The connections between the elements of the narrative and between these elements and aspects of the overall contexts, including other narratives (relationality), construct a version of reality with a past, present and projected future.

Baker introduced the narrative theory in Translation Studies in order to provide a means for discussing disparate texts and their discursive interplay mainly in conflict situations. The theory has in its almost two decades of existence acquired wide interest and adoption into various areas of Translation Studies but, surprisingly, with scarce critical assessment. This critical stance is long overdue. The only notable criticism towards Baker's model can be found in a harangue by Anthony Pym, whose colourful review of and attack towards Baker and Venuti was published in *Translation Spaces* in 2016.[3] While the article is a welcome addition to the discussion on Baker's narrative theory, it is not without its weaknesses. Before critically tackling Baker's theory and Pym's response to it, I shall first briefly look at the different domains of Translation Studies where the narrative approach has been utilised in order to provide a more complete understanding of the theory's applicability.

2.1.3 Applications of Baker's model

Being a relatively new theoretical paradigm, the narrative approach in Translation Studies has to date been adopted in a relatively small body of academic work and predominantly in academic degree research. An overview of the body of work is provided by Harding, who in the entry on *Narratives and Contextual Frames* in the

[3] Prior to this, versions of the article had already been published on Pym's website at http://usuaris.tinet.cat/apym/. My personal copy of the draft article, version 4.1., dates back to 2015.

Handbook Translation Studies (2013, 107) and her article on applying the narrative theory (2012a) gives an overview of the research to which the theory was applied after its initial release. The studies include such diverse areas of study as social movements and civil activism, news reporting and online media, theatre translation, migrant literature, children's literature, folk tales and national identity, author reception, historical fiction, Chinese novels, Bible translation, and website localisation. While an extensive review of these studies is unfeasible at present, some remarks about the general characteristics of these texts vis-à-vis their application of Baker's theory can be provided here. For the practical reason of availability, this study will only address those texts that could be found using methods that were readily available at the time of writing. These studies include Valdeón's and Harding's articles on news reporting (2008 and 2012a, respectively), Aaltonen's article on theatre translation (2009) and Boéri's articles on interpreter activism (2008 and 2010).

Valdéon (2008) studies BBCMundo's online news texts and their English-language source reports by BBCWorld from a critical perspective. He sees Baker's theory as a recent attempt to tackle news texts and their translation and considers selective appropriation, ambiguity (by which Valdéon seems to mean Baker's *frame ambiguity*; cf. Baker 2006, 107–109) and labelling particularly useful concepts for his own purposes (Valdéon 2008, 309). Valdéon regards Baker's approach as limited due to its incapacity to conduct textual analysis and ends up combining the aforesaid concepts with Fairclough's discourse analysis, which he considers to be strongly associated with Baker's approach. In the article, Baker's theory plays a supporting role in offering useful concepts, but the main body of Valdéon's analysis relies more on his own previous research and textual analysis.

Harding (2012a) represents a rare problematising stance with regard to Baker's theory. While she considers Baker's socio-narrative theory "a robust, intuitively satisfying conceptual framework" (Harding 2012a, 287), she feels the need for a more detailed and analytically sound approach. In contrast to Valdéon, Harding's article seeks to apply Baker's theory in a more encompassing manner and to develop the theory further by modifying Baker's narrative classification and distinguishing new categories of analysis. Harding achieves this by striving towards a more concentrated, text analysis-driven approach, as she applies the theory to a case study concerning the news reports on the 2004 hostage disaster in Beslan. Interestingly, Harding's article does not address Baker's narrative features at all. Instead, her study aims to account for the embeddedness of various narrative types in order to uncover the mechanisms of their interaction (ibid., 294–295).

Harding revises Baker's four-part model into a dual typology. She first divides narratives into *personal* (which equals Baker's ontological narratives) and *shared* to highlight the personal responsibility of actors in the former and collective

accountability in the latter. Harding then further divides the shared narratives into three subgroups: societal and theoretical narratives, which correspond to Baker's public and disciplinary narratives, respectively, and meta-narratives (Harding 2012a, 292). Furthermore, Harding adds a subset of public narratives which she calls *local* narratives, which are "narratives relating to particular events (and the particular actions of particular actors) in particular places at particular times" (ibid., 293). However, this additional classification according to scope seems to go against the idea of narratives being open and amorphous entities and steers the theory in a fundamentally different direction. It establishes a hierarchical relationship between the different narrative types, a progression from small and particular (local) to extensive and general (meta), which is somewhat at odds with the original idea of socio-narrative theory: although conceptualising narratives in this manner may provide a clearer picture of the different levels of operation for the narratives and give structure to Baker's theory, it allows the narratives drift further away from the idea that socio-historical phenomena have no clear causality. Further, despite its obvious attempt to do so, the article does little to actually define the borders of various types of narrative.

Interestingly, Harding (2012a, 293) justifies the revision of Baker's model with the material she sets out to analyse and the "'awkward' details" that appear to clash with the coherence of the narrative. In Somers' writing, as will be explained further below, the desire to account for this type of discrepancy between various narrative elements is one of the motivating factors behind her entire sociological narrative theory. This larger issue of what to me appears as theoretical cherry-picking on Baker's part will be addressed in full in the following subsection.

Aaltonen's article (2009) on the heteroglossic Swedish play *Utvandrarna* on the Finnish stage examines the narratives constructed during a theatrical performance. The article adopts Baker's narrative theory as its framework, and uses its concepts of ontological, collective, public and meta-narratives, as well as a new category of communal narratives, to explain how audiences relate what they see on stage to their own realities as actors in contemporary societies. The premise is fascinating as it effectively explores the interface of real-life and "artificially" constructed narratives but, unfortunately, elaboration on this aspect of narrative levels never really occurs. Be that as it may, on the whole, Aaltonen's analysis approaches that of Somers' rather than Baker's in how it takes into account the surrounding realities of the receiving public and approaches the identities on stage as reflections of those experiences. This comes close to Somers's analytical tools – *narrative identity* and *relational setting* – which Baker's theory ignores but which will be discussed further in the following subsection.

Aaltonen revises Baker's model much along the same general lines as Harding: in Aaltonen's article, Baker's original four-part typology is supplanted by a model

in which public narratives are merely one category on a continuum that also includes collective narratives (2009, 110) and communal narratives (ibid., 114). Aaltonen's justification for this revision is less obvious than Harding's, however. For instance, there is no clear distinction between collective and public, both of which can apparently be circulated among the media (c.f. 2009: 110, 111), and the term *communal* appears suddenly without explanation in one of the subheadings of Aaltonen's article, leaving the reader somewhat baffled concerning the motivation behind the newly coined term. As less-than-ideally-motivated as these new categories are and despite the absence of an explicit explanation of the re-categorisation in the text, the finer separation between narrative categories seems to bespeak a need for a more specific definition of different types of narrative.

Finally, Boéri's two articles (2008, 2010) explore the narratives of Babels, an international network of volunteer translators and interpreters. Her study applies Baker's theory to another type of conflict situation, that is, the discussion surrounding the status of volunteer services in the professionalised field of interpreting and in the context of globalised social politics. Theoretically, Boéri's contribution is the division of Somers and Gibson's conceptual narratives into two subsets, disciplinary and *professional*, narratives (2008, 63; 2010, 25–26). The division is motivated by the two competing narratives examined – that of a privileged elite of trained interpreters on the one hand, and that of citizen professionals, on the other – which Boéri sees to be at work in the field of interpreter training and professionalisation. Examining how professional and disciplinary narratives are positioned in relation to the broader narratives at the meta and public level, Boéri then analyses the construction of alternative narratives in the interpreting field. She sees the narratives as a means of explaining actor participation and "the variation of narratives across individuals" (2010, 69) without confining any actor in a static category such as activist versus professional or volunteer versus remunerated.

An interesting aspect in Boéri's articles is the hedging that takes place around the subjectiveness of narrative construction. One point of criticism that has been put forward particularly loudly by Anthony Pym (2016; see subsection 2.1.4 in the present study) is the fact that narratives cannot be empirically tested due to their subjectivity. While this view can be contested, it is true that researchers – as actors often embedded in the selfsame narratives they aim to analyse – need to be reflexive and pay special attention to their own narrative positions. While Boéri somewhat alarmingly and sweepingly posits that "there is no possibility of an objective stance" (2010, 62) in the narrative approach, she also acknowledges that a researcher's narrative position "does not preclude the ability and necessity to reflect on one's narrative assumptions" (2008, 28). This is an important observation with regard to Baker's model, which in *Translation and Conflict* constructs and maintains an openly biased stance in its condemnation of anti-Palestinian politics and pro-activist

approach to translation. While Boéri's study can be criticised with respect to the location of the researcher as an ideologically-positioned actor in the volunteer movement she studies, her approach can be argued to be more balanced than Baker's as she is also a member of the "opposing" force, academia.

This subsection has provided a brief overview of how the narrative approach has been applied in various areas of Translation Studies. One common denominator for all of the studies presented above has been the perceived need to revise Baker's model: Valdeón and Harding call for a more text analytically inclined methodology, while Harding, Aaltonen and Boéri suggest changes to the categorisation of narratives to better suit their analytical goals. How such adaptability is to be understood is a matter of interpretation. One the one hand, these studies can be considered to attest to the malleability of the narrative framework and demonstrate that the rather general construction of Baker's theory allows for leeway in the application of the model but, on the other hand, they can also be thought to point to a certain inconstancy and vagueness of the approach. Therefore, while the studies above have sought to develop Baker's theory by adding to and redefining its concepts, the approach adopted in this thesis will be slightly different, as it directs its gaze backwards to the foundations of Baker's theory. In the following subsection, which discusses the recent criticism directed towards Baker's theory, I shall assess the criticism not only on the basis of Baker's writing but also with regard to the basic tenets of Somers and Gibson. I aim to show that some of the shortcomings of Baker's theory as well as its criticism may perhaps be explained by examining the nature of the original narrative categories of Somers and Gibson in more detail.

2.1.4 Review of Baker's narrative model

As established, Baker's narrative model has attracted wide-spread interested in Translation Studies. However, thus far, the discussion around *Translation and Conflict* appears to have been rather uncritical: in addition to the discussions in academic articles such as those presented above, *Translation Studies Bibliography* mentions three reviews of Baker's book – Xiumei 2010, Brufau-Alvira 2008 and Bánhegyi, 2006 – all of which appear somewhat unbalanced in their highly appreciative and unquestioning stance towards her narrative theory. However, as suggested by the need to constantly modify the approach witnessed in the summaries of previous studies above, a more thorough critique may be warranted now that the theory has been circulating among and applied by Translation Studies scholars for nearly two decades. The present study proposes that returning to the source of Baker's theory, in other words, to Somers and Gibson's approach, may provide some interesting insight into the workings of Baker's narrative model and also help view the translation of socio-historical narratives from a slightly different angle. While it

is acknowledged that the research conducted on narration and narrativity offers a vast playing field and a host of applicable models for Translation Studies, the focus of the present study will remain on the sociological new narratives approach.

Recently, a notable and loud critic of Baker's work on narrativity and indeed even her entire standing as a translation scholar has been Anthony Pym, whose biting, even derisive critique (2016) towards *Translation and Conflict* and the position the work has acquired over the years makes important observations on points that seem to have previously been overlooked by other scholars. Although the present study welcomes Pym's critique and to an extent agrees with his commentary on the weaknesses of Baker's approach – mainly with the purpose-oriented manner in which the theory has been constructed and the absence of self-reflection and "productive contradiction" (Pym 2016, 293) – it does not share Pym's stance of entirely dismissing the value of Baker's theory to Translation Studies. The position adopted here is that with modification and critical reassessment of some of the features of narrativity, Baker's work can be seen as an important contribution and a useful framework for discussing multifaceted sociological phenomena from the perspective of Translation Studies.

As much as a review of Baker's model, this section then also inevitably provides a commentary on Pym's recent critique, since it is to my knowledge the only review of the book that calls into question some of the tenets Baker's narrative approach. In addition, the article needs to be addressed due to Pym's position as a translation scholar of repute. The claims he makes are not jotted down without some amount of bias against the entire sociological approach to narratives and will no doubt have an impact on how Baker's theory will be received in the future by scholars wishing to delve into narrative analysis. Therefore, Pym's arguments themselves need to be subjected to a critical eye, an act that in my view gives further cause to discuss the entire narrative paradigm in Translation Studies.

Pym's critique is summarised in three points (2016, 290–291) that outline his objections concerning the manner in which Baker adopts previous theory from other fields of study into her, as Pym is disposed to point out, political activism. Pym's first point criticises the perceived all-encompassing essentialist and ontological nature of narratives as well as the absence of dialogue in the model; the second point progresses from this essentialism of narratives to claim that the result of such stance is the impossibility of empirical testing; and the third and final point examines the purposeful construction of Baker's narratives by asking whose voice one can actually hear in the narratives Baker presents to her readers. I shall take these three criticisms as a starting point and then scrutinise Baker's model in order to formulate a framework which will hopefully develop the narrative model in a more analytically sound direction and better meet the demands of the study at hand. However, to more fully understand and respond to Pym's criticism, a few more words also need to be

said about the foundations of Baker's narrative theory. As becomes apparent below, Baker's reading of Somers and Gibson, for instance, is selective and incomplete.

Baker's discussion on narrativity is a wide reading of sociological and psychological understanding of narratives that, while making passing references to the works of numerous and largely unrelated researchers, bases itself on four dimensions of narrativity taken from the socio-historical work of Somers and Gibson. Their approach relies on the work conducted by "political philosophers, psychologists, legal theorists, feminist theorists, social workers, organizational theorists, anthropologists, and medical sociologists" who from the 1960s onwards sought to reconceptualise the narrative concept (Somers 1994, 606; Somers & Gibson 1994, 38) and argued for approaching "narratives and narrativity as concepts of *social epistemology* and *social ontology*" (Somers 1994, 606; emphases in the original) rather than as a mode of representation.[4]

Somers's sociological approach was initially developed to tackle some paradigmatic problems of socio-historical studies in general and with special regard to Somers's research on the narratives concerning the formation of the English working class. Somers's (1992, 1994, 1997) recurring argument is that traditional sociology and historiography have failed to explain the amalgamation of the English working class adequately and that the shortcomings of the traditional models have resulted in *ad hoc* explanations and dismissals of facts as anomalous in those cases that do not adhere the prevailing disciplinary explanation of historical events. Working through disciplinary layers of knowledge, Somers finds fault in the conceptual narrative underpinning these academic explanations and maintains that in order to create a more comprehensive and satisfactory interpretation of historical and sociological events, it is the conceptual narratives that need to be deconstructed and redefined. Somers exemplifies her reasoning with the concept of 'society': drawing attention to how the word is used uncritically and unequivocally across time and space so that it is finally impossible to say what is actually meant by the word, she argues that the term itself is flawed, since it "assumes a single entity in which the parts of society co-vary along with the whole" (Somers 1997, 89) thus distorting the complexities of uneven social construction and the heterogeneous nature of the concept. Somers suggests replacing *society* with *relational setting*, which would

[4] Here, Somers (1994, 637–638) and Somers and Gibson (1994, 80) provide a lengthy list of studies from a range of disciplines, including law and critical race theory, psychology, medicine, psychoanalytic theory, education, philosophy, anthropology, physics and biology. However, neither of the articles above nor Somers's two other articles do much to engage in discussion with the field of narrative studies beyond the mentioning of this underlying research. In this regard, the narrative theory in Translation Studies, too, still needs to define its position in the vast field of narrative studies and new narratives.

better reflect the way in which our thinking should be able to "relate narrative identities to that of factors we call social forces – market patterns, institutional arrangements and practices, organizational constraints, legal structures and discourses and so on – that configure together to shape history and social action" (ibid., 88–89). To put it differently, by taking into account the variation of experience of individual historical actors and then interpreting those narratives in light of social and structural relationships at the level of a particular societal constellation, researchers will be better equipped to account for various developments in social and historical events.

The foundation of the sociological narrative approach is thus based on a critical reassessment of old structures and modes of thinking. Somers's and Gibson's model is an attempt to reformulate sociological theory and dissect the premises of historical storytelling. The four-part classification of narratives creates a methodologically-motivated whole in which the various parts complement each other, with ontological, public and meta-narratives being manifestations of the phenomena under study and conceptual narratives providing a frame within which the phenomena are analysed. Baker's model, by contrast, offers no integration of the dimensions in the form of a coherent analysis but the view on narrativity is fragmented. The calling into question of underlying conceptualisations, so essential to Somers' model of narrativity, is absent in Baker's. This effectively renders Baker's disciplinary narratives the odd one out in a theory that otherwise moves in an outward spiral from the narratives of the individual, via cultural to the historical and global narratives. The definition of disciplinary narratives provided by Baker ("stories and explanations that scholars in any field elaborate for themselves and others about their object of inquiry" (2006, 39)) appears awkwardly to reduce Somers's central concept to something which is essentially a public narrative within the institution of academia. In one of Somers's early articles, the category of public narratives actually appeared in the form "public, cultural, and institutional narratives", which were defined as "those narratives attached to 'publics', to a structural formation larger than the single individual, to intersubjective networks and institutions however local or grand, micro or macro" (Somers 1992, 604). On the basis of this definition, Baker's disciplinary narratives are indeed a subset of public narratives.

The result of this demoting of conceptual narratives is that, as the analytical apparatus of the theoretical framework disappears, the other three narrative types are left without a solid methodological tool. It also indirectly affects the identity of meta-narratives, although this is not mentioned in Baker's book: One aspect of meta-narratives considered crucial by Somers is their quality of de-narrativisation. By this Somers refers to the idea that meta-narratives are built on abstractions (such as "social systems" or "social forces") which altogether disregard the conceptual dimension of narrativity (Somers 1992, 605). Interestingly, although basing her

theory on Somers, Baker does not mention this property in her writing. Instead, the examples presented in *Translation and Conflict* seem predominantly to draw on various "oppressive […] meta-narratives of our time" (Baker 2006, 48).

To me, the absence of a critical framework appears to be the greatest weakness in Baker's approach. Without any emphasis on conceptual analysis and the examination of the assumptions behind narratives, narratives turn into entities that are amorphous to the extent where only the researcher's personal preferences determine the constituents of any narrative. Pym (2016) also shares this notion, although the foundation of his critique seems to be justified differently, as Pym's criticism tenaciously returns to his disapproval of the fact that Baker's argumentation dismisses views of linguistic and literary narrativity (cf. Pym 2016, 291, 292, 295, 297). This is highly peculiar considering that Baker very clearly sets herself in the field of narrative sociology (which is a new narratives approach) and distances her theory from the linguistic and literary approach to narratives.[5] While individual points of Pym's critique hit the mark on many occasions, his argumentation is constantly informed by his linguistic understanding that "narratives form just one class of elements in communicative exchange" (Pym 2016, 295) and are thus intrinsically unfounded since his views on narrativity are so fundamentally different from the sociological and historical (or even psychological) understanding of narratives. Much of the criticism that Pym metes out can be considered essentially flawed in its insistence on comparing apples and oranges. With Pym's argumentative premise being so decisively at odds with Baker's sociological view on narratives, separating the wheat of pertinent criticism from the chaff of irrelevance becomes an arduous task.

Although some of Pym's notions are thus rather oddly argued in relation to Baker's theory, the present study finds that his three points of criticism can nevertheless be considered valid remarks on the weaknesses of the approach. Pym's first point of criticism, the essentialist nature of Baker's narratives, is at a deeper level related to Baker's neglect of the significance of the conceptual narrative: without a critically evaluative framework of conceptual narratives, all narratives are reduced to an ontological state – they merely exist, rather than explain. Therefore, Pym's claim that Baker's theory is essentialist (Pym 2016, 291) – that is, impossible to explain without taking the concept of narrative at face value as the be-all and end-all of human experience – can be considered reasonable as far as Baker's own

[5] Cf., e.g., Baker (2006: 9): "An important difference between literary and linguistic approaches and the approach adopted in this book then concerns the status of narrative as an optional mode of communication or as a meta-code that cuts across and underpins all modes of communication. Narrative theory, as elaborated here, adopts the latter view."

argumentation is concerned. It should be noted, however, that for Somers' sociological approach to narrativity, which should be seen as the basis of Baker, narratives are hardly essentialist by nature. On the contrary, Somers clearly considers narratives to be a mode of explanation – rather than being – when she writes that narratives engender "[...] understanding by *connecting* (however unstable) *parts* to a constructed *configuration* or a *social network* (however incoherent and unrealizable). In this respect, narrative becomes an **epistemological category**" (Somers 1992, 601; boldface added). This makes sense considering the premise of Somers's theorisation, as explained above: the narrative approach was developed in order to counter the essentialist constructions of historical narratives, such as the concept of society.

I consider Pym's subsequent call for dialogue a valid criticism. According to Pym (2016, 290–295), there is no room for dialogue and exchange in Baker's approach to narratives. It is true that Baker – with her viewpoint of condemning US, UK and Israeli politics towards the Arab World openly adopted as the overarching theme in her book (cf. Baker 2006, 9) – says little if anything about the ways in which narratives could operate as a diplomatic medium or in bringing opposing viewpoints together. This, however, does not in itself suggest an inherent lack of that potential in the sociological approach to narratives. For Somers (1992; 1994; 1997), dialogue is an essential part of narratives. In fact, it is embedded in the very fabric of ontological narratives, because dialogue and exchange can be found in the manner in which identities are negotiated. According to Somers (1992, 603) "[...] identity, like the self, is neither *a priori* nor fixed. Ontological narratives make identity and the self something that one becomes [...] Above all, ontological narratives are social and interpersonal." This social dimension gives reason to postulate that narratives are constantly being shaped by our interactions with others and with the ontological narratives of other people. It is, then, precisely the interpersonal exchange and dialogue which form the basis of all narratives and enable the construction of narratives in a relational setting. The fact that Baker wants to disregard this capacity of narratives says more about the individual researcher than it does about the theory behind her thinking. Somers's sociological model can effortlessly account for the dialogical construction and revision of public narratives even though this particular feature is lost in the friction-ridden model of *Translation and Conflict.*

Pym's second point concerning the lack of empiricism in narrative analysis is a necessary stab at one perceived shortcoming in Baker's theory but one that, I find, falls slightly short due to the premise upon which Pym bases his critique. Pym has a strong objection to the idea of narratives being amorphous entities which consist of various parts that are not necessarily organised in a linear fashion (Pym 2016, 295), which is a clear indication of his literary and linguistic understanding of narratives. This perceived lack of linearity prompts Pym to profess that narratives constructed

in a non-linear fashion can never be subjected to empirical analysis. I contend that Pym's accusation of narratives being random constructions is forgetting Somers' four features of narrativity. These features render narratives to more than random constructions as they give narratives specificity and explain the mechanisms by which they are constructed through relationality of parts, causal emplotment, selective appropriation and temporality, sequence and place (Somers 1992, 601; Baker 2006, 50 ff).

To put it differently, Baker does indeed, at least superficially, recognise the technique of constructing narratives that have an inner logic. However, the manner in which she fails to apply the analytical apparatus to her own narratives is an alarming defect and one which Pym is right to challenge. It is easy to agree with Pym's criticism on the manner in which Baker's writing only sees one truth. Bearing in mind that the whole motivation for Somers' theorisation on narratives in socio-historical research is to unveil the heterogeneity of experience and the limitations of previous historical explanations in order to account for the multitude of voices in historical events and their narratives, Baker's reading of public narratives is disconcerting in its lack of any such analytical objective. A revealing indication of this neglect is the way she redubs conceptual narratives and reconfigures them as *disciplinary*, after which they are harnessed to serve as a particular type of institutional public narrative rather than as the analytical tools Somers intended them to be. The entire purpose of conceptual narratives is thus eradicated: the instrument that was meant to prevent researchers from, to borrow Pym's expression (2016, 291), stitching together whatever rags they could find is effectively demoted to a subset of public narratives far removed from its original function.

Empiricism, anxiously demanded by Pym (2016, 291), may thus indeed be lacking in Baker's writing but is certainly not absent in Somers's model of narrativity. In fact, writing about the implications of the narrative theory for social science history, she puts special emphasis on her view that "the kinds of narratives people use to make sense of their situation will always be an *empirical* rather than presuppositional question" (1992, 608; emphasis in the original). This is to say that the narratives prevalent in one relational setting can never automatically be assumed to be true in another. The tenability of a narrative needs to be empirically tested by taking into account the narrative identities of those involved and the relational setting in which the narrative unfolds.

This is one point where Baker's silence speaks volumes: the two concepts that lend Somers's empiricism its analytical credibility – that is, *narrative identity* and *relational setting* – are abandoned in Baker's book, which only uses the narrative categories and features of Somers's model. Instead, Baker places much emphasis on the concept of *framing*, the main function of which is to portray translators as active agents in re-narration, that is, the elaboration and reconfiguration of existing

narratives (Harding 2013: n.p.; see also Baker 2006, 105 ff). However, considering again the purposeful manner in which Baker constructs her theory to discuss political conflicts, choosing framing over relational setting can be interpreted as an intentional departure from Somers. Relational setting would require a multifaceted approach to the complex phenomena of social interaction and acknowledgement of differing interpretations, whereas framing, as the term itself suggests, concentrates on the manner in which one particular narrative gains its currency and potentially disregards other points of view. Although the possibility of *frame ambiguity*, or the framing of a set of events "in a different way to promote competing narratives", is recognised by Baker (2006, 107), in framing, the point of departure is that of narrative manipulation and adherence to various ideologies. It is intimately connected to translators' ethics as well as the choices translators make and the strategies they employ in exerting their agency. Framing is thus well suited for examining existing narratives and states of being, whereas the investigation of relational settings is an attempt to explain how narratives come to be over time and space (cf. Somers 1992, 609).

Pym's final point of criticism deals with the construction of Baker's narratives, in which, according to Pym, "the problems of *voice* and the *position* of the narrator are somehow no longer of consequence" (Pym 2016, 291; emphasis in original). This critique is aimed at Baker's position as a researcher-cum-activist and the manner in which the two voices of Baker-the-narrator and Baker-the-scholar intertwine and contradict each other in the argumentation of the book. Pym is particularly taken aback by how Baker's awareness of cultural heterogeneity acknowledged in the introduction of the book is absent in the examples she later presents (Pym 2016, 297), the implication being that Baker should have better acknowledged the multiplicity of voices and positions in the narratives she uses to illustrate her points. This approach is in fact taken to heart by Boéri (2008, 2010), who in her articles deems it necessary not only to overtly admit and justify her position as a researcher-cum-activist but also to provide a more comprehensive account of her object of study by juxtaposing narratives from the opposite sides of conflictual situations.

Finally, with reference to Pym's third point of criticism, it should be mentioned that Somers and Gibson offer no readily applicable solution for the questions of voice or position, as neither concept is explicitly investigated in the articles. This is most likely due to the type of study Somers and Gibson conduct and the questions they ask as they concern themselves with reviewing conventionalised modes of socio-historical research. However, the concept of voice can still be considered deeply ingrained in the entire approach, since the objective of narrative analysis is to account for the multitude of actor positions in the construction of sociological narratives. One of the key concepts in this regard is narrative identity, already referred to above. It is based on the idea that the actions of people are "intelligible

only if we recognize the one or many ontological and public narratives in which actors identify themselves" (Somers 1997, 88). Considering that ontological narratives "exist only interpersonally in the course of social and structural interactions over time" (Somers 1997, 84), social identities must be interpreted in view of the relationships and networks people form in their lives. Thus, the main claim of narrative identity is that social identities are not fixed categories but embedded in a relational setting, defined as "a pattern of relationships among institutions, public narratives, and social practices" (Somers 1994, 626), and therefore prone to variation. It seems to me that, in terms of Somers's and Gibson's writings, Pym's criticism of Baker's activist voice concerns the fact that Baker conducts no analytical inquiry into her own narrative identity and relational setting.

Considering the issues presented above, maintaining a certain distance from Baker's approach appears not only prudent but also necessary. However, as the approach that solidified the idea of sociological narratives in Translation Studies, Baker's theory is also an essential starting point for any narrative study concerning translation with a socio-historical dimension. In the following section, I shall clarify my position with regard to the theory and explain to what extent it will be applied in the case studies of Chapter 4.

2.1.5 Remarks on the narrative approach

The subsections above provided an overview of both Baker's narrative theory and its application in various areas of Translation Studies. They also discussed some of the limitations of the approach and, particularly, the recent critique by Pym, in order to demonstrate how the theory is restricted by some intrinsic features of the framework. By bringing attention to these elements, the objective has been to lay the groundwork for the manner in which the present study wishes to utilise the theory.

The need to further develop the Translation Studies offshoot of the narrative approach was readily recognised by Baker in her 2014 book chapter on translation as re-narration, in which she calls the theory underdeveloped (Baker 2014, 174). Suggesting prospective avenues for research, Baker advocates for three areas of development, in particular: a broader scope of genres and themes, more clearly defined and encompassing methods of analysis, and demonstrations of how the approach can be utilised at the micro level (ibid.). I wish to argue that, in addition to these and perhaps more urgently, the approach would also benefit from being more clearly anchored to the existing field of narrative research. Baker's writings on the narrative theory, while relying on the works of authors discussed above, do little to engage with the field of narrative research as a whole. They lack discussion on the broader developments in the field of narratology and do not readily fall into any

established research tradition within narrative studies and new narratives.[6] This is probably at least partly due the fact that the articles of Somers and Somers and Gibson themselves represent a novel "shift from a focus on *representational* to *ontological* narrativity" (Somers and Gibson 1994, 38; emphases in original) and thus a disciplinary turning point in the reframing of socio-historical studies as relational and narrative sociology (cf. Szlachcicowa 2017; Morrison 2010). In the 1990s, Somers's articles were part of a new wave of narrative studies which, as established in the Introduction, later acquired the name "new narratologies" (Herman 1999; Nünning 2003), referring to a variety of emerging post-structuralist and post-classical approaches that from the 1990s onwards sought to separate themselves from the traditional understanding of narratives, represented, for instance, by the French Structuralists (see, e.g. Barthes ([1966] 1975; Genette ([1972] 1980; [1983] 1988; Greimas ([1973] 1987; for an overview of the history of narratology, see Meister [2011] 2014). Considering that the most prevalent narrative theory in Translation Studies is largely based on an early, itself underdeveloped, new-narratological approach, there is a comprehensive discussion to be had on the relationship of Baker's approach with the field of new narratologies and the theories and methodologies developed in their midst.

That said, this study is presented with a dilemma. One the one hand, the study of narratives within Translation Studies would require a large-scale reassessment of the theory and a comprehensive review of the current state of new narratologies to bring the theory up to date with the field of narrative studies. However, the scope and focus of this study does not allow for such an all-embracing discussion. On the other hand, merely modifying Baker's model with yet another theoretical layer borrowed from the later developments of new narratologies would go against the criticism I have presented above and would, in my opinion, only serve to further muddy the already somewhat murky waters of the narrative approach. Subscribing to an established theory would not advance the overall development of the study of narratives in Translation Studies or solve the inherent problems of the narrative approach introduced in this chapter.

Therefore, the present study will follow a different route: To avoid the further theoretical diffusion, Somers's and Somers and Gibsons' approach to narrativity will be used as the applied theoretical apparatus. Much of the following analysis is

[6] When it comes to the study of narratives, the terminology is somewhat unestablished. For instance, the word *narratology* has sometimes been used to refer strictly to the French school of narrative research of the 1960s and 70s, while the expression *narrative studies* has sometimes been thought to encompass both the structuralist and postclassical views on narratives. The words *narratology* and *narrative studies* have also been used interchangeably, which is the preferred approach of the present study. For a discussion on the terminology of narrative studies, see Nünning 2003, 257 ff.

engendered by relating translational phenomena to Somers's and Gibson's sociological narrative framework. In other words, this study will retain the four-part categorisation of narrative types (which entails reconstituting the conceptual narrative as a central narrative type) as well as the four narrative features. For the sake of a more clearly defined sociological dimension, this study also suggests reinstating Somers's concept of *relational setting* at the core of narrative analysis in order to help create an empirically testable hypothesis of how narratives are plotted over temporally and spatially shifting contexts and how the agency of individuals can be related to that setting. As the narrative features and relational setting will be adopted to explain narrative construction, the secondary features of narrativity adopted by Baker from Bruner will be demoted to an auxiliary position in explaining some of the features of narratives and will only to be referred to occasionally when deemed necessary. Somers's and Somers and Gibson's concepts will prove useful in addressing several issues which have not been discussed in the literature mentioned above.

As I reduce the theoretical premise of this study to Somers and Somers and Gibson, I will simultaneously advance the study of narratives in Translation Studies by enlarging the scope of narrative enquiry into the examination of a nationally significant public figure narrative. Such narratives are not mentioned by Somers or Somers and Gibson, and Baker only acknowledges their existence in passing in her discussion on public narratives (2006, 33–34). This type of narrative warrants further study as it presents an interesting case of balancing between that which is ontological and that which is public. It also offers further motivation for the suggested broader adoption of Somers's terminology, as it dovetails with narrative identity, which together with the idea of a relational setting helps to explain the processes of social identity formation without *a priori* categories of identity. Examining the narrative identities of those involved in the construction of the Sibelius narrative, this study will pay particular attention to the authors and translators connected to the material under study, underlining the fact that the Translation Studies approach to narratives draws attention to the means in which translators and their collaborators modify – sometimes even manipulate – the texts with which they work (cf. Baker 2006, 105). Baker stresses the notion of translators as communicators of narratives on several occasions in her writings on narratives. This aspect can be encapsulated in and enlarged by the concept of *agency*, which is not a word systematically used by Baker but which nevertheless provides a vantage point into the translators' internal motivations as well as the positions they occupy, in other words, their "willingness and ability to act" (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010, 6) in their respective social settings. The concept of agency will be discussed in more detail in the following section.

The questions the case studies in Chapter 4 will seek to answer can be divided into two types: Firstly, they will throw light upon questions more immediately related to the case study on the Finnish Sibelius narrative. The case studies will

examine the properties of individual translated texts in the advancement of the Sibelius narrative and consider the activity of translators in its ideologically-disposed development. Secondly, originating from the need to further develop the narrative theory with regard to Translation Studies, the analysis will advance the general narrative framework so that it will be possible to better account for a variety of translational phenomena. It will delve into the problem of a public figure narrative, in particular, as it explores the interface of the ontological and the public narrative, and examines the mechanisms of public image construction, in which a person's individual narrative is appropriated by the general public and turned into common property. The various facets of the analytical apparatus will be tested in the course of analysing the material of this study in Chapter 4. Based on my findings, I will afterwards propose points of interest for the further study of translated narratives and consider the application of the narrative approach in Translation Studies in the Discussion in Chapter 5.

2.2 Agency and translators

The previous section presented the translation of narratives as a socially-embedded activity. It touched upon the fact that this activity is performed by individuals who in turn operate under various social constraints. Taking this notion as a point of departure, the objective of this section is to discuss ideas which enable the conceptualisation of the figure and actions of the translator. Below, I shall approach the subject from two specific points of view: I begin with a discussion on agency and how it has been defined and conceived in Translation Studies. Attempting to arrive at a more explicit understanding of translators' role, I then continue with an investigation of the idea of translatorship. The section will end with a refocussing of the research questions related to the translators of my research material. By looking at various approaches to translators, my ultimate aim is to outline them as agents of narrative construction and modification.

2.2.1 Agency

Agency is a concept widely employed in various areas of research in social studies, in which it is used to refer to the power which individuals and collectives – that is, agents – wield in society. The initial call for a more agent-driven Translation Studies has often been attributed to Simeoni's 1995 article, which argues for the study of translators in research on translations and translating. In the same year, Hermans (1995) also famously criticised Toury's DTS for "gloriously overlook[ing] the human agent, the translator", signalling a previous lack of and then growing interest in research on translators in Translation Studies. Nearly 15 years later, this

development prompted Andrew Chesterman to argue for the acknowledgment and establishment of Transla*tor* Studies, which "would cover sociology, culture and cognition, all looking at the translator's agency, in different ways" (Chesterman 2009, 13).

In his article, Simeoni (1995, 457) proposes that concentrating on agents could provide a solution for the problems that Translation Studies was facing as a fragmenting inter-discipline. Presenting Translation Studies as a human science caught between trying to define itself in terms of philosophical approaches, on the one hand, and natural science approaches, on the other, Simeoni (ibid., 453) suggests that "the view from the agent" might help to reconceptualise the discipline and reunite its opposing sides around a common point of interest.

The ensuing shift in focus towards an agent-centred approach owed its emergence to the conceptualisation of translation as a human-initiated event: research into translators' agency witnessed a significant increase in connection with the sociological turn in Translation Studies from the mid-1990s onwards and soon divided into two main forms of research: examination of the manifestations of agency in translation history and scrutiny of contemporary practices by means of qualitative sociology and anthropology (Buzelin 2011, n.p.). Apart from the influence of the sociological turn, interest in agency was also driven by the need to "move away from deterministic or mechanistic modes of explanation" (ibid.), such as Toury's notion of translation norms (see Toury 1995), in Translation Studies. Concentrating on agency was also seen to offer a means of rising above systemic generalisations by humanising the processes of translation and as a means for understanding the tensions that existed between the collective and the individual. This latter point has been a central question in the social sciences in general, as they have attempted to explain the interplay of social structures and human actions. Rather than seeing structures and individuals as separate entities, they have come to be understood in relational terms, one influencing the other (Buzelin 2011, n.p.). The common understanding is, as Koskinen (2010, 183) remarks, that "agency is […] causally constrained by the structural positions where the agents are located". Therefore, when discussing agency, "it is equally important to look at various structures and to identify the particular mechanisms encouraged or prohibited by particular structures" (ibid., 184).

Despite its popularity and wide usage, finding an applicable definition for agency has proved to be a challenging task: Kinnunen and Koskinen (2010) remark that Translation Studies literature, which often discusses agency-related matters at length, tends to take the concept at face value and avoid defining it. The definitions that exist are often either too vague or even irrelevant to be of any genuine use in current Translation Studies research. For instance, one of the early definitions of 'agent', attributed to Sager (1994, 321) in *Dictionary of Translation Studies* (1997),

talks about people "in an intermediary position between a translator and an end user of a translation", thus effectively excluding translators from the discussion. The seminal book *Agents of Translation* edited by Milton and Bandia declares that it builds on Sager's definition (Milton and Bandia 2009, 1), but does not, in the end, plainly articulate any definition of its own. It does, however, broaden the scope of agential entities, mentioning, for instance, politicians, companies, and journals – as well as translators – as potential agents. Taking into account the strong emphasis the book has on translators being mediators of new literary and cultural innovations and ideas, the formulation later inferred by Buzelin (2011, n.p.) defines Milton and Bandia's agent as "any entity (a person, an institution, or even a journal) involved in a process of cultural innovation and exchange".[7]

As the examples above indicate, the earlier definitions do not attempt to arrive at a more in-depth understanding of all that agency could or does entail. While the terminology may thus be somewhat vague, Kinnunen and Koskinen (2010, 6) also point out that the discussion on agency has been further complicated by variation in the manner in which different approaches outside of Translation Studies have understood the concept and, moreover, by the fact that the related concepts of 'agency', 'agent' and 'individual' are often used indiscriminately, thus muddying the waters of clear argumentation. A closer inspection of the terms reveals that agency, for instance, is not necessarily tied to human individuals, since agency can also be exerted by institutions or organisations (as already mentioned by Milton and Bandia above), or that individual agents may encounter problems when trying to express their agency (ibid.), making drawing parallels between agency and individuals problematic.[8]

[7] The passage on which Buzelin seems to base her definition (cf. Milton and Bandia 2007, 1) talks about 'cultural innovation and change' (i.e., not '*ex*change'), thus highlighting, even more explicitly, the creative aspect of agents' actions. Naturally, translators are by default also involved in exchange, but Milton and Bandia appear to be mainly concerned with agents' ability to somehow challenge prevailing conditions. This idea is also remarked upon by Jansen and Wegener, who criticise Milton and Bandia for focussing mainly on "high-profile individuals" and neglecting the "'ordinary' professional translators" (Jansen & Wegener 2013, 9). While agents' capacity for change is unquestionably significant and worth researching, I also wish to point out that defining agency through some type of exceptionalism does disregard forms of agency that are important in other ways – and also relevant to the present study.

[8] Nonhuman agency is a central concept in, for instance, the Actor-Network Theory (ANT) (Callon & Latour 1981; Latour 2007), which was originally developed in an attempt to account for knowledge-creation in technology and science and which has since found several applications in numerous disciplines. In the present study, which concentrates on the agency of the authors and translators of the early Sibelius-related texts, the concept of nonhuman agency has no practical value.

One definition of agency that has gained popularity in Translation Studies comes from Kinnunen and Koskinen (2010), who put forward a formulation originally proposed at the closing discussion of the Translator's Agency symposium which was held in Tampere, Finland, in 2008. Wanting to provide a common foundation for the discussions of their book and to find alternatives to Pierre Bourdieu and his concept of habitus (see Bourdieu 1977; *The Translator* 2005), "the subjects' internalized system of social structures in the form of dispositions" (Meylaerts 2008, 93), which they considered too deterministic and static, Kinnunen and Koskinen (2010, 6) came to define agency as "the willingness and ability to act". The definition involves three keywords – *willingness*, *ability* and *act* – each drawing attention to a different aspect of agency: *Willingness* is explained by Kinnunen and Koskinen (ibid.) as "a particular internal state and disposition […] linked to consciousness, reflectivity and intentionality" as well as various ethical issues. Although not separately mentioned by Kinnunen and Koskinen, the definition gives reason to assume that willingness can also be linked to matters of affect and "the ways in which [translation] forms a part of the lives of those involved in it" (Koskinen 2020, x). *Ability* is determined by the manifestation of power relations, whose two-way nature is also acknowledged by Kinnunen and Koskinen. Drawing on Anthony Giddens (1979), they state that even if an actor is in a subordinate position, the fact that they are involved in a social relationship also gives them some power in the situation. *Acting* is finally defined as a temporally restricted but "constantly evolving series of acts" (ibid.). This is to be understood in terms of transitivity and dynamics: agency is difficult to determine in terms of clear temporal boundaries but at the same time it is constrained by time and space.

The definition of agency as 'the willingness and ability to act' has frequently been employed in subsequent translation-related studies (see, e.g., Ruokonen 2013, Schäffner 2014, Drugan et al. 2018, for studies on translator status, translation practices in political institutions, and translation quality, respectively) and at times also further elaborated. For instance, Koskinen and Kuusi (2017) define agency as the "willingness and ability to act *in an intentional way*" (emphasis added), thus alluding to Buzelin (2011) by calling attention to the intention behind any agential action.[9] The appeal of Kinnunen and Koskinen's original definition can be attributed

[9] Considering Kinnunen and Koskinen's definition, the addition may also be deemed somewhat superfluous: If willingness is 'linked to intentionality', as Kinnunen and Koskinen write, and an ability to act is "to conclude that 'at any point in time, the agent could have acted otherwise'" (Kinnunen and Koskinen 2010, 7, quoting Giddens 1979, 56), a degree of intention is already not only directly accounted for in the explanation of willingness but also implied in the freedom to choose one's actions. However, in the context of Koskinen and Kuusi's study, which examines the agency and empowerment of Karelian language activists, the addition is understandable as a highlighting device.

to its succinct but comprehensive nature. Compared to previous definitions, it is more readily applicable to a wide range of contexts and situations. It aims to understand not only translators but also other 'socialised subjects' – to borrow Simeoni's phrase for an agent – as cognisant entities embedded in a spatiotemporal reality in which actions are determined by intersubjective relations. Understanding agency in this manner seeks to apprehend the dependencies of the concept and make apparent both its personal and social dimension.

At least one concern on the limitations of the concept has also been raised in the field and needs to be acknowledged. While generally favourable towards Kinnunen and Koskinen's definition, Pym (2011, 75–76) remarks that the dimension of *willingness* is bound to lead to a philosophical discussion regarding free will, due to the manner in which individuals and structures entwine in sociological thinking. Pym points out that, if we are to believe that actions are determined by social environments, we are obligated to pose the question, 'how can the changes that alter social structures be explained?'. In other words, are wilful actions that are shaped by structures ultimately expressions of free will? Pym does acknowledge the usefulness of agency as a conceptual tool and encourages its use but simultaneously maintains that the concept does not, in and of itself, do "anything more than name a problem" (ibid.). This means that, according to Pym, agency should first and foremost be considered through its ability evoke questions on the role of various agents in translation but that those questions then need to be answered by examining the manifestations of agency in varying contexts.

What Pym is referring to by structural constraints is illustrated in a rather concrete manner by Kujamäki's 2011 article on the agency of translators and interpreters in military conflicts. In it, Kujamäki asks whether translators and interpreters operating under the threat of death can be thought to be exercising their free will (Kujamäki 2011, 15). While the translators are, in the context of the study, deemed to evince willingness and are therefore ultimately considered to exercise their agency (albeit "agency delimited by compelling factors" (ibid.), Kujamäki's question illustrates a valid point: all actions of translators, or other agents, may not be understandable by merely scrutinising their willingness and ability to act.

At the same time, if we are to argue that willingness (or ability, for that matter) is so essential to agency that agency cannot exist in its absence, this still should not prevent investigating situations in which willingness is absent from the point of view of agency. Just as the translation strategy of non-translation, that is, "fragments of source text preserved in the original language in the target text" (Pym 2011, 86), can be considered within the framework of translation, so can non-agency be examined in terms of agency. Approaching agency from this angle will provide information on the boundaries of the concept and result in a more in-depth understanding of the different expressions of agency.

To summarise the discussion above, agency is a concept which has been widely adopted into Translation Studies in its capacity to theoretically connect translators and other agents to societal power structures and the act of translation. It can be thought of as a means of conceptualising the positions that agents in translation occupy and as a point of departure for further investigation on translators' activities. However, although agency seems to be a crucial concept when it comes to considering the societal significance of translation, it has been argued that it does not satisfactorily explain the actual manifestations of agency. It seems that there are matters closely connected to agency, which need further conceptual tools in order to be better understood. In order to account for these elaborations, I will in the following section outline some ideas regarding *translatorship*, which concerns itself with the defining factors of being a translator.

2.2.2 Translatorship

The Oxford English Dictionary defines translatorship as "the position, occupation, or function of a translator; the fact of being the translator of a work" (OED, s.v. *translatorship*). The use of the term resembles that of agency in that Translation Studies literature rarely sees reason to challenge or even to discuss this basic definition, which seems to be taken as a given in most texts in which translatorship is mentioned. However, as explained in the previous section, there is a case to be made for examining translatorship as an entry point to understanding agency in more detail, but to be able to do that requires some further elaboration on the limits and constraints of the concept.

This sentiment is shared, or at least alluded to, in Kujamäki and Paloposki's article (2015, 342), which remarks that although translators – as individuals, agents, or professionals – have received more attention in recent years, examination of their authorship and its relation to other agents or agencies has often been neglected. Kujamäki and Paloposki find that this is particularly true in historical research where translators and their work have often been conceived as emerging from the general cultural context; the article maintains that to remedy the situation, the 'authorship of translators' (i.e., translatorship) should instead be understood in the context of other actors working in the cultural field and the manner in which they, on the one hand, delimit translators' translatorship and, and on the other, are entwined with it (ibid.). This is unfortunately the extent to which the article develops the idea of translatorship; these ideas next lead Kujamäki and Paloposki to consider Pym's writings on multiprofessional translators and to continue onto exploring aspects of professionalisation, which constitutes the focus of the article and which, although naturally related to translatorship, is another strand of research conducted on translators.

The idea of intertwining translatorships as mentioned by Kujamäki and Paloposki's article is already present in Jansen and Wegener's Introduction to the 2013 book *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation 1*, which provides one of the lengthier discussions on translatorship found in Translation Studies literature. Jansen and Wegener's text centres on their self-coined term, *multiple translatorship*, which the authors use to discuss the often collaborative nature of translation (2013, 5) and the distribution of the responsibilities of translation during the translation process. Jansen and Wegener's discussion is geared towards explaining their specific investigative stance and, again, to provide a shared foundation for the articles of their book, but the ideas presented in the Introduction are by no means limited to merely considering the diversity of agents in the translation process. On the contrary, Jansen and Wegener provide valuable insight into the concept of translatorship by outlining its features and connecting them to previous studies on authorship.

Jansen and Wegener's discussion on multiple translatorship approaches the topic from three viewpoints: *translation process*, *translation product*, and *authority and authorship*. The first of these focusses on examining "how agents interact, negotiate and struggle for influence in the various phases leading up to the translated text", by which the authors refer to "the selection of the text to translate, the appointment of the translator, the drafting of the translation, its revision by various agents and its 'wrapping' and subsequent marketing in the target area" (Jansen & Wegener 2013, 5, 6). Following this broad reading of the translation process (which Jansen and Wegener also call the 'translation event', borrowing Chesterman's (2007, 173) definition of Toury's (1995, 249) terminology), the translation product is also defined in broad terms: Jansen and Wegener (2013, 7) propose that the translation product should refer not only to the translated text but also to the "elements that present and sustain it and, at least in theory, influence its reception in the target culture", in other words, to various paratextual materials, such as book covers and reviews. Finally, Jansen and Wegener rely on Harold Love (2002) in defining authorship as a progression of processes and as a series of functions that are carried out in the course of creating a piece of work. Love divides authorship into four types, *precursive*, *declarative*, *executive*, and *revisionary*, and Jansen and Wegener (2013, 23) extend this categorisation to apply to translation in order to account for different types of translatorship.

In Love's model, precursive authorship refers to contributions that have a significant impact on a work's shape and substance. In the case of translations, it is manifested in the source text, as the author of the source text is also the precursive author of the translation. Jansen and Wegener point out that the writer of an original text may also become the executive translator. This is particularly the case in self-translations but also in situations where the original author closely collaborates on the translation with the translator. Declarative translator is explained as the person

to whom a translation is attributed on the basis of the name on the title page. Jansen and Wegener (2013, 23) draw attention to the fact that the recognisability of a name can be a manipulative tool, for instance when it is used to promote sales even when the translation has not been directly created by the person who has been named the translator. Finally, revisionary translatorship refers to the revision processes connected to translation. Jansen and Wegener (2013, 23–24) remark that separating executive and revisionary translatorship can be difficult since revision processes may be indistinguishable from executive translation. All in all, the authors maintain that the "crux of translation as a process occurs in the fraught interplay between executive, declarative and revisionary translatorship" (ibid., 23). To put it differently, the manner in which translators carry out their work, how translators take or are attributed responsibility for translations, and the revisions a text goes through in the course of a translation event are essential to understanding the translation process as a reflection of translatorship.

The ideas introduced by Jansen and Wegener help to bridge the gaps left by Baker's model and its general understanding of agency on the one hand and the conceptual open-endedness of agency-related theorisations on the other, and provide some well-defined avenues for research. Jansen and Wegener's proposition that (multiple) translatorship can manifest separately in different areas of translation (process and product) and is able to assume different modes of expression (precursive, declarative, executive, and revisionary) gives methodological tools for scrutinising the agency of translators. By combining the concept of agency, and translatorship as its manifestation, with the narrative approach, it is possible to form a better understanding of the role translators play as conveyors of narratives and more precisely to pinpoint how they are part and parcel of narrative construction. For instance, the use of a translator's name as a declarative tool is indicative of a very different type of agency than that expressed by a translator exercising their executive and revisionary translatorship, and simultaneously also implies different methods of narrative construction.

In addition to providing a window into distinct expressions of agency, acknowledging the existence of these various forms of translatorship is relevant due to the fact that in my material the translators cannot be considered professional translators in the modern sense. The institutional formation of the translator's profession was only beginning to take shape or in its early stages in the context and time period examined in this study. The Finnish translators' association was founded as late as in 1955, which may seem a relatively late development considering the founding years of other, related, professions: the publishers' association was established in 1859 and those of journalists' and writers' in 1890 and 1897, respectively (see Paloposki 2016, 19). Since the professional field was still largely undefined, and as there are therefore no formalised guidelines against which to

contrast the activities of the translators of this study, the theoretical apparatus applied needs to have a manner of tackling the translators and their motivations to undertake translation tasks. These ambitions can now be approached by examining the translators' translatorship with the tools provided by Jansen and Wegener.

As a final caveat, Jansen and Wegener's approach can be criticised for concentrating on translators while overlooking the role of other agents, such as commissioners, publishers, typesetters, critics etc., in the translation event. However, as the examination of agency in the present study will only concern the translators and, to some extent, the original authors, this one-sidedness serves a purpose. Other types of agencies do feature to a limited extent in Chapter 4, but the examination of agency in the construction of the Sibelius narrative and in public figure narratives in general will mainly be extended only to the translators.

2.2.3 Translator-related research questions revisited

Research on translators can by now be thought to have established itself as one of the subfields of Translation Studies and its sociological turn. As, for example, Pym's call for the humanisation of translation history and Chesterman's proposition for transla*tor* studies from 2009 attest, translators (and their entourage) are today seen as central components in the field of Translation Studies and should be well accounted for in any piece of research dealing with various sociological aspects of translation. Taking into consideration the complexity of translator's agency and its affinity to translatorship discussed above, I will end this section by revisiting the translator-related questions presented in the Introduction and by putting forward my definition of agency.

As established in 2.1, in Baker's understanding, translators are involved in the act of re-narration which creates, negotiates and contests social reality (2006, 105). In their capacity as individuals wielding some degree of societal power, translators can be considered responsible actors, which also turns the shaping of narratives into an ethical issue (see also Chesterman's interview of Baker on the ethics of renarration, Baker & Chesterman 2008). This view is connected to the developments of sociologically inclined Translation Studies, and is therefore echoed, with varying emphases, by other researchers promoting approaches that are otherwise different from Baker, such as Pym, (cf., e.g., 2004, 6–7). In particular, the idea that translators assume an active role in the construction of narratives can be traced back to discussions on agency. The reason for needing to explicitly state this here owes to the absence of any extensive discussion on translators or the principles that govern their actions in *Translation and Conflict* or Baker's other writings on the narrative theory. While Baker lays considerable emphasis on translators' role as responsible actors, she pays little attention to what it entails or how it is generally manifested.

The previous sections have served as an attempt to explicate translators' position as social actors. Above, by having drawn attention to how the concept of agency is understood in Translation Studies, what its limitations are, and how those limitations can perhaps be redressed, I have sought to constitute a link, through the figure of the translator, between agency and the sociological narrative theory. In addition, I have sought to complement the philosophically-geared concept with tools that will allow me to examine how agency is enacted by translators. By combining these two approaches, my objective has been to lay the groundwork for understanding the actions of translators in the construction of narratives and as a result, I propose the following working definition for agency:

> In translation, agency is the manifestation of the expressions of authorship, typically emerging from the translator's willingness and ability to enact their translatorship in its various forms.

This formulation aims to retain the comprehensiveness of Kinnunen and Koskinen's definition together with its core concepts and link them to Jansen and Wegener's ideas on translatorship in order to be able to understand the role of translators in the construction of narratives.

Considering this newly acquired insight into translators and their activities, it seems reasonable to review the questions presented in the Introduction of this study. Taking into account the discussion presented above, the initial question, "Who translated the works, and what motivated their translational activity?", can be further elaborated so that it will more explicitly account for and be conceptually linked to matters of agency and translatorship. I propose the following questions:

i. Through which forms of translatorship were Sibelius translators' agency expressed and what was the link between translatorship and narrative construction?

ii. How is the Sibelius translators' willingness and ability to enact their translatorship present in the material? To put it differently, what motivated the acts of translating (as far as this can be determined), and how were the translators positioned in terms of being able to act according to their inclinations and with regard to, for instance, the authors of the original works?

Question i) provides much needed depth to the first part of the initial question, 'who translated the works'. It adds to the factual information available in literature by allowing for the consideration of the translators' role in the translation event. It also provides a framework within which to account for various phenomena (such as self-translation), which appear in the material, and gives some structure to the

examination of narrative construction by drawing attention to the manner in which different types of translatorship contributed to the construction of the Sibelius narrative. Question ii) is connected to the means of the translators and to how the translators were able to do what they envisioned. It seeks to answer the more general question of the profiles of the translators and to pinpoint possible similarities between them. It has obvious connections with questions of (multi)professionalism as well as broader contextual issues relating to, for instance, the structures of Finland's cultural life in the first half of the 20th century.

In this chapter, I have presented discussions on the two main theoretical concepts of this study. In section 2.1, I began by introducing Baker's narrative framework and its principle underlying theory and drawing attention to the issues I felt should be critically examined and reviewed. In the present section, I advanced to discuss agency and the role of the translator, the person or instance who conveys the narratives that spread through translation. However, agency and translatorship alone cannot account for the emergence of narratives. As Koskinen (2010, 183) mentions, agency is also influenced and constrained by the social structures in which the agents are embedded. Jansen and Wegener (2013, 15) similarly draw attention to the fact that translatorship and agency cannot be satisfactorily understood only by focussing on the micro-level; instead, a more profound understanding is achieved by examining the "micro-level factors emerging in the specific translation event *together with* acknowledgement of macro-level conditions […]". Here, these conditions and structures are understood as the historical context that influenced the formation of the Sibelius narrative and also underpinned the translation of the Sibelius-related texts of this study. In the next section, I will focus on examining the contextual premise of Sibelius translations. I will concentrate, in particular, on three features – the formation of Finnish music culture, the nationalist sentiments of late 19th and early 20th century, and the relationship of the Swedish and Finnish demographics in Finland – all of which are constituent parts of the Sibelius narrative

3 Contextualising the study

In the previous chapter, I introduced the theoretical premise of this study by examining the sociological narrative theory and the concept of agency in Translation Studies. Both of these are closely related to the focus of this section, which explores the context of the material that will be scrutinised in the multiple-case study in Chapter 4. A broadly used concept in Translation Studies, context closely resembles what in Somers's terminology is called a relational setting, "a pattern of relationships among institutions, public narratives and social practices" (Somers 1992, 609), the description of which seeks to contextualise the temporal and spatial emergence of narratives. There are also obvious connections between the idea of relational settings and relevance of context for translation, including the well-established idea in studies of translation history that the social conditions from which translations emerge are key to understanding the translations themselves (see, e.g., Pym 1998, ix). On the one hand, texts are always subject to interpretation in a particular context and may receive different readings depending on their contextual framing. On the other hand, contexts also shape agency and precede expressions of authorship: it is safe to say that actions are meaningless without context, as contexts underlie any activity and give significance to the manifestations of agency.

Given their similarity, in this study the terms context and relational setting are often used interchangeably to account for "the relevant range of […] social forces – from politics to demography – that configure together to shape history and social action" (Somers, 608) and to highlight the dynamic nature of the events in which narratives are embedded. However, one notable exception to this parallel usage can be found in section 3.3 of this chapter, in which context is to be understood in a more static sense: rather than describing a set of conditions that may have had a bearing on subsequent events examined in the analyses, it provides context with regard to the study of Finnish translation and translator history, situating this study among previous research and offering relevant information on the conditions of non-fiction translation in the first half of the 20th century.

In the present study, the narrative examined has a rather significant temporal breadth, connecting it to various social developments. A potential complication that follows from this temporal unfolding is that the context does not remain constant but

changes over time, which makes it impossible to anchor the narratives in an isolated relational setting. However, even if contexts themselves are not stable, the ideas they engender may come to define later developments and resist change even when challenged. In sections 3.1 and 3.2, I have therefore identified social forces that have a stable standing in Sibelius-related texts and are thus connected to the Sibelius narrative over the span of almost 60 years during which time the 12 texts in my material were published and translated. These ideas naturally precede the publication of the texts and link to other complex relational settings. For instance, even though discussed as a separate phenomenon below, Finnish nationalism with all its distinctive manifestations was still a part of the broader social changes of 19th-century European nationalism. The focus on overarching themes also means that I do not concern myself with certain issues, which often indicate national sore points and which Sibelius scholars have debated at a later time, such as matters related to Sibelius political inclinations. These belong to later stratum of the Sibelius narrative. Instead, I will provide a broad view of two over-arching relational settings within which the discussion on Sibelius was embedded during his lifetime and some years after his passing. Providing a guideline for further discussion, these contexts will be complemented in the case studies as needed.

The chapter will be divided into three parts which draw on Finland's linguistic history, musicology and Translation Studies. The first subsection will provide an overview of the national aspirations of the 19th and early 20th century and the sometimes uneasy relationship between Finland's Swedish- and Finnish-speaking populations. Section 3.2 will discuss the formation of Finnish music culture around the turn of the 20th century and Sibelius's rise to his pre-eminent status. The third part will examine the general conditions under which non-fiction translators worked. These discussions will broadly contextualise the texts that will be examined in Chapter 4 and provide a background against which it is possible to understand the themes of the texts under study as well as the reasons for their translation. The present chapter will end with a summarising remark that will define the 'Sibelius narrative' as understood in this study.

3.1 Relational setting 1: The linguistic dimension of Finnish nationalism

It has been suggested that understanding the cultural identity of Finland requires consideration of Finland's history as a part of the Kingdom of Sweden and recognition of the "post-colonial" environment which developed in the course of the 19th century and determined the status of the Finnish-speaking culture in relation to the Swedish-speaking one (Pulkkinen 1999, 118). Taking this notion as a point of departure, this section will focus on the rise and significance of the idea of

Finnishness and the division of cultural life into Swedish and Finnish speaking entities. The discussion will shed light on the shift from Swedish-speaking cultural life to the Finnish-speaking one and consider the history leading up to the 20th century from the viewpoint of emerging Finnish nationalism and cultural awakening.

Finland shares a long history with Sweden, which ruled over the majority of the area known today as Finland from ca. 1100–1300 to 1809. Forming an eastern province on the outskirts of the Kingdom of Sweden, the area was mostly inhabited by Finnish-speaking rural folk, whose language, lacking prestige, had no official status, although it was sometimes used out of necessity in certain official contexts. The language of legislation and the state as well as the language of those higher up the social ladder – the nobility, official administrators, clergy, scholars and members of the bourgeoisie – was Swedish (Kielilakikomitea 2000, 5; Pulkkinen 1999, 120). With the growth of the Finnish population in the late 18th century, however, demands for the advancement of the Finnish language began surfacing, and the Finnish peasants made several pleas for the recognition of their language at the Riksdag of the Estates, the national assembly of Sweden. Around the same time, the Fennophile movement, which originated at the Royal Academy of Turku (today, University of Helsinki), began showing academic interest in Finnish folk traditions and the Finnish language (Kielilakikomitea 2000, 6). However, this movement was largely unpolitical and had no motivation to destabilise the status of the Swedish language or the Swedish rule. On the contrary, for example Henrik Gabriel Porthan, professor at the Royal Academy of Turku and the 'Father of Finnish History', who to a large extent personified the Fennophile movement, believed that the Finnish language would eventually disappear with the spread of high, Swedish, culture (ibid.).

The transfer of power to Russia and the establishment of the Grand Duchy of Finland in 1809 enabled the development of a different mindset and influenced the eventual emergence of Finnish nationalism and identity. Finland's newly acquired autonomy meant that the share of Finnish speakers grew substantially: in 1812, with the annexation of the eastern area of 'Old Finland', which had already belonged to Russia prior to 1809 to 'New Finland', the area previously ruled by Sweden, the share of Finnish speakers in the Grand Dutchy of Finland rose to 87 per cent (approximately 870,000 inhabitants) from the mere 22 per cent it had been in the Kingdom of Sweden (Kielilakikomitea 2000, 6).

Even though Finland remained under Russian rule for over a century, it never became Easternised. This is not to say that Russia made no attempts at limiting the autonomy of the Grand Dutchy. Finland experienced two Russification periods in 1899–1905 and 1908–1917, which included, for instance, the Language Manifesto of 1900, establishing Russian as the language of administration. Despite these attempts, Finland managed to retain its Protestant faith, its own laws and its

languages as an autonomous state. Furthermore, the period of autonomy also gave rise to the idea of a unified and politically agential Finnish people, nation and citizens, which had not existed before 1809 (Pulkkinen 1999, 122). A part of this unification process had linguistic motivations: Swedish had outlasted Swedish rule as the language of the upper classes and retained its role as the official language of administration even in the Grand Duchy of Finland, which was at odds with the idea of a nation whose citizens were supposed to be actively engaged in societal development as a single political unit (ibid., 126–127). According to Pulkkinen (1999, 119, 127), this incongruity was significant for the emergence of the concept of a linguistically defined people, around which the ideas of nation and citizenship then intertwined.

Despite such a link existing between language and Finland's social development, it has also been argued that Finland's national, cultural and economic development into a modern state was in fact not a question of language or its history as such (Kielilakikomitea 2000, 6). The reasoning for this claim can be found in the fact that both the Finnish and Swedish-speaking parts of the population were elemental to the process of nation creation, as both sides of the language divide participated in formulating the ideas of Finnishness and the national ethos. This could be seen, for instance, in literature, where, for example, Finland's national poet Johan Ludvig Runeberg (1804–1877), wrote in Swedish, but Elias Lönnrot (1802–1884), the compiler of the Finnish national epic *The Kalevala*, wrote in Finnish (Kielilakikomitea 2000, 6). Although writing in different languages, both of these 'cultural giants' had an enduring effect on the nation's cultural landscape, drawing attention to the fact that 19th-century Finnish literature came to be understood as thematically national – not linguistically determined – literature (Lyytikäinen 1999, 142).

However, an opposing view has been convincingly argued by Pulkkinen (1999, 129). She bases her discussion on an analysis of J. V. Snellman's social philosophical thinking, tracing it back to Hegelian principles, the further development of which she then follows. A philosopher, author, journalist and statesman, Snellman's thoughts had a profound effect on the development of the idea of Finnishness. The transformative processes through which Finland came to define itself in the late 19th and early 20th centuries were based on his idea of "one language, one mind", modelled after a widely-used principle of nation construction (for an overview of how national identity has been linked with language, see, for example, Carter & Sealey, 2007).

Snellman was also a highly influential Fennoman. The Fennoman movement, which gained ground from the 1840s onwards and continued the work of the Fennophiles, once again originated at the university. It sought to raise Finnic culture from its inferior status to a national culture and establish Finnish as the national

language. The remarkable feature of this process was that although many of its most fervent contributors were Finnish-speaking intellectuals with a farming background, for generations upper-class Swedish speakers also kept experiencing a Fennoman awakening, adopting Finnish surnames and changing their home language to Finnish (Pulkkinen 1999, 131). The social, political and linguistic change of the 19th and early 20th century was in other words carried out with significant support from the Swedish-speaking side, making the endeavour of turning Finland into a Finnish-speaking country truly a common, national effort (Sevänen 1994). This is not to say that the transition was entirely frictionless: from 1870 onwards the Fennoman movement had a counterforce in the Svecoman movement, which emphasised the Swedish identity of Finland's Swedish speakers and based their ideology on the "two peoples, two languages" model.

Finland's elite remained largely Swedish-speaking until the end of the 19th century, but the nationalist agenda gradually raised the Finnish-speaking part of the population to a more prominent position in society. The promotion of the Finnish language was largely a university-led endeavour: the use of Finnish was encouraged in the training of priests and teachers, which increased the significance of Finnish among the church and increased the number of Finns who received their education in Finnish, slowly building up the pressure for a societal change. Finnish was finally recognised as an official language of administration alongside Swedish in 1902 (Kielilakikomitea 2000, 9).

Although the status of Finnish was thus officially recognised, the social reality was still different. In the early 20th century, growing numbers of young university-educated Finnish speakers began to express their dissatisfaction with the over-representation of Swedish-speakers in high places of society (Sevänen 1994, 119). In 1922, at the time of the passing of the Language Act, which officially made Finland a bilingual state, Finland had approximately 340,000 Swedish speakers, amounting to 11 per cent of the population (Virrankoski 2009, 795). At the same time, however, the Finland-Swedes still comprised approximately one fourth of the student corps and held the majority of important posts in society (Sevänen 1994), causing friction on part of the Finnish speakers. A number of language feuds erupted between the late 19th century and the 1930s until the position of Finnish as the language of tuition was officially decreed and the rights of Swedish speakers guaranteed in the University Act of 1937 (Saarinen 2012, 239–240).

The presentation of the development of the language divide above seeks to provide a background for the discussions that, as will become apparent, revolved around Sibelius's Finnishness as a Finland-Swede. In addition, it foreshadows the anxieties that were potentially present in the act of translating texts written by a Finland-Swede into Finnish. The question that needs to be addressed, in particular, concerns the possible cross-culturality of such translations and the significance of

these linguistic transfers for narrative construction. Before continuing to the analysis, however, the next section will provide an overview of the development of Finnish musical life in the late eighteen and early nineteen hundreds and outline a relational setting regarding the cultural environment in which the first Sibelius translations were created.

3.2 Relational setting 2: The early stages of modern Finnish music culture and Sibelius as a national hero

Although impossible to consider separately from the overall change in society and Finnish nationalism and language politics, this section will draw attention to a number of features that characterised the formation of Finnish-speaking musical life. It will provide information on the sometimes linguistically motivated shifts in cultural practices and consider the significance of Sibelius for Finnish cultural life. It needs to be noted that the following summarises developments which reflect the emergence of an elite culture and which, as such, have often been linked to the grand narrative of Finnish musical life with its nationalist overtones. An alternative to this perspective has emerged only fairly recently, with scholars such as Vesa Kurkela, the Principal Investigator of the research projects *"Finnish" Music History: Transnational construction of musical life in Finland from the1870s until the 1920s* (2011–2016) and *Translocal Cultural Fields: Music as a Cultural and Economic Enterprise in the Four Biggest Cities in Finland, 1900–1939*, paving the way for a more varied understanding of the late 19th- and early 20th-century music-cultural currents (see, e.g., Kurkela 2007; 2010; Kurkela & Rantanen 2017).

Affected by Fennoman ideals, Finland's cultural aspirations from the 1860s onwards were marked by a desire to find and establish a genuinely Finnish cultural life. This endeavour sought to distance Finland from its Russian as well as Swedish influences and see the nation as an internationally recognised Western country in its own right. Paradoxically, these aspirations were often made concrete through influences that were adopted or appropriated from abroad. This phenomenon has been commented upon by scholars, such as Huttunen (1993, 127–128), who points out that the relationship of national and international was dialectic: national originality was regarded as a means to an end, the recognition of international audiences. In the arts as well as academia, this search for originality often assumed the form of Karelianism, which regarded the region of Karelia, an area today divided between Russia and Finland, as the cradle of Finnishness and emphasised the importance of *The Kalevala* for the Finnish identity (Goss 2009, 145–146). This National Romantic movement saw a variety of artists from painters and architects to

authors and composers – Sibelius among them – seek inspiration from the Karelian landscape and people.

Late 19th-century Finnish music culture could be described as budding. The last page of Sibelius's composition teacher Martin Wegelius's (1846–1906) book series *Hufvuddragen af den västerländska musikens historia från den kristna tidens början till våra dagar 1–3* (The main features of the history of Western music from the beginning of Christianity till our time 1–3) famously contains a bleak assessment of the contemporary state of the art: 'In Finland, music history needs to be made before it can be written' (Wegelius 1904, 629)[10]. The timing of the statement was more opportune than Wegelius could have realised, as many of the foundations of Finnish music culture that enabled and defined later cultural developments were in the process of being set in place. The founding of Helsingfors Musikinstitut (Helsinki Music Institute; later, Sibelius Academy, which today is part of University of the Arts Helsinki) by Martin Wegelius and the establishment of Helsingin Orkesteriyhdistys (The Helsinki Orchestra Association; today Helsinki Philharmonic Orchestra) by Sibelius's trusted conductor Robert Kajanus had already taken place in 1882. Sibelius's symphonic Kullervo created a truly Finnish musical idiom ten years later in 1892 (Salmenhaara 1996, 65). Finnish music culture had entered a period of institutionalisation, which in its first phase witnessed the founding of Kotimainen ooppera (Domestic Opera; today the Finnish National Opera and Ballet) in 1911 and Suomen musiikkitieteellinen seura (The Finnish Musicological Society) in 1916[11], in addition to the already mentioned establishments. In the second phase, the institutionalisation extended both socially and regionally: for instance, city orchestras were established in Turku (1927) and Tampere (1929), and the Finnish Broadcasting Company and its orchestra began operating in 1926 and 1927, respectively (Huttunen 1993, 273).

The progress was hardly straightforward, however. As discussed in the previous section, language politics was an emblematic part of Finnish social development in the late 19th and early 20th century and soon manifested itself in the cultural circles as well. At the turn of the century, the nationalist agenda led to the institutional separation of not only Finnish- and Swedish-language literatures (Sevänen 1994, 16) but also music practices. The beginning of the 1910s witnessed a power struggle between Finnish- and Swedish-speaking musical circles, which culminated in the

[10] In this study, I use single inverted commas to indicate that I have translated the quotation in question. Double inverted commas are used for direct quotations.

[11] This was the year the Society was re-established and registered in Finland, but it had effectively been active as a subsection of Internationale Musikgesellschaft even before 1916. Due to this, the founding of the Society can justifiably be interpreted as a sign of internationalisation rather than nationalisation, but this does not remove the fact that its establishment was also part of the broader cultural expansion occurring in Finland.

'War of the Orchestras' between two linguistically opposed orchestras led by the Finnish-speaking Robert Kajanus and Swedish-speaking Georg Schneevoigt (Salmenhaara 1996, 266–276). This was incidentally not the first time Kajanus had been involved in a schism over cultural dominance. Huttunen (1999, 268–270) mentions that already in the 1880s the power struggle between Kajanus and Wegelius had resulted in the formation of two different types of music cultures in Helsinki. This time the conflict was not language-related as such but concerned the essence and objectives of the city's cultural life. As a university-educated scholar and founder of the Music Institute, Wegelius and the Music Institute's chamber music and *Lied* concerts represented the learned strand of music culture in Finland, whilst Kajanus concentrated on developing the cultural scene with a more hands-on approach through his orchestra and its orchestral school. Wegelius found Kajanus's success with its outward-looking and musically dramatic concert programmes difficult to accept, going as far as forbidding his students from attending Kajanus's concerts (ibid.).

A part of Sibelius's significance for the Finnish music culture was that he was able to unify the two opposing cultures. Huttunen (1993, 270) argues that apart from having being Sibelius's artistic breakthrough and signalling Sibelius as Finland's new national composer, the premiere of Kullervo also marked the linking of the cultures represented by Wegelius and Kajanus. The composition simultaneously demonstrated musical prowess and learnedness, yet also provided a sense of drama that appealed to the audience. Sibelius's rise to fame created a synthesis of the opposing tendencies of the musical life in Helsinki (ibid.). Sibelius's role as the unifier of various cultural strands may appear almost symptomatic in the light of his later role as a national icon who personified ideas of not only Finnish music but the nation itself. *Kullervo* began a process that between 1892 and 1917 made Sibelius a national hero. His other Kalevala-inspired works, such as the *Lemminkäinen Suite* (1895), *Pohjola's Daughter* (1906) and *Luonnotar* (1913), as well as works, such as *Finlandia* (1899), that during the Russification of Finland acquired particular national importance, were involved in building Finland's national identity. Later in his life, Sibelius was able to represent a unifying figure for the entire Finnish nation, which, after gaining its independence in 1917, experienced a bitter civil war the following year (Huttunen 2002, 46).

In addition to his national importance, Sibelius was Finland's first composer of truly international renown. His first significant appearance on the international stage occurred at the 1900 Paris Exhibition, which focussed on presenting "genuine Finnishness" and represented a tour-de-force of Finnish cultural exports (Mäkelä 2007, 57). The Exhibition concerts did not mark a breakthrough for Sibelius as such, but the connected tour concert introduced Sibelius's music in several countries across Europe (ibid.). The places that later sealed Sibelius's international rise to fame

were London in 1905 and New York in 1914 (ibid., 63). The victories the composer gained in England and the United States also paved the way for Sibelius's commercial success.

In the 1920s, Sibelius began to withdraw from the public eye. While the previous decades had been defined by his personal involvement in the musical life of Finland as a composer as well as a conductor, the final 30 years of Sibelius's life were marked by his withdrawal to his home in Järvenpää and the absence of further artistic output, a period known as 'the silence of Ainola'. These decades changed the nature of Sibelius's status as the national hero, turning him into a national institution and a 'remote object' (Huttunen 1999, 273–274). This institutionalisation has been seen as a prerequisite for the emergence of Sibelius research. Huttunen (ibid., 274) writes that the older "inspired" writing on Sibelius continued until Toivo Haapanen's book on the history of Finnish music, *Suomen säveltaide*, published in 1940 but was also complemented by a novel interest in the structural aspects of Sibelius's compositions (ibid). As will be seen, the established style of writing also endured in some of the translations of Sibelius-related books, published in the 1940s and 1950s.

For the Finnish musicologists of early 20th-century Finland and their nationally predisposed history writing, Sibelius existed at the pinnacle of perceived and purposefully constructed narrative. In their histories, spanning from the early Middle Ages to the emergence of the Finnish musical idiom, Sibelius was presented as the embodiment of the nationalist spirit (Huttunen 1993, 104). However, less attention has been paid to texts that spread around as translations. It would be reasonable to assume that the same phenomenon was somehow present in texts that were chosen to be translated. One of the objectives of the analysis that follows is to pursue this hypothesis and investigate whether the narrative the translations created aligned with the musicological history writing of the early 20th century. To better understand how and by whom non-fiction literature was translated at the turn of the 20th century and beyond, the following section will provide information related to the research on Finnish translation history.

3.3 Remarks on the translation of non-fiction literature in the early 20th century

A discussion on the translators and translation neatly brings together the themes of this chapter. First, translation has clear points of connection with the linguistic dimension of Finnish nation building. Whether translation was needed for practical reasons during the Riksdag of the Estates to cater for the needs of the peasants (Kielilakikomitea 2000, 6), used for ideological reasons to deliberately shift the emphasis of Runeberg's poetry by changing more general Nordic references to Finnish ones for the sake of nationalist appropriation (Lyytikäinen 1999, 145), or, as

I later wish to argue, used as a means of constructing Finland's self-image by translating texts on the country's main cultural representative, translation was a natural part of Finland's nation building process. Second, translation was also involved in the development of Finnish music education, as the founding of the Music Institute created a demand for educational literature. The development of music pedagogy was personified in Wegelius, who authored several Swedish-language works, some of which have been in use until quite recently (Dahlström & Salmenhaara 1995, 513–515). What has been considered the first significant Finnish translation of a non-fiction book on music was also of a book by Wegelius, the aforementioned *Hufvuddragen af den västerländska musikens historia*, which was translated into Finnish in 1904 by Axel Törnudd (Aho & Mänttäri 2007, 310). To serve the needs of the growing music culture, a variety of music theoretical, historical and composer-related texts were translated into Finnish, including Wegelius's *Yleinen musiikkioppi ja analyysi* translated by Armas Järnefelt in 1922, or Rolland's *Beethoven* translated by Leevi Madetoja in 1918. The translated Sibelius literature that followed addressed a similar demand: they provided information on Finland's foremost cultural figure and validated his status as the main representative of Finnish music.

This section serves a dual purpose. Firstly, it broadly situates the Sibelius translators on the continuum of Finnish translation history and connects this study to research that in the 2000s has delved into the history of translation and translators in Finland. The core of this research was initially formed by a weighty tome on the history of Finnish literary translation, the two-part *Suomennoskirjallisuuden historia*, published in 2007. These volumes were followed by the history of non-fiction translation into Finnish, *Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia*, which was published six years later in 2013. Both works charted not only the history of translation in Finland but also the translators. On the whole, historical translators have often remained rather obscure figures, and more studies combining research on translations and their translators are therefore needed, as these studies serve to provide a more comprehensive image of the field of translation in general (Paloposki 2016, 21) and also throw light on why a particular space and time produced certain kinds of translations (Pym 1998, ix).

Secondly, this section refers back to the discussion on translatorship in section 2.2.2, simultaneously connecting it to the relational settings introduced in the previous sections. It provides a backdrop for certain preconditions delineating the Sibelius translators' agency, thus offering a frame of reference for the agential analysis of this study. In the analysis, a particular point of interest will be to consider the degree to which translation featured in the professional careers of the Sibelius translators and the manner in which it intertwined with their other activities, as this calls attention to the research question first put forward as item 1c. in the

Introduction: who translated the works, and what motivated their translational activity.

It has been suggested that due to the increase in the volumes of translated non-fiction during the first decade of the nineteen-hundreds and thereafter as well as due to the variedness of topics, publishing formats and motivations for translation, providing a general image of the translation of non-fiction in Finland in the 20th century is an impossible task (Aho & Mänttäri 2007, 552; Hiidenmaa 2013, 98–99; Paloposki 2011, 63). However, a more focussed approach is feasible, making it possible to make certain remarks on the types of texts that the materials under study represent, translation of Swedish texts into Finnish and the professionalism of non-fiction translators, understood here in the sense of "minimal" professionalism (Pym 2000, 4–5; see also Pym 2009, 36), the carrying out of a translation task for remuneration.

The final point was already briefly touched upon in the discussion on translatorship, in which it was mentioned that the institutionalisation of the translators' profession was only at its early stages at the beginning of the 20th century. It comes as no surprise then – also considering the fact that, as specialist literature, non-fiction texts have often been translated by the experts of their respective fields (Hiidenmaa 2013, 99) – that none of the translators involved with the early Sibelius translations were professionals in the sense that translating would have provided their primary source of income. Many of them earned their living elsewhere, often in the field of music, which gives reason to approach them as multiprofessionals (cf. Pym 1998, 162; 2000, 3), for whom translation constituted only one gainful activity among others. Paying attention to this aspect of the translators may prove important, for, as Kujamäki and Paloposki (2015, 342) point out, scrutinising translators' agency vis-à-vis that of other agents has often been neglected in studies on translation history: translators and their work have typically been contextualised with regard to general cultural conditions rather than other people whose work and activities overlap with and limit the work of the translators. Considering those Sibelius translators who were also active in the Finnish musical scene in light of their involvement in the field of music may, then, reveal something of their loyalties, motivations, objectives, use of translation strategies and so on.

The analysis section to follow comprises altogether twelve texts, falling under the category of translated non-fiction. In this study, non-fiction is understood broadly as texts encompassing academic works, factual works aimed at the general public, educational literature, guidebooks and manuals, biographies, essays, pamphlets and factual prose (cf. Paloposki, Riikonen & Latikka 2013, 11), the twelve works analysed representing six biographies, two theoretical works, one essay, one memoir (two separate editions) and one collection of newspaper articles. The prominence of biographies is a notable feature in the material. According to Aho and Mänttäri

(2007, 556), the popularity of biographies as a genre has been ever increasing since the beginning of the 20th century. The authors point out that biographies have typically been a literary genre that has relied on translation due to the fact that biographies are often written about foreigners and have therefore only occasionally been authored by Finns. Aho and Mänttäri acknowledge that some biographies of Finns have also been translated into Finnish from Swedish, mentioning, for instance, Werner Söderhjelm's biography of Runeberg. Erik Tawastjsterna's five-part Sibelius biography also receives a mention as a 'nationally significant' translation. Riikonen (2013, 477–478) approaches Sibelius biographies from a broader perspective recognising the central position they occupy among translated artist biographies and drawing attention to the fact that many of them were translated from Swedish. Pertinent to the present study, he also makes an important general observation on biographical literature being characterised by its teetering between factual and fictional writing (Riikonen 2013, 465). As a literary presentation of a person's life, a biography is always a distinct interpretation and narrative.

One final point worth considering, already alluded to above, is the status of Swedish-language source texts and their translation into Finnish. Taking into account the troublesome history of the two languages and bearing in mind that of the twelve texts selected for analysis in this study six were originally written in Swedish but in Finland, translation from Swedish into Finnish warrants for some further investigation. Considering the status of Finland as a bilingual country, the translation between these national languages has received surprisingly little scholarly attention. One notable exception is Grönstrand's (2011) case study on the author Kersti Bergroth (1886–1975) who in the 1920s wrote novels both in Swedish and in Finnish. Grönstrand's study demonstrates that the hostile attitude of some Finnish nationalists towards the Finland-Swedes and the Swedish language influenced Bergroth's translation. Describing the situation of the 1920s as volatile, Grönstrand (2011, 86) maintains that linguistic practices formed a political issue, reflecting ideologies of solidarity and unification. Wishing to avoid conflict, Bergroth opted for adjusting the setting and word choices of the different language versions of her works, thus allowing them to reflect the realities of the Swedish- and the Finnish-speaking demographics. It is worth mentioning that although Bergroth's novels were published in two languages, they included no indication that they had been translated. Instead, they were presented as original works in both languages to avoid causing tension between the Swedish-speakers and nationalists who thought linguistic plurality would hinder the formation of a unified national state (ibid., 87). This enabled Bergroth to give the impression that her works were monolingual and thus helped her avoid situations where linguistically marked sides had to be chosen.

Another highly relevant study concerning translation between Swedish and Finnish in Finland, opportunely concerning the translation of Sibelius's journal from

1909 to 1944 and its commentary published in 2015, is Hartama-Heinonen's article from 2017 (Hartama-Heinonen 2017a). Its significance for this study lies in its theoretical approach, which discusses the relationship of not only the linguistic but also cultural transfer by examining the translation as both interlingual and intracultural action. The article introduces avenues that make it possible to further problematise the dependencies between languages operating in the same cultural sphere: Should the relationship between the Swedish and Finnish (sub)cultures be understood as intracultural, as the article professes, or intercultural? Does the time period during which the translation is conducted have an effect on determining the boundaries of inter- or intracultures? How does defining the relationship of the source and target text as inter- or intracultural affect the interpretation of the texts and their function? Consideration of such questions will inform the analysis of the Sibelius translations in this study.

The three sections in this chapter have provided tools for understanding the phenomenon that Sibelius became during his lifetime. The historical progressions described in Sections 3.1 and 3.2 outlined two broad relational settings that were essential for the development of Sibelius's status as a national icon, while the present section related this study to other research conducted in the field of translation history and contextualised this investigative stance. Having outlined the necessary preconditions for the investigation to be conducted in Chapter 4, this chapter will end with a definition of the Sibelius narrative as understood in this study.

3.4 The Sibelius narrative as an object of enquiry

As mentioned in the sections on the sociological narrative theory in Translation Studies, Baker does little to explain how a narrative analysis should be conducted or how the object of investigation should be determined. In addition, the examples provided by Baker focus on events rather than life stories, which are considerably more complex as narratives not only because they themselves involve various events but also because they intimately lace together various personal, public and even meta-narratives. As the examination of narratives moves from the scrutiny of static states to the examination of dynamic developments – and interpretations thereof – the researcher is soon faced with the realisation that public figure narratives cannot be contained in any conclusive manner. Being amorphous entities, sociological narratives inherently defy exhaustive definition. They exist in relation to their relational settings and gain further narrative layers with each interpretation and commentary that somehow positions itself in relation to the existing narrative in a reiterative and cumulative process. Therefore, the examination of the materials under study requires further delimitations to the scope of the investigation.

In this study, the limits of the enquiry are determined by the 12 source and target texts examined in the following chapter, on the one hand, and by the paratextual materials surrounding these texts, on the other. Paratexts, here considered to include both the peritexts (materials surrounding a given text, such as titles, author's and publisher's name, blurbs or annotations), as well as epitexts (materials found outside the physical manifestation of a text, such as reviews, correspondences, later studies and so on) (Genette 1987, 7–11), are considered to provide access to the constituents of the narrative, referred to in this study as 'narrative strands', which emerge from the Sibelius-related works and their translations. The Sibelius narrative, then, is understood as a public narrative created by the interplay between various relative settings, the Sibelius-related texts examined, the agential influence behind the translations, and the paratextual materials that further elaborate on the original texts and, especially, their translations. Thus, although biographical in nature, the 'Sibelius narrative' is not to be understood as a story about Sibelius's life. Instead, it refers to how the ideas, values and ideals which Sibelius represented and was thought to embody as a national hero and which were often vague, ambiguous and infinitely porous (such as 'Finnishness') were negotiated in the Finnish society through the medium of Sibelius-related literary works. These texts will be introduced in the next chapter in a series of case studies, which explore the content, public reception and agents of the works.

4 Case studies on Sibelius-related texts translated into Finnish

This chapter presents case studies of Sibelius-related works that were translated in Finland between 1916 and 1965. The texts analysed include all the Finnish translations named in Aarre Hemming's *List of works concerning Jean Sibelius and his compositions* from 1958. The list of works has been complemented with two subsequent work, Harold E. Johnson's *Sibelius* from 1960 as well as the second, enlarged edition of Törne's *Sibelius – lähikuvia ja keskusteluja* from 1965, which will be discussed in connection with the first edition from 1945. These works extend the scope of the analysis until the beginning of modern Sibelius Studies, defined as the publication of the first instalment of Erik Tawaststjerna's five-part Sibelius biography in 1965. The selection of works excludes Tawaststjerna's collection of essays, *Sibeliuksen pianosävellykset ja muita esseitä*, from 1955 (translated by Tuomas Anhava and Erkki Länsiö) as a precursor of the author's later works and due to the fact that a significant number of the essays focus on certain performers of Sibelius's music, not Sibelius himself. In addition to the primary source material of twelve Sibelius-related texts and their translations, this section will also utilise various archival sources, such as newspaper articles and personal archives, together with relevant literature explaining and interpreting the Sibelius narrative.

The case studies advance chronologically to more clearly link the translations to their contexts as outlined in the previous chapter and to pinpoint certain events that have come to bear significance for the development of the Sibelius narrative. Although narrative construction does not suppose chronological order (cf. Baker 2006, 51), the development of narratives is nevertheless tied to temporal events, which is why the chronological approach will aid in understanding the unfolding of the narrative. Chronological order is by no means the only manner in which the material could have been examined. For example, it would have been possible to categorise the texts based on the source language, but this seemed to offer no apparent benefits. On the contrary, the often complex relationship between the source and target language or the source and target culture, which becomes apparent in the analyses and is elaborated on in the discussion in Chapter 5, would only have led to difficulties of categorisation. Therefore, the chronological approach was

adopted as the frame of systematic analysis. There are, however, two instances where the chronological approach is discarded in order to favour a discussion on translational features over that on narrative construction: when examining the works of Ekman and von Törne, the enlarged versions and their translations are analysed within the same subsection as their respective original versions. This enables a more practical discussion on the differences and similarities between the versions as well as on the motivation behind creating the enlarged editions.

The analysis has two main areas of emphasis, the first being the investigation of the material from the point of view of narrative construction and the second focussing on the translators' agency, although, as will be seen, narrative construction and agential influence are in many cases intertwined. Rather than focussing on one specific narrative feature or systematically exploring one translation-related question within each of the texts in my material, I approach the analyses from a viewpoint of plurality. The translations and their source texts are considered to form a dispersive prism that reveals different points of interest in the narrative construction. Each of the translations is analysed in relation to a particular characteristic or characteristics arising from the text or its creation. By characteristics, I refer not only to the narrative features as presented in section 2.1.2 but also other idiosyncrasies that may characterise a particular text in terms of its production or reception, for example. In my view, this approach is supported by the notion that narratives are essentially amorphous configurations, which suggests that the constituents of narratives should not be analysed by systematically applying the same model to each instance of analysis. In contrast, they should be regarded with reference to their individual position within the narrative and, to access their significance, considered through a changing emphasis on the various narrative characteristics and features as well as questions of agency. This view echoes Baker (2014, 174), who remarks that narrative analysis in translation should aim at "providing models of analysis in which the [narrative] features are integrated and invoked only as and when they become relevant", that is, arise as compelling features from the material itself.

The analysis below will not only provide insight into various features of the Sibelius narrative. It will also, perhaps first and foremost, explore the idea of approaching a corpus from multiple narrativity- and agency-related angles rather than one predetermined theoretical aspect. The objective is to offer a more comprehensive understanding of the material under study as well as of the range of issues underlying translation in a set of material that involves notable socio-historical undertones. In other words, as was explained to be one of the implications of my research question on the significance of translation in this research material, the objective of the analysis is also to empirically test the narrative theory to better understand the meaning of translation in the framework of narrative construction. The findings of this approach will also be discussed in Chapter 5.

4.1 *Jean Sibelius: hans tondiktning och drag ur hans liv* (1916) and *Jean Sibelius: hänen sävelrunoutensa ja piirteitä hänen elämästään* (1916)

As was explained in the previous chapter, as a Finland-Swede, Sibelius was at the nexus of the linguistic feud between Swedish and Finnish speakers, with both the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking sides of the Finnish population wanting to claim the composer as their own. This was demonstrated, for instance, by an incident concerning two fundamentally different family trees compiled by the musicologist Otto Andersson and the founder of The Genealogical Society of Finland Eeli Granit-Ilmoniemi in late 1915 and 1916, respectively. The former traced Sibelius's family history to Swedish farmers in the Swedish-language music journal *Tidning för Musik* V, n:o 14–15, whereas a month later the latter offered evidence, first in the Finnish-language newspaper *Helsingin Sanomat* (23 May, 1916) and later in *Tidning för music* VI, n:o 9, which sought to prove that Sibelius descended from Finnish peasants (Tawaststjerna 1989, 149, 160–161; Goss 1998, 78). Two opposing narratives on Sibelius's heritage were thus circulated simultaneously among the Finnish public. Sibelius himself seems to have been somewhat annoyed not so much over the question whether his ancestors were Finnish or Swedish but over the manner in which his family history was polemicised (cf. Tawaststjerna 1989, 149–150, 161–162).

The publication of the first ever book-length biography on Sibelius also became a race to the finish line between Swedish and Finnish speaking Finns, as Erik Furuhjelm and Leevi Madetoja, both notable Finnish composers and music critics and the latter also Sibelius's former composition student, worked on their respective Swedish- and Finnish-language Sibelius biographies at the same time. In 1915, Madetoja had approached the publishing company Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö (WSOY) with a letter dated 19 July 1915, to ask whether they would be interested in a book on Sibelius he was planning to write for the Christmas market, just in time to honour the 50th anniversary of the composer (WSOY, 19 July 1915). The publisher soon replied that the company was in the process of negotiating on a series of monographs which would include a biography by Furuhjelm and therefore could not, at the time, accept Madetoja's offer (WSOY, 24 July 1915). Furuhjelm's Swedish-language Sibelius biography, *Jean Sibelius: hans tondiktning och drag ur hans liv*, which was originally supposed to have come out in 1915 for Sibelius's 50th anniversary year, was finally released at the end of 1916, simultaneously in Swedish by Schildts and in Finnish as *Jean Sibelius: hänen sävelrunoutensa ja piirteitä hänen elämästään* by WSOY. In his letter to Sibelius, Madetoja speculated that the sudden surge in Sibelius biographies in preparation for the composer's anniversary made the publishers consider the release of Madetoja's biography too risky financially

(Tawaststjerna 1989, 134). Translation, on the other hand, must have been considered a more profitable venture, which is why Madetoja, instead of having his own book published, found himself translating Furuhjelm's biography into Finnish.

The delay in the publication of Furuhjelm's book was to allow Furuhjelm to unearth the score of *Kullervo* for commenting (Goss 1998, 63), and the biography came out before Christmas in 1916 (Tawaststjerna 1989, 196). In addition to excepts from *Kullervo*, the biography includes numerous other examples of Sibelius's music up until the first version Fifth Symphony in 1915. It pays particular attention to Sibelius's youth and his musical influences, which has made it a particularly valuable source of information on the young Sibelius's life and works (ibid.), in addition to which it illustrates the composer's life with several images.

As the first biography on Sibelius, Furuhjelm's influential work laid the foundation for many later Sibelius writers. For instance, one of the features which is often mentioned in connection with the biography is Furuhjelm's remarks on Sibelius's connection with nature, which the author explains as stemming from Sibelius's childhood:

> Love for nature seems to be the most original, the most deeply characteristic feature about Sibelius, and we will surely do no injustice to the master's other inclinations by emphasising this phenomenon or assuming it as the starting point of our scrutiny. For the entire oeuvre of the tone poet seems to have grown out of a child's and youngster's ecstatic wonder at nature and lively sense of reality, and everything that Sibelius has since become, in all his turns, at all times, have we had the opportunity to witness the fascinating nature portrayer steadfastly at work, but at the same time not always dominant, in his personality as an artist. (Furuhjelm 1916a, 15; cf. also Furuhjelm 1916b, 16–17, 38, 62)

This affinity with nature was by no means Furuhjelm's own invention, as it had been part of Sibelius's public image also previously and even internationally (cf. Section 4.2). In terms of durability, however, Furuhjelm's biographical framing of Sibelius's life in this manner may have had far-reaching consequences. According to Goss (1998, xv), the biographies on Sibelius published after Furuhjelm's book formed a network of related texts as they drew on previously published works on the composer: "Cecil Grey borrowed from Rosa Newmarch and Karl Ekman Jr., who, in turn, had borrowed from Erik Furuhjelm and Karl Flodin, all of whom were used by Constant Lambert and Olin Downes." While Goss is writing about the pattern of borrowings at a more general level, Sibelius's empathy with nature can be regarded as one of the tropes that Furuhjelm's book helped solidify. Of the books mentioned by Goss and analysed in this study, nature does play a role, for example, in both Ekman's and Downes's characterisations of Sibelius, which will be discussed in

more detail in subsections 4.3 and 4.6, respectively. Gray's theoretical account of Sibelius's symphonies (cf. subsection 4.4) leaves fewer opportunities for such considerations, although examples of nature imagery can be found in Gray's book as well. The fact that the network of borrowings sustained certain concepts from earlier works can be seen as indicative of selective appropriation, whereby specific elements of Sibelius's life and works were chosen and incorporated into the Sibelius narrative.

References to nature and its significance in Sibelius's life have been an essential part of the Sibelius narrative, not only in Finland but abroad as well. Anecdotes about Sibelius and some of his own journal entries do support the view that the composer had a close relationship with some natural phenomena, but as has been pointed out, the relationship of an individual to their surroundings is always multifaceted and susceptible to interpretations (Mäkelä 2007, 97). It needs to be remembered that Sibelius composed many of his important works in various European metropolises, so it is debatable whether the importance of nature for Sibelius and his works should be seen as inspirational to the extent that it has been. The narrative of Sibelius and nature has also often been misrepresented in international publications, testifying to the power of the narrative rather than the facts: foreign literature has depicted Sibelius's typical environs as primeval forests (often located in places such as Enontekiö and Inari in Lapland) rather than as the lakeside field and pinewoods landscape in the proximity of Helsinki that they actually were (ibid.).

One of the features that caused controversy at the time of the publication of the biography was that the picture Furuhjelm paints of Sibelius was understood to depict a composer who does not exhibit particularly 'Finnish' qualities. More emphasis is given to Sibelius's universal nature an artist who can at most be considered Scandinavian in his artistic expressions. It must be presumed that such passages – as well as the allusions to Sibelius's particularly Finland-Swedish upbringing (cf. Furuhjelm 1916a, 68–69) or Furuhjelm's questioning of the national character of Sibelius's use of folk music – prompted the critics of the Finnish-language newspapers *Turun Sanomat*, *Helsingin Sanomat* and *Vaasa* to protest. The critic of *Turun Sanomat* (2.2.1917) stated that the word 'Nordic' was not enough to characterise the special nature of Sibelius's music, and that the author would have done wisely not to have involved Sibelius's name in language politics. In the *Helsingin Sanomat* review (6.1.1917), the composer and conductor Heikki Klemetti was annoyed by the fact that Furuhjelm had laid emphasis on the Germanic cultural education, Swedish language and overall Swedish atmosphere at Sibelius's childhood home. Klemetti also makes a point of mentioning, as the book should have done in his opinion, that Sibelius's agrestic ancestry was Finnish, thus linking the discussion to the schism over family lines mentioned above. The considerably more succinct review in *Vaasa* (3.2.1917) remarked that it was unacceptable to think that

Sibelius's music was not national. Despite these objections, the reviews agree on the importance of Furuhjelm's work. Madetoja's translation is briefly acknowledged and complimented in each review.

The translation of Furuhjelm's Sibelius biography expanded the original relational setting of the work. Instead of having been read and discussed through the original Swedish-language work, the book was simultaneously available to both the Swedish- and the Finnish-speaking Finns. The reviews mentioned above are indicative of the types of issues that the biography prompted: On the one hand, the need for a Finnish book on Sibelius was recognised. For instance, the review in *Turun Sanomat* (2.2.1917) began with a relieved remark that an indigenous biographical and analytical work on Finland's foremost composer had finally been produced in Finland, after several misleading studies conducted abroad. The book was generally complimented for finally offering insight into Sibelius and, to quote *Kansan Lehti* (12.1.1917), for bringing him 'down from Parnassus'. At the same time, the other types of reactions the book elicited seem symptomatic of the position Sibelius had acquired among the Finnish-speaking public. Although Furuhjelm's views on nationalism and Sibelius's position were perhaps not as straightforward as the piqued comments of the Finnish reviewers lead the reader to believe, the Finnish-minded writers were impassioned to defend the Finnishness of Sibelius and his music against Furuhjelm's more broadly contextualised presentation. The time was not yet ripe for a more nuanced discussion.

In terms of narrative construction, the translation of Furuhjelm's book may be considered at several levels of selective appropriation. This is in accordance with Baker, who sees selective appropriation not only as a local strategy in which "selective appropriation of textual material is realized in patterns of omission and addition designed to suppress, accentuate or elaborate particular aspects of a narrative encoded in the source text or utterance, or aspects of the larger narrative(s) in which it is embedded" but also as higher-level selection governing the selection of texts to be translated (Baker 2006, 114). Madetoja's translation is a faithful rendition of Furuhjelm's original and does not appear to manipulate the text in any manner that would give reason to suspect misrepresentation of the narrative contained in the book. However, Furuhjelm's case may be understood to involve selective appropriation in how the entire undertaking of translating a book is a selectively appropriative act. The decision to have a text translated is a selective process that enables appropriation of certain aspects of the surrounding reality. Whatever the reasons behind the decision for not commissioning a Finnish-language book on Sibelius were, Sibelius's national importance still warranted a translation – perhaps a less costly option for the publisher. From the point of view of the Sibelius narrative, this was a determinative step: for the first time, Sibelius's life was documented in Finnish in a more lasting form than an ephemeral newspaper column,

for instance. To the potential 89 per cent of the population who were not Swedish speakers, the translation was influential not only in solidifying ideas which were circulating in society and accommodating them into the target text context but in negotiating views which at the time seemed controversial and perhaps threatening to the already established narrative.

That the nature of Sibelius's Finnishness rose to be discussed in the reviews suggests that Furuhjelm had managed to touch upon an essential element in the Sibelius narrative. The fact that this issue was brought to the attention of the reading public is an instance of a selectively appropriative act that served to highlight and promote the idea of Sibelius's Finnishness. The discussion around the translation found ways of linking passages in the biography to phenomena which had relevance at the societal level, such as the divide between the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking demographics. Unlike in the cases discussed by Baker and other scholars, the translation itself appears to have had a relatively minor significance in the construction of the narrative. Instead, the translation can be considered to have served as a touchstone for further narrative construction, as it was the reception and interpretation of the book that determined its narrative value. For instance, Toivo Haapanen, a prominent Finnish conductor and musicologist, criticised the work in a Finnish-language music journal and accused Furuhjelm of downplaying the Finnishness of Sibelius's music (Haapanen 1918). At the same time, he was willing to accept other ideas about Sibelius that appeared in the biography and its translation, such as Sibelius's strong empathy with nature. Therefore, the question was not what the translation selectively appropriated from the source text but how the concepts which were selectively appropriated from the translation and related to the national understanding on the significance of the composer further shaped the public narrative. Even though these subsequent discussions could have been had on the basis of the Swedish-language original, it was, as the review in the newspaper *Karjala* (14.1.1917) also remarked, the translation which ensured the wider distribution of the text and therefore had an impact on the narrative construction.

Madetoja's translation functioned as a catalyst for the examination of often rather abstract values and views connected to Sibelius, such as his 'Finnishness' or 'Nordicness', which contributed to the Finnish-language discussion on who Sibelius was and what he represented. As the text, through being translated, entered a new set of relational meanings in the target culture, parts of the narrative were adopted into the developing Finnish-speaking cultural system. Here, certain parallels can be seen to the manner in which a nation's literary system is linked to a wider cultural entity through the translation of world literature. As has been discussed in studies on the history of translation (cf. Riikonen 2007, 21) and hypothesised, for instance, in the polysystem theory (cf. Even-Zohar 1990), translation can be seen as a means of validating an emerging culture and introducing new repertoires. In the present case,

the noteworthy particularity is that the validation happens not between geographically disparate cultures but within the boundaries of one autonomous nation. This notion will be revisited and expanded upon in the subsections to follow.

4.2 *Orchesterkompositionen von Jean Sibelius* (1908) and *Jean Sibeliuksen varhaisemmat orkesterisävellykset* (1926)

In the material of the present study, the translation of Georg Göhler's article is a slight deviation from the book format otherwise prevalent in the material. Given the fact that the article was nevertheless mentioned in Hemming's Sibelius bibliography and considering the culturally prominent publication channel of the article, Göhler's text and its translation have been included in this analytical chapter.

Georg Göhler's article "Orchesterkompositionen von Jean Sibelius" first appeared in the German journal *Der Kunstwart* in 1908. Nearly twenty years later in 1926, the text appeared in Finnish translation in the sixth volume of *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja*, the *Annals of the Kalevala Society*, entitled "Jean Sibeliuksen varhaisemmat orkesterisävellykset" ('the earlier orchestral compositions of Jean Sibelius').[12] The volume of the Annals was dedicated to Sibelius in celebration of his 60th anniversary. The translator is unnamed.

Göhler's original article was written as an endorsement of the artistic ideals that Sibelius was thought to embody. In the text, these ideals are contrasted with what the author viewed as damaging influences of the Richard Strauss fad sweeping over Central Europe in the early nineteen-hundreds. Attesting to the urgency of the topic, an abridged version of the text appeared in two other German publications in 1908 and 1909 (Goss 1998, 120). Viewed against its contemporary cultural backdrop, the article is a discussion of an alternative to Strauss's effects on German cultural life. This makes the text highly context-specific and presents several challenges for the translation. It furthermore prompts a question on the motivation behind translating

[12] This translation is mentioned by Hemming as well as by Goss as the only translation of the article. However, Göhler's article had first appeared in Finnish as early as in 1909, over several numbers (Nos 1, 2, 4, 7–8) of the Finnish music periodical *Säveletär*. In addition, a summary of the article was published the newspaper *Uusi Suometar* in the same year. This information was brought to my attention by Benjamin Schweitzer from the University of Greifswald in an e-mail I received on 12 August 2022. Due to the late date of the correspondence, this early version of the translation, which in part differs from the one published in the Annals, could not unfortunately be analysed for this study. However, as Schweitzer points out, it is interesting that this significant international article reached the Finnish audience even before Furuhjelm's biography.

the text, considering how far-removed it is from the Finnish cultural discussions both geographically and, with regard to the republication in the Annals, also temporally.

In the Preface to the Annals, three reasons are given for including the translation in the celebratory volume (n.n. 1926, 8). The editor acknowledges that the text is somewhat dated but explains that Göhler's profound understanding of Sibelius's character and art means that the article merits publication also in Finland and even after nearly two decades. The editor continues to make a remark on Göhler's efforts in promoting Sibelius's music in German concert repertoires, an example of cultural advancement that apparently also warrants the article's inclusion in the volume. Lastly, the Preface mentions the moral capacity of the article: Göhler's text is introduced as a reminder for the Finnish readers of the responsibilities they have towards the art of their nation. While not explicitly explained in the text, this is probably best understood as a part of the nation building process and "the promotion of co-operation between the arts and sciences, with a national focus" (History of the Kalevala Society), which had been the guiding principle of the Kalevala Society since its founding in 1911. Comparing the motivations which Göhler and the Annals have for the publication of the article reveals differing dispositions towards the text: Göhler's aim is to present and discuss the cultural values of Germany, while the objective of the translation is to reinforce the sentiments connected to Sibelius in Finland. In the translation, the change in the relational setting, the spatio-temporal context of the article, is partly reconciled by altering the viewpoint of the text.

The reconciliation is most readily noticeable in how the translation is adapted by omitting several passages and references found in the original article. These include both the beginning and the end of the article as well as two allusive references to German cultural items, a line from Wagner's *Die Walküre*, in which the god Wotan describes his hapless son Siegmund (Göhler 1908, 262), and the final stanza of Hugo von Hofmannsthal's poem *Manche freilich* (ibid., 263). The shared feature of the omissions is that they in one form or another address the German speaking audience and are involved in constructing the framework of Göhler's cultural criticism.

The three paragraphs at the beginning of the original article, missing from the translation, discuss the problematic nature of fame. Göhler maintains that Sibelius has undeservedly come to be known only for his minor compositions, such as Valse Triste, which have overshadowed his accomplishments as a composer of large-scale works. Considering the success Sibelius had enjoyed, for example, in London and New York by the time the article was published in Finland, it is quite understandable that this passage was omitted from the translation. The omission is also justified considering the context of the publication: drawing attention to Sibelius's underratedness would clearly have been inappropriate in a volume published in honour of his 60th anniversary. However, removing the paragraphs also changes the point of view of the article and somewhat blurs the underlying cultural criticism of

Göhler's article. In terms of the overall text, the change is subtle but meaningful, as it concerns the motivation of the publication: cultural criticism versus cultural promotion.

Further manipulation of this kind can be found in the final paragraph of the original article, in which Göhler returns to his reproval of the Strauss fad and reiterates his wish that the cultural life of Germany would renounce its affinity with trivial art. However, only the beginning of the paragraph has been translated in the Finnish version, and the paragraph is truncated mid-sentence. In the following, the omitted passage has been written in boldface in the original version:

> Tämä on alkuperäistä taidetta, joka perustuu kokonaisen kansan tuntemistapaan, se on voimakkaan runollisen ja soitannollisen hengen sisäisesti välttämätöntä ilmausta. Erottakaamme musiikista tarkoin kaikki, mikä on toisenlaisen hengen luomaa. [Ø] (Göhler 1926, 26)

> Das ist ursprüngliche Kunst, die im Empfinden eines ganzen Volkes wurzelt, innerlich notwendige Äußerung starken dichterlichen und musikalischen Geistes. Scheiden wir scharf davon, was anderen Geistes ist, **nennen wir ohne Scheu beim rechten Namen, was sich als Scheinkunst jahrelang aufdringlich breitgemacht hat, und heißen wir jeden willkommen, sei er Deutscher, Nord- oder Südländer, der wie Sibelius aus dem Borne einer reichen Phantasie – wie außerordentlich mannigfaltig sind die Gaben seiner Kunst! – den kristallhellen, durch keine Sorte Schlamm getrübten Labetrunk echter Kunst schöpft!**[13] (Göhler 1908, 269; my emphasis)

Göhler's final, rather elaborate sentence urges the readers to take action ("nennen wir ohne Scheu beim rechten Namen, was sich als Scheinkunst jahrelang aufdringlich breitgemacht hat") and makes an appeal for expressions of pure art ("heißen wir jeden willkommen […] der […] den […] Labetrunk echter Kunst schöpft"). Neither clause is retained in the translation, thus moving it further away from Göhler's original intent and criticism. The part of the paragraph which is retained in the translation is directly relevant for the Finnish readers, relating

[13] 'This is original art, which is rooted in the feeling of an entire people, the necessary inner expression of a strong poetic and musical spirit. Let us separate from it that which belongs to a different spirit, **let us without hesitation call the invasive spreading of specious art which has continued for many years by its proper name, and let us welcome anyone, whether they be a German, a northerner or a southerner, who, like Sibelius, out of the well of abundant fancy - how exceptionally varied are the gifts of his art! - draws the refreshing crystalline cup of genuine art, untarnished by any mud!'**

Sibelius's music to the sentiments shared by the nation. As not all of the original meaning is conveyed, the shortened final sentence acquires a somewhat different meaning in the translation. While in Göhler's original version, the latter part of the sentence reflects on Sibelius's artistry, again contrasting it with the Strauss mania and its *Scheinkunst* (specious art), the ending of the Finnish translation, by contrast, seems to underline the ideal qualities of Sibelius's music and their connection with the nation that engendered them.

As mentioned above, the translation also leaves out Göhler's cultural allusions, a quotation from Wagner and a poem by Hofmannsthal. The Wagner quotation, "In wilden Leiden erwuchs er sich selbst" ('in grievous distress he grew up by himself'), is from the second act of *Die Walküre*, the second opera in Wagner's Ring cycle. The line is preceded by Göhler's remark that due to the unique national character of Sibelius's music, people outside Finland can only partially understand the composer's artistry. The quotation from Wagner then seems to try to facilitate this understanding by apparently drawing parallels between Sibelius and the character of Siegmund from the Ring cycle, who 'grew up by himself' in the woods with a strong connection to the surrounding nature. The 'grievous distress' also seems to connect with Göhler's ideas about Finland, where 'the rays of the sun are duller, colder and infrequent' and 'rich colours' something of a rarity, and where people's 'thoughts turn inward' and the 'dark forces of life and nature are felt more profoundly' (Göhler 1908, 262–263). Even if the reader is unable to recognise the allusion, its meaning is easily deciphered: Göhler portrays Sibelius as an extraordinary individual whose genius is a reflection of his surrounding environment, harking back to the idea of Sibelius's empathic relationship with nature (although the tone is significantly different from that encountered in Furuhjelm's biography).

If the Wagner quotation served to highlight Sibelius's uniqueness, Göhler's use of Hofmannsthal's poem appeals to the idea of universality:

> Viele Geschicke weben neben dem meinen / Durcheinander spielt sie alle das Dasein, / Und mein Teil ist mehr als dieses Lebens / Schlante Flamme oder schmale Leier.[14] (Göhler 1908, 263)

Just as the Wagner quotation, the poem appears abruptly without an introduction or explanation and thus relies purely on contextual interpretation. The lines follow Göhler's reflections on the uniquely national aspects of Sibelus's music, on the one hand, and the capacity of humans to bring value to their lives by being open to life's

[14] Many fates weave alongside my own / All are interconnected by a common existence / And my part is more than simply this life's / Slender flame or narrow lyre. (Transl. Scott Horton; available at https://harpers.org/2007/11/hofmannsthals-manche-freilich/)

various expressions, on the other. Göhler ponders whether, despite its national nature, Sibelius's music contains qualities that could be considered common to all human experience ("was allem menschlichen Fühlen gleichermaßen eigen ist"; ibid.), linking the use of the stanza to this idea of people's interconnectedness.

In Göhler's original article, the allusions function as a rhetorical device that is used to represent different sides of the same argument, Göhler's call for original and elevated art in the German cultural context. Omitting them from the translation is understandable on the grounds of their, in all likelihood, poor recognition in Finland, but at the same time the act of omission gives the translation a slightly different emphasis. The quotations gain significance as a part of Göhler's negotiation of cultural values. As instances of German cultural accomplishments, they act as reminders of the ideals the nation is capable of achieving even though the article otherwise discusses the works of a foreign artist, Sibelius. Therefore, their absence in the Finnish version is indicative of not only challenges brought about by the translation of allusions but also the shift in the purpose of the text in its new relational setting.

Much of the above has concentrated on making observations on the relational setting of Göhler's original publication. This discussion has foreshadowed my consideration of the Finnish version, whose function, as has been demonstrated, necessarily differs from that of the German original. The Preface of the Annals provided some clues regarding the purpose of the translation. Upon closer inspection, however, they do not seem to offer an actual reason for selecting the text. The question remains: why was it important to translate this text by Göhler? What qualities in Göhler's description of Sibelius made the text relevant for translation 18 years after its original publication?

The translation can be approached by examining its meaning "in temporal and spatial relationship to other events" (Somers & Gibson 1994, 59), in this case, the cultural developments connected to Finland's search for its national identity. Since the late eighteen-hundreds, one significant and recurring cultural discussion had concerned Finland's identity as a nation. The debate featured two main views. One wanted to see Finland acknowledged as an international and modern Western country, while the other advanced the idea of promoting Finland as a distinct nation in its own right (Melgin 2014, 33). In practice, these views became mixed, and Finland's identity as an independent state was often validated through the recognition it received internationally. According to Melgin (2014, 34), an example of this was how, in the early decades of the Finnish independence, the Finns' self-image was often shaped by newspaper articles on the perceived successes of Finnish culture abroad, as reading about these achievements promoted Finland's sense of worth as an independent nation.

Bearing in mind the nature of the Kalevala Society and the Annals as promoters of Finnish culture, Göhler's article can be read as an instance of this type of writing. The text conveys appreciative German views on Sibelius to the Finnish readership. What is more, the manner in which those views are communicated also highlights the exceptional qualities of Finnish culture in the form of Sibelius's music. In other words, the translation both provides the readers with foreign impressions and fosters their sense of exceptionalism, supporting the development of their national identity. This double portrayal of domestic and international views is also at play in the manner in which the entire sixth volume of the Annals is structured, beginning with the volume's dedication 'to Jean Sibelius […] who makes Finland's name resound far away'. To highlight the fact that the volume was published in honour of Sibelius's 60th birthday, the pages after the Preface are reserved for translated congratulatory messages sent to Sibelius from Sweden, Denmark and Norway (1926, 8–12). Göhler's article is followed by a selection of newspaper clippings from the Nordic countries, Great Britain and the United States, again translated into Finnish (1926, 27–40). Despite the character of the Annals of the Kalevala Society as a promoter of Finnish cultural heritage, no Finnish salutations are, interestingly enough, included in the volume. Instead, the part of the volume that celebrates Sibelius is comprised of imports from other, foreign narratives on Sibelius into the Finnish one. Göhler's article and the messages that surround it form a dialogue that balances between an international portrayal and domestic reception of Sibelius's significance.

The discussion above can also be summarised in narrative terms. As far as narrative construction is concerned, the Annals runs the gamut of narrative features. Firstly, the entire celebratory volume represents narrative construction based on relationality, referring to the manner in which the translations "inject [the] target text […] with implicit meanings derived from the way a particular item functions in the public or meta-narratives circulating in the target context" (Baker 2006, 66), and thus reconstituting the narrative through relational accommodation (ibid., 62). The translation of Göhler's article, in particular, demonstrates another side of relationality by obscuring the relational relevance the text had in its source environment (cf. ibid., 66). Thus, it downplays the original cultural context of the text by omitting passages or, reversely, selectively appropriating those that are relevant for the purposes of the translation. This means that the translation is, furthermore, causally emplotted to promote Sibelius's significance in the Finnish relational setting. This causal emplotment connects to the translation's conspicuous temporal displacement. The 18-year gap between the publication of the original and the translation in the Annals allows the Finnish version to concentrate on aspects of the article that are relevant to the Finnish readers and disregard certain aspects of the dated discussion, thus enabling the text to be more readily used as a tool for identity

construction. Finally, considering the purpose of the Annals volume, the durative sequence from the source text to the target text also provides the translation with a historical perspective, a look back at the compositions of Sibelius, appropriate for his anniversary.

As a text that is more ephemeral compared to the other translations in this study, the Finnish translation of Göhler's article may not be one of the most salient or widely read writings on Sibelius. Nevertheless, it serves to illustrate one important aspect of the Sibelius narrative, that is, the manner in which Sibelius's persona was utilised in the Finnish nation building efforts and the institutionalisation of the composer as a national monument. Examples of this development will be encountered in subsequent analyses, including, to an extent, in the one discussed in subsection 4.4 on the translation of Cecil Gray's *Sibelius – The Symphonies*.

4.3 *Jean Sibelius – En konstnärs liv och personlighet* and *Jean Sibelius – taiteilijan elämä ja persoonallisuus* (1935); *Jean Sibelius och hans verk* and *Jean Sibelius ja hänen elämäntyönsä* (1956)

Karl Ekman (Jr) (1895–1962) was a Finland-Swedish non-fiction author and translator. As an author, he was responsible for a number of histories documenting various industrial enterprises in Finland. For the wider public, Ekman is probably best known for his seminal Sibelius biography *Jean Sibelius – en konstnärs liv och personlighet* ('Jean Sibelius – the life and personality of an artist') released in 1935. The book was reissued as an enlarged and corrected edition in 1956 as *Jean Sibelius och hans verk* ('Jean Sibelius and his work'). Both of these editions appeared in Finnish in the same year as the Swedish version.

The Finnish publishing history of Ekman's Sibelius books introduces interesting avenues for examining the construction of the Sibelius narrative. These include questions related to Ekman's role as a supposed self-translator, the differences of the 1935 and 1956 editions and the reasons behind the reissue of the book. However, before delving deeper into the narrative features of the biographies, some remarks need to be made on the inconclusiveness of available information on Ekman and his translatorship.

Considering Ekman's status as the author of an influential book and the fact that Ekman has a personal archive at the National Library of Finland, the availability of relevant information about Ekman's translatorship is surprisingly scarce. The existing information on Ekman mostly focusses on his career development. The record sheet in Ekman's archive tells us that he was born in Bratislava on 29

September 1895.[15] His parents were Karl Ekman Sr, a renowned pianist, and Ida Ekman, née Morduch, a soprano, who often performed Sibelius's compositions and for whom Sibelius wrote several of his solo songs. Ekman graduated from the Swedish-speaking Nya svenska samskolan in 1913, received his M.A. in 1916 and his doctorate in 1922,[16] both from the University of Helsinki, which at the time was still largely Swedish-speaking. He occupied a post as an office manager of the HOP bank in Borgå (Finnish: Porvoo) between 1920 and 1923 and worked for the Holger Schildt publishing company in 1925–1926. After this, in 1926, he became a foreign reporter for the Swedish-language newspaper *Hufvudstadsbladet*, where he worked until 1935.

Ekman's career as an author was largely defined by his industrial histories, the first of which appears to have been *August Eklöf, aktiebolag 1864–1924* published in 1926. This was followed by *Nokia bruk 1868–1928* (1929), *Aktiebolag Troili osakeyhtiö 1911–1936* (1936), *Stockfors bruk* (1936), *Ett gammalt herrgårdsbruks historia. Tykö bruk 1686–1936* (1937), *En gammal helsingforsverkstads historia. John Stenbergs maskinfabrik 1882–1942* (1943) and *Masugnen som blev storgjuteri. Högfors bruk 1–2* (1952). Four of these histories also appeared in Finnish: the Finnish translation of *Nokia bruk* came out in 1930, *Aktiebolag Troili osakeyhtiö* was published in both Swedish and Finnish in 1936, the translation of *Tykö bruk* was released in 1938, and the translations of the two volumes of the history of *Högfors bruk* came out in 1953 and 1954. Apart from the translation of *Tykö bruk*, there is no mention of histories having been translated in the Finnish versions.

Outside the publishing history of these works, little information, for instance, on Ekman's working methods has survived. To access the practicalities of Ekman's work, inferences need to be drawn from circumstantial evidence rather than documented facts, which is naturally a rather unfortunate point of departure, considering that the questions the available information raises are rather interesting in terms of translation. This study is particularly intrigued by the question of Ekman's level of Finnish as a person who came from a Swedish-speaking family, received his schooling in Swedish, made his career in Swedish-speaking circles, whose recorded translation history apart from the Sibelius biography is exclusively into Swedish and whose archive only contains Swedish-language (and some English-language) personal notes. The question is relevant due to the fact that both the Swedish and the Finnish versions of the Sibelius biographies are credited directly to

15 A copy of the record is also available for download at http://urn.fi/URN:NBN:fi-fe2014100845103

16 According to Fennica, Ekman's doctoral thesis *Nietzsches estetik: en konstruktion och en kritik* was published by Schildt in 1920 but the archival record sheet states that Ekman received his doctorate in 1922.

Ekman. This would give reason to discuss these books as instances of auto- or self-translation, which in turn would affect the examination of Ekman's agency, for example. Similarly, however, any indication of the existence of covert translation practices would influence the exploration of the questions surrounding Ekman's biographies.

There is some reason to speculate on the idea that the industrial histories Ekman wrote could have been translated into Finnish by an external translator although the Finnish histories, except for the translation of *Tykö bruk,* are not in any manner marked as translations. Hiidenmaa (2013, 99) writes that in the early 20th century translated non-fiction books were not always acknowledged as translations due to the perceived expert nature of non-fiction writing, which sometimes resulted in leaving the translator unmentioned. Therefore, as far as Ekman's industrial histories are concerned, it would not be unprecedented to suggest that the works could have been translated into Finnish by others, for instance, clerks employed by the industries.

One instance that could indicate such a practice is the two volumes of *Högfors bruk*, which was for the most part written by Ekman but complemented by the journalist and author W. E. Nordström, who provided introductions and final chapters to both of the volumes. As mentioned above, the Finnish translations of the two volumes appeared in 1953 and 1954 after the publication of the original Swedish version in 1952. No translator was mentioned in either of the books. However, it appears rather likely that the work was translated by an external translator. This assumption is based upon the examination of the bibliography *W. E. Nordströms tryckta publikationer 1932–1979* ('W.E. Nordström's printed publications 1932–1979'), which was compiled by Olof Mustelin in 1979 and which contains well over a thousand bibliographical entries written by the second author of *Högfors bruk*. The Finnish version of the *Högfors bruk* is one of only five texts that Nordström published in Finnish. At the same time, it is also rather strikingly the sole one that makes no mention of a translator in the publishing record. Furthermore, based on the information available, it seems likely that Ekman was not responsible for the Finnish translation of his part of the text. According to the foreword of the *Högfors bruk* history, Ekman left the project before it was finished, leaving Nordström to finish the book and edit Ekman's manuscript. Unless Ekman worked on the Swedish and Finnish versions of the history at the same time, he could not have been responsible for the translations of the Finnish versions, having abandoned the project before the Finnish history was published. Moreover, the final form of the text is not Ekman's, as Nordström is mentioned as having edited his manuscript for publication. Finally, the forewords of the histories are dated and signed, not by Nordström or Ekman, but by *Kymmene Aktiebolag, Högfors bruk* ('Kymi Ltd, Högfors factory'), indicating an agency other than the named authors.

Due to inconclusive evidence, it is impossible to say to what extent this practice could be considered standard. However, if we assume that in all the industrial histories that Ekman wrote the author's role was only to prepare the Swedish-language manuscript and that the Finnish translations were produced by other people, can we feel confident that Ekman's knowledge of Finnish was strong enough to translate his Sibelius biographies? Apart from the perhaps now dubious self-translations, the only surviving piece of evidence connecting him to Finnish is his only translation from Finnish, the Swedish translation of Unto Seppänen's novel *Markku och hans släkt* in 1940 (orig. *Markku ja hänen sukunsa*, 1939). Compared to his other translation work, Ekman untypically translated this book in co-operation with the journalist Olof Enckell, who later became Professor of Swedish Literature at the University of Helsinki. It proves that Ekman had at least a working knowledge of Finnish but perhaps also makes the extent of his Finnish skills suspect. Of the two translators, Enckell clearly had more experience in translating from Finnish, since by 1940 he had already translated several books from Finnish into Swedish. *Markku och hans släkt* remained the only instance of literary translation from Finnish for Ekman, who mostly translated from English.

In a series of one-offs, only one piece of non-fiction writing commissioned from Ekman has been explicitly mentioned to have been translated by a translator: Ekman's 1937 *Tykö bruk* was translated from the Swedish manuscript by Viki Kärkkäinen, a Finnish journalist, translator and poet, and published in 1938 entitled *Herraskartanon vanhan tehtaan historia: Teijon tehdas 1686–1936*. The reason for mentioning Kärkkäinen as the translator may be connected to his profile as someone who wished to be explicitly recognised as one. Having translated, for instance, the Nobel prize winners Knut Hamsun and Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, translation was clearly an activity in which Kärkkäinen was invested.

In summary, of the four Finnish translations of Ekman's industrial histories, one can without a doubt be identified as a translation while another one, *Högfors bruk,* is quite likely a translation as well. Insufficient evidence prevents any worthwhile remarks on the origins of the Finnish translations of *Nokia bruk* and *Troili*, but considering previous research in the field of Finnish non-fiction translation in general as well as Ekman's documented translation practice into Swedish it seems possible that they could have been translated by someone other than Ekman. If we are to accept this, then the self-translation of the Sibelius biography appears quite extraordinary.

Unfortunately, the discussion on Ekman's profile as a Swedish to Finnish self-translator cannot venture beyond speculation and remains inconclusive on account of the available evidence. The archives of neither Åbo Akademi (which holds the archive of Schildts Förlag) nor the National Library contain any conclusive information on Ekman's translational activities. The publishing company Otava,

furthermore, has no record of the author.[17] The history of Ekman's linguistic practices lacks transparency as often seems to be the case in circumstances that are multilingual in nature. Where the use of several languages seems natural, one rarely finds reason to pay particular attention to it. Therefore, although there are question marks that appear to surround Ekman's career as a writer and translator, one is hard-pressed to actually find solid proof of ghost translators – agents "taking on translation work for a nominal literary translator without being formally credited for it" (Solum 2015, 24) – or, indeed, even acknowledgement of multilingual practices.

This is rather common in the context of Finnish literary history. According to Grönstrand (2016), language ideological reasons have often influenced discussions on Finnish literature. Questions of language were especially important in the late 19th century, when the idea that the Finnish identity could be built on the literary foundation laid by Swedish-speaking Runeberg and Topelius came to be discarded. Grönstrand argues (2016, 47) that similar thinking also continued to affect ideas on literature in the 20th century and that the crossing of linguistic barriers was only rarely mentioned.

While Grönstrand approaches her topic from the point of view of belles-lettres, she also echoes the ideas on non-fiction presented by Hiidenmaa. Grönstrand maintains that "monolingualising" the multilingual practices of authors, that is, disregarding their linguistic variedness in institutionalised contexts, such as literary histories, aims to maintain the purity of language and the idea of literature as a unifier of nations. It is not implausible to suggest that a book on Sibelius – a Finnish symbol and, as established, also a figure caught in the throes of language politics – may have fallen victim to monolingualising. With the language feud of the late 1920s fresh in mind, the release of Ekman's Sibelius biography in 1935 could have been surrounded by an air of reservation which would have led to the presentation of both language versions as originals or even to the use of a ghost translator.

A nod in this direction is the publishing company Otava's advance advertisement in the magazine *Opintotoveri* (n:o 8, 1935), which promotes Ekman's 'soon to be published book' by announcing that 'for the first time, the Finnish speaking readership will have the opportunity to acquaint themselves with the life and work of our great composer, as until now works on Sibelius have been written in foreign languages'.[18] The advertisement is baffling in more ways than one. Stating that

17 My personal communication with Otava's archivist Tiina Pirttimäki, dated 23 January 2014, contains the supposition that no records have been preserved because authors and translators who lived and worked in the Helsinki area tended to meet with the publisher in person, leaving behind no documentation.

18 "Ensi kerran suomenkielisellä yleisöllä on tilaisuus tutustua suuren säveltäjämme elämään ja työhön, sillä tähän astiset [sic] Sibelius-teokset ovat olleet vieraskielisiä."

Ekman's biography was the first book to provide the Finnish speaking readers with information on Sibelius seems odd, remembering that Furuhjelm's Sibelius book and its Finnish translation had been published 19 years earlier. If we are to give Otava the benefit of the doubt and trust that the publishing company was not trying to entirely dismiss Furuhjelm's book and claim his Swedish to be a "foreign language", drawing attention to the novelty of the biography may have been Otava's attempt to highlight the exceptional approach of Ekman's book, which was also noticed by some newspaper reviews. For instance, *Turunmaa* (8.12.1935, 5) and *Hufvudstadsbladet* (21.9.1935, 1) pointed out that the biography was the first one to focus on Sibelius at a more personal level. Otava's phrasing may also have been a reference to the prematurity of Furuhjelm's biography compared to, for example, Cecil Gray's lauded biography, which had come out in 1931.

How ever the advertisement is to be interpreted, the ending seems to underline the salience of originally Finnish-language Sibelius literature. The irony is that even in its supposedly self-translated form, Ekman's Finnish version was a translation as well. The original notes and manuscript were written in Swedish, as it is safe to assume that the conversations between Ekman and Sibelius were had in this language. However, as the Swedish and Finnish versions were published at the same time and as the Finnish version was presented as an original alongside the Swedish version, the Finnish speaking audience perceived Ekman's *Taiteilijan elämä ja personallisuus* as the first originally Finnish-language book on their composer. Since the 1935 edition of Ekman's biography was largely based on quotations from Sibelius, giving no indication of translational practices also meant that the book gave an impression of the composer as a Finnish speaker. While this can be considered an inadvertent side effect of the translation process, it simultaneously provides an example of a monolingualising practice and blurs the linguistic reality surrounding the biography.

This rather lengthy introduction to the biographies serves as a demonstration of the unanswered, language-related questions present in the examination of the materials under study. It shows that the available materials are often sketchy at best and that more research is needed to create a more solid image of the translation practices in various fields. Next, I shall venture deeper into Ekman's biographies themselves, maintaining the established presumption that his biographies were self-translations. A particular point of interest will be the publication of the fourth edition of the biography and general differences between the 1935 and 1956 versions.

When Ekman's original Sibelius biography was published in 1935, the work was greeted in newspaper reviews as a welcome addition to Sibelius-related literature as the first Sibelius biography to focus on the personal life and personality of the often evasive composer (cf., e.g., *Uusi Suomi* 1.11.1935, 8; *Keskisuomalainen* 8.11.1935, 3). According to Mäkelä (2007, 91–92), Karl Ekman Jr was allowed to write his

biography as Sibelius's favour to Ekman's parents. For the same reason, Sibelius did not later publicly correct any of the mistakes the book contained despite his grievance with its inaccuracies, and saved the complaints about having been misquoted and misunderstood by Ekman for his journal (Riikonen 2013, 478; Goss 1999, 63; cf. Tawaststjerna 1988, 354). The reception by the Finnish readers was enthusiastic. The biography was heralded as a cultural achievement (*Salmetar*, 16.11.1935, 4), with many newspaper reviews drawing attention to the manner in which Ekman let Sibelius speak directly through the book's numerous quotations (cf., e.g., *Salmetar* 16.11.1935, 4; *Kansan Voima* 21.12.1935, 6; *Mikkelin Sanomat* 28.12.1935, 3). With only Ekman's name adorning both versions of the biography, the book gave no reason for any language political debates. The newspaper *Turunmaa* (8.12.1935, 5) did, however, mention that the biography had been published simultaneously in Finnish and in Swedish and remarked that in places the fluency of the Finnish left something to be desired.

The personal nature of Ekman's book set it apart from previous biographies and secured its place among some of the foremost works on Sibelius also internationally (Mäkelä 2007, 92) – for instance, Edward Birse's 1936 English translation was available in reprint well into the 1970s. As Ekman (1935, 6) mentions in the Foreword to the biography, Sibelius had previously been reluctant to talk about himself or explain his works to the general public. Getting Sibelius to talk about himself was not without its difficulties, either. In a letter draft dated 25 October 1956 available at the archives of the National Library of Finland, Ekman explains that breaking Sibelius's life-long silence required some effort: producing the 'self-declarations', which formed 'the essential content and raison d'être' of the 1935 biography, was not easy for Sibelius, which meant that Ekman was left with the task of reformulating Sibelius's statements into acceptable prose. Ekman continues that he wanted to make his own part as inconspicuous as possible in order to highlight Sibelius's role as the raconteur.

The contrast between the reception of the biography and Sibelius's own aversion to it reveal interesting aspects about narrative construction. By the extensive use of quotations, Ekman effectively brought Sibelius's personal narrative into the public one. At the same time, however, the interpretation of the composer's personal narrative was at least partly Ekman's, keeping in mind Sibelius's reaction to the biography as well as the fact that a biography is, in and of itself, a causally emplotted narrative, a purposefully composed life story. The use of Sibelius's quotations in a narrative about his own life can be considered causal emplotment on Ekman's side, as the quotations provided a means of giving credence to the life narrative presented to the readership. For instance, demonstrating Sibelius's empathy with nature near the beginning of the book, Ekman (1935b, 35) writes how Sibelius's 'creativity had developed in close contact with nature, in fertile interaction between natural

sensations and musical inspiration, ensuring richness of thought and originality'.[19] This introduction is followed by a quotation from Sibelius, who reminisces about holding endless concerts to birds overviewing the Vanajavesi lake and playing his violin to the sea while standing at the prow of a boat (ibid.).

Having his personal narrative made public property also had an impact on Sibelius's understanding of himself and the manner in which he perceived his role in the public eye. In his journal, Sibelius wrote about being 'caught in an inescapable web of lies' (Mäkelä 2007, 99), referring to how his statements were handled by the public. The negative experiences created by works such as Ekman's biography and von Törne's memoir (see 4.5) made Sibelius cautious to the point where he actively hindered the work of his later researchers, such as Otto Andersson (see 4.9) and Harold E. Johnson (see 4.10) (ibid.).

The fourth, revised and enlarged edition of the biography, which has also been called Sibelius's authorised biography (Goss 1998, 63), was released in 1956 with a new title. Again, the two language versions of the book came out in the same year, published by Schildts Förlag and Otava in Swedish and Finnish, respectively. The reasons for the reworking of the original volume for the fourth edition are never explicitly given by Ekman in the Foreword of the book. The Foreword does, however, throw some light on the revision principles and indicates how the enlarged edition differs from the original version. Ekman explains that the revisions to the 1935 version were made on the basis of Sibelius's correction notes from the 1930s and that the passage of time had given some new perspective into the significance of Sibelius's life's work (Ekman 1956b, 8). The fourth edition aims to emphasise Sibelius's role as a defender of 'Finnish values' and his importance as a great national figure (ibid.), a feat presumably achieved by the addition of passages Ekman wrote for the 1956 version. In addition to this added historical perspective, the fourth edition also includes more information on Sibelius's compositions. This is a significant difference to the 1935 version, which was never intended to concentrate on Sibelius's music and even began by stating that

> It is not our intention in this book to enter into competition with the numerous trustworthy and intelligent authors who have analysed and described Jean Sibelius the composer and his work in an excellent manner. We have been drawn

[19] "Luomiskyky oli kehittynyt läheisessä kosketuksessa luontoon, hedelmöittävässä vuorovaikutuksessa luonnontunteen ja musikaalisen innoituksen kesken, ja se takasi ajatuksen rikkauden sekä alkuperäisyyden."

> to a hitherto untrodden field to which we have turned our interest: Jean Sibelius the man, the unique personality behind his work. (Ekman 1936b, 5)[20]

However, in the Foreword to the fourth edition, Ekman writes that after careful deliberation he has come to the conclusion that Sibelius's music deserves more attention and that Sibelius's psychological and humane characteristics gain further meaning through the introductions of his works.

The letter draft in Ekman's archive at the National Library of Finland referred to above provides some further insight into the revision process. The letter mentions that the re-release of the book occurred at the initiative of the publisher but that the idea to revise and enlarge the text was Ekman's. The letter calls the original version fragmentary, while the enlarged edition is considered more satisfactory. Ekman writes that the 1935 version had to focus on Sibelius's self-declarations, as it would have been inconsiderate to have given the impression that the author was competing for the readership's attention during Sibelius's anniversary year. In 1955, by contrast, Sibelius's statements were already well known, which made it possible to add passages to the biography that made the book more substantial and original. Ekman's letter draft goes on to give a slightly different account of how the music examples came to be added to the fourth edition. Ekman writes that the idea to add information about Sibelius's compositions came from the publisher and that he 'unhesitatingly accepted the proposition without giving any thought to what [he] was getting into'.[21] Interesting are also Ekman's thoughts on his agency, given in the penultimate paragraph of the letter: 'So here I am all of a sudden, author of the most comprehensive Sibelius book to date, through no volition or ambition of my own. I am an amateur music scribbler par excellence.'[22]

Ekman's lack of willingness in asserting his agency becomes suspect as a result of another letter found in the archive. In a typewritten letter draft to a British publisher dated 1 August 1956, Ekman underlines the extensive work that the preparation of the fourth edition has required: "We are now publishing a re-issue, thoroughly revised and considerably enlarged by the author. Practically a new book, entitled JEAN SIBELIUS AND HIS WORK". This, too, goes against Ekman's

[20] Tarkoituksemme ei ole ollut ryhtyä tällä kirjalla kilpailuun niiden monien luotettavien ja älykkäiden kirjoittajien kanssa, jotka erinomaisella tavalla ovat eritelleet ja kuvailleet säveltäjä Jean Sibeliusta ja hänen tuotantoaan. Meitä on houkutellut tähän asti muokkaamaton ala ja olemme kohdistaneet mielenkiintomme kokonaan siihen: Jean Sibeliukseen ihmisenä, teosten takana piilevään omalaatuiseen persoonallisuuteen.

[21] Jag gick tveklöst med på förslaget, utan att ana vad jag verkligen gav mig in på.

[22] Så kom det sig att jag nu plötsligt står som auktor till den t.v. kompaktaste Sibeliusboken, utan att egentligen ha velat det och utan att sätta någon ambition däri. Jag är ju en i allra högsta grad improviserad musikskribent.

Foreword to the fourth edition, in which he maintains that 'in essence, the original form has been retained, and corrections based on the Master's notes dating back to the 1930s have only been made here and there' (Ekman 1956b, 8).[23] The letter was first addressed to Macmillan and Company Ltd., but the original recipient was later struck through and the name and address of Cassell & Company Ltd was added in pencil. The letter suggests that Ekman was actively seeking an international publisher for the enlarged edition. The letter also reveals that at this point Ekman had already contacted Alfred A. Knopf Inc. in the United States and received a response suggesting a broader anglophone publication plan (emphasis in the original):

> We should not be very favorable to the idea of ourselves making a translation for our own sole use, but if an English publisher were either willing to use our translation or were to make a translation in England, the problem would be solved much more satisfactorily.

At the end of his draft letter, Ekman even proposes a certain type of translator to carry out the translation task, saying he "would greatly prefer a literary man, not entirely devoid of musical experience". Despite Ekman's active efforts to have the 1956 version of the biography published in English, *Jean Sibelius och hans verk* only appeared in Swedish and in Finnish.

Although archival evidence provides little information on Ekman's translatorship, Ekman's personal notes, the information provided by the Forewords of the biographies as well as the discrepancies between these two offer interesting glimpses into Ekman's agency and authorship as well as their development. Ekman's role in the creation of the original version seems almost apologetic, considering that the project came about as Sibelius's personal favour to Ekman's parents. There is nothing apologetic about the revision of the fourth edition, however. Ekman's active involvement in proposing the enlargement is a clear sign of professional ambition regardless of his attempts at denying any such endeavours in his draft letter. Ekman's desire to more clearly participate in the creation of a particular story also becomes evident in the added passages of the fourth edition, which aim to portray Sibelius not only by quoting his own words but by painting an image of a 'defender of the most sacred values of the Finnish nation' (Ekman 1956b, 8).

The promotion of *Jean Sibelius och hans verk* to international publishers is yet another sign of Ekman's agency and his willingness and ability to participate in the translation process as an agent asserting his precursory authorship. In a manner of

[23] Alkuperäinen muoto on olennaiselta osaltaan säilytetty, vain siellä täällä on tehty mestarin 1930-luvulta peräisin oleviin muistiinpanoihin perustuvia korjauksia.

speaking, Ekman's biographies are examples of a certain arbitrariness connected with narrative construction. While the objective of the 1935 biography was to let the Finnish readership hear Sibelius's own voice, Ekman's interpretation failed to convey Sibelius's message in a manner that the composer would have found satisfactory. Despite this failure, the biography was immensely successful among the reading public, causing the inaccurate information to be widely circulated. The author's later attempt to remedy the damage done fell short despite his concerted efforts to exert his agency. In other words, sometimes the attempt to construct a certain kind of narrative can succeed or fail depending on the point of view, and narratives may assume unexpected meanings depending on the agencies at play in the narrative construction.

The following section will continue discussing the theme of agency. It will examine Cecil Gray's analysis of Sibelius's symphonies, which appeared in English in the same year as Ekman's original biography, and its 1945 Finnish translation by Sibelius's son-in-law Jussi Jalas.

4.4 *Sibelius: The Symphonies* (1935) and *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat* (1945)

Cecil Gray's *Sibelius – The Symphonies* is one of the two predominantly theoretical works in the material of this study. Some of the other books, such as Furuhjelm's biography discussed above, also include analytical remarks and sections that discuss Sibelius's works from a more music theoretical point of view, but Gray's entire book is built around analyses of Sibelius's symphonies. Analysing *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat* focusses on a new strand in the Sibelius narrative: the discussion surrounding Sibelius's symphonies, including themes such as traditionalism versus modernism, renewal of the symphonic form as well as the fate of the Eighth Symphony, the drafts of which Sibelius burned in the 1940s.

Gray, who was also one of the early Sibelius biographers with his 1931 book on the composer, published *Sibelius – The Symphonies* with Oxford University Press in 1935. Although the book is an analytical piece of writing, its preface implies that it is nevertheless aimed at the layman. In the author's foreword Gray (Gray & Jalas 1945, 5) mentions that since Sibelius's compositions have established themselves in the concert repertoires of all significant orchestras in the Anglo-Saxon countries, a book that would introduce and examine Sibelius's symphonies is probably needed. This type of thinking also seems to have influenced the translation of the book. The Finnish version was published in a series of music guides intended to 'introduce its readers to the different forms of musical art and the works of musical masters in a matter-of-fact and enjoyable way' (Gray & Jalas 1945, back cover). In the second foreword to the book, the translator Jussi Jalas (1908–1985), Sibelius's son-in-law

and an internationally renowned conductor, remarks that the concise format and easily understandable writing style of Gray's book will undoubtedly appeal to the Finnish readership, who have previously not been able to access academic analyses of Sibelius's music (Gray & Jalas 1945, 8).

The Finnish translation has one striking feature: the translation is replete with comments and additions made by Jalas, comprising approximately one tenth of the overall length of the Finnish translation.[24] The comments are typographically marked with italics and placed in square brackets. Jalas justifies these additions in his foreword (Gray and Jalas 1945, 9) by noting that Gray's text includes certain inaccuracies which needed to be corrected in the translation. He continues that the book also includes some additional commentary which introduces the reader to the original features of Sibelius's musical form uncovered by Finnish music theory since the publication of Gray's original book. In particular, Jalas relies on the findings of Eino Roiha, who in 1943 had defended a doctoral thesis on the formal aspects of Sibelius's symphonies, and Ilmari Krohn, who was one of the key figures in the field of Finnish music theory for a good part of the 20th century. By connecting Gray's text with the developments in Finnish musicology, Jalas efficiently adopts the translation into the Finnish relational setting and weaves Gray's book into the budding canon of Sibelius analysis.

Jalas remarks on the use of Krohn's terminology, in particular, in his translator's foreword (Gray & Jalas 1945, 10). He mentions having discarded some of Krohn's terminology, such as the word *pääponsi*, Krohn's coinage for 'main theme', as somewhat esoteric and not yet fully established. In the same breath, Jalas admits to having used Krohn's elaborate analytical terminology in contexts where Gray's analysis remains more cursory. Krohn's terms are utilised, for instance, in discussions relating to matters of form and, in Jalas's words, often in places 'where the source text merely makes a particular reference to some longer passage that occurs in a composition' (ibid.). As a result, the use of Krohn's terminology adds a further layer of information to the text, causing the translated analysis to include not only the more immediately perceivable commentary placed in square brackets but also tacitly added interpretative layers in the form of terminological choices.

As products of the Finnish music culture, Krohn's terms represent a type of realia. In Translation Studies, realia are normally defined as concepts "which are found in a given source culture but not in a given target culture" (Leppihalme 2011,

[24] This figure was obtained by calculating the approximate number of commentary rows and dividing the sum by the multiplication of pages and the number of rows per page. This means that text-wise the share of the commentary is even greater, since 62 of the book's 102 pages (excluding both forewords) contain illustrations from the scores of Sibelius's symphonies.

n.p.) or "intimately bound up with the universe of reference of the original culture" (Lefevere 1993, 122). They are considered to give the original "a certain degree of local 'colour' and 'flavour'" which is then lost or at least diluted in the translation (Leppihalme 2011, n.p.). However, as the realia used in Jalas's translation are products of the target culture, the opposite can be considered to be true. By making use of Finnish realia in lieu of more general terminology, the translation amplifies the Finnish character of the translation and, as when translating source culture realia into the target culture, "look[s] for solutions that serve current target-cultural norms and other aspects of the translation situation" (ibid.).

As already mentioned, the covert alterations of the analysis comprise only one set of changes in the translation of Gray's book. A second set is comprised of a host of comments and additions made by the translator. These additions are so numerous that the book transcends its status as a mere translation and merits the mentioning of Jalas alongside Gray on the cover of the book, suggesting not only the role of an executive translator but also that of an author. Indeed, Fennica, the National Bibliography of Finland, labels Jalas as the 'translator, author of foreword, author of commentary' of the Finnish version.

Through Jalas's commentary, the Finnish version becomes a review as well as a criticism of the foreign Sibelius analysis. This is achieved through various types of alterations: The book includes several comments in which Jalas provides explanations or further details on something Gray writes (e.g., pp. 58, 106). The commentary makes several corrections to Gray's misinterpretations (e.g., pp. 47, 53) and rephrases Gray's statements (e.g., pp. 24, 47). Jalas also corrects some factual errors, including Gray's misconception about the commission of the Fifth and completion of the Seventh Symphony (pp. 65 and 101, respectively), and provides references to additional Finnish analyses and research on Sibelius's music (e.g., pp. 19, 25, 71–75). Jalas's comments turn the translation into a unilateral dialogue in which Gray's analysis is confidently emended and updated based on recent, Finnish, musicological findings.

This confidence owes to Jalas's authorial voice, which allows him to frame the translation with his commentary. In Baker's terms, this authority comes from Jalas occupying two frame spaces (Baker 2006, 109). This means that instead of the conventional frame space of a translator, Jalas's agency also draws on another normative mode of action, determined by his capacity as a music professional. Translators' prescribed frame space often constrains their discursive agency and contains the idea of invisibility. Translators normally exceed these boundaries only in translator's prefaces or, covertly, through word choices and rewordings (ibid., 110–111). What makes Jalas notably different from the examples provided by Baker is his reliance on an overtly visible and intervening translation strategy in which he presents himself not only as a translator but also as an expert in the field of music,

thus assuming a double role in the creation of the target text. The double frame space Jalas occupies expands his discursive agency beyond that of an ordinary translator and enables him to speak with an authorial voice alongside Gray as a fellow music professional. Moreover, by virtue of knowledge accrued in the course of the ten years between the publication of the original and the translation and as the conductor who as Sibelius's son-in-law became a 'significant mediator of Sibelius's intentions' (Dahlström 2009 [2001]), Jalas's voice overpowers that of Gray.

In the examination of the translation's narrative construction, Jalas's agency becomes one of the central points of interest. Jalas began studying the piano at the Helsinki Conservatory in 1926 and graduated in 1932. He also studied languages and musicology at the University of Helsinki, where he was taught by Ilmari Krohn, whom Jalas held in high regard and whose theoretical thinking had a significant impact on Jalas's own musical development. His fascination with languages carried over to his work as a musician. In addition to the two Sibelius-related works discussed in this study, he translated several operas into Finnish, including Britten's *Peter Grimes* (1949), Honegger's *Jeanne d'Arc* (1954), Debussy's *Pelléas and Mélisande* (1958) and Bartók's *Bluebeard's Castle* (1981). Jalas held several esteemed positions during his career. He worked as the chief conductor at the Finnish Opera (and later National Opera) and taught conducting at the Sibelius Academy, Finland's prestigious and only university of music. With his language skills and comprehensive knowledge of the Finnish music culture, he was in a position to advance the Finnish cultural scene through his translational activities.

Jalas's commentary can be considered a framing strategy that aligns Gray's text with the translator's narrative position: the additions provide a means of reading Gray's text from a particularly Finnish perspective and frame the translation in terms of the Finnish discussion on Sibelius's music. The temporal framing of the translation (which can also be regarded as a change in the relational setting of the text), created by importing a ten-year-old text from Britain to contemporary Finland, produces gaps in the text that are then filled by the addition of Finnish accomplishments in the field of music research. The construction of the book's narrative is largely based on this temporal feature: the lacuna between the writing of Gray's book and its translation by Jalas enables the correction and reinterpretation of Gray's analyses on the basis of Krohn's and Roiha's domestic achievements in music theory. Krohn's book on form analysis (the final volume of his five-part book series on music theory, 1911–1937) had been published in 1937 and Roiha had defended his doctoral thesis on the symphonies of Sibelius in 1941, giving Jalas ample material for discussing Sibelius's music further on the basis of Finnish musicological research.

It is worth noting that in spite of these and other advancements in musical scholarship in Finland, the first book to systematically discuss Sibelius's symphonies

in Finnish and to be available to a larger audience was a translation from English. This lends itself to a double reading of the significance of Jalas's translational undertaking that is not dissimilar to the one discussed in the section on the translation of Göhler's article: On the one hand, it is possible to consider the translation of Gray's book as an act of reaching out to the broader European context in an attempt to position the cultural life of Finland in relation to the wider Western heritage and European cultural discussions. On the other hand, providing markedly Finnish reinterpretations of Gray's analyses suggests a more nationally bound approach to Sibelius. This time, however, the "ownership" over Sibelius's music and its interpretation is more possessive than in the case of Göhler's article and Finnish views take precedence over those presented in the English original. The translation effectively reconstitutes Gray's text in the relational setting of the Finnish cultural narrative – a feature that would hardly have been possible in the manner presented without the particular type of agential input provided by Jalas.

This section was the first one to delve deeper into the significance of agency in the construction of narratives. As such, it provided a rather extraordinary example of translatorship which manifested itself both at the level of the translation and the commentary. In the following section, I shall continue to explore the idea of agency. This time, however, the consideration will be rooted in questions related to the position of Finland-Swedish translation and self-translation.

4.5 *Sibelius – A Close-Up* (1937), *Sibelius i närbild och samtal* (1945/1965) and the Finnish translation of the Swedish version *Sibelius – lähikuvia ja keskusteluja* (1945/1965)

Sibelius – A Close-Up is a memoir written by Finland-Swedish Bengt von Törne (1891–1967), a former composition student of Furuhjelm who also took orchestration lessons from Sibelius. The book was published by Faber & Faber in London in 1937 and by Houghton Mifflin & Co in Boston later in the same year.[25] In 1945, the book was translated into Swedish by von Törne himself and into Finnish from the Swedish version by Sibelius's daughter Margareta Jalas (1908–1988). The second, augmented Swedish edition, which included an added chapter as well as examples from Sibelius's scores in honour of Sibelius's 90th anniversary, was published in 1955. The Finnish version of the augmented edition followed for

[25] In the first edition of the English version of the book, the nobiliary particle of von Törne's name appears in its French form *de*. Although none of the sources I have encountered justify the change, the political climate of the late 1930s could offer a plausible explanation for the substitution.

Sibelius's centenary ten years later in 1965, with the final chapter translated by Erkki Salmenhaara (1941–2002). In Finland, the Swedish editions of the book were published by Söderström and the Finnish versions by Otava. The original book comprises eight and the augmented version nine chapters, in which von Törne predominantly reminisces on his encounters with Sibelius and imbues the stories with "observations that are supposedly the great man's [Sibelius's] own" (Goss 1998, 74). von Törne's contribution to Sibelius-related literature has become particularly famous for the reaction it aroused in the German cultural critic and philosopher Theodor Adorno (1903–1969), whose influential review "Glosse über Sibelius" in 1938 became an inseparable part of the overall Sibelius narrative both nationally and internationally.

The narrative the book creates is intimately connected to von Törne's personal connection with Sibelius, his agency as an author and a translator as well as his ability to promote his own work. Apart from having been a composer, von Törne was also a cultural historian who wrote several well received works on various historical topics, such as the Spanish and the Italian renaissance (Backman 2009). *Sibelius – A Close-Up* was based on a series of lectures von Törne gave on Sibelius in England (Mäkelä 2007, 92). The book was said to have been based on a series of conversations between the author and Sibelius, but later research has questioned this claim. Although von Törne and Sibelius had met several times in the 1910s, the views presented in the book as Sibelius's, including disparaging remarks on composers such as Wagner, Mahler and Debussy, seem to a great extent to have been von Törne's own.

Most of the chapters describe a particular meeting with Sibelius in great detail, and Sibelius's thoughts are communicated through numerous anecdotes marked as quotations. This manner of writing prompts Mäkelä (ibid.) to question von Törne's motivations for writing the book and to propose that von Törne's approach may have been rather calculating and self-serving. Scholars have suggested that certain self-promotion was indeed present in the creation of the book. According to Goss (1998, 74), *A Close-Up* was "endlessly promoted" and "irksomely publicized" by the author, while Mäkelä (2008, 123) remarks that the motivation behind writing the book was von Törne's desire to present himself as Sibelius's trusted associate. At a personal level, von Törne's endeavours were successful, as they resulted in the book or parts of it being widely translated. Before the Swedish and Finnish translations already mentioned, the book also received an Italian version in 1943, and sections of *A Close-Up* and its translations appeared as separate articles in English, Swedish, Finnish and German (Goss 1998, 74). As the texts spread across linguistic and geographical divides, so did its misrepresentations.

In one particular instance these misrepresentations caused a fierce reaction. von Törne's book triggered an outraged response in Theodor Adorno whose "Glosse über

Sibelius" verbally assaulted the composer and his following. Adorno's text appeared in 1938 as an untitled review of *A Close-Up* in *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung*, a journal of social sciences and promoter of social critique and Marxist humanism edited in exile (Mäkelä 2007, 122). Upon closer examination, the text reveals itself to be a criticism of Sibelius rather than of von Törne's book – the author's name is not even mentioned in the essay itself (Oramo 2021 [1996], n.p.; Mäkelä 2007, 92).

Adorno's aversion to Sibelius had increased during his exile in England and the United States, both being countries in which Sibelius's compositions were much preferred over those of Arnold Schönberg, his pupils or even Mahler (Goss 1995, 131–132). Sibelius's popularity in the Anglo-American world baffled Adorno, who, as a jab at Sibelius's triviality, remarked that in England and the United States the composer was mentioned as frequently as the name of some car brand (Adorno 2009, 49). Apart from Adorno's personal dislike, the attack in "Glosse" seems to have been influenced by the fact that Sibelius was also valued in Hitler's Germany, if only by virtue of him not being Jewish, while the works of the Second Viennese School, a group of composers centred around the figure of Schönberg and his atonal twelve-tone composition technique, were considered 'degenerate art' (Oramo 2021 [1996] n.p.). Adorno's personal investment in the Second Viennese School and its ideals of progress made him view Sibelius's music as reactionary and unintellectual (Goss 1995, 131; Tarasti 1998, 129–130). Therefore, while Adorno's reaction grew out of certain elitist frustration at the values of contemporary musical tastes, the critique was also significantly informed by moral and political undertones (cf. Oramo 2021 [1996], n.p.).

It is interesting to note that although Adorno's critique was written in the late 1930s, it entered the collective Finnish consciousness at a much later date. Part of this has to do with the fact that *Zeitschrift für Sozialforschung* had introduced the text to a fairly limited audience and that, for most of the previous century, Adorno's critique and other works were predominately read by specialists (Moynihan 2018, 65). However, in 1968 Adorno decided to include it in his collection of essays called *Impromptus*, which became influential in shaping the German reception on Sibelius (Oramo 2009, 54). It was also only in the 1960s, when Tawaststjerna was asked to write an article for a book series of the Institut für Wertungsforschung in Graz, that Adorno's "Glosse über Sibelius" was adopted into the Finnish Sibelius narrative (Mäkelä 2007, 122). Since then, the text has received extensive academic attention. However, "Glosse über Sibelius" did not appear in Finnish before 2006, when it appeared in the journal *Kulttuurivihkot*, translated by Rosa Rönkkö under the title "Reunahuomautus Sibeliuksesta". A second translation by the same title – as well as a commentary on the first translation – by Ilkka Oramo appeared three years later in *Säteitä*, the yearbook of the Department of Music Theory and Translation at the Sibelius Academy.

I would consider the delayed adoption of Adorno's reaction into the Sibelius narrative as key to understanding the narrative construction connected to *A Close-Up*. At the same time, von Törne's case attests to the power of relationality, referring to the manner in which the occurrence of an event has the ability to change our understanding of a narrative. Without Adorno's critique or the academic interest which emerged approximately thirty years after the publication of the text, today's understanding of von Törne's book would be quite different. As argued above, the emplotment of the memoir into the Sibelius narrative has fairly little to do with the content of the book. Instead, the significance of the work is tied to its role in a set of events that followed its appearance and the interpretations which emerged from the temporally distanced reconfiguration of the context. In examining the unfolding of the narrative, it is important to ask what the role of translation was in the overall development. While Adorno's critique was based on von Törne's original English-language text and even though "Glosse" mainly affected Sibelius's reception in German-speaking countries, the fact that *A Close-Up* was introduced into the Finnish relational setting through translation increased Finland's cultural investment in the book.

One could speculate whether the academic interest would have been as extensive had *A Close-Up* remained solely an Anglo-American (and Italian) cultural product. By the time the book began to be analysed in relation to Adorno's response, it had already received altogether four translations in Finland, with the 1955 and 1965 versions being exclusive to the Finnish relational setting. The translations also came out as Sibelius's anniversary publications, which imbued them with additional significance in the Finnish cultural context. In Finland, the unusual publication history of von Törne's book may have only added to its relevance as a work on Sibelius. The fact that it was written by a Finn but first published abroad in countries with a favourable attitude towards Sibelius and his music can be read as overcoming some of the unease related to Finland's self-image in the international context and assuming authority over the narrative construction on Sibelius also outside Finland.

In Finland, the translation of von Törne's book into Finnish was trusted to two figures, Margareta Jalas and Erkki Salmenhaara, both of whom had ties with the contemporary music culture in different capacities. Although information on how the book came to be published is not available, Margareta Jalas may have been the reason why Sibelius authorised the publication despite its questionable content (Oramo 2009, 53). Sibelius was in the habit of letting personal relations take precedence over his sense of self-preservation, as was already demonstrated in the case of Ekman's biography where the composer's loyalties to Ekman's parents prevented him from protesting about the inaccuracies of the book. If allowing the publication was Sibelius's personal favour to his daughter, it would suggest that Margareta Jalas's agency was intimately tied to her relationship with her father.

Unfortunately, Jalas remains a rather shadowy figure.[26] In literature, her role is most often relegated to 'Sibelius's daughter' and 'Jussi Jalas's wife', owing to the fact that the two men in her life were significant public figures but, at the same time, obscuring Jalas's role as a Sibelius promoter.

Of Sibelius's five daughters, Margareta was the only one to obtain an academic degree. She was employed as a secretary and clerk at the Sibelius Academy in 1936–1965 and 1966–1969, respectively (Dahlström 1982, 324), which places her at the nexus of Finnish musical life. Her active years as a translator fall between 1945 and 1960 (excluding the reissuance of von Törne's book in 1965) during which time she translated altogether nine works from Swedish and English into Finnish as well as edited one book. Of these ten titles in her name, five were related to her father. These included four translations of Sibelius-related works and an edited photography book entitled *Jean Sibelius* in 1952. In addition to this section, the questions related to Jalas's agency will unfold in the case studies on her other Sibelius translations, discussed in sections 4.7–4.9.

Lähikuvia ja keskusteluja contains no translator's remarks. Even the foreword, which mentions the translation process, is somewhat confusingly a direct translation of von Törne's Swedish self-translation. Therefore, the remark 'it has been deemed most appropriate not to make changes in the translation, which therefore follows the English original word for word' (von Törne 1965, 5) refers to von Törne's Swedish translation, not to the source text of the Finnish translation.[27] No mention of the Swedish source text appears in the book, but the title page does indicate that the book has been translated into Finnish by Margareta Jalas. The other translator of the 1965 edition, Erkki Salmenhaara, better known as a composer and one of Finland's most notable music scholars, has only been mentioned in a footnote in connection with chapter IX (von Törne 1965, 96). The translation of this added chapter suffers from the same type of ambiguity as the preface, created by not clearly differentiating the translation from the original text. von Törne's original chapter, written in 1955 for Sibelius's 90th anniversary, is entitled "Sibelius inför sitt tionde decennium" ('Sibelius on the eve of his tenth decade').[28] Ten years later, Salmenhaara translated

26 My personal correspondence with Johanna Lindfors, whose book on Sibelius's daughters is due to be published by WSOY in the near future, confirms this notion. According to Lindfors, having been the shyest and most self-effacing of Sibelius's daughters, biographical data on Margareta Jalas is scarce and manifests itself mostly in relation to her husband, travels and children.

27 "On pidetty soveliaimpana olla tekemättä muutoksia käännökseen, joka siis sananmukaisesti seuraa alkuperäistä englanninkielistä tekstiä."

28 Goss (1998, 74) claims that this chapter is included in the 1945 edition, but this has to be considered a misprint. Chapter IX was added to the second edition of von Törne's book, and in 1945, at 79 or 80 years of age, Sibelius would have been "on the eve of" his ninth, not tenth, decade.

the title as "Sibelius satavuotisjuhlansa kynnyksellä" ('Sibelius at the threshold of his centenary'). While factually correct considering the year when the second edition was published in Finnish, it is not entirely clear whether the title is intentional or a mistranslation resulting from misunderstanding 'tenth decade' as 'centenary'. The translation repeats a reference to Sibelius's 100th anniversary on page 100 ('At the threshold of his centenary, Sibelius is one of the sovereign figures of our times'),[29] but on page 102 the translation mentions that 'Sibelius is approaching his 90th anniversary in the spirit of Hellenic clarity'.[30]

Although Sibelius had passed away in 1957, the translation still writes about him in the present tense (see, e.g., von Törne 1965, 101: 'He reads new scores with enthusiasm and listens to the radio with great interest to learn what is going on in the world of musical art').[31] This suggests that the translation is simply relaying the message of the original Swedish text without attempting to adapt the text for the context of 1965, which, by extension, is likely to make the translation of "tionde decennium" as 'centenary' a mistake. The error could be attributed to Salmenhaara's inexperience as a translator: according to Fennica, Salmenhaara's only other translations include the Finnish translation of Alfred Einstein's *Geschichte der Musik* (1965) and the third and fourth volumes of Tawaststjerna's Sibelius biography,[32] making the translation of the IX chapter his first or second published translation.[33] Considering the publication date of the translation of Einstein's work, which was also published by Otava, it is not impossible to imagine that the publisher offered Salmenhaara, a young music scholar who had received his MA in musicology only a year before, the task of translating the chapter. His professional knowledge in music as well as his accessibility as the translator of Einstein's work would have made him a good candidate for the relatively minor commission. Although Salmenhaara's contribution to the 1965 Finnish translation is not extensive, it repeats and reinforces the pattern in which the translators of Sibelius-related literature have some personal connection to the Finnish music culture. At the same time, Salmenhaara marks the first translator who did not have personal ties to

29 Sibelius satavuotisjuhlansa kynnyksellä on yksi aikamme valtiashahmoja.

30 Sibelius lähestyy 90-vuotispäiväänsä helleenisen selkeyden hengessä.

31 Hän lukee innokkaasti uusia partituureja ja seuraa radiosta suuresti kiinnostuneena, mitä säveltaiteen maailmassa tapahtuu.

32 Salmenhaara's translatorship has been contested with regard to the fourth volume, however. In the book itself, Salmenhaara is mentioned to have also translated the fourth volume 'from the Swedish manuscript in cooperation with the author' (Tawaststjerna 1989, title verso) but there is proof that the translator was in fact the music critic Seppo Heikinheimo, who had to rework, "retranslate", Salmenhaara's translation. (Riikonen 2013, 290).

33 Salmenhaara also edited and translated Håkan Sandblad's Swedish-language book *Popmusik* in 1971, but this has not been listed on Fennica.

Sibelius, having started his composition studies under Joonas Kokkonen at the Sibelius Academy at the age of 18 in 1959 (Salmenhaara, Erkki).

To summarise the discussion above, von Törne's book lends itself to multiple approaches. Firstly, the matter of, to borrow Goss's words, "endless promotion" as well as self-translation both steer the discussion in the direction of agency and von Törne's intentions in writing the book. The fact that the content of the conversations on which the book is based was partly made up by von Törne suggests a degree of intentional manipulation and conscious narrative construction on the author's part.

Secondly, considering von Törne's role as an international scholar and author as well as the routes through which his book reached the Finnish audience gives reason to examine the memoir from the point of view of cross-cultural communication. Insofar as texts can be assigned a culture to which they originally belong, von Törne's text can be justifiably examined as a product of the Anglo-American culture as well as the Finnish one, reflecting the dialectic negotiation of that which is international, on the one hand, and that which is national, on the other. While the content of the book is informed by national ideals, the target audience in the first instance is British. In other words, although the text was first published in England, it is also a product of the Finnish relational setting. The fact that the target audience is "external" also appears to remove the *A Close-Up* from the "internal" struggles of the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking cultural circles; the Sibelius portrayed in von Törne's work is common property. This broadening of the narrative field in this manner is a new trait in the narrative construction examined. It features a Finnish citizen with a personal connection to Sibelius demonstrating their agency outside Finland in matters related to the composer.

Thirdly, the reaction and subsequent scholarly debate engendered by von Törne's book, illustrates how the intersections of various narrative strands and shifts in context may change the interpretation of a narrative. Had it not been for the academic investigation into Adorno's critique initiated by Tawaststjerna in his article, von Törne's book would not have occupied its current position in the Sibelius narrative.

As illustrated above, a part of Adorno's critique was affected by Sibelius's reception in the Anglo-American countries. Among the creators of this reception was the music critic Olin Downes, who was perhaps the most vocal and influential promoter of Sibelius's music in the United States and whose numerous articles on Sibelius were elemental in shaping Sibelius's fame on the other side of the Atlantic. The Finns received their share of the American Sibelius mania when Downes's articles and other writings were compiled into a book and published in Finland. This book, Olin Downes's *Sibelius*, will be the focus of the next section.

4.6 *Sibelius* (1945)

Olin Downes's *Sibelius* presents a fascinating case for the examination of highly conscious narrative construction. Although being a translation, the book was published only in Finnish when Olin Downes's newspaper columns were translated and compiled into a book together with a handful of other texts. The extent of collaboration between various agents, the process of selecting the texts and the structuring of the finished book suggest a laborious project that resulted in a premeditated narrative on Sibelius.

Olin Downes (1886–1955) was a prominent music critic for the Boston Post and later New York Times. Downes had a particular interested in Sibelius's music and worked as its fervent promoter practically throughout his career, an accomplishment that also earned him the title Sibelius's Apostle. Downes's influence has generally been considered crucial for the recognition Sibelius received in the United States after the Great War but, as Weigel Williams (2010) argues, without the efforts of the Finnish-American Yrjö (George) Sjöblom (1889–1971) and his son Paul Sjöblom (1914–1997) as well as their involvement in American cultural discussions, Finnish music may never have become as popular in the United States as it did. Weigel Williams (2010, 168) proposes that, in his capacity as a translator, Yrjö Sjöblom was in fact the essential link between Sibelius and his American promotors. The article raises a rare point in music literature by bringing to the fore the significance of translation in the development of cultural practices. The involvement of individual agents in cross-cultural exchanges of various types has to a large extent often been a matter of translation, but so far this form of historical activism has mostly been mentioned as an aside in discussions unrelated to the practices of translation itself. These cultural (and at times also political) exchanges would warrant further investigation to provide a more comprehensive picture of situations in which translation is present but often overlooked. For instance, Paul Sjöblom, whose translations from Finnish into English in Fennica include 35 works and often discuss the history, literature and music of Finland, would provide an interesting case study on the promotion of Finnish cultural exports.

Downes's *Sibelius* was published in 1945. The distinctive trait of the book is that it is based on Downes's texts that were handpicked from various sources and translated by Paul Sjöblom – as the back cover phrases it, 'a personal acquaintance of Downes' – with the help of Jussi Jalas for publication in Finland. The names of the source publications are mentioned in the preface, but no further details have been provided on their origins apart from the dates indicated at the end of some of the articles in the book. In addition to Downes's articles, the book also includes an essay entitled "Sibeliuksen apostoli" ('Sibelius's Apostle'), originally published in the *Musiikkitieto* journal in 1936 and written by Paul Sjöblom's father, Yrjö Sjöblom. Downes's own preface "Ave atque laudatio" is also included in the collection, translated by Yrjö Sjöblom.

The form the book eventually took was the result of both conscious choices and happenstances. In their preface, Paul Sjöblom and Jalas lament the fact that during the editing process the postal connections between the United States and Finland had not worked in the best manner possible, resulting in some of the intended material having been left out of the collection (Downes 1945, 5–6). The back cover of the softcover edition of the book explains that the collection aims 'to provide an image of Sibelius as a person and as a composer', and, in the same vein as the translation of Gray's *Symphonies*, Downes's *Sibelius* is 'by no means meant for professional musicians' but 'for anyone who enjoys Sibelius's music'.

Perhaps more than any other book in the material, Downes's *Sibelius* represents a highly premeditated narrative: The author of the texts was well-known for his outspoken appreciation for Sibelius, inherently influencing the point of view of the texts. In addition, the amount of work invested in the selection process of the articles, the extent of collaboration between various agents, and the fact that the book was aimed at the Finnish readership despite the distinctly American origin of its source material all propose a decidedly premeditated story conveyed of the 'person and composer'. Outside of Downes's original contributions, the book is the result of collaboration between three people, Paul and Yrjö Sjöblom and Jussi Jalas. In the Preface, Yrjö Sjöblom receives special thanks for his help, acquisition of materials and liaising with Downes. The exact role played by Jalas remains ambiguous: on the back cover, he is mentioned alongside Paul Sjöblom as one of the selectors of the articles, whereas on the title page Paul Sjöblom is mentioned as the editor and translator and Jalas's role is relegated to assistant.[34] In a footnote of her article, Weigel Williams (2010, 167) puts Jalas's role under further suspicion: according to a letter the author had received from Paul Sjöblom, Jalas's role was limited to fetching a book Sjöblom needed from the attic of Sibelius's home, Ainola. According to Sjöblom's letter, Jalas's name was mainly used as a sales gimmick – as Sibelius's son-in-law and a renowned conductor, Jalas's name was apparently thought to give the book additional prestige.[35]

The marketing of the book in this vein can be considered another strand in the Sibelius narrative. It demonstrates that Sibelius had become a phenomenon which was no longer self-contained, as it were, but which had become a theme around which various other public discussions were centred. The use of Jalas as a voice of authority reflects the type of thinking where *what* was being discussed was not the

34 Toimittanut ja suomentanut Paul Sjöblom avustajanaan Jussi Jalas

35 Even though the reality of the matter may be more complicated than Paul Sjöblom reported in his personal letter to Weigel Williams, I will nevertheless believe the anecdote to be true in essence and will from now on refer only to Sjöblom when mentioning the translator and editor of *Sibelius*.

only important factor but where *who* spoke on the theme of Sibelius was also of consequence. As with Grey and Jalas's translation of *The Symphonies,* here, as well, the narrators of the Sibelius narrative are given special significance as the persons able to provide interpretations of Sibelius and his music and further elaborate on the narrative. Interestingly, however, if we are to believe Weigel Williams and Paul Sjöblom, the narrative provided by *Sibelius* has very little to do with Jalas's contribution. Rather than his knowledge and professionalism, then, it is his personal gravitas as an agent *in* the Sibelius narrative and its offshoots that are being harnessed to further the narrative. This attests to the mechanisms of narrative construction: narratives operate at the level of conceptions, not necessarily mere facts.

Unlike other biographical accounts in the material, which centre upon the composer more or less organically, *Sibelius* is an artificial whole compiled by purposefully combining a variety of pre-existing sources. The editors mention that while the overall structure of the book is based on a chronological review of Sibelius's life, which Downes had written for *The International Cyclopedia of Music and Musicians* in 1939, the main content primarily comes from columns written for the New York Times (Downes 1945, 5). Other sources mentioned are the journal *The New Music Review* (1914) and the book *Symphonic Broadcasts* (1931) (ibid). The table of contents of the book is divided into five main sections: The first, *Henkilökohtaista* ('a personal account'), includes two of Downes's personal impressions of Sibelius. It is followed by *Alkutaival* ('start of the journey'), which includes texts discussing Sibelius's background, youth and early stages of his career. The largest section of the book is dedicated to Sibelius's development as a symphonic composer with the title *Sinfonian maailmat avautuvat* ('the worlds of the symphony open up'). The section involves columns on each of Sibelius's seven symphonies and works such as the *Violin Concerto* and *The Oceanides* in addition to some of his smaller-scale compositions. The penultimate section *Esittäjiä arvostellaan* ('criticising the performers') focusses on reviewing the performers of Sibelius's music, and the final part of the book entitled *Vuosien varrelta* ('over the years') presents a number of highlights from Sibelius's career, starting from his voyage to the United States and ending with a thumbnail sketch of the composer on his 78th birthday. The final section also includes a column on Cecil Gray's Sibelius biography which was published in Britain in 1931 and which in the hands of Downes receives a favourable critique. A purposefully mediated and organised narrative is created, as the book pieces together a story by making use of Downes's columns, spread across various newspapers and publications as well as time, and reorganises them into an account of Sibelius's life. *Sibelius* becomes more than the sum of its parts, since the narrative it creates is one that only emerges in the translation, not in Downes's original texts.

The conscious effort of narrative construction is evident not only in the manner in which the columns of the book have been organised into larger sections but also

in how the editors of Downes's book have treated their source material. A tell-tale example of this can be found in a footnote on page 142, which reveals that the source texts have actually been divided into smaller units and reintegrated into the narrative structure of the translation. The column in question discusses Sibelius's *The Captive Queen*, a ballade for male choir and orchestra, and its performance by the Finnish YL Male Voice Choir and the Boston Symphony Orchestra in Boston in 1938. The editors' footnote on page 142 reads as follows: 'A more detailed introduction to this composition, originally a part of this review, has already been included in this book and can be found on page 71'.[36] On this page, Downes's description of *The Captive Queen* has been removed from the original critique and re-associated with the narrative on the development of Sibelius's symphonic thinking in a subsection called *Käännekohta* ('turning point'). To serve the purpose of the narrative the editors wish to convey, Sjöblom has causally emplotted the presentation of the composition as a 'turning point' in Sibelius's career and included it in a discussion on Sibelius's oeuvre from 1903–1909. This re-contextualisation of Downes's introduction of *The Captive Queen* gives the passage additional weight, as this part of Downes's original column is reinterpreted as a constituent part of a sequence of compositions. The reorganisation also carries with it some other traces of temporal manipulation. Originally, Downes's text was not meant to be read biographically, as it merely introduces *The Captive Queen* to the reader of the concert review. In *Sibelius*, the pseudo-biographical narrative organisation of the book places the text in a frame of Sibelius's progression as an artist, that is, the temporal development of his craft. By detaching the text from its original context and incorporating it in a new, temporally ordered set of events, the translation is reconstituted in a new type of narrative. Although this manner of narrative construction has here been revealed through the example of *The Captive Queen*, it is actually at the core of how the entire narrative of *Sibelius* is constructed. The reordering functions not only in this particular instance but also at the level of the entire collection of texts, since the book is essentially a temporally ordered narrative of Sibelius's life.

Further examination of the Finnish text and its comparison with the original English columns reveals yet another feature of translated book. Although, as mentioned, the exact publication information has not been provided by the editors, conducting a search in the digital archives of The New York Times returns some of the assumed source texts of the translation. This is the case, for instance, with the section entitled *Kolmas sinfonia (1905–1907)* (Downes 1945, 72–73), which introduces and discusses Sibelius's Third Symphony and can be traced to a review in the New York Times published on 5 April 1934, entitled "Berezowsky Work Has First

[36] Sävellyksen tarkempi esittely, joka alkuaan kuului tämän arvostelun yhteyteen, on jo esiintynyt kirjassa s. 71.

Hearing" based on the dating "5. IV. 34." given at the end of the passage. Comparing the New York Times review and the translation shows significant differences between the two texts: As the translation is based on an actual concert review, all references to the rest of the concert and its performers have been omitted and the content of the Finnish version has been modified to fit the style of an introductory text. The translation includes a general description of the significance of the Third Symphony among Sibelius's works, which is curiously missing from the newspaper review. Missing from the original, although found in the translation, are mentions of the fact that the symphony is written in three parts, and characterisations of the second and final movement at the end of the second paragraph on page 73. Finally, at the end of the column, the order of the English-language clauses has been reversed:

> For all that the listener experiences the power and the spell of Sibelius's art; **the power that dwarfs most other modern composers**; *the spell of the man's sincerity, imagination and feeling for nature*. (Downes, New York Times, 5 April 1934; my emphasis)

> Kaikesta huolimatta kuulija kokee Sibeliuksen taiteen voiman ja lumouksen: *lumouksen, jonka synnyttää säveltäjän vilpittömyys, mielikuvitus ja luonnon tunne*; **voiman, jonka rinnalla useimmat nykyajan säveltäjät vaikuttavat kääpiöiltä**. (Downes 1945, 73; my emphasis)

While the text is dated 5 April 1934, the translation includes one detail which reveals some editing having taken place. The first paragraph of the *Kolmas sinfonia* passage, which does not appear in the New York Times review, introduces the general importance of the Third Symphony and reads as follows:

> The writer thinks that the importance of the Third Symphony lies in the way it demonstrates the development from the style of the First and Second Symphony to that of the Fourth rather than in any inherently lasting value or significance. On the other hand, the late Philip Hale (a great Bostonian music critic and the author's mentor) has considered the Third Symphony more significant than either of the preceding symphonies. (Downes 1945, 72)[37]

[37] Kirjoittajan mielestä Kolmas sinfonia on tärkeämpi siinä, että se osoittaa kehityksen Ensimmäisen ja Toisen sinfonian tyylistä Neljännen tyyliin, kuin oman kestävän arvonsa ja merkityksensä takia. (Suuren bostonilaisen musiikkiarvostelijan ja kirjoittajan oppi-isän) Philip Hale-vainajan mielestä Kolmas on taasen merkittävämpi kuin kumpikaan edeltävistä sinfonioista.

Hale's obituary published in the New York Times on 1 December 1934 reveals that Hale passed away after the date indicated as the publication date of the passage, which serves as evidence of the first paragraph originating from a later date. This realisation raises the question on the origin of the first paragraph and whether it was written by Downes himself or the editors of the book. The use of the third person ('the writer') could indicate another author besides Downes, were it not for the fact that Downes sometimes referred to himself in the third person in his writings (cf. Downes, New York Times, 19 November 1934). Hale's description in parentheses is likely to be an editorial addition, however, given the manner in which Hale is introduced and characterised. Accepting this argument would confirm Downes as the presumed author, albeit still leave open the question of the origin of the paragraph. Although uncovering the source is beyond the scope of this study, identifying two distinct sources for the passage for which only once source is indicated does serve as proof of the editing that occurred in the preparation of *Sibelius* and the covertness of practices related to the editorial process. It attests to the translator's and editors' agency in creating a particular type of narrative and raises questions on the acceptability and range of possible editorial decisions at different time periods.

One final observation will here be made on the use of footnotes in the book. One of the seven footnotes and one editorial anecdote found in *Sibelius* (found on pages 5, 6, 30, 65, 91, 96, 142) is somewhat reminiscent of Jalas's *The Symphonies* translation. This is the footnote on page 65, which also include the note *toim. huom.* ('editor's note'), unlike all the other annotations save one.[38] Both *Sibelius* and *The Symphonies* were translated into Finnish in the same year and perhaps for that reason the remarks bear a resemblance to the commentary in Gray's translation. On page 65, in a discussion on Sibelius's second symphony, Downes explains the final movement to be in rondo form, prompting the editor's footnote 'Finnish interpreters have construed this as a sonata form'.[39] In that Finnish translation of *The Symhonies* (1945), a similar addition is made by Jalas when he writes the note [*sonaattimuoto*] ("sonata form") on page 35 after Gray's remark that the form of the finale is the simplest and most straightforward of all the movements of the symphony. Although this is the only clear connection between the two books, the fact that Jalas was involved in the publication of both works and that the type of commentary is similar in its authorial character suggests that the comment in *Sibelius* could be an addition by Jalas. That he would have found the subject

[38] The second footnote including the addition *toim. huom.* is found on page 30, where Downes claims Sibelius to have designed (and managed the construction process of) his home Ainola. The footnote reads: 'Here, Downes is mistaken. Sibelius's villa was designed by archit. Lars Sonck.' Considering the professional and personal nature of these two footnotes, it is possible that the *toim. huom*. addition is a sign of Jalas's input.

[39] Suomalaiset selittäjät ovat tulkinneet sen sonaattimuodoksi.

of Finnish achievements in Sibelius analysis worth of a mention in *Sibelius* as well in turn implies a certain vested interest on Jalas's part, the authoritative interpreter of Sibelius's music. It also ever so slightly extends Jalas's agency beyond that mentioned in Sjöblom's letter to Weigel Williams, mentioned above.

The year 1945 was a productive one for the Jalas's. Altogether three Sibelius-related translations by Margareta and Jussi Jalas were published during this year alone. The next Sibelius book I shall examine, Nils-Eric Ringbom's *Sibelius*, appeared three years later in 1948 in Swedish and also in Finnish translation, once again translated by Margareta Jalas. In the following section, the focus will move from editing and other visible forms of agency to a more subtle exercise in agential influence as well as reinforcement of already established narratives.

4.7 *Sibelius* (1948)

Nils-Eric Ringbom (1907–1988) was a composer, musicologist and a long-time intendant of the Helsinki City Orchestra. His biography *Sibelius* was written for the Swedish publishing house Bonnier's book series entitled *Musikens mästare* ('the masters of music') and published in 1948. In Finland, the book was published in the same year in Swedish by Holger Schildts Förlag as well as in Margareta Jalas's Finnish translation by Otava. The book was later also translated into Danish and German in 1950 and into English in 1954. Of these, the latter two included a preface by the author explaining Ringbom's purpose and principles for writing the book.

Sibelius was the first post-war Sibelius biography. Although the year 1945 was marked by Sibelius's 80th anniversary jubilations and commemorative publications – which in addition to the works discussed in this study also included Santeri Levas's abundantly illustrated *Sibelius ja hänen Ainolansa* as well as Martti Similä's adulatory booklet *Sibeliana* – Ringbom's *Sibelius* was the first book to assume a biographical approach after Ekman's 1936 biography. In terms of its content, however, *Sibelius* treads a line between a biography and an analytical work. In Finland, this double focus was reflected in the marketing of the book, which was advertised as being the first book-length presentation of both Sibelius's personality and his works.[40] The book has been considered simultaneously novel and recapitulatory in its approach: Huttunen (1993, 163) mentions *Sibelius* as having been the first Finnish exploration of Sibelius's motive technique, first introduced by

40 "Nils-Eric Ringbomin teos on ensimmäinen kirjan muodon saanut yritys eritellä sekä mestarin henkilöllisyyttä että hänen teoksiaan alkaen lapsuusajan ensimmäisistä kokeiluista ja jatkuen aina seitsemänteen sinfoniaan ja Tapiolaan asti" ('Nils-Eric Ringbom's work is the first book-form attempt to examine the Master's personality and works from the first childhood experiments all the way to the Seventh Symphony and Tapiola'; Otava's advertisement in Ringbom's archive at the Sibelius Museum)

Gray in *Sibelius – The Symphonies*. As was discussed in section 4.4, this book was published in Finnish in 1945 with Jalas's remarks, which combined Gray's views with Krohnian terminology. In Ringbom's work, Gray's method of analysis was applied for the first time by a Finnish musicologist. This type of motive analysis subsequently established itself as a salient approach to Sibelius's symphonic music and was also involved in changing the collective views of Sibelius's historical position as a composer, as the emphasis on the significance of Sibelius's nationalistic period gave way to a more universal understanding of the composer's works (ibid., 163–164).

Ringbom's pioneering contribution to Sibelius analysis was offset by the author's reliance on existing Sibelius literature in his biographical presentation. *Sibelius* draws heavily on the previous authors from Finland and abroad, including Furuhjelm and Ekman, thus setting a familiar tone from the first chapter onward (Goss 1998, 69; 2004, 4). This feature did not go unnoticed by Ringbom's contemporary critics either. Several reviews written in Finnish and in Swedish as well as, later, in English remarked on the summarising nature of the book (cf. e.g., *Hufvudstadsbladet* 16.12.1948; *Östergötlands Folkbladet* 14.9.1949; *Music & Letters* 36 no. 2, 1955; these texts can be found at the Sibelius Museum's Ringbom archive). Perhaps due to such reactions, Ringbom defended his approach in the preface which he wrote for the German translation of his book and which was later also translated into English. In the preface, Ringbom downplays the biographical contribution of his work and emphasises its musicological approach:

> […] I do not claim to have presented any essentially new facts concerning the external life and the personality of the composer. But in setting forth in concise form the distinctive features and qualities of his principal compositions and his highly individualistic style, I have proceeded independently, finding new approaches and correcting previous misunderstandings. (Ringbom 1954, v)

The "distinctive features and qualities" are approached, above all, through analyses of each of Sibelius's seven symphonies and illustrative music examples, while a handful of his other works receive more cursory remarks and verbal descriptions. This focus on Sibelius's absolute – that is, non-programmatic – music reflects the shift in the narrative in terms of presenting Sibelius not as a nationalistic but a universal composer.

Ringbom's letters reveal that the author was rather actively involved in the translation processes of his book. This is apparent in Ringbom's correspondence with his American publisher University of Oklahoma Press, dated 10 May 1954, in which the author mentions his close cooperation with his previous translators: "My Sibelius book has been published in four languages and in each case my relations

with the translator have been marked with the spirit of the most loyal collaboration". Ringbom also describes his cooperation with his translators in a letter to his English translator Geraldine de Courcy (G. I. C. de Courcy) dated 6 March 1954. In the letter, the following passage appears after Ringbom has sought to justify his involvement in the translation process through his experiences with his German translator, who had used an incorrect verb tense in his translation, thus changing the original meaning (emphasis in the original):

> This is a trivial point, but I noticed several things while reading the manuscript that were <u>not</u> trivialities, and I think not one of my translators (neither the German or Danish translator nor the Finnish one – who was one of Sibelius's daughters) has regarded my little remarks as a lack of trust in their competence! On the contrary, I have had the very best and most trusting collaborative relationship with all of them, and we have been in complete understanding that this cooperation has above all been to the author's and the translator's mutual benefit – even when each of these translators has had an excellent command of the language (in two cases almost perfect).[41]

The passage gives reason to assume that Ringbom's involvement in the translation process originated from his desire, as the precursive author, to keep his narrative intact. His remarks on the translators' command of the Swedish language indicates that his interest in the translation is not, at least primarily, concerned with matters of language or style (as he also mentions in his letter to University of Oklahoma Press on 10 May 1954). Instead, Ringbom seems to have been concerned with the cultural integrity of his text, by which I mean "the degree to which culturally specific elements of the source text are maintained in the translation" (Ekberg 2019, 44). Such issues are later listed by Ringbom for de Courcy's consideration: Ringbom mentions naming conventions of Finnish place-names, which 'due to Finland being a bilingual country is a very delicate matter'[42] and wonders about the correct

41 "Detta är en bagatell, men ett och annat blev också under manuskriptläsningen från min sida observerat, som <u>inte</u> var bagateller, och jag tror inte att en enda av mina översättare (varken den tyska eller danska översättaren och inte heller den finska översättarinnan – som var en av Sibelius' döttrar) har uppfattat mina små anmärkningar som en brist på förtroende för deras kompetens! Tvärtom har jag stått i det allra bästa och mest förtroendefulla samarbete med dem alla, och vi har varit fullkomligt eniga om att detta samarbete i högsta grad har varit i författarens och översättarens gemensamma intresse. Och dock har även alla dessa översättare behärskat svenska språket utmärkt (i två fall nästan perfekt).

42 "En inte oviktig detalj är bruket av finländska ortsnamn, som på grund av Finlands tvåspråkighet är en mycket delikat fråga." ('A detail that should not be considered

description of the geographical location of Sibelius's family farm Sibbe as well as the accurate term of proprietorship for the owner of this farm, Sibelius's great-grandfather. Although the latter two admittedly cross over to questions of language and word choices, and even though Ringbom's comment on de Courcy's translation regarding the location of the Sibbe farm is caused by his insufficient understanding of the structures of the English language, the points Ringbom raises are nevertheless culturally bound and linked with the organisation of Finnish society.

As a related aside, Ringbom's insistence that de Courcy highlight Finland's bilingualism provides an interesting contrast to the versions published in Finland. In the letter above as well as in his later correspondence with the translator, Ringbom instructs de Courcy to provide both the Finnish and the Swedish names of towns and cities when they first appear in the text. This is a solution that, quite understandably, does not feature in either the Swedish or the Finnish version of *Sibelius*, both of which only use the place-names of their respective language. By making Finland's bilingualism visible, the English translation version thus reveals some of the underlying narrative structures which have become normalised in the Swedish and Finnish relational setting. This attests to the usefulness of comparing multiple language versions of the same text when examining the construction of narratives.

Ringbom's archives throw sufficient light upon his collaboration with de Courcy to warrant a separate case study but, as in the case of von Törne's translation, Margareta Jalas's role is obscured by the absence of substantial evidence, and no direct correspondence between Ringbom and Jalas appears to have survived. However, it is likely that Jalas and Ringbom were in contact during the translation process, and Ringbom's correspondence with Bonnier as well as the English translator of *Sibelius* de Courcy does sometimes also touch upon Jalas's work.

Ringbom's mentioning of Margareta Jalas or, rather, 'Sibelius's daughter' in the passage above deserves some further consideration. Ringbom's collaboration with Jalas was hardly motivated by matters of cultural integrity in the same manner as with de Courcy. Ringbom's involvement was probably not linguistically motivated either. Bearing in mind the critical tone with which Ringbom wrote about the German translation of his book, Jalas must have been one of the two translators whose Swedish was 'almost perfect' by the author's standard.[43] There is even evidence of one occasion where Jalas's grasp of the Swedish language exposed a misleading phrasing in Ringbom's original: In a letter dated 30 October 1948, Bonnier addresses a question

unimportant is the use of Finnish place-names, which due to Finland being a bilingual country is a very delicate matter')

43 The language primarily spoken at Margareta's childhood home was Finnish, but the children were also taught Swedish, and Aino and Jean often spoke Swedish with each other (cf. Sirén 2000, 347).

raised by Ringbom, who was of the opinion that Jalas had misinterpreted the meaning of a sentence in her translation draft. Ringbom's surviving letter sketch found in connection with the letter from Bonnier reads as follows:

> I have been racking my brain about a language-related detail for a while now. When Mrs Jalas translated rows 2–4 on p. 149 in the proofs, she misunderstood what I said about Roiha's observation and translated it along the lines of "as Roiha didn't, either" etc. Surely the phrase does not lend itself to such an interpretation? Did her translation error result from an inadequate understanding of the nuances of Swedish, or is the meaning unclear? Should it, instead of "i likhet med" [similarly to], say "i motsats till" [contrary to]? I think I am right, but I would ask you, sir, to have a look at the paragraph at some point just to be sure.[44]

Bonnier's representative sided with Jalas's interpretation. The phrasing of the ambiguous source text was changed for the final publication, and the translation was corrected accordingly. Although this correction of a relatively minor detail is merely an isolated glimpse into the translation process, the example illustrates how exercising one's agency through executive translatorship may result in instances of revisionary authorship.

This type of insight engendered by collaboration may have been what Ringbom referred to as 'the author's and the translator's mutual benefit'. At least in Jalas's case, there is little reason to assume that Ringbom's incentive to cooperate had been connected to the translator's linguistic abilities or her cultural awareness. Rather, Ringbom seems to have considered collaboration simply an essential part of the publishing process. In his letter to de Courcy (6 March 1954), after having introduced his concerns regarding de Courcy's translation, as presented above, Ringbom further elaborates on his desire to be involved in the process (emphases in the original):

> These are but a few examples showing that there are <u>always</u> things that can (and should) be discussed between author and translator, and therefore I beg you not to take offence if I still insist that you consider allowing me to see the manuscript for the benefit of the <u>matter at hand</u>. I assure you that I do not in the slightest doubt your extraordinary stylistic and linguistic abilities (the two books I have had the

[44] "En språkdetalj har i någon mån förvirrat min hjärna. Då fru Jalas översatt 2–4 raderna på s. 149 i korrekturet hade hon missförstått vad jag sagt om Roihas iakttagelse och översatt till finska ungefär: "liksom inte heller Roiha" etc. Inte kan väl meningen förstås så? Berodde hennes översättningsfel på bristande insikt i svenskans nyanser, eller är meningen otydlig? Borde det i stället för "i likhet med" heta "i motsats till"? Jag tror att jag har rätt, men ber doktorn för säkerhets skull titta på stycket ett tag."

> pleasure of receiving already provide compelling evidence of your prowess), but, as I said, there are things which go beyond matters of personal ambition and competence and which bear significance "an und für sich" [in and of itself].[45]

While Ringbom does not provide further details on the things that he finds to bear essential significance to cooperation, the passage suggests that Ringbom understood translation to be a collaborative effort between the author and the translator. The cautious tone of the passage is the result of Ringbom and de Courcy not seeing eye to eye on Ringbom's wish to see the translation before publication. In her letters, de Courcy was very protective about her translation, suggesting that Ringbom's wish to see it was a vote of no confidence on her abilities as a translator. Another possible reason for de Courcy's reluctance to share her translation with the author is that she seems to have translated Ringbom's book using the German version as her main source despite the fact that Ringbom's agreement with the publisher had outlined that the Swedish original be used for the translation work.[46]

45 "Detta blott som några exemplar på att det alltid finns saker, som kan (och bör) diskuteras mellan författare och översättare, och därför ber jag Er att inte ta illa upp, att jag ännu insisterar på att Ni måtte överväga, om det inte vore till fördel för saken att jag finge se manuskriptet? Jag försäker, att jag inte hyser det minsta tvivel om Eder utomordentliga stilistiska och lingvistiska förmåga (de två böckerna jag hade glädjen mottaga är redan absolut övertygande bevis härpå), men det finns som sagt saker, som står över personliga ambitionshänsyn och kompetensfrågor, och som äger en viss betydelse 'an und für sich'."

46 To my knowledge, the Swedish original has to this date generally been considered the primary source for the English translation, as this is also the information that was printed in the English version. However, the correspondence in Ringbom's archive held at the Sibelius Museum suggests that the matter is more complex. On 10 May 1954, Ringbom wrote a letter to the University of Oklahoma Press expressing his dissatisfaction with de Courcy and asking the publishing house to encourage the translator to provide Ringbom with the translation draft: "As far as I am aware, Miss de Courcy's command of the Swedish language is not perfect and I assume that she does her translating with the help of the German version." In the same letter, Ringbom also explains that the English translation should not be based on the German version, which "is not adequate" The press director Savoie Lottinville replied on 21 May 1954: "I recognize your concern, but at the same time I recognize hers, because the principal work of translation was done, I think, from the German edition, rather than the Swedish." There is no doubt about the fact that the German version was involved in the translation process to some extent. For instance, the Preface, which did not appear in the original Swedish book, was translated from the German version in accordance with Ringbom's instructions (Ringbom's letter to Max Pfeffer on 27 November 1953). However, determining the full extent of indirect translation in the English version of *Sibelius* would require a separate case study on this type of compilative translation where "several STs are used to *compile* a full text" (Ivaska 2020, 28; emphasis in original).

Knowing that the literary Sibelius narratives often suffered from misunderstandings and inaccuracies, Ringbom's desire to involve himself in the translation processes of his work and to safeguard the integrity of his text seems reasonable. Ringbom's case also indicates a gap in the research on translated narratives. The collaboration between author and translator and its effects on the shaping of narratives are aspects of narrative construction which would deserve further research in studies focussing on the translation of narratives, considering the fact that thus far various conflictual aspects of narrative construction have to a great extent dominated the research of narratives in Translation Studies.

Ringbom's book, while perhaps not being a work that could be considered a major work of Sibelius literature due to its content recycling, did function as a sustaining force behind previously established Sibelius-related ideas and anecdotes and managed for its part to correct some of the mistakes made by previous authors. In terms of the number of translations, it was also well distributed, even though, according to his letters, Ringbom was somewhat vexed about what he considered the small number of copies printed and sold in the United States as well as in Sweden. Rather than focussing on the content of *Sibelius,* Ringbom's case has drawn attention to the collaborative aspects of narrative construction and the conflation of agencies in the creation of translations. It has provided evidence of the fact that sometimes authorship may intertwine with various types of translatorship, thus blurring the perceived boundaries of narrative construction in source and target languages and cultures. The following section, concentrating on Simon Parmet's largely theoretical work on Sibelius's symphonies, will provide another type of example of such blurring of linguistic and cultural borders while also moving the focus to the practicalities and the sometimes extensive temporal breadth of text creation potentially influencing the shaping of narratives.

4.8 *Sibelius symfonier: En studie i musikförståelse* (1955) and *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat: ajatuksia musiikin tulkinnasta* (1955)

Simon Parmet (originally Pergament) (1897–1969) was a Finnish conductor, composer and writer of Russian-Jewish descent. Parmet became known as an interpreter of Sibelius's music in addition to which he authored numerous texts on the composer and wrote reviews on books written on Sibelius. His book on Sibelius's symphonies, *Sibelius symfonier: en studie i musikförståelse* ('Sibelius's symphonies: a study in musical understanding'; henceforth abbreviated as *Symfonier*), was published in Swedish by Söderström & Co. The Finnish version, *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat: ajatuksia musiikin tulkinnasta* ('Sibelius's symphonies: thoughts on the interpretation of music'; henceforth abbreviated as *Sinfoniat*) was translated from

the Swedish manuscript by Margareta Jalas and published by Otava. Both books came out in celebration of Sibelius's 90th anniversary in 1955. Four years later, the book appeared in English, published by Cassell and entitled *The Symphonies of Sibelius: A Study in Musical Appreciation* (henceforth abbreviated as *Symphonies*). The book was translated by the Finland-based translator Kingsley Hart, perhaps best known for his English translations of Tove Jansson's Moomin books. The English version included a new Preface, an eight-page Introduction, a new chapter speculating on the fate of Sibelius's Eight Symphony, and an Author's Postscript. In addition, some of the chapters appear in somewhat edited form with omitted as well as added paragraphs.

Unfortunately, there is very little to be said about Margareta Jalas's Finnish translation of *Symfonier*, which closely follows the Swedish original. As with all Otava's publications, no archival records survive, and my attempts to locate any personal records discussing Margareta Jalas's translation processes have been unsuccessful. Based on the available evidence, the Finnish translation appears to yield no novel means of approaching narrative construction. However, Parmet's book provides other opportunities for approaching the Sibelius narrative. One fruitful perspective is its thematic content, which closely relates Parmet's book to Cecil Gray and Jussi Jalas's *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat.* The examination of the differences between these two presentations of Sibelius's symphonies is potentially beneficial in terms of uncovering variation in narrative construction. Both Parmet's and Gray and Jalas's book support the narrative of Sibelius as the great 20th-century symphonist. Translated and written by conductors, both of whom had personal contact with the composer, the voice with which the books speak of Sibelius's symphonies is both authorial and authorised. However, where the books differ is the direction of their intended message. Whereas Jalas's translation with its commentary of a foreign interpretation is clearly aimed at the Finnish audience and thus looks inward, Parmet's book is outward and expansive based on archival evidence.

The complexities of the publishing process of Parmet's book seem to have gone largely unnoticed in the literature. Taking into account Parmet's own words in *Symphonies* as well as archival evidence, the journey of *Symfonier* to a published product was long and meandering. The 1959 version of Parmet's Preface, which bears little resemblance to the considerably more succinct Preface of *Symfonier*, mentions that the idea for writing the book emerged during the author's visit to Ainola in 1936 (Parmet 1959, vii). During the visit, Sibelius "expressed his concern over the distorted performances of his symphonies he had heard over the radio from various countries", "complained about the many printing mistakes in his scores" and asked whether Parmet would be interested in assisting him with correcting the misprints and revising "misleading tempo indications and other faults of notation" (ibid.). Parmet accepted the task and soon realised that the work he was doing could

be turned into a study of the symphonies and their performance. However, soon Sibelius began showing signs of uneasiness. Parmet wrote to the composer, who replied:

> $19\frac{4}{V}36$
>
> Dear Parmet,
>
> My warm thanks for your kind and understanding letter. We must let the matter rest.
>
> Ekman's book has made me feel as though I were naked among my fellow human beings. To expose myself as an artist as well would be catastrophic for me. It is hard for me to have to admit this.
>
> Sadly but with sincere affection,
>
> Yours
>
> Jean Sibelius
>
> Your analyses are outstanding and highly individual.
>
> (Parmet 1959, 160)

Parmet stopped working on the book. However, a few years later Sibelius asked Parmet how the writing process was progressing.[47] Sibelius was surprised to hear Parmet had ceased writing and urged him to complete what he had started (ibid.).

Recommencing the work on the book coincided with Parmet's time in the United States, where he relocated with his family and where he worked between 1941 and 1948 (Dahlstöm 2006, n.p.). In the Preface of *Symfonier*, Parmet acknowledges The American Committee for Emigré Scholars Writers and Artists, which helped "refugee scholars and artists in the United States through a 'modest' grant program for research, writing, and other creative projects" (Leff 2019, 251). The result of this grant appears to have been the first of the two English-language manuscripts stored at the National Archives of Finland, entitled *A Guide for the Performance of Sibelius' Symphonies* (henceforth abbreviated as *Guide*). The second manuscript, an edited version of *Guide,* is entitled *The Interpretation of Sibelius' Symphonies. A Study in Appreciation and Analysis* (henceforth abbreviated as *Interpretation*).

Guide comprises 272 typewritten pages and covers each of Sibelius's symphonies. Hand-written corrections made to the *Guide* manuscript have been

[47] According to papers in Parmet's archive at the National Archives of Finland, this happened in 1941: "I often met Dr. Sibelius in the ensuing years but the matter was never mentioned between us until my last visit with him in 1941 before my departure for America."

implemented in the draft version of *Interpretation*, which includes further handwritten emendations.[48] The version of *Interpretation* in the archive only extends to the third movement of the Fourth Symphony and thus only includes 76 pages. Based on these manuscript drafts, Parmet's initial idea was to write a substantially more theoretical book than *Symfonier*, aimed at a professional audience. This is also something the author alludes to in the Preface of *Symphonies*:

> The completed work, with its corrections of every error detected, its extensive analyses, and liberal use of very long musical examples, turned out to be a very bulky book appealing first and foremost to professional musician. This struck me as being a disadvantage, for I felt that I had a great deal that would interest many lovers of music who would scarcely take the trouble to read a work with such a marked professional bias. (Parmet 1959, vii–viii)

In places, the completed *Guide* analyses Sibelius's symphonies measure by measure. While *Interpretation* is more readable, even this rather significantly edited version contains considerably more music examples and references to individual measures than *Symfonier.* To demonstrate the extent of the editing process between *Guide* and *Interpretation,* the analysis of the First Symphony takes up 47 typewritten pages in *Guide* but 26 pages in *Interpretation*; furthermore, the analyses of the first four symphonies cover 76 pages in *Interpretation* and 158 pages in *Guide*.[49]

A particularly interesting feature of the manuscripts concerns their altogether three Prefaces, here named Preface no. 1, 2 and 3 based on their presumed chronological order. These Prefaces differ considerably from the one in *Symfonier* and content-wise resemble more closely that of the English version of 1959, which offers information on the motivation and history behind the writing of the book. Preface no. 1 comprises three typewritten pages with emendations written in pencil and ink. Preface no. 2 is two pages long and includes editorial markings, signalling the omission of the first paragraph and the relocating of the second paragraph further down in the structure of the text. Preface no. 3 is a one-page long fair copy of Preface no. 2 and its emendations. The Prefaces help with the temporal placement of the manuscripts. The final sentence of Preface no. 1 reads as follows:

48 Included in the same folder with the draft version of *Interpretation* are the fair copies of its two chapters discussing the Second and the Third Symphony (marked as pages 17–45).

49 Although not directly comparable, it is worth mentioning that in the printed 1959 version of Parmet's book, the analyses of all the symphonies (excluding the chapter on the lost Eighth symphony) span 143 pages.

> In celebration of the master's eightieth birthday I herewith submit ~~it~~ [above in pencil: my study on Sibelius' Symphonies] to the public.
>
> Simon Parmet
> Bay Side, New York, May 1945
> [in pencil:] ninethieth [sic]

This suggests that Parmet's theoretical presentation was already completed ten years before *Symfonier* was published. It also suggests that the first complete source material for *Symfonier,* which bases itself on *Interpretation*, was originally written in English and that Parmet was aiming for an international publication at least since 1945. In Prefaces nos. 2 and 3 the occasion for the publication has changed to Sibelius's 90th jubilee. Preface no. 2 still includes a mention originating from Preface no. 1, that the book "was written by a musician for musicians, and its only purpose is to propagate good performances of Sibelius' symphonies".[50] If the dates in Prefaces nos. 1 and 2 are accurate and if these Prefaces were meant to accompany the manuscripts with which they are associated in Parmet's archive, it seems that Parmet was still trying to get his more theoretical book published around the time when *Symfonier* appeared.

In a partly stricken-through sentence in Preface no. 1, Parmet explains that Sibelius had promised to help the author get his book published "both in England and in America".[51] However, the task of promoting Parmet's publication fell onto Jussi Jalas, not Sibelius. In the published Prefaces, Parmet thanks his colleague solely for his advice and for reading the manuscript, but according to archival evidence, Jalas was also involved in helping Parmet to get his book published in the United States. In a letter received by Jalas, stored at the National Archives of Finland and dated 23 March 1956, Jussi Himanka, representative of the non-profit cultural and educational organisation Finlandia Foundation wrote the following:

> Yesterday Esa Arra received a letter from Mr Purdy, the head of Putnam. He did understand that Pergament's presentation was part of a larger study but thought that the print run would be too small due to limited demand. In other words, he

50 Preface no. 1 includes the draft version of the paragraph, with emendations made in pencil. The fair copy of this paragraph appears in Preface no. 2 ten years later, but the passage was omitted from the edited Preface no. 3.

51 "He expressed satisfaction with what I had done and ~~offered his assistance for the publication of my book both in England and America as soon as I had finished the work.~~"

> thought that the circles interested in the book would consist of purely hypermusical people, who he doesn't believe exist in sufficient numbers. […][52]

Later, on 17 May 1956, Jalas received a letter from Esa Arra himself. The Vice Chair of Finlandia Foundation and editor of The Finnish New York News, *New Yorkin Uutiset*, lamented the fact that while he had attempted to offer Parmet's book for certain American publishers' consideration, they had not shown much interest.[53] Jalas's archives also contain a letter from Parmet: in his letter of 26 June 1957, Parmet expresses his annoyance over Arra's failing to return his manuscript and mentions that his book is going to be published in England.[54] While none of the letters specify whether the manuscript offered to the Americans was *Symfonier* or *Interpretation*, Purdy's description of the work, the existence of Preface no. 2 with its reference to professional musicians and Sibelius's 90th jubilee as well as the fact that the fair copy of the first chapter of *Interpretation* is missing from Parmet's archives are potential signs that the manuscript sent to the United States was *Interpretation*. However, not knowing, for instance, when Hart began working on the translation of *Symfonier* makes it impossible to state this with confidence. Only the completion of Hart's translation is mentioned in the Preface of *Symphonies*, dated 1957 (although the book only came out in 1959), where Parmet writes that the use of the present tense in the book stems from the fact that the translation was completed before Sibelius's death, that is, 20 September 1957. If this is true, the English translation was completed in late summer or early autumn of 1957, as Parmet was still asking Jalas for his opinion on some passages which were later added to *Symphonies* in his letter from June 1957.

The reason for such a detailed presentation of the history of *Symfonier* has been deemed necessary due to the lack of information on the topic in literature. However, as fascinating as the questions surrounding the history of Parmet's *Symfonier* are, the above discussion has first and foremost served to highlight Parmet's agency as well

52 "Esa Arra sai eilen kirjeen Mr Purdy'lta, joka on Putnam'in pää, hän ymmärsi kyllä, että Pergamentin juttu oli osa suuremmasta tutkielmasta, mutta arveli painoksen tulevan liian pieneksi kysynnän rajoittuneisuuden perusteella. Hän siis arveli, että intresseeratut piirit ovat puhtaasti hypermusikaalisia ihmisiä, joita hänen uskonsa mukaan ei olisi tarpeeksi. […]" (the dots over the ä's are missing from the typewritten letter and have been added to the sentence above)

53 "Olen sitä nyt muutamille tarjonnut, mutta mielenkiinto ei ole kovin suuri." (I've now offered it to a few publishers, but there hasn't been much interest)

54 "Jag har aldrig fått tillbaka mitt manuskript från mannen i New York. Det är ingen idé, att manuskriptet ligger där, då det nu ser ut, som om boken kommer att publiceras i England." (I still haven't received my manuscript back from the man in New York. There's no point in having the manuscript remain there, since it now looks like the book is going to be published in England.)"

as the tug-of-war between international and Finnish developments in the publication process of his book. The study on Sibelius's symphonies presumably began as a Finnish project – at least it is difficult to imagine a scenario where the original 1930s project would have already been international in nature given its short life-span in early 1936. The English manuscript was created as a result of Parmet's emigration to the United States, and the failure to get the book published in 1945 led to the revision and self-translation of the book into Swedish ten years later. At the same time Parmet was still attempting to find his work a publisher in the English-speaking world. Hart's translation translated the self-translated Swedish text back into English – whether this was done with the help of Parmet's *Interpretation* would warrant an investigation but lies outside the scope of this study. The consideration of these crossings over linguistic and cultural borders draws attention to the routes through which narratives emerge in international contexts and raises a question on the identity of texts born in such complex circumstances.

The changes between *Symfonier* and *Symphonies* are indicative of a shift in Parmet's narrative stance. The omissions of passages redolent of the Finnish discourse, particularly in the essayistic first chapter, and the addition of the contextualising Preface, Introduction and Author's Postscript alter the narrative tone of *Symphonies*, making it more approachable to the foreign reader. To give an example, the very beginning of the first chapter in *Symfonier*, which borrows directly from *Interpretation*, characterises Sibelius as a lone fir tree with its roots deep in the soil of its native land (Parmet 1955b, 7). In *Symphonies,* the first two paragraphs have been omitted, changing the perspective to something quite different: "The music of Sibelius belongs to the world" (Parmet 1959, 1). Although the main content and the narrative of Sibelius as the great 20th century symphonist remains the same in both *Symfonier* and *Symphonies*, this is where Parmet's narrative becomes expansive and distances itself from the Finnish relative setting. While the extent to which Parmet exercised his revisionary authorship in preparation of the English version of the book is not known, his precursive authorship moulds the emphasis of the Sibelius narrative presented in his book.

Compared to Gray and Jalas's *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat*, Parmet's work is able to rely on a broader range of studies on Sibelius's symphonies. The book makes several references to pre-existing studies, such as Gray and Jalas (1945), Ringbom (1945) and Abraham (1947), and comments on their interpretations. Parmet's desire to advance the development of scholarly debate is perhaps best illustrated by two additions found in Symphonies, which Parmet writes about in his letter to Jalas referred to above. The first addition concerns a remark on the melodies of the Fifth Symphony made by Ringbom in his 1945 book. In *Symphonies*, Parmet (1959, 78) adds that Ringbom's remark was originally made by Jalas. The other addition is a longer passage (ibid, 130–131) discussing Jalas's understanding of the concept of

Sectio Aurea in Sibelius's symphonies, which he had published in the *Uusi Musiikkilehti* magazine in 1955. The additions, albeit relatively minor, move the discussion to a meta-level, demonstrate the desire to advance a critical debate on Sibelius's music and make visible the emerging need to establish authority figures in the interpretation of Sibelius's music. While I argued that the last mentioned was present in Jussi Jalas's translation of Gray's analyses, here the debate has transferred to the international level. Although Jalas's and Parmet's presentations are different, both conductors occupied several frame spaces in their capacities as music professionals, authors and (self-)translators – as well as 'authorised' interpreters of Sibelius's music.

This section diverged from the usual pattern of discussion in order to consider the often invisible routes and motivations of narrative construction. It demonstrated that the obvious source of a narrative may hide a far more complex reality, which may give reason to reconsider the assumed premises of narrative analysis. In the following section, I shall delve into a strand in the Sibelius narrative focussing on his connections with the United States. Already present in the translation of Downes's articles and featuring as a backdrop of Parmet's writing process, the success story of Sibelius in America was first captured in Otto Andersson's *Jean Sibelius i Amerika*.

4.9 *Jean Sibelius i Amerika* (1955) and *Jean Sibelius Amerikassa* (1960)

Otto Andersson's (1879–1969) book *Jean Sibelius i Amerika* ('Jean Sibelius in America'), published by the author-run Förlaget Bro in Swedish in 1955, appeared in honour of Sibelius's 90th anniversary. The Finnish translation by Margareta Jalas followed five years later, published by Otava. The book includes accounts of American performances of Sibelius's music, excerpts from concert reviews and introductions of some of the public personalities involved in promoting Sibelius's music in the United States. In the preface of his book, Andersson (1955, 8) expresses his wish that the book would 'increase awareness of the immense influence Sibelius's art has had on the American musical life and provide an understanding of the significance of Sibelius and his music on the recognition of Finland and its people in the United States'.[55] Despite this somewhat bombastic formulation, the book also covers some of the challenges and misconceptions of the American Sibelius

[55] Jag hoppas att boken i någon mån skall öka kunskapen om det mäktiga inflytande J e a n S i b e l i u s genom sin konst utövat på det amerikanska musikintresset samt giva en föreställning om vad han och hans musik betytt för spridande av kännedom om Finland och dess folk i Förenta staterna.

reception although, as Goss (1998, 87) mentions, it simultaneously "glosses over the anti-Sibelian forces evident in the United States by the 1950s". Considering the nature of the book as an anniversary publication and the narrative of accumulating fame the book conveys, the decision to disregard this side of the 1950s' Sibelius reception cannot be considered entirely surprising, and while a discussion of this development is missing, some of the anti-Sibelian criticism mentioned by Goss still manages to seep through Andersson's account: 'But the discussion is ongoing. There are always those who will avoid superlatives and continue making their biting remarks on certain compositions' (Andersson 1955, 125).[56]

The literature often underlines Andersson's image as a scholar. Although Andersson never graduated from upper secondary school, his early writings on folklore and music caught the attention of Kaarle Krohn, a professor of folklore, as well as his brother Ilmari Krohn. They encouraged Andersson to apply for an exclusive right to study at the University of Helsinki, to which he gained admittance in 1905 (Dahlström 2001, n.p.) and from which he received his Master's degree in 1915 and doctorate in 1923. Andersson was widely interested in folk music and traditions and became a rigorous academic, who placed great importance on source criticism. As a folklorist, Andersson was also actively involved in reviving Finland-Swedish cultural traditions. Although his earlier works until the 1940s were informed by attitudes which drew on national ideals (Huttunen 1993, 13), his academic integrity allowed him to rise above typical nationalist approaches (Dahlström 2001, n.p.). In his study on the beginnings of modern music history writing in Finland, Huttunen (1993, 61) describes Andersson as the initiator of the source critical and sociohistorical tradition, in contrast to the Finland-Swedish aesthetic and philosophical approach to music history practised by Wegelius, Furuhjelm and von Törne.

Jean Sibelius i Amerika serves as a fine example of Andersson's – to borrow Mäkelä's (2007, 91) words – 'brutally academic' investigative stance. The book expands the discussion of Sibelius's reception in the United States, which had gained significance since his visit to the country in 1914 and which since then had been discussed in several shorter texts in magazines and music journals (see, e.g., "Jean Sibelius Amerikassa – Suuremmoinen menestys" [Jean Sibelius in America – A tremendous success] in *Uusi Säveletär* 1.8.1914; "Amerikkalainen sana Sibeliuksesta" [Some American words on Sibelius] in *Suomen musiikkilehti* no. 9 (1935); "Olin Downesin kirjeitä Sibeliukselle" [Olin Downes's letters to Sibelius] in *Uusi musiikkilehti* 2, no. 9 (1955)). In the present study, America's ties to Sibelius have previously been present in Sjöblom and Jalas's compilation of Downes's texts.

[56] Men diskussionen går vidare. Det saknas icke de som draga sig för superlativer och t.o.m. fortfarande göra ampra uttalanden om vissa verk.

The feature that sets Andersson's book apart, however, is its presentation of Sibelius's personal contacts in the United States, which even until recent years have received only meagre attention at the expense of his more extensively researched Austro-German contacts (Goss 2011, 158). Despite the fact that only a modest amount of research has been conducted on the topic, writing of a book on the Americans' relationship with Sibelius was always only a matter of time due to the fame the composer enjoyed across the Atlantic. As early as 1935 Sibelius had been voted the most famous living composer in the world in a poll organised by an American radio channel (Mäkelä 2007, 64). This outcome resulted from the commercialisation of Sibelius's music as well as a conception which presented Sibelius as an alternative to modernist German composers and their "new music" (ibid.)

The narrative of Andersson's book charts American Sibelius reception from the beginning of the 20th century until 1950. The reception-centred approach of Andersson's work is a novel addition to the Sibelius-related works under study, as it distances itself from the personal depictions given by previous Finnish chroniclers and focusses on tracing an existing public narrative and its development. In this sense, *Jean Sibelius i Amerika* and its translation enters a meta-level of the Sibelius narrative, as it is the first book-length work in the material to concentrate on describing the manner in which Sibelius was perceived rather than Sibelius's works or the composer himself. The same type of meta-level investigation was already mentioned in the previous section in connection with Parmet, whose commentary on other Sibelius authors works was seen as a sign of increasing Sibelius scholarship. However, with Parmet, the focus was still on his own analysis of Sibelius's symphonies to which the other sources provided additional perspectives. Andersson's focus, on the other hand, is on the documentation of foreign views and the narratives these perceptions constructed in the United States. These impressions are communicated not only by presenting summaries and translations of American newspaper reviews but also by making quantitative observations on the performances of Sibelius's works in the form of several diagrams (see Andersson 1955, 108, 119 and 138). The book also lists and comments on a selection of Sibelius-related books published in the United States, the proliferation of which after the 1940s is regarded as a sign of Sibelius's growing popularity in the country by the author (Andersson 1955, 153–155).

While discussing the overarching development narrative, Andersson touches upon a variation of a theme which had been an increasingly important strand in the Finnish Sibelius narrative for more than a decade. Outlining the emergence of the Sibelius cult with its four major conductors Arturo Toscanini, Leopold Stokowski, Serge Koussevitzky and Eugene Ormándy, Andersson (1955, 126) observes an increase in the interest in Sibelius's symphonies as the number of performances of

the composer's more nationalist and Kalevala-inspired compositions decreases. Although Andersson's account is a report on a foreign development, the emphasis on symphonic music and the culmination of Sibelius's appreciation in his large-scale orchestral works has its parallel in the Finnish context, which had begun to highlight the significance of Sibelius's symphonic music from the 1940s onwards. This development originated in academic dissertations and was soon supported by biographical Sibelius works (Huttunen 1993, 156), such as Ringbom's biography discussed in section 4.7, as well as the more theoretical works such as those by Gray and Jalas (1945) and Parmet (1955). Even though the narrative focussing on the changes of the Americans' musical preferences can be argued to have had no direct bearing on the Finnish context, the discussion can still be considered an instance of narrative accrual, as it broadens the scope of the existing narrative through the introduction of a related narrative.

At a more general level, narrative accrual reflects the ability of a narrative to grow and to adopt novel perspectives and themes. Although narrative accrual necessarily follows from the addition of each additional narrative construct and is thus intimately connected with relationality in its capacity to append constitutive parts to a narrative, importantly it explains the expansion of narratives into new areas of existence. The reporting style of *Jean Sibelius i Amerika* and its translation seem to suggest a certain broadening of Sibelius's image beyond its national expression, as Andersson's outsider view on American cultural development expands the range of academically informed modes of literal depiction. Although external perspectives had been brought into the Finnish Sibelius narrative before Andersson's book (cf. discussions on Göhler and Downes in sections 4.2 and 4.6, respectively), the recontextualisation of these translations had ultimately turned the texts self-reflexive. Andersson, by contrast, seems to have been driven by a genuine desire to understand and outline the development of the American "Sibelius cult". Here, Andersson's capacity both as a professional academic and as a Sibelius chronicler needs to be noted, as his work appears to be signalling to a more academically rigorous endeavour compared to earlier Finnish Sibelius authors. Given Andersson's scholarly informed approach to writing about Sibelius-related phenomena, it is tempting to regard him (along with Johnson, discussed in the following section) as a harbinger of modern Sibelius studies, although it is best to avoid exaggerating this side of his agency in the development of Sibelius-related literature given the relatively limited extent of works examined in this study.

Andersson's fascination with Sibelius extended beyond the writing of *Jean Sibelius i Amerika*. Andersson's interest in the composer was already alluded to previously in section 4.1 in connection with the discussion that focussed on Sibelius's ancestry, which the author traced back to his Swedish speaking paternal lineage in the early 20th century. An active promoter of the Swedo-Finnish culture, Andersson was

known to advance his cultural agenda in his writings about Sibelius, which often included fleeting comments defending the Swedish language (Huttunen 1993, 118), thus connecting him to the linguistic and cultural debates of the early 20th century. Sibelius featured in Andersson's writings for a good part of Andersson's career. Goss (1998) lists altogether 12 texts which Andersson wrote on Sibelius between 1911–1966, many of which were published multiple times and circulated widely in various newspapers, magazines and journals. In his later years, Andersson also worked on a Sibelius biography which was never completed, leaving *Jean Sibelius i Amerika* Andersson's most extensive Sibelius-related work.

Jean Sibelius i Amerika was written on the basis of material Andersson collected on his two visits to the United States in 1950 and 1954, during which he interviewed people with ties to Sibelius and gathered materials for the collections of the Sibelius Museum, Finland's largest museum of music in Turku. The museum gradually grew out of an archive, originally known simply as *musikvetenskapliga seminariet vid Åbo Akademi* (the musicological seminar at Åbo Akademi) or *musikhistoriska samlingarna vid Åbo Akademi* (the music historical collections at Åbo Akademi), which Andersson had established in Turku in 1926 under the self-coined professorship of musicology and folklore at the Swedish-language university Åbo Akademi (Goss 1998, 86–87; Dahlström 2001). After a Sibelius-related exhibition in the late 1940s, which had unofficially been called 'a Sibelius museum' by a reporter, the museum was renamed at Andersson's initiative and with Sibelius's approval in 1949. While the already then significant collection of Sibelius miscellanea in the museum's possession was an important motivational factor for the renaming, Andersson's professional interest in and friendship with Sibelius played a role as well (Sibelius Museum's website).

Jean Sibelius Amerikassa became Margareta Jalas's final Sibelius translation, not taking into account the second edition of von Törne's book in 1965, which was a republication of Jalas's 1945 translation with an added chapter translated by Salmenhaara. The translation of Andersson's work also marked the end of Jalas's career as a translator, as it is the final work she published with a publishing house. Throughout her career as a translator, Jalas worked for the same publishing company, Otava, which also published the Sibelius-themed photography book she edited in 1952. Of her nine translations, eight were for this company and, of these, half were Sibelius-related. Sibelius literature formed a thematic series for Otava. In addition to the works discussed in this study, the company also published Sibelius's private secretary Santeri Levas's *Jean Sibelius ja hänen Ainolansa* ('Jean Sibelius and his Ainola'; 1945), Helasvuo and Sjöblom's *Sibelius and the Music of Finland* (1952; the original Finnish manuscript was written by Veikko Helasvuo and translated into English and enlarged by Paul Sjöblom) as well as three works by Erik Tawaststjerna: *Sibeliuksen pianosävellykset ja muita esseitä* ('Sibelius's works for

piano and other essays'; 1955), *The pianoforte compositions of Jean Sibelius* (1957) and *Sibeliuksen pianoteokset säveltäjän kehityslinjan kuvastajina* ('The piano works of Sibelius as reflectors of the composer's development'; 1960).[57] The four other translations which Margareta Jalas rendered into Finnish for Otava included a guidebook, a topical political text and two novels. Lina Boldemann's singing guide *Naturröstens hemlighet* ('The secret of the natural voice') came out in 1947 under the title *Luonnonäänen salaisuus*.[58] In 1948, Jalas translated the political pamphlet *Miksi sosialisoisimme?* ('Why would we nationalise'), the original version of which, *Varför socialisera*? written by the Swedo-Finnish politician and economist Nils Meinander, had been published the year before. At the beginning of the 1950s, Jalas worked on the Finnish versions of Rosemond Lehmann's novels *The Weather in the Streets* (1936) and *Invitation to the Waltz* (1932), translated into Finnish as *Kaduilla tuulee* in 1950 and *Tanssiinkutsu* in 1951, respectively.

The one translation Margareta Jalas did for the publishing house WSOY was *Pianonsoiton avaimet* (1950), a translation of the piano playing guide *Keys to the Keyboard* (1948) by the Hungarian-born pianist Andor Földes. Letters in Jussi Jalas's archive at the National Archives of Finland indicate that the Jalas and Földes families kept in contact, but whether the couples knew each other already before the translation of *Pianonsoiton avaimet* remains unclear. The first archived letter from Andor Földes to the Jalas family, dated 17 October 1949, expresses Földes's excitement over the Finnish translation of his book: "I was happy to hear from Maisteri Yantti [= Magister Jäntti; most likely referring to Yrjö A. Jäntti, Deputy Director of WSOY at the time] that you are translating my book into Finnish." Due to an unknown reason, Földes seems to have been under the impression that the Jalas's were working on the translation together. This misinformation also spread in the British press based on a press release which Földes sent to the Jalas's and which is stored in Jussi Jalas's archive.

As has already become clear, Margareta Jalas's visibility as a translator is rather minimal, typically manifesting itself only as a name on the title page. Therefore, it is better to view her agency with respect to the entirety of her translation work and the fact that working on Sibelius-related translations constituted practically half of her career as a translator. While Margareta Jalas did not occupy the same kind of double frame space as her husband in his role as a conductor and translator-commentator, she can hardly be considered "only a translator" even in the absence

57 Soon after, Tawaststjerna's five-volume Sibelius biography was also published by Otava.

58 Perhaps worth mention is the fact that the Swedish vocal pedagogue Boldemann was a friend of the Sibelius family and the grandmother of Margareta's cousin Maija Järnefelt's son on his father's side.

of material that would explicitly tell us more about her personal or professional life. On the one hand, Jalas's position as a Sibelius translator was defined by her familial relationship with both Sibelius and Jussi Jalas as well as the ensuing personal connections and knowledge of the subject matter.[59] On the other hand, one must also acknowledge her day job at the Sibelius Academy, which as the fundamental music institution undoubtedly provided her with a near panoptic view over the happenings of the Finnish music culture. This centrality must have affected the enactment of her role as a translator who not only knew the people whose works she translated but whose presence at the hub of Finnish music education spanned over three decades. While Margareta Jalas may be destined to remain a shadowy figure, there is no denying her constancy in the construction of the Finnish Sibelius narrative for a majority of the period known as the Silence of Järvenpää during which Sibelius's institutionalisation was sealed.

The case studies in this chapter have by and large fallen into two categories: texts whose authors had close ties to Finland and its cultural discourse and texts which, despite being imports from other cultures, supported the established narrative either inherently or by virtue of adopted translation strategies. This section presented a shift in perspective, as Andersson's book no longer concerned itself with Finnish developments but turned its gaze outward. Andersson's book leads rather organically to the final work examined in this chapter, already alluded to above, the Sibelius biography by the American musicologist Harold E. Johnson. Johnson's rendition of the composer's life shook the modes of Sibelius discourse by offering a critical outsider view on Finland's national hero.

[59] This can perhaps be witnessed in one rare instance where Jalas adds information to *Jean Sibelius Amerikassa*. Towards the end of the book Andersson discusses Sibelius's late tone poem *Tapiola*, which received its world premiere in the United States. This is a composition for which Sibelius, at the request of the publisher, wrote a short description which explained the meaning of title and which was printed in the musical score as a four-line poem in English, French and German. While Andersson's original book only provides the English poem, *Jean Sibelius Amerikassa* provides both the original English version as well as its Finnish translation by A. O. Väisänen (Andersson 1960, 95–96). As an interesting detail, for an unknown reason, the first two verses differ from the version which later spread via Tawaststjerna's Sibelius biography and which, based on the metre, seems to be the correct one: instead of "On metsät Pohjolassa sankat, tummat / ne ikisalat, haaveet hurjat loi*"* (The forests of Pohjola are dense, dark / they created eternal secrets, wild imaginings; Tawaststjerna 1989, 251), the version in Andersson (1960, 95) reads "On metsät Pohjolassa sankat / ne ikisalat, haaveet hurjat, tummat loi*"* (The forests of Pohjola are dense / they created eternal secrets, wild, dark imaginings).

4.10 *Jean Sibelius* (1959 and 1960)

Harold E. Johnson's (1915–1985) biography *Jean Sibelius*, originally published by Alfred Knopf in the United States in 1959 and by Otava in Finland the following year, is often portrayed as something of a turning point in the Finnish Sibelius discourse in its divergence from the established modes of writing about the composer in Finland. Johnson's biography was a departure from the state of nationally experienced reverence caused by Sibelius's passing in 1957, as it made what were considered opprobrious claims on Sibelius's idealised view of himself and his lack of modesty and gratitude in the face of his national recognition (Goss 1995, 146). Internationally, the reception of the biography was somewhat mixed. The Americans considered it "an antidote to what many viewed as the sensational myth-making surrounding the composer", while in England (where the book was also published in 1960) and in Finland the book was decried as scandalous (Goss 1998, 60). This attests to the different relational settings of the countries of publication. As a piece of American writing, Johnson's biography has been considered symptomatic of the forces that swept over the American universities and the western musical landscape in the aftermath of the two world wars (Goss 2014, n.p.) and as a backlash against the Sibelius idolatry promoted by the likes of Downes. The tearing down of old icons reflected the disillusioned state of the cultural elites and symbolised the progression into a better world. In Finland, where Sibelius's significance was closely tied to recent historical and cultural developments, the attitude towards Johnson's biography was quite different.

It appears that despite the partly negative reaction to the biography in Finland, Johnson's attitude towards Sibelius was not malevolent. Describing his ongoing project in the journal *Suomi-Finland-USA* in 1957, Johnson explained that his aim was to contribute to "the care and preservation of […] [an] important monument […] which Sibelius himself has designed – his music" (cited in Schlüter Teller 1993, iv). It has been proposed that Johnson's perceived annoyance at the composer was actually an outlet for the author's subsequent disappointment (Nummi 1959, 37; Mäkelä 2007, 47). Johnson had spent the years 1957–1958 in Finland, preparing his biography on a Fulbright scholarship, gathering primary sources in various archives and libraries and trying to promote the preservation of the material (Goss 1998, 60; Schlüter Terrell 1993, iv). Soon after arriving in Finland, he had attempted to approach Sibelius but had not succeeded. Sibelius had become wary of anyone who came to visit him with a pen and notepad in hand and purposely made it difficult for the American, just as Andersson before him, to make contact, as Sibelius increasingly considered himself to be misunderstood and misquoted in the public sphere (Mäkelä 2007, 47, 99). Contemporary accounts reveal that after having been denied audience Johnson felt abashed, stopped seeking Sibelius's favour and announced that he no longer desired to meet the composer because, as Johnson

explained, he wanted to portray Sibelius objectively (Nummi 1959, 37). The composer Seppo Nummi (ibid.) proffers that the book would probably have been different, had Johnson and Sibelius met.

According to Johnson himself, the biography aspires to describe Sibelius in a neutral light. Johnson's objective as a "detached foreigner" was to "reduce the composer to a 'mortal stature'" (Johnson 1959, xii). This was something the author clearly thought had not been done by "Finnish biographers, who considered it their moral and patriotic duty to respect [Sibelius's] slightest wish" and who were "obliged to discuss their great composer with reverence" (ibid, viii). Johnson's attempt at objectivity was not met with understanding. For instance, already after the publication of Johnson's original biography, Nummi warned the readers of *Suomen Kuvalehti* (26 September 1959) not to confuse Johnson's aspirations towards objectivity with the feelings of resentment expressed by a petit-bourgeois author.[60] In a series of texts published in the newspaper *Uusi Suomi,* columnists reacted to Johnson's various claims, including the assertions that Sibelius had decided to become a symphonic composer due to the criticism his Kalevala-inspired works had received from the critic Karl Flodin (30.8.1959, 18), that he had ungratefully denounced all influences on his works and that he had denied support to the younger generation of composers (22.12.1959, 17). Interestingly, while the book attracted a great amount of criticism, there were also some commentators who drew attention to Johnson's accomplishments. The author's industriousness was acknowledged and the information he gathered on Sibelius's works – "the most complete work list of the time" (Goss 1998, 65) – was recognised as an impressive feat (*Maaseudun tulevaisuus* 14.4.1960, 5; *Uusi Suomi* 30.8.1959, 18; Nummi 1959, 37). In another commentary, the pseudonym S.O., while agreeing that the biography's view of Sibelius is distorted, pointed out how Johnson's critics only cited the book's negative remarks and left out Johnson's appreciative assessments (*Uusi Suomi* 6.1.1960, 11). In the June of 1960 in a report entitled 'Johnson did not want to defame Sibelius', an *Uusi Suomi* correspondent summarised a *Sunday Times* review of Johnson's book, putting forward the idea that Johnson's character profile of Sibelius with all its human frailty did not cheapen Sibelius's worth as an artist but rather placed him among other great composers, such as Wagner (*Uusi Suomi* 27.6.1960, 16). For Otava, the furore and debate around Johnson's biography worked as a marketing gimmick: in its newspaper advertisements, the publishing company urged the readers to 'get to know the controversial Sibelius book themselves' (*Uusi Suomi* 10.4.1960, 7).

60 Siksi varoittaisin Johnsonin lukijoita sekoittamasta objektiivisuuden pyrkimystä pikkuporvarin kaunantunteisiin.

These comments indicate at least two points of interest. Firstly, it is worth noting that the discussion around Johnson's biography had already begun with the publication of the English version in 1959. Johnson's project had been well-known in Finland, as the author had been in contact with numerous people during the research process, ranging from Erik Furuhjelm and Simon Parmet to Kai Maasalo, Director of Music for the Finnish Broadcasting Company, and the librarians of the major Helsinki-based orchestras, to name but a few (Johnson 1959, xiii–xiv). The book became widely debated and caused 'a great stir among the musical circles as well as the general public' (*Maaseudun tulevaisuus* 14.4.1960). The reason for such investment in the book must have at least partly stemmed from Johnson's immediacy to the Finnish context, a trait that had not featured in previous unfavourable Sibelius-texts. Adorno's critique had to be separately introduced into the Finnish relational setting in the late 1960 before it was slowly adopted into the Sibelius narrative. The same applies to René Leibowitz's pamphlet *Sibelius, le plus mauvais compositeur du monde* (1955), which can be regarded as a largely plagiarised version of Adorno's *Glosse* (see Oramo 2021 [1996], n.p.; see also Leibowitz 2009, 68–69 for Oramo's Finnish translation of Leibowitz's text) and which entered the Finnish awareness through Johnson's book (1960, 220). Johnson, however, was already operating in the relational setting in which his book was later discussed. The involvement of a variety of personal and institutional agents with whom Johnson was in close contact, made the book be of interest to the Finnish audience.

The second point arising from the public commentary concerns the debate itself. Even though the Finnish response to the book was generally negative and disapproving of Johnson's tone, the comments appear to recognise the need for a new type of Sibelius discourse. In *Suomen Kuvalehti*, Nummi (1959, 37) remarks that while the mythical and statuesque portrayal of Sibelius in literature is unsustainable, the "humanising" of Sibelius requires both first-rate skills and endless individuality from the researcher – attributes which, according to Nummi, Johnson is lacking. In the same vein, Olavi Pesonen's review in *Uusi Suomi* (30.8.1959, 19) recognises that Johnson's attempt to depict Sibelius as a human being has greatly advanced the research on Sibelius even though the findings of the book are inconclusive. These comments signal a need to dismantle some of the mythos surrounding Sibelius and can be understood as indicative of the desire to shift from the idolising depictions of Sibelius to a more comprehensive and academically informed public narrative. As a first work of its kind to be published in Finland, Johnson's biography provided a site for negotiating these views despite its controversial nature.

The notion that the type of book Johnson's biography represented was chosen for publication is in itself a tell-tale sign that the time was ripe for a more varied Sibelius discourse. In addition, an indication of the dawning new era of Sibelius

translation can perhaps also be seen in the choice of translator. Until Johnson's book, the translators of Sibelius-related texts from Madetoja to Margareta Jalas had been people who were either somehow involved in the musical life of Finland or, alternatively, had a personal connection to other agents in the field. Yrjö Kivimies (1899–1980), the translator of Johnson's book, by contrast, seems to have had no apparent ties of this kind. In his lifetime, Kivimies came to be known as a celebrated author and screenwriter as well as a prolific translator of several Anglo-American literary classics such as Rudyard Kipling, Edgar Allan Poe and Mark Twain (Fennica). It is possible to think that Kivimies's detachment from the music cultural circles as well as the role he otherwise occupied as a translator of English-language works and an active cultural commentator made him particularly suited for the task of translating Johnson's book. As a kind of 'detached foreigner' in the world of music himself, he was able to exert his agency without compromising his position in the cultural field. Considering the indebtedness that the music culture as a collective felt towards Sibelius, it may have been necessary to have an outsider as the translator of Johnson's book. The practice of utilising music professionals as the translators of Sibelius-related books hardly ended with Kivimies, however – for instance, as mentioned above, Erkki Salmenhaara was later involved in the translation of Tawaststjerna's Sibelius biographies and, to provide an even more recent example, Goss's 2009 collection of essays *Sibelius, Amerikka ja amerikkalaiset – Vieläkö lähetämme hänelle sikareja?* ('Sibelius, America and the Americans – Are we still sending him cigars') was translated into Finnish by the Finnish Broadcasting Company's music journalist Martti Haapakoski. However, having Kivimies as the translator can be considered to point to a new type of cultural context in which the composer was no longer merely a national project to be developed and upheld by those involved in the music cultural scene but a phenomenon that could begin to be assessed from multiple perspectives and articulated in more foreign-sounding voices. This notion is not unimportant, considering the construction of the Sibelius narrative until this point. As has become apparent in the preceding case studies, prior to Johnson's book, depictions of the composer had to a large extent been aimed at sustaining a nationally vital image and at elaborating on the existing models of representation. Although texts dissenting from the accepted mode of discourse, such as Adorno's critique or Leibowitz's pamphlet some time later, had been produced during Sibelius's lifetime, they had not been publicly discussed, let alone translated into Finnish. Johnson's biography went against this prevailing discourse on Sibelius and was able to introduce new patterns of discussion into the Finnish Sibelius narrative.

In narrative terms, by breaching the norms of Sibelius depiction, Johnson's biography becomes a play on the normativeness of the established Sibelius

narrative. Baker (2006, 98), who approaches normativeness, canonicity and breach as the different facets of the same phenomenon, writes that the "normative function underlines the central role that narrative plays in policing cultural legitimacy" – in other words, regulating the understanding of what is accepted and what is not. Although "breaches of the canonical […] are often highly conventional" (Bruner 1991, 12), referring to the manner in which they are normally understood with respect to the norms which they breach, they have the power to lead "people to see human happenings in a fresh way, […] in a way they had never 'noticed' or even dreamed" (ibid.). Johnson's biography was the first interpretation of Sibelius which to a significant extent called the composer's iconicity into question. The shock value of the biography arose from the manner in which the author broke the nationally established patterns of portrayal and modes of discussion. Johnson's breach of the norm can be considered to have stemmed from his agency as an outsider, which enabled him to articulate new ideas and challenge generally accepted assumptions. While he may have failed to do this in a manner that was considered tactful by the Finns, he "had an eye for what those unfamiliar with Finnish history and culture needed to know to understand Sibelius" and was able to write a book that was "ultimately to the benefit of Sibelius's wider reputation" (Goss 2009, xi).

This brings the discussion to the extent of the influence that Johnson's biography had on the Finnish Sibelius narrative and to the consideration of recognising *what* changed. If we are to understand the Sibelius narrative as 'the ideas, values and ideals which Sibelius represented and was thought to embody as a national hero', as defined in section 3.4, Johnson's book could be said to have affected the publicly expressed idea of how the composer *could* be perceived. By breaching the norm, it expanded – rather than broke – the boundaries of normativeness, as the addition of the new narrative layer enabled the re-evaluation of the values connected with Sibelius's persona in the public consciousness. While the portrayal of Sibelius as an ungrateful and unsympathetic money-grubber has hardly become mainstream even in later times, Johnson's biography paved the way for more comprehensive and realistic depictions. One cannot help but think that Johnson's unnecessarily negative characterisations made Tawaststjerna's subsequent work easier by giving him the opportunity to portray Sibelius not as an icon but as a human being without having to be the first one to breach the norm.

Since the book marks a transition into modern Sibelius studies and is clearly set apart from the rest of the texts in my material by its approach, considering its role in the light of future developments in this manner stands to reason. However, it needs to be born in mind that interpreting the significance of Johnson's book in this manner is a causally emplotted element of an even later strand of the Sibelius narrative, constructed and explained from the vantage point of subsequent developments. The

contemporary meaning of *Jean Sibelius* had more to do with the relational properties of the book and its translation as well as with how these texts partook in the contemporary Sibelius narrative. Understanding the narrative significance of the book therefore presupposes its constitution as a part of the heretofore accumulated Sibelius narrative and its examination with regard to the preceding Sibelius-related translations. Paying attention to the differences in how Johnson's biography and the other texts emerged may prove significant in terms of the narrative construction. One such difference is the cultural distance between Johnson's standpoint and the relational setting of Finland as an enabler of Johnson's authorship. The distance can also be seen as a contributing factor to the clearly different reactions the book provoked in Finland, where it caused outrage, and in the United States, where it "was praised for its 'objectivity'" (Goss 1998, 65).

The existence of various cultural ties has been a recurring albeit often implicit feature in the case studies examined. The matter deserves more attention, however. As was already noted in connection with Furuhjelm's biography in section 4.1, the power of a translated narrative may lie in its capacity to introduce new repertoires into the target culture. While in Furuhjelm's case the introduction took place within the same cultural sphere between the Swedish and Finnish-speaking demographics, Johnson's biography provides an opportunity to examine the transfer of translated ideas between two distinct and geographically separated cultures. Moreover, compared to the other four source texts which were originally published outside Finland – Göhler, Gray, Downes and von Törne – Johnson's book is also the only one to represent a prototypical translation with what seems to be a straightforward transfer between two languages and cultures. The question is whether and to what extent such considerations carried significance in the construction of the Sibelius narrative.

The final case study in the material also brings the Sibelius narrative to the doorstep of its next phase, in which the life as well as works of Sibelius were subjected to careful scholarly scrutiny. This approach owed much to Johnson, whose use of primary sources of both musical and personal nature paved the way for future Sibelius scholars (Goss 2009, xii). The creation of Tawaststjerna's five-volume biography also indirectly owes a great deal to Johnson's biography, as its publication gave the Sibelius family the impetus to ask Tawaststjerna to write a more balanced account of the composer's life (Goss 2009, xi). This began a new era of Sibelius studies as well as a process towards a more fact-based Sibelius narrative. A stretch of the long journey leading up to this point was explored in the case studies of this chapter, which served as reflections of the Sibelius narrative prevalent during Sibelius's lifetime. The many strands and associations of this early Sibelius narrative will be brought together in the next chapter. In this Discussion, I shall revisit the research questions and explore the implications of the various constellations of

source languages, cultures, agents and routes through which the texts travelled to Finland. In addition, I shall consider the different features of the Sibelius narrative from the viewpoint of the entire research material and finally summarise the findings of this study.

5 Discussion on the character narrative

Chapter 4 conducted ten cases studies of altogether 12 Sibelius-related texts translated between 1916 and 1965. The objective was to discuss the research material and the agents behind the translations of the texts and to bring forth narrative strands that have proven lasting constituents of the Sibelius narrative. The chapter brought together information concerning Sibelius-related texts as well as their translations and translators which to date has only been available in separate publications and archival sources. In addition, the chapter also examined each of the individual texts from a specific and prominent narrative viewpoint with the objective of gaining insight into different means of narrative construction. For the most part, however, the case studies paid little attention to the connections between the texts and the agencies or to the wider implications of the material for the narrative-agential approach and the construction of character narratives.

To remedy the situation, the overarching theme of this chapter, then, will be the character narrative, a sub-type of the public narrative that gives prominence to the stories centred around an individual. This chapter will be divided into two sections. In the first section, I shall direct my focus to creating a synthesis of the cases studies. Comparison of the narrative-agential features connecting the texts and translations will provide information on the generalisable tendencies prevalent in the construction of the Sibelius narrative and also foreshadow various theoretical aspects that would deserve more attention in the study of translated character narratives. The discussion of my findings will tie in with the research questions focussing on Sibelius-related literature first presented in the Introduction of this study. The second subsection of this chapter will refocus on the second objective of this study, as it concentrates on character narratives as a methodological question and considers their applicability with regard to the narrative theory in Translation Studies.

5.1 Revisiting the research questions – findings of the case studies

In this dissertation, I set out to explore how the sociological narrative theory introduced into Translation Studies by Baker could be applied to a study on a nationally significant character narrative focussing on Finland's national composer, Jean Sibelius. To examine the construction of the narrative, I determined and further developed a number of research questions related to translation and agency which were used to frame the investigation of altogether twelve Sibelius-related texts and their translations. This material formed the case studies of this research. The objective of the investigation was to examine narrative construction from a number of shifting angles and thus to outline methods of dissecting a translated character narrative. The research question overarching the examination concerned the role of translation in the construction of the early Sibelius narrative in Finland, understood as the manner in which the ideas, values and ideals which Sibelius represented were negotiated in society. This question was divided into several supplementary questions regarding the general motivation for translating the Sibelius-related texts, the origin of the texts, the translators and their motivation, and the significance of translation for the Sibelius narrative. Each of these topics will be discussed below.

The material in this study, from Göhler's original article in 1908 to the second edition of von Törne's memoir in 1965, spans nearly six decades. The earliest texts were produced in a relational setting where Finland was still under Russian rule and Sibelius's position was dictated by a nationalist understanding of his importance, a stance which had been established at the beginning of the 20th century (Huttunen 1993, 115–116). By the beginning of the 1960s and the release of Johnson's biography, Finland had already come a long way as an independent state, having for instance survived the gruesome civil war of 1918 as well as two Soviet-Finnish Wars in 1939–1940 and 1941–1944, and was experiencing a rapid modernisation and internationalisation in the throes of the Cold War. A characteristic feature of the timeframe examined was the change in Sibelius's public image, as his active presence in the Finnish cultural life was replaced by his institutionalisation, furthered by his withdrawal to his home Ainola in Järvenpää. The tone poem Tapiola, which received its premier performance in New York on 26 December 1926, became Sibelius's final major orchestral work.

With the exceptions of Furuhjelm's biography and Göhler's article, all the works discussed in this dissertation were published after this date. As Sibelius no longer published any major works in the last 30 years of his life, his public image began to rely more on factors other than his music, with the texts and their translations scrutinised in this study constituting one aspect of this development. From today's perspective, we are able to claim that these texts were involved in building and supporting a nationally significant character narrative, but such a teleological

argument is only made possible through the benefit of hindsight. However, as the case studies above demonstrated, it is possible to approach the causes which underlay the emergence of the narrative by focussing on factors such as the motivations of the agents involved. While these cannot be reduced to single answers due to the complexities of human (inter)actions and even though they may omit other socio-historical factors, they offer clues for uncovering the narrative identities of the agents and help to examine why and how the authors and translators became involved in the construction of the narrative.

One contributing factor is the prominent role of many of the agents – authors and translators alike – in Finland's cultural life. This study acknowledged altogether six declarative translatorships: Leevi Madetoja, Jussi Jalas, Margareta Jalas, Paul Sjöblom, Yrjö Kivimies and Erkki Salmenhaara. These translators, with the exception of Yrjö Kivimies, each had close ties with the music culture of their time. Moreover, the work of these agents – now with the exceptions of Kivimies and Salmenhaara as far as could be determined – was characterised by the translators' personal connection to Sibelius through some type of professional or familial relationship. Considered in tandem with the fact that most of the authors of the original works also had some type of direct connection to Sibelius, the early literary construction of the Sibelius narrative is shown to have been concentrated in the hands of a group of people centred around the composer.

In the case studies, the translators' motivation was approached through the few surviving statements in the material and its accompanying paratexts as well as by drawing inferences from other aspects of the translators' activities. For instance, although the archival evidence is not conclusive, it seems likely that Madetoja's ending up as the translator of Furuhjelm's book was linked to the fact that he approached WSOY about his own book project, suggesting that Madetoja's translatorship was a by-product of his unrealised authorship. A contrasting example is provided by Jussi and Margareta Jalas, who represent an entirely different type of translatorship. Both had studied languages at university level and translation featured significantly in their professional lives, although not as their main line of work. As members of Sibelius's immediate family, the couple's translation activities can be regarded as something of a personal mission.

In Jussi Jalas's case, the translation of Gray's book was an extension of his role as a Sibelius conductor and, according to the translator's preface of Gray's book, a means of correcting existing misconceptions about Sibelius's symphonies. An interesting detail concerned the use of Jalas's name for marketing purposes in connection with Sjöblom's Downes translation. As a 'significant mediator of Sibelius's intentions' (Dahlström 2009, n.p.), Jalas received his share of the composer's personality cult. For Margareta Jalas, Sibelius translations formed a theme than spanned the translation of four individual work and 15 years (excluding

the second edition of von Törne's book). Her education in languages, intimate knowledge of the subject matter and vantage point at the centre of Finnish music culture characterise her agency as a Sibelius translator, as does her desire to stay out of the limelight. Although Margareta was never what could be called a public figure, archival evidence and biographical data attest to her capabilities on a number of fronts. In addition to her work at the Sibelius Academy and as a translator and editor, she was part of a group that established the first Steiner school in Finland in 1955 (Paalasmaa, 2011, 10, 13). She also belonged to a delegation that accompanied the presidential couple Urho and Sylvi Kekkonen on their state visit to Sweden in 1956. Letters in Jussi Jalas's archive show traces of Margareta's active participation in the running of Sibelius-related errands, such as replying to messages addressed to her father on his behalf or sending out photographs to record companies at their request. Something of the personal aspect of Margareta Jalas's translation work is perhaps visible in the thank-you letter, today stored at the archives of Åbo Akademi, which she wrote to Andersson after having received a copy of his book complete with a dedication:

> Highly esteemed Professor,
>
> I wish to thank you from the bottom of my heart for kindly sending me your book with its beautiful inscription. It was a great pleasure for me to trace my father's footsteps in America as well as to admire the eagerness and dedication you had put into the preparation of the book.
>
> Respectfully, Margareta Jalas. [61]

The letter is indication of the manner in which the private dimensions of translation were interwoven into Jalas's translatorship. She highlights the personal enjoyment of working on the translation and compliments Andersson on his commitment to his endeavour – an act that could be considered breaching the lines of a translator's traditional frame space. While Jalas's narrative identity stays largely hidden with only glimpses of her motivations visible to the researcher, it is safe to say it was constituted not only by the prevailing relational setting but also by a feeling of personal responsibility.

61 "Högtärade Herr Professor, | För Eder vänliga bokförsändelse med den vackra tillägnan ber jag att få tacka på det hjärtligaste. Det var för mig ett stort nöje att följa I min faders spår I Amerika och likaså att beundra det intresse och den noggrannhet Professorn lagt ner i förarbeten till boken. Med en vördsam tillgiven hälsning | Eder | Margareta Jalas."

A question that this study will be unable to answer and which seems to have fascinated at least one contemporary literary critic as well concerns the potential collaboration between Jussi and Margareta. Väinö Pesola's review of Andersson's, Parmet's and Tawaststjerna's Sibelius works from 1956 (*Suomen Sosiaalidemokraatti* 11.1.1956) commends Margareta Jalas's Parmet translation: 'The work, reflecting a thoroughly personal stylistic vision, has been translated with surprising aptitude by Margareta Jalas. Perhaps Jussi Jalas has played a part in the pleasant outcome as well?' From today's vantage point, it is easy to interpret the tone as condescending, taking into account that Parmet's book was aimed at the lay audience and therefore not particularly challenging, knowing Margareta Jalas's experience as a translator and considering the fact that Margareta Jalas had actively played the violin since she was a girl. As an adult, she had continued playing at least in Ylioppilaskunnan Soittajat (Helsinki University Symphony Orchestra), and thus had considerable knowledge of music herself. Be that as it may, Pesola also touches upon an important point: the potential for collaboration between the translators. It is easy to believe that language and translation were discussed at the Jalas household, keeping in mind that both Margareta and Jussi had studied languages, that Sibelius featured prominently in both of their lives and that both were involved in translation also outside the Sibelius translations.

Paul Sjöblom's role as a Sibelius translator seems to have been part and parcel of his broader professional profile as a type of cultural ambassador to Finland. As a journalist and as an author, Sjöblom showed extensive interest in the culture, history and politics of his family's country of origin. As Goss has put it, his "unaffected observations, first-rate linguistic gifts, and often genuinely moving accounts of virtually every imaginable aspect of life in Finland provided a wide public with credible and regular English-language information about Finns for more than half a century" (Goss in Sjöblom 2000, 16). Although Sjöblom is said to have claimed that he had "written more about Sibelius than anyone alive" (ibid., 21) and even though Sibelius thus did feature prominently in Sjöblom's writing, his work on Sibelius is only one aspect of his promotion of Finnish-American relations in general. Sjöblom's agency concerns only one book in the material, yet it is impressive as an example of the hybridity that translatorship may entail. Encompassing not only the declarative, executive and – one must assume – revisionary dimensions of Janssen and Wegener's translatorship (the first-mentioned supported by Jalas's contribution), Sjöblom's agency also covers the precursive authorship which Sjöblom exercised in determining the form and substance of the book. This editing work represents another example of a double frame space in the material in addition to Jussi Jalas's role as Gray's translator. As a journalist, Sjöblom must have been highly aware of the choices he made in organising Downes's texts into a book and, therefore, his authorial decisions carry particular meaning in terms of narrative

construction. The book warrants a detailed case study that would determine the source texts and also consider the organisation of the work from a narratological perspective.

Considering the information available, Yrjö Kivimies seems to form an exception to the otherwise music culturally connected group of Sibelius translators. During his lifetime, Kivimies worked for several publishing companies, including Tammi, Gummerus and WSOY, and based on the information on Fennica, his first works for Otava – a Finnish thesaurus *Synonyymisanasto* as well as a collection Kipling's short stories in Finnish translation – came out in 1955. In 1956, Kivimies translated Mark Twain's *Tom Sawyer Abroad* (*Tom Sawyerin viimeiset seikkailut*), which was followed by three novels in 1958: Geoffrey Household's *Rogue Male* (*Ihmismetsästys*), Eleanor Farjeon's *A Little Bookroom* (*Lasinen riikinkukko*) and Monica Dickens's *The Angel in the Corner* (*Virginia*). After *Jean Sibelius* in 1960, Kivimies's final translation for Otava was Kipling's *Stalky & Co* (*Minä ja kumppanit*) in 1962. The works listed indicate that when working for Otava, Kivimies was as a translator solely focussed on English-language works, and while the ultimate reason for why Kivimies was offered the task of translating Johnson's book remains unknown, his activities as an active cultural commentator and as a non-fiction author may have influenced the decision. In the section on Johnson's book, I suggested that the selection of Kivimies as the translator of Jean Sibelius was perhaps symptomatic of the dawning of a new era in Sibelius literature, but it is also possible to look at translation through a lens that focusses on the absence of Margareta Jalas's input.

Jalas had been responsible for all of Otava's Sibelius translations (excluding the dubious case of Ekman's biography) but she either turned down or was not offered the task of translating Johnson's book. This may have been affected by her working on the translation of Andersson's book around the same time but considering the relatively small scale of Andersson's book (141 pages in the Finnish edition) and the fact that Jalas must have known about Johnson's work well in advance – Johnson's project was well known in Finland as became clear in the section 4.10, in addition to which archival evidence shows that Johnson had already contacted Jussi Jalas in 1956 right after arriving in Finland and that he had remained in contact with the conductor and his family at least until the summer of 1959 – one cannot entirely dismiss the possibility of personal reasons for not accepting the assignment.

Kivimies, with his fundamentally different narrative identity, would have had no qualms translating a vivifying cultural text such as Johnson's biography. Kivimies had, for instance, previously argued against uncritical ideological acceptance of commonly held truths about the nature of the Finnish psyche in his 1937 culture-political book *Pidot Tornissa* ('a banquet at Hotel Torni'), which was based on actual conversations had by a number of Finland's leading intellectuals. In his introduction

to a discussion on the character of the Finnish people, Kivimies, partaking in the conversation under the pseydonym Konservatiivi ('conservative'), states the following: 'In other words, we only imagine the characteristics of Finns, and we keep imagining, which prevents us from seeing clearly' (Kivimies 1937, 4). Although no evidence suggests that Kivimies's translation of Johnson's Jean Sibelius was ideologically motivated, the iconoclastic ethos of the biography was not far-removed from at least some of Kivimies's culture-political ideas.

In addition to the declarative translatorships discussed above, this study featured two cases – the translation of Göhler's article and the translations of Karl Ekman's biography editions – where the translator was not explicitly named. The translation of Göhler's text represented a deviation from the otherwise book-length format of the other works. However, as it was mentioned in Hemming's catalogue and as its length was approximately the same as Adorno's and Leibowitz's pamphlets, which would have been included in the material had they been translated within the timeframe of this study, the article was examined as a separate case. Excluding it from this study may have increased the coherence of the material but, on the other hand, its inclusion served as an example of the open-endedness of narrative construction and offered a glimpse into the more ephemeral material on Sibelius which circulated in abundance in the Finnish society. Göhler's case very concretely demonstrates how narratives can be layered, or in Baker's words embedded, so that they form wider narrative constellations beyond the immediate text. The translation of Göhler's text gained significance not only as an edited translation but also as a text within the wider anniversary publication. The publication itself could also be considered significant as a notable cultural journal, which carries its own narrative as a promoter of Finnish cultural heritage. The different narrative layers feed into the understanding and interpretation of Göhler's text and vice versa.

Ekman's case introduced the idea of self-translation into the construction of the Sibelius narrative. The phenomenon, which in Translation Studies has traditionally been discussed in connection with literary translation, featured in the material not only in Ekman's biography but also in the creation of the Swedish-language version of von Törne's 1945 book as well as, arguably, Parmet's work. Of these works, Ekman's Sibelius biography is the only one which exemplifies self-translation into the primary translated language examined in this study, Finnish. For this reason, and the questions surrounding Ekman's agency as a self-translator, this study did not venture deeper into questions of self-translation and narrative construction. Yet, self-translation would benefit from further research as a developing area of Translation Studies (Bassnet 2013, 15; Montini 2010, n.p.; Hokenson & Munson 2007, 2). Applying it to narrative theory should also be promoted, as this approach could provide insight into topics such as translators' agency and the similarities and differences in the methods of narrative construction in various relational settings. I

shall briefly mention only one mind-game, which was evoked by the cases examined in this study: According to Jung (2002, 30), self-translation is largely a matter of the authority that the self-translator exerts over the original text, since "[…] self-translators can access their original intention and the original cultural context or literary intertext of their original work better than ordinary translators". In narrative terms, this means that self-translators hold double agency in the relational settings in which they operate, being able to communicate narratives according to their intention. In both Ekman's and von Törne's case, the books also contained direct quotations from Sibelius originally spoken in Swedish. This means that while the authors are self-translators of their own texts, they are also translators of Sibelius' utterances, rendered by Ekman into Finnish and by von Törne into English. To complicate things further, both authors have been accused of putting words into Sibelius's mouth. In both Ekman's and von Törne's authored works, the translations of such invented passages that were portrayed as quotations would ultimately have to be considered self-translation while actual direct quotations would be considered ordinary translations in languages other than Swedish. The example invites philosophical discussions concerning original/version and source/target, but also serves to highlight one of the ambiguities of self-translation which could also have implications for the manner in which self-translation may influence narrative construction.

As became apparent in the case studies, Sibelius was involved in the creation of many of the books of which he was the focus. Furuhjelm's, Ekman's, von Törne's, Ringbom's and Parmet's works benefitted from the composer's willingness to be approached and interviewed. This is not to say that Sibelius was unreserved about the being the subject of literary depictions. Already around the time when Furuhjelm's biography was published, Sibelius wrote in his journal: 'Erik Furuhjelm's book published. I am truly impressed by his monography, which is extremely conscientious and based on comprehensive research. But it will raise objections. It discusses so many "controversial issues"' (Dahlström 2015, 318). He also bemoaned Ekman's biography in 1944: 'Ever since Karl Ekman's book about me /1935/ came out, it has made my life bitter and grey […] Ekman has put words in my mouth, which I haven't said […]' (ibid, 421). Sibelius's notebook from 1945–1946 also makes a reference to von Törne: 'I've replied to the silliest of letters with the most peculiar compliments, which have unfortunately been taken in earnest, for example letters to Ilmari Krohn, v. Törne etc.' (ibid., 433). Although these thoughts remained largely private until Tawaststjerna's biography and, later, the publication of Sibelius's journals, they form an undercurrent to the public narrative which, through Sibelius's own accounts and statements, also revealed part of Sibelius's ontological narrative, the stories he told about himself as well as his works. Many of the biographies seem to be characterised by their desire to reveal something personal

about Sibelius. The 'Master's own words' formed a selling point for, for instance, Ekman's book as well as von Törne's memoir, which conflated Sibelius's ontological ponderings with his public narrative. The authors' personal connections with the composer as well as what were considered Sibelius's authentic words were recurring points of interest for advertisements and book reviews of the original works as well as their translations. This echoes Baker (2014, 165), who maintains that "[u]nderstanding the relationship between personal and public narratives can have important implications for what is selected for translation […]". It seems to me, however, that this aspect in the translation of narratives was only secondary. In the Finnish context where the Swedish-language books were translated undiscriminatingly and released in tandem with the translations until the delayed translation of Andersson's book, translation of the Sibelius-related books is portrayed as a matter of the prestige and dominance of the Finnish-speaking culture.

This brings the discussion to the origins of the Sibelius texts, which I have divided into three categories: texts that were produced by Swedish-speaking Finns in Finland; texts that were created outside of Finland by non-Finnish authors; and finally, texts that in the process of translation challenged straightforward transfers from one language or culture to another, either by being produced outside of Finland by a Finnish author (von Törne's *Sibelius – A Close-Up*) or by including such extensive a translator's commentary (Gray and Jalas's *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat*) that the boundaries between translation and authorial work become blurred. The book by Olin Downes, compiled from the American critic's newspaper columns and published as a book only in Finland, could also be considered to belong to this final group. I have previously discussed this categorisation in an article published in the book *Key Cultural Texts in Translation* (2018), edited by Kirsten Malmkjær, in which I wrote about the categories under the descriptive titles 'translation within the same cultural sphere', 'cross-cultural translation proper' and 'pseudo-crossculturality in translation'. The purpose of the division is to place the texts on a continuum, with domestic portrayal at one end and international depiction at the other. While the categories do leak, as often is the case, the classification provides three different viewpoints on the Sibelius narrative and the construction of his public image, in addition to which it makes visible some of the borders that were crossed in the transfer of the texts from one linguistic reality to another. In this capacity, they provide a fruitful starting point for examining the construction of the Sibelius narrative both as a national and an international endeavour.

The translation within the same cultural sphere examined in this study, already alluded to above, is rooted in the shared history of the Swedish and Finnish speaking Finns. My decision to separate the Swedish- and Finnish-speaking cultures is connected to the somewhat uneasy relationship between the languages, which manifested itself particularly forcefully in the language feuds of the early 20th

century, and also serves to highlight the shift from Swedish- to Finnish-speaking culture in Finland. In practice, these cultures were intertwined not only in terms of their agents but also their discourses. Already the question of Sibelius's family lineage had been interchangeably discussed on both Swedish- and Finnish-language fora, with, for instance, Granit-Ilmoniemi publishing his responses to Andersson's family tree in both Finnish and Swedish. However, although both the Swedish- and the Finnish-language cultural circles are parts of the same Finnish culture, that is, constituents of the same cultural sphere, discussing them as separate entities highlights the "carrying across" aspect of the Sibelius translations. In my categorisation, this group of texts covers the entire timespan of the material in this study starting with Furuhjelm's biography and continuing through Ekman's, Ringbom's and Parmet's works to the translation of Andersson's account of Sibelius's American connections as well as the enlarged second edition of von Törne's work, published only in Swedish and Finnish.

Cross-cultural translation proper included, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, the smallest number of translations in the material. If this category is to be understood as representative of a prototypical translation event, the transfer of a text from one language and culture to another, the texts that fall into this category are Göhler's article and Johnson's biography. The exclusion of Downes's text from this category relates to the fact that the source text does not exist as a single entity but was instead constructed for the purposes of the Finnish translation.

The translations of Göhler's and Johnson's texts represent different types of texts which also had very different functions in the Finnish context. The translation of Göhler's text with its editorial changes was a means of contemplating on and validating the significance of Sibelius through a sympathetic external view. While the translation of Johnson's biography was also pointedly external, the mirror provided by the book was divulging rather than congenial, and the work had the pioneering function of introducing new discursive modes into the Sibelius narrative. The relative absence of properly cross-cultural translations suggests that the Sibelius narrative was largely a rather self-contained phenomenon. This was naturally affected by the Finns' proximity to the subject matter, which made the need to approach the narrative from other perspectives limited. However, with the evidence suggesting a nascent change in attitudes in the late 1950s, Johnson's book may have been the necessary shock that finally steered the stagnated narrative into new directions and simultaneously also reflected the internationalisation of Finnish society more broadly.

Finally, the examination of pseudo-crossculturality in translation highlights the complexity of cultural transfer. Although the Finnish Sibelius narrative can easily be conceived to be a particularly Finnish phenomenon, its mechanisms of literary narrative construction are more complicated and varied. The pseudo-crossculturality

of the Sibelius translations refers to the ambiguity present in the status of the texts as products which are materially of foreign origin but simultaneously Finnish in spirit, due to the Finnish agencies present in their production. The texts are characterised by their hybridity as texts aimed primarily at foreign audiences but harnessed for the use of Finnish narrative construction through translation. Jalas's translation and commentary of Gray was shown to negotiate two somewhat differing theoretical interpretations of Sibelius's symphonies. In Törne's case, a complicating factor is the aspect of self-translation, which renders both the English and Swedish source texts as originals with authorial intent. An interesting detail concerns the preface of the 1945 "delayed self-translation", a translated work published after the appearance of the original (cf. Grutman [1998] 2009, 258), in which von Törne states that following the English original word for word was deemed the most appropriate approach to the text. Although self-translations are often characterised by the author's opportunity to make even rather significant changes between different language versions, von Törne's decision is perhaps explainable through the subjectivity of his personal narrative not being affected by being transferred from a British context to a Finnish one.

Sjöblom's translation and editing work provided Downes's individual articles a narrative form, which the original texts were lacking. Although the translation of the source texts was an act of cross-cultural translation proper, the reorganising of the material with the purpose of creating a unique literary and biographical narrative gives it a distinctly Finnish identity. It needs to be noted that translation compilations are not extraordinary occurrences as such. However, I would claim that translations of texts which concern the culture into which they are imported and the subject of which is not temporally distanced from the act of translation are much rarer. Another contributing factor is Sjöblom's hybrid identity as an American Finn, whose entire career was marked by operating in between these two cultures.

Apart from Göhler's article, the Sibelius-related texts examined form two main groups on the basis of their content: biographical and theoretical writings. The biographies and memoirs of this study are characterised by having been published while Sibelius was still alive, save for Johnson's biography and the translations of Andersson's work and the enlargement of von Törne's book, which appeared after Sibelius's death but were nevertheless originally written or in the process of being written during his lifetime. Writing a biographical text of a person who is still alive results in a necessarily incomplete account of the person's life but also prone to creating myths when the person themselves takes part in the process by sharing their ontological narrative. It has been said (Mäkelä 2007) that Sibelius was also partly responsible for many of the misconceptions about himself that in time came to be regarded as truths. Sibelius also provided fertile ground for the spreading of misinformation, as he did not seek to stop it. Biographical writings preserved many

of such characterisations and also distributed them internationally in cases where translations carried them outside Finland.

Another narrative strand was formed by theoretical writings and their translations. In these texts, Sibelius's symphonies acquired particular weight as a means of validating his position in the international musical canon, which has traditionally placed particular importance on symphonic works. Of the contemporary conductors, the role of Sibelius's interpreter was bestowed particularly on Jalas, but also Parmet, both of whom were able to express their views of Sibelius's symphonies in book format – Jalas through his translation and extensive commentary, which introduced the ideas of two Sibelius connoisseurs simultaneously negotiating international views, and Parmet in his idiosyncratic Sibelius interpretation which made use of his idea of the connection between the Finnish language and Sibelius's music. In addition to these two theoretically inclined works, the biographical works also often included some analytical passages.

The present study has placed some emphasis on the fact that early Sibelius translations were affected by the bilingual nature of Finnish society and the historical significance of the Swedish language, in particular. The early books on Sibelius were rooted in a relational setting where the cultural life of Finland was still to a great extent influenced by Swedish-speaking cultural personae. The authoring of the Swedish-language works was simultaneously a reflection of the old Swedish-language cultural structures and the emergence of a Finnish-speaking one. The primacy of the Finnish-speaking culture could be seen in how the Swedish-language works were translated into Finnish without fail while of the admittedly considerably rarer Finnish-language works only Santeri Levas's memoir from 1945 was translated into Swedish. From this perspective, the translation of the Swedish-language works into Finnish is seen as a manifestation of power relations, in which the translations supported the narrative construction of the dominant culture.

Financial aspects may have also played a role in the translation of Sibelius-related literature as was already mentioned by Tawaststjerna in Madetoja's case. The case studies also proposed a different type of monetary aspect. Those authors who actively sought to have their work translated, such as Ringbom and Parmet, did so at least in part due to the extra income the translation was projected to provide through the subsequent wider circulation of the work. In particular, Ringbom's correspondence with his publishers in Sweden and in the United States discussing the compensation for book sales lead us to consider the financial significance of translational activities for the executive authors of the source texts. For Ringbom, the hope for financial gains seemed to have at least partly motivated the creation of his translations, which means they could have been a motivating factor for other authors as well. The author's active advocacy of the translation of their work calls

for more investigation into the agency of the precursive author in narrative construction utilising translation.

Translation was also carried out for various other reasons, some already mentioned in passing above. At the deeper levels of national identity, translations of texts discussing Finland's foremost cultural icon were a means of cultural legitimisation. Those Sibelius-related translations which were produced by non-Finnish authors additionally provided a means of examining, supporting and challenging Finland's identity through the character of Sibelius "in the mirror of others", to draw on Berman's (1992, 64) formulation. Although no evidence survives, such broader culture-political reasons could have been behind Otava's decision to publish their book series on Sibelius. For publishers, the composer's anniversaries provided a good reason for releasing Sibelius-related literature. A fortunate coincidence in terms of marketing was the fact that Sibelius's birthday fell in early December, allowing the publishers to release the books opportunely for Christmas. Only one of the texts examined gave any direct indication as to why it had been chosen for translation. Jalas's preface to the translation of Gray's book suggested that the work had been translated for the benefit and education of the concert-going public. The only other translation to feature a translator's preface was Sjöblom's selection of Downes's columns. This did not, however, offer any explication of the reason for translation, although proposing that it involved not only Downes's prominent position and appreciative attitude towards Sibelius but also the personal connections of the Sjöbloms is probably not entirely without foundation. As translators, both Jussi Jalas and Paul Sjöblom step beyond the confines prototypically assigned to the role. The other works in the material reflect a more traditional setting, which is probably the reason why they include no translator's prefaces. The personal motivating factors behind such translations have been considered above in connection with the discussion on the agencies of the translators.

By means of conclusion, I shall end this section with a brief consideration of how texts create meaningful narratives in the broader, not necessarily text-dependent, sense. It is reasonable to assume that the means through which translated narratives gain currency in society involve the same principles that dictate the meaning creation of translation in general. In his article, Katan (2009, 91) concludes that in translation, the actual text being translated offers only one cue in the construction of the text's meaning, while other, hidden, meanings are determined on the basis of other factors, such as culture. Katan (2009, 88) views culture "as an integrated system, in a constant state of flux, through which textual signals are negotiated and reinterpreted according to context and individual stance". This bears resemblance to the narrative approach, which also sees the construction of stories as a process of constant negotiation and re-narration in relational settings and which considers translators' motives elemental to the formulation of narratives. I would argue that the 'hidden

meanings' alluded to by Katan are what ultimately cause the emergence of narratives. A translation is, in and of itself, unable to create any viable public narrative unless it is reconstituted in the target culture through interpretations given to it by those taking part in the shaping of the relational setting. Furthermore, it is the 'individual stance', or agency, of those actors which gives prominence to the narrative being communicated. This complexity of meaning creation is a phenomenon which also requires attention in the construction of narratives. Otherwise, narrative analysis will be unable see beyond the textual message and its subjective interpretations.

5.2 Considering the character narrative

In her 2014 article on the narrative approach, Baker points out the undeveloped nature of the methods of narrative analysis (Baker 2014, 174). One of the objectives of this study was to advance this aspect of the narrative theory through empirically testing a set of material focussed on a nationally significant character. This type of public narrative focussing on "specific individuals who become symbols of a people, a movement, or an ideology" (Baker 2006, 34), have thus far been absent from research on public narratives both by Baker and in its subsequent applications. At the same time, this lacuna in the field of research provided an untouched playground for testing ideas and raising points about the use of the theoretical apparatus. Sibelius's position as a Finnish cultural symbol and national icon, whose 'life story was folklore, private life folk poetry and work national property', to quote the composer Einojuhani Rautavaara (1989, 118), provided an opportunity to explore the manner in which different narrative strands and their respective ideas and values were communicated in a nationally constructed narrative. The fact that much of the literary material on Sibelius was also translated in linguistically and culturally varied configurations provided the study with ample material for a Translation Studies approach.

I begin with general remark on the nature of narratives. In the Introduction to Translation and Conflict, Baker claims that "[o]ne of the attractions of narrative is that it is a highly transparent and intuitively satisfying concept that can easily be understood by anyone" (2006, 3). In the light of this study, I take particular issue with the transparency aspect of this statement. As analytical concepts, narratives are highly complex entities which require painstaking analysis in order to be understood. For example, to me, there was nothing particularly transparent about understanding the books on Sibelius's symphonies as constituents of a narrative on Sibelius's musical significance, with its connection to contextual valuations, temporal developments and negotiations of personal assessments, as well as to other public narratives. To form an understanding of why, for instance, theoretical books on

Sibelius's symphonies were written and translated, the research needed to burrow into layers of conceptions and values and unearth discussions outside the immediate relational setting. A public figure narrative, or a character narrative, as I chose to call it in this study, is another deceivingly simple concept. In Sibelius's case, the scale of the character narrative is much greater than an individual man's life story. Sibelius's narrative is a story about Finland's cultural and national awakening, values and societal negotiations – in other words, conceptual narratives that inform the interpretation of the character narrative and the actions of the agents involved in its creation.

Narrative analysis could be likened to an optical instrument which allows for zooming in on a phenomenon and uncovering various viewpoints on a topic. This is particularly true for character narratives, which carry the potential to encompass the entirety of an individual's existence. One needs to only consider one's own ontological narrative to understand how complex such stories can be and how they can also acquire new meanings through time. When it comes to character narratives, the plurality of narratives only increases. This is because character narratives are not only a subtype of the public narrative but, whenever the individual character's voice is heard, also the ontological narrative, as they mix the public's interpretations with the projections of the individual's sense of self. In the Sibelius narrative, this could be exemplified by the frequent use of Sibelius's own voice in the telling of his life stories. The complexity of character narratives also owes much to the existence of sub-narratives connected to any individual's life. Narratives are not merely embedded; they can also be what I have called stranded.

Throughout the study, I have used the expression 'narrative strand' to refer to the fact that broader narratives consist of smaller narratives of more limited scope that, when combined, complement each other and provide a more comprehensive image of the phenomenon under study. This notion is crucial if we are to venture beyond the analysis of any isolated narrative strand and attempt to create any type of broader understanding of a character narrative in changing contexts and temporal settings. Sociologically, a character narrative may not merely, or sometimes even primarily, be about the person at the centre of the narrative but concern the people and phenomena surrounding the central character. The Sibelius narrative, for instance, is ultimately not a story about Sibelius. Instead, it highlights societal and cultural developments, the reasons behind such events and the motivations of people connected to its construction. In other words, character narratives do not seek to describe the individual at their centre but offer an explanation for why they come to embody the values and ideas inscribed in their narrative. The greater a character narrative becomes, the more varied the interpretative possibilities connected to it are.

This open-ended approach to the character narrative was also applied to the case studies examined. The texts investigated were not systematically studied from a

textual perspective; instead, they were related to the narratives to which they were considered to have contributed on the basis of other, connected discussions. This approach was used to avoid imposing the researcher's own interpretations upon the primary material since, as explained in the previous section, the narratives created by translations are not necessarily directly rooted in the target (or source) texts. Even in such cases, they may still have a key role in terms of narrative construction in their capacity to prompt responses and motivate interpretations which lead to the elaboration of a narrative.

While reading the present study, it may be tempting to repeat the criticism Pym expressed with regard to Baker's *Translation and Conflict* that the content of narrative analysis relies heavily on the original text and pays too little attention to the translation. I am willing to admit that this claim holds a kernel of truth, although the present study has also enabled me to recognise several potential reasons for the under-representation of translation in narrative analysis.

First, in many of the texts examined in this study, the role of the target text in narrative construction was essentially the same as that of the source text. This was particularly true with regard to the Swedish source texts written in Finland. In these cases, the contexts of the source and target texts were entwined, thereby rendering a separate narrative analysis of the target text a largely superfluous task. Not only were these texts published in the same cultural sphere, but the close relationship of the source and target texts was also evident in the often simultaneous publication of the original and the translation. Of the translations of the Swedish-language books in this study, the publication of Andersson's work in Finnish was the only instance where the translation was published later than the source text. This simultaneous publication was also often connected to the roles of the books as anniversary publications which celebrated Sibelius regardless of the language front.

The second reason for the strong emphasis on the source text was that they were found to potentially open up analytical possibilities in situations where information on the target text is otherwise limited. Understanding the creation process of Parmet's book on Sibelius's symphonies with its unpublished and archived English versions enabled the examination of both the Swedish original and Finnish translation in a new light. The possibility that the Swedish version published in Finland was merely an offshoot of a project that never came to fruition in the manner intended by the author is also a relevant aspect of narrative construction when considering the creation of the translation.

Third, without resorting to (comparative) textual analysis, which this study to a large extent avoided in an effort to concentrate on the broader questions of narrative creation, translations may not yield a great amount of information on how the narratives are constructed. A translation which represents a faithful rendering of the original may be of fairly limited interest to the researcher. The function of such a

translation may merely be the carrying across of the message already inherent in the original, in which case the methods of narrative construction are by and large the same in both the translation and the source text. If, as I have argued, the narrative significance of a text is ultimately defined by its reception and the points appropriated to public discussion, the translation may prove to be of secondary importance. Narrative construction is highly dependent on the social interactions and discussions that a translation effects as well as the interpretations which that discourse engenders. In this sense, a translation may only operate as the instigator of narrative construction in the target language and culture. This means that it is the points on which the discussions following the translation focus which truly elaborate a narrative, not so much the translated point of reference. This is something that occurred, for instance, in Furuhjelm's biography and the ensuing discussion on Sibelius's family history. The Swedishness or Finnishness of Sibelius's lineage was not a new narrative strand at the time when Furuhjelm's book was published, but it revitalised the debate and was thus involved in corroborating the narrative related to Sibelius's language-political position.

In her call for research on character narratives, Baker (2006, 33–34) mentions that narratives are prone to substantial change over time, illustrating her point by mentioning how Nelson Mandela moved from a terrorist to a symbol of resistance and Nobel Peace Prize winner. In character narratives, temporal aspects play a crucial role, as they signal changes in attitudes, beliefs and valuations. Narrative construction involving translation is a temporal process which assumes different meanings at different times and cannot be solely attributed to translation. The accrual of narrative layers is a complex process in which translation may be involved only indirectly. von Törne's *A Close-Up*, for example, gained additional narrative importance 30 years after the book came out in England. By this time, the ripples of the book had already had their effect in the German-speaking world unbeknownst to the Finnish audience, whose understanding of the book was shaped by the studies begun by Tawaststjerna in the 1960s. The case served as an example of the connectedness of narratives as well as their potentially delayed emergence and demonstrated how narratives can be renegotiated as they become more layered. No closer inspection of temporal narrative development of this type appears in Baker's writings, although she acknowledges the existence of the phenomenon. To me, the absence of such examples has to do with Baker's focus on narratives which are explained in relation to the fixed *a priori* existence of events rather than their emergence, development or change. If narratives are essentially amorphous, it would be prudent to examine them from the perspective of permutations, not stability.

Finally, the diverse analyses of the texts, their associated agents and their activity, as well as narrative construction served to demonstrate that information about the construction of narratives can be acquired in a myriad of ways. The

narrative features Baker borrowed from Somers and Gibson and Bruner are useful for explaining the shape that the building blocks of narratives are, but they cannot provide information on questions such as where the blocks came from, how many blocks the construction uses, why the construction is built, who does the construction, why the builders are invested in the building process, how the construction changes over time and so on. In other words, the questions concerning narrative construction extend beyond the technicalities and structural aspects of the building process and need to be given some consideration if the aim is to gain a more in-depth understanding of the narrative under study. Behind every narrative being scrutinised there is a narrative waiting to be discovered.

6 Conclusion

In this doctoral thesis, I explored the use of Baker's narrative theory in a narrative-agential character narrative analysis of a set of material comprised of early Sibelius-related translations into Finnish translated between 1916 and 1965. Upon conducting a critical evaluation of Baker's model, a fundamental weakness was detected in the theoretical framework pertaining to the crucial significance of conceptual narratives to narrative analysis. The theory was therefore accepted as the premise of this study only in its skeletal form. The theoretical framework was further complemented with concepts concerning translators' agency and translatorship. A three-part contextual framework was introduced to throw light upon some of the relational settings from which the literary materials examined emerged and to provide an understanding of the overall literary genre of non-fiction texts. In Chapter 4, I conducted a multiple-case study on 12 Sibelius-related texts and their Finnish translations. The purpose was to both discover and consider various manifestations of agency and narrative construction in the material without a pre-formed apprehension about what those manifestation should be. The findings of this approach were considered to increase awareness of the types of issues that could inform later studies on both the construction of character narratives and the role of agency in the construction of translated narratives in general. The study established numerous ways in which translation was involved in creating the Sibelius narrative. The common themes of the case studies as well as the manner in which the present study could contribute to the narrative theory and especially the study of character narratives and agency were deliberated in the Discussion.

The general conclusion of this research project suggests that there is still plenty of potential for narrative research in Translation Studies. While Baker's model has been the most prolific sociological approach to date, a more encompassing understanding of and dialogical relationship with the field of socio-historical narrative research and new narratologies would be beneficial for truly advancing the paradigm in Translation Studies. Famously an interdisciplinary field of enquiry, Translation Studies can be at risk of cherry-picking its concepts and approaches from other disciplines without a true and explicit acknowledgment of the history and development of the inceptive discipline. Based on the review conducted in this study,

this seems to hold true also for Baker's theory, which does not really position itself in the field of narrative studies beyond the selection of its sources. Although necessarily cursory, the brief look at the history of new narratologies provided in this thesis suggests that the background of the narrative theory in Translation Studies still requires further clarification. The need for retrospection also became evident in Baker's misinterpretation of Somers and Gibson. If this avenue of narrative research is to be pursued further in Translation Studies, some corrective measures should be taken to rectify the existing misalignment with the original theory.

Assuming Baker's narrative theory maintains its position as the main representative of a new narratologies approach in Translation Studies, the present study invites further attention to be paid to matters of agency in the construction of translated narratives. Today, research on translators' agency is already well established, and combining insights engendered by this field of study with the narrative approach can provide a fruitful avenue for examining translators' role in large-scale social developments rather than in isolated case studies. As a concept, narratives can provide unifying themes against which the activity of translators can be considered and which have the potential to span extensive periods of time. This type of longitudinal analysis also warrants further investigation and theorisation, since studies on the construction of translated narratives have thus far focussed on cases that have been temporally fairly compressed. The cases examined in this study demonstrated a multitude of factors that may have an impact on the evolution of a narrative, and more research on the temporal unfolding of translated narratives is needed to uncover the mechanisms of narrative accrual through the agents of translation.

The study provided some preliminary insights into factors that may contribute to the building of a character narrative through translation. The contextual peculiarities, the exceptional array of translators and the national significance of the narrative these helped to create all provided a multifaceted foundation for considering the possibilities of character narratives, but the work on this narrative type has only begun and the possibilities are practically endless. Potentially interesting studies on character narratives could be conducted, for instance, on the translations of biographies alone. One fundamental question concerns the definition of a character narrative or a public figure narrative. As this study demonstrated by showing how stories about Sibelius, his music, abstract national ideals and even Sibelius's own thoughts about himself became entangled, even such seemingly transparent terms can manifest in infinitely complex forms.

List of References

Primary sources

Andersson, Otto. 1955. *Jean Sibelius i Amerika*. Åbo: Bro.

———. 1960. *Jean Sibelius Amerikassa*. Translated by Margareta Jalas. Helsinki: Otava.

Downes, Olin. 1945. *Sibelius*. Translated by Paul Sjöblom and Jussi Jalas. Otava.

Ekman, Karl. 1935a. *Jean Sibelius : En Konstnärs Liv Och Personlighet*. Helsinki: Schildt.

———. 1935b. *Jean Sibelius : Taiteilijan elämä ja persoonallisuus*. Helsinki: Otava.

———. 1956a. *Jean Sibelius ja hänen elämäntyönsä*. 4th edited and enlarged edition. Helsinki: Otava.

———. 1956b. *Jean Sibelius och hans verk*. 4. edited and enlarged edition. Helsinki: Schildt.

Furuhjelm, Erik. 1916a. *Jean Sibelius : Hans tondiktning och drag ur hans liv*. Porvoo: Schildt

———. 1916b. *Jean Sibelius: hänen sävelrunoutensa ja piirteitä hänen elämästään*. Translated by Leevi Madetoja. Porvoo: WSOY.

Göhler, Georg. 1908. 'Orchesterkompositionen von Jean Sibelius'. *Kunstwart*, September, 261–69.

———. 1926. 'Jean Sibeliuksen varhaisemmat orkesterisävellykset'. *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja* 6: 13–26.

Gray, Cecil. 1935. *Sibelius. The Symphonies*. London: Oxford University Press.

Gray, Cecil, and Jussi Jalas. 1945. *Sibeliuksen Sinfoniat*. Lahti: Kustannustalo.

Johnson, Harold E. 1959. *Jean Sibelius*. New York: Knopf.

———. 1960. *Jean Sibelius*. Translated by Yrjö Kivimies. Helsinki: Otava.

Parmet, Simon. 1955a. *Sibelius Symfonier. En studie i musikförståelse*. Helsinki: Söderström..

———. 1955b. *Sibeliuksen sinfoniat: ajatuksia musiikin tulkinnasta*. Translated by Margareta Jalas. Helsinki: Otava

———. 1959. *The Symphonies of Sibelius: A Study in Musical Appreciation*. Translated by Kingsley Hart. London: Cassel.

Ringbom, Nils-Eric. 1948a. *Sibelius*. Helsingfors: Schildt.

———. 1948b. *Sibelius*. Translated by Margareta Jalas. Helsinki: Otava.

———. 1954. *Jean Sibelius : A Master and His Work*. Translated by G. I. C. de Courcy. Norman, Okl: University of Oklahoma Press.

Törne, Bengt von. 1937. *Sibelius : A Close-Up*. London: Faber & Faber.

———. 1945a. *Sibelius i närbild och samtal*. Helsinki: Söderström.

———. 1945b. *Sibelius: lähikuvia ja keskusteluja*. Translated by Margareta Jalas. Helsinki: Otava.

———. 1955a. *Sibelius i närbild och samtal*. 2nd enlarged edition. Helsinki: Söderström.

———. 1955b. *Sibelius: lähikuvia ja keskusteluja*. 2nd enlarged edition. Translated by Margareta Jalas and Erkki Salmenhaara. Helsinki: Otava.

Archival sources

Arra, Esa. 'Arra's Letter to Jussi Jalas', 17 May 1956. Jussi Jalas's archive, National Archives of Finland.

'Bonnier's Letter to Ringbom'. 30 October 1948. Ringbom's archive, Sibelius Museum.

Ekman, Karl. ‘Letter Draft’, 1 August 1956. Karl Ekman’s archive, National Library of Finland,.
———. ‘Letter Draft’, 25 October 1956. Karl Ekman’s archive, National Library of Finland.
Földes, Andor. ‘Földes’s Letter to Jussi Jalas’, 17 October 1949. Jussi Jalas’s archive, National Archives of Finland.
Himanka, Jussi. ‘Himanka’s Letter to Jussi Jalas’, 23 March 1956. Jussi Jalas’s archive, National Archives of Finland.
Hufvudstadsbladet. ‘Newspaper column’, 16 December 1948. Nils-Eric Ringbom's archive, Sibelius Museum.
Jalas, Margareta. n.d. ‘Margareta Jalas’s Letter to Andersson’. Otto Anderssson’s archive, Åbo Akademi.
Lindfors, Johanna. Personal correspondence, 2021.
Lottinville, Savoie. ‘Lottinville’s Letter to Ringbom’, 21 May 1954. Ringbom’s archive, Sibelius Museum.
Music & Letters. ‘Journal article’, 1955. Ringbom’s archive, Sibelius Museum.
Östergötlands Folkbladet. ‘Newspaper column’, 14 September 1949. Ringbom’s archive, Sibelius Museum.
Parmet, Simon. ‘Parmet’s Letter to Jussi Jalas’, 26 June 1957. Jussi Jalas’s archive, National Archives of Finland.
———. n.d. ‘A Guide for the Performance of Sibelius’ Symphonies’. Simon Parmet’s archive, National Archives of Finland.
———. n.d. ‘Preface 1, 2 & 3’. Simon Parmet’s archive, National Archives of Finland.
———. n.d. ‘The Interpretation of Sibelius’ Symphonies. A Study in Appreciation and Analysis’. Simon Parmet’s archive, National Archives of Finland.
Pesola, Väinö. ”Jean Sibelius musiikkikirjailijain valottamana”. *Suomen Sosiaalidemokraatti* 11 January 1956. Andersson's archive, Sibelius Museum.
Pirttimäki, Tiina. Personal correspondence, 23 January 2014.
Ringbom, Nils-Eric. ‘Ringbom’s Letter to Max Pfeffer’, 27 November 1953. Ringbom’s archive, Sibelius Museum.
———. ‘Ringbom’s Letter to Geraldine de Courcy’, 6 March 1954. Ringbom’s archive, Sibelius Museum.
———. ‘Ringbom’s Letter to Oklahoma University Press’, 10 May 1954. Ringbom’s archive, Sibelius Museum.
———. ‘Ringbom’s Letter to Geraldine de Courcy’, 1 August 1956. Ringbom’s archive, Sibelius Museum.
WSOY. ‘Madetoja’s letter to Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö’, 19 July 1915. WSOY archives, National Archives of Finland.
———. ‘WSOY’s letter to Madetoja’, 24 July 1915. WSOY archives, National Archives of Finland.
Schweitzer, Benjamin. Personal correspondence. 12 August 2022.

Newspaper and magazine articles

Andersson, Otto. 1915. *Tidning för Musik* V, no 14–15.
Downes, Olin. 1934. ‘Sibelius Symphony Given by Janssen’. *The New York Times*, 19 November 1934. https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/.
Granit-Ilmoniemi, Eeli. 1916. *Tidning för Musik VI*, no 9.
Haapanen, Toivo. 1918. “Uusin Sibelius-Tutkielma Ja Kysymys Sibeliuksen Musiikin Suomalaisuudesta”. *Säveletär* 1 (9), 109–14.
Helsingin Sanomat. 23.5. 1916. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1174270?page=1.
———. 6.1.1917. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1174616?page=1.
Hufvudstadsbladet. 21.9.1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2210149?page=1.

———. 16.12.1948. Ringbom's archive, Sibelius Museum.
Kansan Lehti. 12.1.1917. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1242615?page=1.
Kansan Voima. 21.12. 1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2003216?page=6.
Karjala. 14.1.1917. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1243793?page=1.
Keskisuomalainen. 8.11.1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2023734?page=3.
Maaseudun tulevaisuus. 14.4.1960.
https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1140884?page=5.
———. 14.4. 1960.
https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1140884?term=1960&term=14&term=MAASEUDUN&term=4&page=1.
Mikkelin Sanomat. 28.12.1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2064055?page=3.
Nummi, Seppo. 26.9.1959. *Suomen kuvalehti*.
https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/aikakausi/binding/1145351?page=63.
Opintotoveri. 1.1.1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/aikakausi/binding/952344?page=2.
Pesola, Väinö. ”Jean Sibelius musiikkikirjailijain valottamana”. *Suomen Sosiaalidemokraatti* 11 January 1956. Andersson's archive, Sibelius Museum.
Salmetar. 16.11. 1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2083236?page=4.
Suomen Kuvalehti. 26.9.1959. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/aikakausi/binding/1145351?page=37.
Suomen musiikkilehti, no. 9. 1935. “Amerikkalainen sana Sibeliuksesta”.
The New York Times. 1.12.1934. “Philip Hale, Oritic, Dead in Boston, 80”.
https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/.
Turun Sanomat. 2.2.1917. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1182106?page=1.
Turunmaa. 8.12.1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2116067?page=5.
Uusi musiikkilehti 2, no. 9. 1955. ‘Olin Downesin kirjeitä Sibeliukselle’.
Uusi Säveletär. 1.8.1914. ‘Jean Sibelius Amerikassa – Suuremmoinen menestys’.
Uusi Suomi. 1.11.1935. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1803517?page=8.
———. 30.8.1959. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2047317?page=18.
———. 22.12.1959. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2048153?page=17.
———. 6.1.1960. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2048165?page=11.
———. 18.3.1960. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2048236?page=5.
———. 10.4. 1960. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2048259?page=7.
———. 12.4.1960. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2048261?page=21.
———. 27.6.1960. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2123879?page=16.
———. 18.12.1962. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/2129533?page=20.
Vaasa. 1917. 3.2. 1917. https://digi.kansalliskirjasto.fi/sanomalehti/binding/1335309?page=1.

Secondary sources

Aaltonen, Sirkku. 2009. "Noni Sosokokeror Alolotosa Asyl? Constructing Narratives of Heteroglossia in the Swedish Performances of Utvandrarna on the Finnish Stage". *TRANS. Revista de Traductologia* 13: 107.
Adorno, Theodor. 2006. "Reunahuomautus Sibeliuksesta". Translated by Rosa Rönkkö. *Kulttuurivihkot*, no. 1: 38–40.
———. 2009. "Reunahuomatus Sibeliuksesta". Translated by Ilkka Oramo. *Säteitä* 1: 49–52.
Aho, Tuomo, and Pia Mänttäri. 2007. "Tietokirjallisuuden Suomennoksista 1900-Luvulla". In *Suomennoskirjallisuuden Historia 1*, 552–71. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
Ahola, Sakari, and David M Hoffman. 2012. *Higher Education Research in Finland: Emerging Structures and Contemporary Issues*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
Baker, Mona. 2005. "Narratives in and of Translation". *SASE Journal of Translation and Interpretation*, no. 1: 4–13.

———. 2006. *Translation and Conflict : A Narrative Account*. New York: Routledge.
———. 2014. "Translation as Re-Narration". In *Translation: A Multidisciplinary Approach*, edited by Juliane House, 158–77. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
Baker, Mona, and Chesterman, Andrew. 2008. "Ethics of Renarration". *Cultus* 1 (1): 10–33.
Backman, Sigbritt. 2009. "Von Törne, Bengt". *Uppslagsverket Finland*. https://www.uppslagsverket.fi/sv/view-170045-VonToerneBengt.
Bánhegyi, Mátyás. 2006. "Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account". *Across Languages and Cultures* 7 (2): 269–75.
Barthes, Roland. 1966. "An Introduction to the Analysis of Narrative". *New Literary History*, 6 (1975): 237–72.
Bassnet, Susan. 2013. "The Self-Translator as Rewriter". In *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture*, edited by Anthony Cordingley, 13–25. London: Bloomsbury.
Berman, Antoine. 1992. *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*. New York: State University of New York Press.
Boéri, Julie. 2008. "A Narrative Account of the Babels vs. Naumann Controversy". *The Translator* 14 (1): 21–50.
———. 2010. "Emerging Narratives of Conference Interpreters' Training: A Case Study of Ad Hoc Training in Babels and the Social Forum". *Puentes* 9: 61–70.
Boldemann, Lina. 1949. *Naturröstens hemlighet*. Saltsjöbaden: Boldemann.
Bourdieu, Pierre. 1977. *Outline of a Theory of Practice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Brufau Alvira, Nuria. 2008. "Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account". *Trans. revista de traductología*, 12.
Bruner, Jerome. 1991. "The Narrative Construction of Reality". *Critical Inquiry* 18 (1): 1–21.
Buzelin, Hélène. 2011. "Agents of Translation". In *Handbook of Translation Studies*. Volume 2. https://benjamins.com/online/hts/articles/age1.
Callon, Michel, and Bruno Latour. 1981. "Unscrewing the Big Leviathan: How Actors Macro-Structure Reality and How Sociologists Help Them to Do So". In *Toward an Integration of Micro- and Macrosociologies*, edited by K. Knorr-Cetina and A. Cicourel. London: Routledge.
Carter, Bob, and Alison Sealey. 2007. "Languages, Nations and Identities". *Methodological Innovations Online* 2 (2): 20–31.
Chesterman, Andrew. 2007. "Bridge Concepts in Translation Sociology". In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Michaela Wolff and Alexandra Fukari, 171–83. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Chesterman, Andrew. 2009. "The Name and Nature of Translator Studies". *Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42: 13–22.
Dahlström, Fabian. 2001. "Andersson, Otto". Translated by Heli Alanko. *Kansallisbiografia-verkkojulkaisu*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-001453.
———. 2009. 'Jalas, Jussi'. Translated by Heli Alanko. *Kansallisbiografia-verkkojulkaisu*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-001162.
———, ed. 2015. *Jean Sibelius Päiväkirjat 1909–1944*. Porvoo: Svenska litteratursällskapet.
Dahlström, Fabian, and Erkki Salmenhaara. 1995. *Suomen Musiikin Historia I. Ruotsin Vallan Ajasta Romantiikkaan*. Porvoo: WSOY.
D'Hulst, Lieven. 2010. "Translation History". In *Handbook of Translation Studies, Volume 1*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer, 397–405. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
Drugan, Joanna, Ingemar Strandvik, and Erkka Vuorinen. 2018. "Translation Quality, QualityManagement and Agency: Principles and Practice in the European Union Institutions". In *Translation Quality Assessment: From Principles to Practice*, edited by Joss Moorkens, Sheila Castilho, Gaspari, Federico, and Doherty, Stephen, 39–68. Cham: Springer International Publishing AG.

Dwiartama, Angga, and Christopher Rosin. 2014. "Exploring Agency beyond Humans: The Compatibility of Actor-Network Theory (ANT) and Resilience Thinking". *Ecology and Society* 19 (3).

Ekberg, Laura. 2020. *Heterolingualism and Cultural Integrity in Finnish Translations of Anglophone Caribbean Novels*. Doctoral dissertation. https://www.utupub.fi/handle/10024/148683.

Ekman, Karl. 1926. *Aug. Eklöf, aktiebolag 1864–1924*. Borgå: publisher unknown.

———. 1929. *Nokia bruk 1868–1928*. Helsingfors: Nokia.

———. 1930. *Nokian tehdas 1868–1928*. Helsinki: Nokia.

———. 1936a. *Aktiebolaget Troili osakeyhtiö 1911–1936*. Helsingfors: Troili.

———. 1936b. *Stockfors bruk, dess tillkomst och utveckling intill närvarande tid*. Helsingfors: Stockfors.

———. 1937a. *Ett gammalt herrgårdsbruks historia: Tykö bruk 1686–1936*. Helsingfors: Tykö bruk.

———. 1937b. *Herraskartanon vanhan tehtaan historia: Teijon tehdas 1686–1936*. Helsinki: Teijon tehtaat osakeyhtiö.

———. 1943. *En gammal Helsingforsverkstads historia: John Stenbergs maskinfabrik 1882–1942 : minnesskrift*. Lovisa: John Stenberg.

———. 1952a. *Masugnen som blev storgjuteri: Högfors bruk. 1, 1820–1874*. Karkkila: Kymmene aktiebolag.

———. 1952b. *Masugnen som blev storgjuteri: Högfors bruk. 2, 1874–1950*. Karkkila: Kymmene aktiebolag.

———. 1953. *Masuuni josta tuli suurvalimo: Högforsin tehdas. 1, (1820–1874)*. Karkkila: Kymin osakeyhtiö, Högforsin tehdas.

———. 1954. *Masuuni josta tuli suurvalimo: Högforsin tehdas. 2, 1874–1950*. Karkkila: Kymin osakeyhtiö, Högforsin tehdas.

Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1990. "The Position of Translated Literature within the Literary Polysystem". *Poetics Today* 11 (1): 45–51.

Fennica. n.d. The Finnish National Bibliography. https://www.kansalliskirjasto.fi/en/services/fennica-finnish-national-bibliography.

Földes, Andor. 1950. *Pianonsoiton Avaimet*. Translated by Margareta Jalas. Helsinki: WSOY.

Genette, Gérard. 1972. *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.

———. 1983. *Narrative Discourse Revisited*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.

———. 1987. *Seuils*. Paris: Seuil.

Giddens, Anthony. 1979. *Central Problems in Social Theory: Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Goss, Glenda Dawn. 1995. *Jean Sibelius and Olin Downes: Music, Friendship, Criticism*. Northeastern University Press.

———. 1998. *Jean Sibelius : A Guide to Research*. New York: Garland.

———. 2009a. *Sibelius : A Composer's Life and the Awakening of Finland*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

———. 2009b. *Sibelius, Amerikka ja amerikkalaiset: vieläkö lähetämme hänelle sikareja?* Translated by Martti Haapakoski. Helsinki: WSOY.

Greimas, Algirdas Julien. 1973. "Actants, Actors and Figures." In *On Meaning: Selected Writings in Semiotic Theory*, 106–20. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Grönstrand, Heidi. 2011. "Eeva Suomeksi Ja Eva Ruotsiksi: Kirjailija-Kääntäjä Kersti Bergroth Kielikiistojen Sovittelijana". In *Både och, sekä että: om flerspråkighet = Monikielisyydestä*, edited by Heidi Grönstrand and Kristina Malmio, 81–100. Helsingfors: Schildts.

———. 2016. "Kirjallisuushistoria, kansakunta ja kieli. Monikielisyys metodologisen nationalismin haasteena". In *Kansallisen katveesta: Suomen kirjallisuuden ylirajaisuudesta.* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Grönstrand, Heidi, Ralf Kauranen, Olli Löytty, Kukku Melkas, Hanna-Leena Nissilä, and Mikko Pollari. 2016. *Kansallisen katveesta: Suomen kirjallisuuden ylirajaisuudesta*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Grutman, Rainier. n.d. "Self-Translation". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 2nd edition, 257–60. London and New York: Routledge.

Harding, Sue-Ann. 2012a. "'How Do I Apply Narrative Theory?': Socio-Narrative Theory in Translation Studies". *Target: International Journal on Translation Studies* 24 (2): 286–309.

———. 2012b. "Translating Eyewitness Accounts: Personal Narratives from Beslan, September 2004". *Journal of Language & Politics* 11 (2): 229–49.

———. 2013. "Narratives and Contextual Frames". In *Handbook of Translation Studies Volume 4*, 105–10. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://benjamins.com/online/hts/articles/nar1.

Harding, Sue-Ann, and Monwabisi K. Ralarala. 2017. "'Tell Me the Story Is and Do Not Leave out Anything'. Social Responsibility and Ethical Practices in the Translation of Complainants' Narratives: The Potential for Change". *The Translator* 23 (2): 158–76.

Hartama-Heinonen, Ritva. 2017a. "Kulttuurin rajat, kääntämisen rajat. Kulttuurinsisäisen kääntämisen mahdollisuus ja luonne". *MikaEL - Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu*, 10: 17–30.

———. 2017b. "Kunskapsluckor och intra-och interkulturella ingrepp i original och översättning". Edited by Beatrice Silén, Anne Huhtala, Hanna Lehti-Eklund, Jenny Stenberg-Sirén, and Väinö Syrjälä. *Svenskan i Finland 17 : Föredrag vid den sjuttonde sammankomsten för beskrivningen av svenskan i Finland, Helsingfors den 18-19 maj 2017*, 18–31.

Helasvuo, Veikko. 1952. *Sibelius and the Music of Finland*. Translated by Paul Sjöblom. Helsinki: Otava.

Hemming, Aarre. 1958. *Luettelo Jean Sibeliusta Ja Hänen Teoksiaan Käsittelevästä Kirjallisuudesta = List of Works Concerning Jean Sibelius and His Compositions*. Helsinki: Suomen kulttuurirahasto.

Herman, David. 1999. *Narratologies: New Perspectives on Narrative Analysis*. Columbus: Ohio State University Press.

Herman, David, Manfred Jahn, and Marie-Laure Ryan, eds. 2010. "Introduction". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London: Routledge. http://www.proquest.com/lion/docview/2137960407/citation/8B2DF6F82990451DPQ/14.

Hermans, Theo. 1995. "Toury's Empiricism Version One". *The Translator* 1 (2): 215–23.

Hiidenmaa, Pirjo. 2013. "Tietokirjallisuuden suomentaminen ja kustantaminen 1900-luvulla'. In *Suomennetun Tietokirjallisuuden Historia : 1800-Luvulta 2000-Luvulle*, edited by Outi Paloposki and H. K. Riikonen, 98–106. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

"History of the Kalevala Society". n.d. https://kalevalaseura.fi/en/the-kalevala-society/history-of-the-kalevala-society/.

Hokenson, Jan, and Marcella Munson. 2007. *The Bilingual Text: History and Theory of Literary Self-Translation*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

Hühn, Peter, John Pier, Wolf Schmid, Jörg Schönert, Peter Hühn, and Jörg Schönert. 2009. *Handbook of Narratology*. Berlin: De Gruyter. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kutu/detail.action?docID=453878.

Huttunen, Matti. 1993. *Modernin musiikinhistoriankirjoituksen synty Suomessa. Musiikkikäsitykset tutkimuksen uranuurtajien tuotannossa*. Dissertation. Helsinki: Suomen musiikkitieteellinen seura.

———. 1999. "Sibelius ja Suomen musiikillinen yhteiskunta ennen toista maailmansotaa". *Musiikki*, 262–76.

———. 2002. "Cult and Canon: Finnish Music in the 1920s and 1930s". *Finnish Musical Quarterly* 2: 46–53.

Immonen, Leena, Mari Pakkala-Weckström, and Inkeri Vehmas-Lehto, eds. 2011. *Kääntämisen tekstilajit ja tekstilajien kääntäminen*. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

Inghilleri, Moira, ed. 2005. "Special Issue: Bourdieu and the Sociology of Translation and Interpreting". *The Translator* 11 (2).

Ivaska, Laura. 2020. *A Mixed-Methods Approach to Indirect Translation: A Case Study of the Finnish Translations of Modern Greek Prose 1952–2004*. Dissertation. https://www.utupub.fi/handle/10024/150755.

Jalas, Jussi. 1981. *Elämäni teemat*. Edited by Olavi Lehmuksela. Helsinki: Tammi.

Jansen, Hanne, and Anna Wegener, eds. 2013. *Authorial and Editorial Voices in Translation*. Montréal: Éditions québécoises de l'oeuvre.

Jung, Verena. 2002. *English-German Self-Translation of Academic Texts and Its Relevance for Translation Theory and Practice*. Frankfurt am Main: Lang.

Jyrhämä, Outi. 2006. "Salmenhaara, Erkki". *Kansallisbiografia-verkkojulkaisu*. http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kbg-001162.

Katan, David. 2009. "Translation as Intercultural Communication". In *The Routledge Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Jeremy Munday, 74–92. London: Routledge.

Kielilakikomitea. 2000. "Kansalliskielten Historiallinen, Kulttuurinen Ja Sosiologinen Tausta".

Kindt, Tom, and Hans-Harald Müller, eds. 2003. *What Is Narratology?: Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*. Berlin: De Gruyter. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kutu/detail.action?docID=325682.

Kinnunen, Tuija, and Kaisa Koskinen, eds. 2010. *Translators' Agency*. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Kivimies, Yrjö. 1937. *Pidot tornissa*. Helsinki: Gummerus.

Koskinen, Kaisa. 2010. "Agency and Causality: Towards Explaining by Mechanisms in Translation Studies". In *Translators' Agency*, edited by Tuija Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen, 165–87. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

———. 2020. *Translation and Affect : Essays on Sticky Affects and Translational Affective Labour*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. http://search.ebscohost.com.ezproxy.utu.fi/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=2494121&site=ehost-live&ebv=EB&ppid=pp_x.

Koskinen, Kaisa, and Päivi Kuusi. 2017. "Translator Training for Language Activists". *Trans-Kom* 10 (2): 188–213.

Kujamäki, Pekka. 2010. "Reconstructing a Translators' Network and Their Narrative Agenda". In *Translators Agency*, edited by Tuija Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen, 165–87. Tampere: Tampere University Press.

———. 2011. "Sota, käännöskulttuurit ja toimijuus". *MikaEL - Kääntämisen ja tulkkauksen tutkimuksen symposiumin verkkojulkaisu* 5. https://www.sktl.fi/@Bin/85378/Kujamaki_MikaEL2011.pdf.

Kujamäki, Pekka, and Outi Paloposki. 2015. "Sujuvasti suomesta saksaan kääntävä konekirjoittajatar saa paikan heti. Historian näkökulma kääntäjyyteen ammattina tai tehtävänä.' *Virittäjä* 119 (3): 342–69.

Kurkela, Vesa. 2010. "Kansallismielisyys Suomen musiikin historiankirjoituksessa". *Musiikki*, no. 3–4: 24–42.

———. 2017. "Suomen synty musiikkikulttuurissa: Orkesterimusiikki ja julkisuus Helsingissä 1860–1910". *Musiikki* 47 (1–2): 41–85.

Kurkela, Vesa, and Saijaleena Rantanen. 2017. "Germany as a Cultural Paragon. Transferring Modern Musical Life from Central Europe to Finland." In *In Cultural Mediation in Europe 1800–1950.*, edited by Reine Meylaerts, Lieven D'Hulst, and Tom Verschaffel, 177–94. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Latour, Bruno. 2007. *Reassembling the Social – An Introduction to Actor-Network Theory.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lefevere, André. 1993. "Untitled Introduction to Florin". In *Translation as Social Action. Russian and Bulgarian Perspectives*, edited by Palma Zlateva, 122–23. London: Routledge.

Lehmann, Rosamond. 1950. *Kaduilla sataa ja paistaa: romaani*. Helsinki: Otava.
———. 1951. *Tanssiinkutsu: romaani*. Helsinki: Otava.
Lehtonen, Tuomas M. S., ed. 1999. *Suomi, outo, pohjoinen maa? Näkökulmia Euroopan äären historiaan ja kulttuuriin*. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus.
Leibowitz, René. 2009. "Sibelius, maailman huonoin säveltäjä (1955)". Translated by Ilkka Oramo. *Säteitä* 1.
Leppihalme, Ritva. 2011. "Realia". *Handbook of Translation Studies Online*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. http://benjamins.com/online/hts/articles/rea1.
Levas, Santeri. 1945. *Jean Sibelius ja hänen Ainolansa*. Helsinki: Otava.
Love, Harold. 2002. *Attributing Authorship*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Lyotard, Jean-François. 1984. *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
Lyytikäinen, Pirjo. 1999. "Suomalaiset syntysanat". In *Suomi, outo, pohjoinen maa? Näkökulmia Euroopan äären historiaan ja kulttuuriin*, edited by Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen, 138–65. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus.
Mäkelä, Tomi. 2007. *Sibelius, me ja muut*. Helsinki: Teos.
Meinander, Nils. 1947. *Varför socialisera?* Helsingfors: Söderström.
———. 1948. *Miksi sosialisoisimme*. Translated by Margareta Jalas. Helsinki: Otava.
Meister, Jan Christoph. 2014 (2011). "Narratology". *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/48.html#.
Melgin, Elina. 2014. *Propagandaa vai julkisuusdiplomatiaa? Taide ja kulttuuri Suomen maakuvan viestinnässä 1937–52*. Dissertation. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.
Meuter, Norbert. 2013 (2011). "Narration in Various Disciplines" *The Living Handbook of Narratology*. https://www.lhn.uni-hamburg.de/node/49.html#.
Meylaerts, Reine. 2008. "Translators and (Their) Norms: Towards a Sociological Con-Struction of the Individual." In *Beyond Descriptive Translation Studies. Investigations in Homage to Gideon Toury*, edited by Anthony Pym, Miriam Schlesinger, and Daniel Simeoni, 91–102. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
Meylaerts, Reine, Lieven D'Hulst, and Tom Verschaffel, eds. 2017. *Cultural Mediation in Europe 1800–1950.* Leuven: Leuven University Press.
Milton, John, and Paul F. Bandia, eds. 2009. *Agents of Translation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
Montini, Chiara. n.d. "Self-Translation". *Handbook of Translation Studies Online*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. http://benjamins.com/online/hts/articles/sel1.
Moorkens, Joss, Sheila Castilho, Federico Gaspari, and Stephen Doherty. 2018. *Translation Quality Assessment: From Principles to Practice*. Cham: Springer International Publishing AG. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kutu/detail.action?docID=5452404.
Morrison, Linda J. 2010. "Sociology and Narrative". In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London: Routledge. http://www.proquest.com/lion/docview/2137960202/citation/E27A9D6B2E2E448DPQ/394.
Moynihan, Sarah. 2018. *Sibelius and Material Formenlehre Projections Beyond the Edges of Musical Form*. Dissertation, London: University of London.
Muir, Simo. 2009. "Jiddišistä ruotsin kautta suomeen: Helsingin juutalaisten kielenvaihdoista ja etnolektistä'. *Virittäjä* 4, 533–556.
Mustelin, Olof. 1979. *W. E. Nordströms tryckta publikationer 1932–1979*. Åbo: akademi.
Nünning, Ansgar. 2003. "Narratology or Narratologies? Taking Stock of Recent Developments, Critique and Modest Proposals for Future Usages of the Term". In *What Is Narratology? Questions and Answers Regarding the Status of a Theory*, edited by Tom Kindt and Hans-Harald Müller, 239–75. Berlin: De Gruyter. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kutu/detail.action?docID=325682.
'OED'. n.d. https://www-oed-com.ezproxy.utu.fi/.

Oramo, Ilkka. 2021. "Maailman huonoin säveltäjä". https://muhi.uniarts.fi/maailman-huonoin-saveltaja/.

Paalasmaa, Jarno. 2011. *Steinerkoulun tulo Suomeen. Miten vaihtoehtopedagogiikka juurtui osaksi suomalaista koulua*. Jyväskylä: Steinerkasvatuksen liitto ry.

Paloposki, Outi. 2011. "Tietokirjallisuuden suomentaminen". In *Kääntämisen tekstilajit ja tekstilajien kääntäminen*, edited by Leena Immonen, Mari Pakkala-Weckström, and Inkeri Vehmas-Lehto, 51–66. Helsinki: Finn Lectura.

———. 2016. "Translating and Translators before the Professional Project". *The Journal of Specialised Translation*, 25: 15–32.

Paloposki, Outi, and H. K. Riikonen, eds. 2013. *Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia : 1800-luvulta 2000-luvulle*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Paloposki, Outi, H. K. Riikonen, and Anne-Maria Latikka. 2013. "Esipuhe". In *Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia: 1800-luvulta 2000-luvulle*, edited by Outi Paloposki and H. K. Riikonen, 11–12. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Pulkkinen, Tuija. 1999. "Kielen ja mielen ykseys". In *Suomi, outo, pohjoinen maa? Näkökulmia Euroopan ääreen historiaan ja kulttuuriin*, edited by Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen, 118–37. Jyväskylä: PS-kustannus.

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

———. 2000. *Negotiating the Frontier. Translators and Intercultures in Hispanic History.* Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.

———. 2004. *Moving Text : Localization, Translation, and Distribution*. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company. http://site.ebrary.com/lib/alltitles/docDetail.action?docID=10052863.

———. 2009. "Humanizing Translation History". *Hermes - Journal of Language and Communication Studies*, 42: 23–48.

———. 2011. "Translation Research Terms: A Tentative Glossary for Moments of Perplexity and Dispute'. In *Translation Research Projects 3*, edited by Pym, Anthony, 75–110. Tarragona: Intercultural Studies Group.

———. 2016. "A Spirited Defense of a Certain Empiricism in Translation Studies (and in Anything Else Concerning the Study of Cultures)". *Translation Spaces* 5 (2): 289–313.

Rautaoja, Turo. 2018. "Construction of a Cultural Narrative through Translation. Texts on Sibelius and His Works as Key Cultural Texts." In *Key Cultural Texts in Translation*, edited by Kirsten Malmkjær, 257–74. Amsterdam ; John Benjamins.

Rautaoja, Turo, and Yves Gambier. 2015. "L'autotraduction : Une Pratique Ancienne, Un Concept Ambigu. Le Cas Du Suédo-Finlandais Karl Ekman." *Glottopol* 25 (1). 151–162. http://glottopol.univ-rouen.fr/telecharger/numero_25/gpl25_10rautaoja_gambier.pdf

Rautavaara, Einojuhani. 1989. *Omakuva*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Ricoeur, Paul. 1979. "The Human Experience of Time and Narrative". *Research in Phenomenology* 9: 17–34.

Riikonen, H. K. 2013. "Elämäkerrallinen kirjallisuus". In *Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia: 1800-luvulta 2000-luvulle*, edited by Outi Paloposki and H. K. Riikonen, 465–81. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Riikonen, H. K., Urpo Kovala, Pekka Kujamäki, and Outi Paloposki, eds. 2007a. *Suomennoskirjallisuuden Historia 1*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

———, eds. 2007b. *Suomennoskirjallisuuden Historia 2*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Rolland, Romain. 1918. *Beethoven*. Translated by Leevi Madetoja. Porvoo: WSOY.

Ruokonen, Minna. 2013. "Studying Translator Status. Three Points of View". Edited by M. Eronen, and M. Rodi-Risberg. *VAKKI Publications 2*, 327–38.

Ryan, Marie-Laure, and Ernst van Alphen. 1993. "Narratology". In *Encyclopedia of Contemporary Literary Theory. Approaches, Scholars, Terms*, edited by Irena R. Makaryk, 110–16. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Saarinen, Taina. 2012. "Internationalization and the Invisible Language? Historical Phases and Current Policies in Finnish Higher Education". In *Higher Education Research in Finland: Emerging Structures and Contemporary Issues*, edited by Sakari Ahola and David M Hoffman, 235–48. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Sager, Juan C. 1994. *Language Engineering and Translation: Consequences of Automation*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Salmenhaara, Erkki. 1996. *Suomen Musiikin Historia 2. Kansallisromantiikan Valtavirta*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Schäffner, Christina, Luciana Sabina Tcaciuc, and Wine Tesseur. 2014. "Translation Practices in Political Institutions: A Comparison of National, Supranational, and Non-Governmental Organisations". *Perspectives* 22 (4): 493–510.

Schlüter Terrell, Gisela. 1993. *The Harold E. Johnson Jean Sibelius Collection at Butler University: A Complete Catalogue (1993)*. http://digitalcommons.butler.edu/scbib/1.

Sevänen, Erkki. 1994. *Vapauden rajat. Kirjallisuuden tuotannon ja välityksen yhteiskunnallinen sääntely Suomessa vuosina 1918–1939*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Shuttleworth, Mark, and Moira Cowie. 1997. *Dictionary of Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

'Sibelius Museum's Website'. n.d. https://sibeliusmuseum.fi/en/jean-sibelius/.

Simeoni, Daniel. 1995. "Translating and Studying Translation: the View from the Agent". *Meta: Journal des traducteurs* 40 (3): 445–60.

Similä, Martti. 1945. *Sibeliana*. Helsinki: Otava.

Sirén, Vesa. 2000. *Aina poltti sikaria. Jean Sibelius aikalaisten silmin*. Helsinki: Otava.

Sjöblom, Paul. 2000. *Finland from the Inside: Eyewitness Reports of a Finnish-American Journalist, 1938–1997*. Edited by Glenda Dawn Goss. Helsinki: NewBridge Press.

Somers, Margaret R. 1992. "Narrativity, Narrative Identity, and Social Action: Rethinking English Working-Class Formation'" *Social Science History* 16 (4): 591–630.

———. 1994. "The Narrative Constitution of Identity: A Relational and Network Approach". *Theory and Society* 23 (5): 605–49.

———. 1997. "Reconstructing and Reconstructing Class Formation Theory: Narrativity, Relational Analysis, and Social Theory". In *Reworking Class*, edited by John R. Hall, 73–105. Ithaca: Cornell U. P.

Somers, Margaret R., and Gloria D. Gibson. 1994. "Reclaiming the Epistemological 'Other': Narrative and the Social Constitution of Identity". In *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity*, edited by Craig Calhoun, 37–99. Oxford: Blackwell.

Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem. 2009. "The Case Study Research Method in Translation Studies". *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 3 (1): 37–56.

Szlachcicowa, Irena. 2017. "After the Relational Turn: The Problem of Social Identity". *Stan Rzeczy*, 12: 191–214.

Tawaststjerna, Erik, Tuomas Anhava, and Erkki Länsiö. 1955. *Sibeliuksen pianosävellykset ja muita esseitä*. Helsinki: Otava.

The New York Times. 1934. "Philip Hale, Oritic, Dead in Boston, 80", 1 December 1934. https://timesmachine.nytimes.com/.

Thornborrow, Joanna, and Jennifer Coates. 2005. *Sociolinguistics of Narrative*. Philadelphia,: John Benjamins Publishing Company. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kutu/detail.action?docID=623121.

Todorov, Tzvetan. 1969. *Grammaire Du Décaméron.* The Hague: Mouton.

Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies – and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/kutu/detail.action?docID=673082.

Väisänen, Armas Otto and Kalevalaseura, eds. 1926. *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja*. 6. Porvoo: WSOY.

Valdeón, Roberto A. 2008. "Anomalous News Translation: Selective Appropriation of Themes and Texts in the Internet". *Babel. Revue Internationale de La Traduction / International Journal of Translation* 54 (4): 299–326.

Virrankoski, Pentti. 2009. *Suomen Historia 1 & 2*. Vol. 2., revised edition Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Wegelius, Martin. 1891. *Hufvuddragen af den västerländska musikens historia från den kristna tidens början till våra dagar 1–3*. Helsinki: Holm.

———. 1904. *Länsimaisen musiikin historia pääpiirteissään kristinuskon alkuajoilta meidän päiviimme*. Helsinki: Holm.

Weigel Williams, Hermine. 2010. "George (Yrjö) Sjöblom: Jean Sibelius's Link with America". In *Sibelius in the Old and New World: Aspects of His Music, Its Interpretation, and Reception*, edited by Timothy L. Jackson, Veijo Murtomäki, Colin Davis, and Timo Virtanen, 159–68. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Xiumei, Xu. 2010. "Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account". *Babel* 56 (4): 397–401.

Appendix 1 – List of texts

Original title	Translation	Author	Translator	Year of publication (orig./ transl.)
Orchesterkompositionen von Jean Sibelius (in *Kunstwart*)	Jean Sibeliuksen varhaisimmat orkesterisävellykset (in *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja* 6)	Göhler, Georg	?	1908/26
Jean Sibelius. Hans tondiktning och drag ur hans liv.	Jean Sibelius. Hänen sävelrunoutensa ja piirteitä hänen elämästään	Furuhjelm, Erik	Madetoja, Leevi	1916/16
Sibelius. The Symphonies	Sibeliuksen sinfoniat	Gray, Cecil	Jalas, Jussi	1935/45
Jean Sibelius: En Konstnärs Liv Och Personlighet	Jean Sibelius. Taiteilijan elämä ja persoonallisuus	Ekman, Karl	Ekman, Karl	1935/35
(Sibelius: A Close-up) Sibelius – Närbild och Samtal	Sibelius: lähikuvia ja keskusteluja	Törne, Bengt von	Jalas, Margareta	(1937)/45/45; second, enlarged edition 1955/65
N/A	Sibelius	Downes, Olin	Sjöblom, Paul with Jalas, Jussi (+ Sjöblom, Yrjö)	1945
Sibelius	Sibelius	Ringbom, Nils-Eric	Jalas, Margareta	1948/48
Sibelius symfonier. En studie i musikförståelse	Sibeliuksen sinfoniat. Ajatuksia musiikin tulkinnasta	Parmett, Simon	Jalas, Margareta	1955/55
Jean Sibelius och hans verk	Jean Sibelius ja hänen elämäntyönsä	Ekman, Karl	Ekman, Karl	1956/56
Jean Sibelius i Amerika	Jean Sibelius Amerikassa	Andersson, Otto	Jalas, Margareta	1955/1960
Jean Sibelius	Jean Sibelius	Johnson, Harold	Kivimies, Yrjö	1959/60

TURUN
YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY
OF TURKU

Painosalama, Turku, Finland 2023

ISBN 978-951-29-9319-2 PRINT
ISBN 978-951-29-9320-8 PDF
ISSN 0082-6987 (Print)
ISSN 2343-3191 (Online)