

Foreigners as Narrators of  
National History:  
The Role of Translation in Finnish  
Historiography of the Continuation War

Lauri Koukila

MA Thesis

English, Translation and Interpreting Path

School of Languages and Translation Studies

Faculty of Humanities

University of Turku

May 2018

Turun yliopiston laatujärjestelmän mukaisesti tämän julkaisun alkuperäisyys on tarkastettu Turnitin OriginalityCheck -järjestelmällä.

UNIVERSITY OF TURKU

School of Languages and Translation Studies/Faculty of Humanities

KOUKILA, LAURI: Foreigners as Narrators of National History: The Role of  
Translation in Finnish Historiography of the Continuation War

Thesis, 72 pp.

English, Translation and Interpreting Path

May 2018

---

The subject of this thesis is the role of translation in Finnish historiography of the Continuation War. The important early role of three Anglo-American historians, C. L. Lundin, A. F. Upton, and H. P. Crosby, in the study of this subject is almost universally recognised in Finnish historiography. However, the fact that their studies had to be translated before they could properly become part of the Finnish discourses has thus far been largely ignored.

This thesis focuses on the Finnish translations of four influential studies by the aforementioned historians, but rather than studying the translated texts themselves, it seeks to contextualise them by looking into multiple different types of texts related to them (collectively known as paratexts), including reviews, advertisements, and translator's footnotes, as well as bibliographical information about the publishers and the translators. The purpose of this interdisciplinary study is to contribute the missing translation-related details to an otherwise thoroughly researched topic. The thesis also presents a concise overview of the Finnish historiography of the Continuation War to properly situate these studies within it.

Asiasanat (keywords): kääntäminen, historiantutkimus, jatkosota, ajopuuteoria, parateksti, kulttuurienvälinen vuorovaikutus

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	1
1.1	The Structure of the Study .....	2
1.2	Notes on Terminology .....	3
1.3	Notes on the Use of References .....	4
2	Overview of Previous Research .....	6
3	Methodology .....	12
3.1	Between History and Translation .....	12
3.2	Defining the Scope of the Study .....	14
4	Historical and Historiographical Background .....	18
4.1	The Driftwood Debate .....	18
4.2	Counterarguments from Abroad .....	20
4.3	Later Developments .....	22
5	Lundin, Upton, and Krosby in Finnish .....	25
5.1	Notes on Genre Definitions .....	25
5.2	Lundin .....	26
5.3	Upton .....	27
5.4	Krosby .....	29
6	The Translators .....	32
6.1	Jorma Aaltonen .....	33
6.2	Sirkka Upton .....	34
6.3	Markku Järvinen .....	34
6.4	Erkki Ihanainen .....	35
6.5	Ulla Pakkala .....	35
7	The Publishers .....	36
7.1	Political Climate in Finland during the 1950s and 1960s .....	36
7.2	Kirjayhtymä .....	37
7.3	Gummerus .....	38
8	Paratextual Evidence .....	39
8.1	Marketing and Other Publisher's Paratexts .....	40
8.1.1	Lundin .....	41
8.1.2	Upton .....	42
8.1.3	Krosby .....	43
8.1.4	Common Themes in the Marketing Paratexts .....	46
8.2	Translator's Footnotes .....	47
8.2.1	Jorma Aaltonen .....	47
8.2.2	Sirkka Upton .....	48

8.2.3	Markku Järvinen .....	49
8.2.4	Erkki Ihanainen and Ulla Pakkala.....	49
8.2.5	Some Concluding Remarks on Footnotes .....	50
8.3	The Reviews .....	51
8.3.1	Lundin .....	55
8.3.2	Upton.....	57
8.3.3	Krosby .....	60
9	Conclusion .....	64
	References.....	67
	Finnish Summary – Lyhennelmä .....	73

# 1 Introduction

This study explores the role of translation in shaping the Finnish historical study of the Continuation War and the public discourses surrounding the subject. The important contributions to the historical study of this particular period in the history of Finland that were made by three Anglo-American historians, Charles Leonard Lundin, Anthony F. Upton, and Hans Peter Krosby, are generally acknowledged or even emphasised in Finnish historiography, but one detail is missing from these representations of the academic and public debates that took place in Finland during the 1950s and 1960s: the ‘translatedness’ of these influential foreign studies.

Translation is often seen as a form of cultural transfer, a way of exchanging ideas between nations and cultures. I believe it has an essential role in preventing a nation-state from turning inwards, from ultimately becoming a closed society where only one truth is allowed to exist. The historical studies by Lundin, Upton, and Krosby were an outside influence that forced their Finnish counterparts to engage in healthy debate and finally to reconsider the nationalist and Finnocentric narrative of the Continuation War that had become the consensus within Finnish academic history, a narrative in which Finland had fought its wars alone and emerged as a valiant survivor, in which the military co-operation between Finland and Hitler’s Germany was either glossed over or categorically denied. Furthermore, these studies, originally all written in English, were also translated into Finnish, which allowed them to become a part of the public discourse and influence the ways in which the Continuation War was viewed in Finland.

This study focuses on four influential books by the aforementioned three historians, all of which were also translated into Finnish:

- *Finland in the Second World War* (1957) by Charles Leonard Lundin, in Finnish *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* (1960), translated by Jorma Aaltonen
- *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941: A Study in Small-power Politics* (1964) by Anthony F. Upton, in Finnish *Välirauha* (1965), translated by Sirikka Upton
- *Petsamo in the Spotlight: A Study in Finnish-German Relations, 1940–1941* (1966) by Hans Peter Krosby, in Finnish *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* (1966), translated by Markku Järvinen

- *Finland and Operation 'Barbarossa'* (unpublished manuscript) by Hans Peter Krosby, in Finnish *Suomen valinta 1941* (1967), translated by Erkki Ihanainen and Ulla Pakkala

However, the books themselves, as translated texts, are not really what is being studied here, but rather their social context. The real primary sources of this study are the texts that surround these translations, the library and bibliographical data about them, the advertisements created for marketing them, and the reviews of them in magazines and journals. In the published translations themselves, the focus is mostly on the prefaces, postfaces, footnotes, and forewords, rather than the main texts of the books. These are collectively called 'paratexts', borrowing a term from Gérard Genette (1997). However, Genette's theories have not been employed in this study any further, and 'paratext' is simply used as a shorthand in a way that has, I would argue, become quite common in translation studies.

This study is attempting to make a contribution in both the history of translation in Finland and the Finnish historiography of the Continuation War. In the former, it is a case study on four translations of history texts, a genre that has been the subject of a relatively small number of studies thus far, while in the latter, it is a new point of view on a subject that has otherwise been explored quite extensively.

The Continuation War itself is not the subject of this study, and as such, no historical narrative of the war is included within these pages. The presupposed level of knowledge on the subject is rather low, but readers who feel like they would prefer more background information than is provided here are advised to look up any relatively recent general presentation of Finland in the Second World War by a reputable academic publisher, such as Olli Vehviläinen's *Finland in the Second World War: Between Germany and Russia*, published in English by Palgrave in 2002 (translated by Gerard McAlester).

## 1.1 The Structure of the Study

Chapter 2 of the study discusses previous translation-related research, attempting to find different types of common ground with the present study. Chapter 3 details the methodology, materials, and the scope of the study, and also briefly discusses its position between the disciplines of history and translation studies. The historical and

historiographical context of the study is discussed in chapter 4, that presents the timeline of the so-called Driftwood Debate, in which the aforementioned Anglo-American historians challenged the general consensus of their Finnish counterparts. Chapter 5 switches the focus from historiography to translation history, and gives the timeline of how the aforementioned foreign studies were each translated into Finnish. The translators, first mentioned in the previous chapter, are introduced chapter 6, which consists mostly of their individual bibliographies. Chapter 7 begins with a brief discussion of the political climate in Finland during the 1950s and 1960s, in order to contextualise the discussion on the publishers of these translations, and their position on the political spectrum. Chapter 8 presents both the most important materials and the main analysis of the study. It focuses on paratexts, and is divided into three sections, the first of which examines the paratexts produced by the publishers, i.e. promotional material for the books, while the second one focuses on paratexts produced by the translators, i.e. their footnotes in the translations, and the third one looks at a selection of reviews of these historical studies, focusing on any translation-related remarks, as well as the overall reception of these studies. Chapter 9 concludes the study and briefly summarises the findings of the previous chapters.

## 1.2 Notes on Terminology

This study uses the terms *history* and *historiography* as defined by Lieven D’hulst in *Handbook of Translation Studies*:

*History* is the proper sequence of facts, events, ideas, discourses, etc. [...] an oral or written mode of presentation of these facts, events, etc.; a strong tradition favors a narrative mode of presentation.

*Historiography*, in its traditional sense, is defined as the history of histories, i.e., the history of the practices of history-writing. By extension, it is also understood as the history of other intellectual practices such as linguistics, philosophy, literature, science, etc.

(D’hulst 2010: 397, emphasis in the original)

D’hulst’s ‘typology’ also includes a third term, *metahistoriography*, which refers to “the explicit reflection on the concepts and methods to write history” (ibid.). For the purposes of this study, the first two terms were considered to be sufficient, and using this term is, therefore, generally avoided.

The reader should keep in mind, however, that elsewhere, the term historiography is often also used simply to refer to the act of writing history, or as defined



by the Oxford English Dictionary, “[t]he writing of history; written history” (OED 2012). While this usage is avoided in the present study, some instances of it can still be found in direct quotations from other studies. To avoid confusion, the phrase ‘history writing’ is used in this study instead of historiography in this wider sense of the term. The phrase “historiography of the Continuation War”, which appears a few times in the present study, could be seen as a sort of borderline case between the two usages of the term historiography, as it often includes both the sum total of all academic history writing on the subject, as well as the history of those histories, similar to the sense D’huilst refers to in the last sentence of the above-quoted paragraph.

The word ‘narrative’ is used quite frequently in this study, but that should not be taken to imply any particular affiliation to narratology or narrative analysis (see e.g. Baker 2006) in terms of methodology. The usage of ‘narrative’ that is employed here is one that has become more or less standard in academic history after the so-called linguistic turn (see e.g. Bandia 2006), which brought with it a general understanding of the fundamental subjectiveness of history writing. A historical study is never the historical ‘truth’, which the historian has simply written down, but instead a narrative of the events, as interpreted by the historian. The word ‘narrative’ does not in any way imply that a history text is a work of fiction, but simply acknowledges that the text is, by necessity, an interpretation of the sources used by the historian, not an objective representation of the past itself. It does not, however, imply that all historical narratives are equal either, and the demand that history writing should always seek to represent the past in the most accurate and balanced way possible, without hiding ‘inconvenient details’ (like, say, a certain military alliance during the Continuation War) is actually rather central to this study.

### **1.3 Notes on the Use of References**

In addition to the more typical academic sources, which can all be found in the list of references as per usual, this study also makes numerous references to other publications which are not sources *per se*, because their actual content is not referenced in any way. These are usually other books written by the same historians, or translated by the same translators, as the ones this study focuses on. As such, their importance to the study is not in anything specific they contain, but simply in the fact that they exist, as parts of the

bibliographies of these historians and translators. The basic logic that is followed in this study is, therefore, that if a reference is made to something written in a source, it is given a proper citation in the text and included in the list of references, but if a book or other publication is only mentioned in passing, it is not included in the list. In the latter case, the full name of the book, and generally also the year of publication, are given in the text. English translations of Finnish titles are included in brackets and quotation marks after the actual title. These are all my own translations, and are generally meant to be as literal as possible, to give non-Finnish speaking readers an idea of what the book's subject might be.

## 2 Overview of Previous Research

This chapter offers an overview of the previous research from the field of translation studies. The studies presented in this chapter were all considered to be relevant to the present study in one way or another, approaching the subject from multiple different angles. The focus here is exclusively on translation-related research. The historiographical research on the subject of Continuation War, which is relevant to this study as background information, is discussed in chapter 4.

Since the 1990's, translation history has gradually come into its own as a research area within translation studies, and even a relatively popular one at that. Within the academic discipline of history, on the other hand, translation as a phenomenon and/or as a social practice is still, for the most part, not considered to be of any particular interest. As Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia put it in their introduction to *Cultural Translation in the Early Modern Europe*, “the turn towards history in Translation Studies has not yet been matched by a turn towards the study of translation on the part of historians” (Burke and Hsia 2007: 3), and it does not seem like such a turn has taken place within the last decade either, at least not in any major way. Sergia Adamo makes an interesting observation in pointing out that translation history as a whole has a lot in common with microhistory (Adamo 2003: 85), which seeks to reduce the scale of historical inquiry to highlight previously neglected and marginalized people and events, things that get lost in the traditional grand narratives of history. Translation as a phenomenon and translators as individuals can certainly be seen as something that fits into that category. Much of translation history also uses the same types of sources, and a similar methodology in researching them, as microhistory, employing sources such as translators' manuscripts and personal correspondences. This sets translation history apart from both traditional (or 'political') history, which prefers official archival documents and other 'state level' sources, and from other, more 'traditional' schools of translation studies, which tend to be much more focused on the translated texts themselves and view the microhistorical sources as secondary (see e.g. Munday 2014: 66).

Besides translation history, another strand of study relevant to the present one is the translation *of* history, i.e. studies that focus on translations of history texts, especially ones written in the context of academic historical research. Quite often the same studies fit into both categories, as the history texts that are being studied were written and translated in the more or less distant past, their historical context needs to be

taken into account, and researching the texts and their social and historical contexts requires, for the most part, the same type of methodology as any other inquiry into the history of translation would. This particular sub-field is quite marginal, or as O’Sullivan (2012: 131) put it, a “neglected topic”, and in 2003, Abdelmajid Hannoum was likely justified in claiming that “there has been no investigation of the translation of historiography and its transformation from one language to another” (2003: 61). The subject of Hannoum’s study is the transformation of ‘local’ history into ‘colonial’ history, and specifically the 19<sup>th</sup> century French translations of the texts written by medieval Arab historian Ibn Khaldûn. Hannoum shows how these translations, commissioned by the French colonial administration in Algeria, impose the European vocabulary of ‘race’ and ‘nation’ on the medieval text where, by any reasonable definition of equivalency, such terms were nowhere to be found, thus changing the narrative from a medieval North-African one into a 19<sup>th</sup> century French colonial one. This version of the narrative was an essential part of the French historiography of North Africa, and has kept influencing even some post-colonial historians (Hannoum 2003: 81), presumably because they, too, read the translated versions of Ibn Khaldûn’s texts.

Another example of a study that focuses on translations of historical texts is Monika Baár’s (2010) “From general history to national history: the transformations of William Guthrie’s and John Gray’s *A general history of the world (1736–1765)* in Continental Europe”, which follows the travels of an Enlightenment-era British history text, first into Germany and then partially into Southeastern Europe. First published as ‘a general history of the world’ (which at the time mostly meant Europe), parts of the text were transformed into early examples of national history by Hungarian and Serbian translators. These translations were made because the translators, both important figures in the national revival movements in their respective regions, felt that a written history of the nation was needed, but writing an original one was not feasible at the time. In addition to only translating the chapters of the original work that dealt with their home countries, both translators also made significant additions and corrections to the texts. While Baár deals with a significantly earlier time period, and therefore different translation conventions, the subject of Baár’s study still bears some resemblance to the subject of the present one. In both cases history texts, which were written elsewhere, but had as their subject matter the history of the country into which they were brought by means of translation, were used to supplement the historiography of that country.

Continuing with studies on translation of history texts in earlier time periods, one of Peter Burke's own contributions to the aforementioned *Cultural Translation in the Early Modern Europe*, entitled simply "Translating histories" (Burke 2007), goes a couple of centuries further back into European history than Baár, and offers an overview of the translation of historical texts in Europe from late 15<sup>th</sup> century to 17<sup>th</sup> century, including numbers of known translations from that time period per source and target language, followed by two small case studies that follow the various different translations of two specific texts. Both of the texts featured in these case studies are related to ecclesiastical history, and were originally written by Catholics who were critical of their own church, and then translated in Protestant countries, in which the translations amplified these criticisms and, in some cases, even added explicitly anti-papal statements in paratexts. Burke uses these case studies as an example to illustrate how translation between languages "was at the same time cultural translation, in other words an adaptation to the needs, interests, prejudices and ways of reading of the target culture, or at least some groups within it" (Burke 2007: 133).

Both of the studies discussed above, Baár and Burke, are examples of historical studies that focus on translation as a form of cultural transfer. This idea has been very influential in the field of translation history, and even translation studies in general. The term 'cultural transfer' itself originates from cultural history, and was coined by Michel Espagne and Michael Werner in 1988, although while broadly similar ideas are quite commonly employed, relatively few researchers within translation studies have explicitly used their theory. Of the two discussed above, Burke talks of 'cultural translation', while Baár's article, which itself does not mention cultural transfer, was published in an edited monograph entitled *Cultural Transfer through Translation* (Stockhorst (ed.) 2010), which places it within that context. One notable example of applying Espagne's and Werner's ideas to translation studies is D'hulst (2012), who combines cultural transfer with Toury's 'assumed translations' to form the concept of 'assumed transfer', a broader definition that allows translation to be seen as one of many ways in which cultural exchange can take place (D'hulst 2012: 140-143). D'hulst proves the usefulness of the concept by applying it to the multilingual environment of 19<sup>th</sup> century Belgium, namely to the early history of Belgian literature in the few decades after the country became independent in 1830. Simple source/target dichotomies, which broadening the concept from 'translation' to 'transfer' seeks to avoid, would be ill-

equipped to deal with a historical setting where texts could move between languages within one culture (e.g. from French to Flemish) or between cultures within one language (e.g. from France to Belgium).

Whether we call it ‘cultural transfer’, ‘cultural translation’ or, for example, ‘transmission of ideas’, what translation essentially does in this context is bring new ideas into a cultural sphere from outside of it, and through that, also influence the discourses within that culture. All of the studies discussed in this chapter share this same basic idea to some extent. Obviously, this view of translation includes a wide variety of studies that are neither particularly historical in their approach, nor have history writing as the genre of the translations they focus on. The kind of knowledge that is produced by history, as an academic discipline, is, however, similar to the information produced by other disciplines within the humanities and the social sciences, and we can, therefore, look for parallels in the studies which have focused on translations of those types of texts. One very interesting example is Şebnem Susam-Sarajeva’s *Theories on the Move* (2006), which extensively maps the travels of the texts written by French theoreticians Roland Barthes and Hélène Cixous, into Turkish in the case of the former, and into (American) English in the case of the latter. Susam-Sarajeva demonstrates how translation, both the strategies of individual translators and the patterns of translation in terms of what was translated and what was not, had an important role in shaping the discourses about the theories these two writers came to represent within the target cultures, structuralism and semiotics in the case of Barthes, and French feminism in the case of Cixous.

To circle back to the various names for the movement of ideas between cultures, ‘travelling theory’ is a notion that Susam-Sarajeva has borrowed from Edward Said, but she is quite critical of Said’s complete neglect of translation as a factor in his analysis of how ideas move from culture to culture (Susam-Sarajeva 2006:7-8). However, despite its lack of attention to translation, Said’s ‘travelling theory’ has also been employed by a few other researchers within translation studies. For example, Abé Mark Nornes’ study on the Japanese translations of film theorist Paul Rotha’s book *Documentary Film* (1935) is billed as “a case study in ‘travelling theory’” by editor Mona Baker (Nornes 2010: 96). Nornes examines how Rotha’s theories had a significant impact on Japanese documentary film and the birth of *bunka eiga*, or ‘culture film’, the official ‘documentaries’ (or propaganda films) produced by the state-controlled film industry in the 1930’s and 40’s Imperial Japan. While Rotha’s original texts were moderately left-

leaning, in Japan there was “a struggle over meaning on many levels” (Nornes 2010: 99), as both the conservative government and the left-wing intellectuals, who had to hide their political opinions at the time, claimed Rotha’s ideas to different ends, with debates on Rotha and the translations of his texts serving as a sort of proxy for debates that could not be had under the Imperial regime (ibid.), and different translations of *Documentary Film* highlighting or suppressing different sides of Rotha’s text.

Castro (2014) compares the historiographical traditions within translation studies and philosophy, and argues for a mutually beneficial “merging of narratives” between the two endeavours to form a more complete understanding of the functions translation of philosophical texts has had in different intellectual traditions (2014: 81). Castro also points out the same general neglect of translation, and the translatedness of certain texts (2014: 82), within history of philosophy that others (see e.g. Burke and Hsia 2007: 3) have noticed in general history. As a case study to highlight these points, Castro explores the Spanish translations of German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey’s texts that influenced the formation of Mexican ‘historicist’ philosophical tradition, showing how “translators and translation are linked to the institutional practice of philosophy” (2014: 91).

Moving beyond just historical and/or descriptive studies, one study that has the most similarities with the present one purely in terms of the kinds of translations it focuses on is Hannu Kemppanen’s doctoral thesis *Avainsanoja ja ideologiaa: käännettyjen ja ei-käännettyjen historiatekstien korpuslingvistinen analyysi* (the English version of the title, as it appears in the abstract of the thesis, is *Keywords and Ideology: A Corpus-based Analysis of Translated and Non-translated History Texts* (Kemppanen 2008: vii)). Both the similarities and the differences are apparent from the title: Kemppanen studies translated texts that share both the genre and the target language with the ones that the present study is interested in, but its purpose and methodology are quite different. Kemppanen operates primarily on textual level, using a corpus-based methodology to compare the ideological elements in translated and non-translated texts (with a 0.5 million word corpus of each) that all deal with the political history of Finland, mostly its relations with the Soviet Union. The source language of all the translated texts is Russian, and the analysis shows that these texts represent “an ideology of friendship” (ibid.) while the non-translated texts “refer to an ideological function of opposition, resistance or conflict” (ibid.). To complement his corpus-based quantitative analysis and

reach these conclusions, Kemppanen also employs a qualitative method called “actantial analysis”, which shares a strong resemblance to narrative analysis, most famously applied to history by Hayden White and to translation studies by Mona Baker. While Kemppanen’s aims of testing new methods for corpus linguistics, or his contributions to the study of translated Finnish (“käännössuomi”) are not very relevant in the context of this present study, the final results of Kemppanen’s research offer an interesting new angle to studying the ideological functions of translated history texts. Using a similar methodology to compare the Lundin, Upton, and Krosby translations to the central Finnish studies of the same time period, such as Arvi Korhonen’s *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi*, would certainly make for an interesting companion to this study. The main ideological differences are obvious enough on the content-level, but a linguistic analysis could, and likely would, still reveal something worthwhile.



### **3 Methodology**

This chapter discusses methodological concerns, including the present study's multidisciplinary nature and its aspirations in both translation studies and history. This chapter also presents the criteria by which the scope of the study was defined and briefly discusses some historical studies which could have been used in the present study if a different set of criteria had been used.

#### **3.1 Between History and Translation**

Christopher Rundle (2012, 2014) has argued for a kind of translation history that seeks to contribute to the general historiography of its chosen subject, rather than conduct historical research strictly within translation studies and as translation itself as the main object. In other words, to study 'translation *in* history' instead of 'the history *of* translation'. According to Rundle, researchers of translation history would benefit from associating themselves more with the historians who specialise in the same historical field (time period and/or subject matter), as opposed to staying within translation studies, where other researchers will generally not be familiar with the intricacies of the historical context, and are thus most likely to be only able to contribute in matters related to shared methodology, not as much on the subject itself (Rundle 2014: 4). Rundle's main point, as I see it, is a call for a more interdisciplinary approach to translation history that takes part in the wider endeavour for historical research, instead of only doing historical research for the purpose of accumulating knowledge within translation studies, and mainly for the benefit of translation studies itself, which others, such as Bandia (2014: 113), have advocated. The difference may not, however, actually be all that significant on a more practical level, as in the end, both schools of thought are still interested in studying translation in a non-contemporary context, which always requires an understanding of that context, whether one puts more emphasis on the first or the second word in the phrase 'translation history'.

As a Master's thesis written in the School of Languages and Translation Studies, this study is, by necessity, written for an audience within translation studies. However, this study also seeks to make a contribution, small as it may be, in the field of political (or general) history, more specifically the historiographical research on the Continuation War ('historiography' is here used in the sense of 'a history of histories', as

per D'hulst (2010), not in the sense that would indicate that the present study seeks to make a contribution in the study of Continuation War as such). For that reason, this study tries to adopt a relatively simple methodology that is compatible with the ones generally used in history, and to avoid, at least to some extent, theories and methodologies that are particular to translation studies and generally better suited for accumulating the kind of knowledge that is only relevant to translation studies specifically. Most importantly, this means excluding any source vs. target textual comparisons that would be mainly aimed at uncovering translation strategies or other features that are generally of interest only for those whose viewpoint is based on translation studies and translation as a professional activity. Modern academic history, having long since made peace with the fact that it resides within the humanities and not the sciences, tends to have a particular aversion to the kind of 'empiricism' that translation studies, especially its descriptive translation studies (DTS) branch, has often been drawn to (see Rundle (2012) and Pym (1998) for more on this subject). That is not to say that there is anything wrong with the DTS framework, but simply to point out that certain aspects of it are, I believe, likely to alienate some of the historians whom I would like to include among the potential readers of this study.

However, having said that, it must in all fairness also be pointed out that the types of sources this study employs, particularly the paratexts of published translations discussed in chapter 8, are definitely more typical for translation studies or literary criticism than history (or historiography, for that matter), although history has also, especially with the increased popularity of microhistory, become much more inclusive in its use of sources. While paratext as a term is likely not familiar to most historians, the types of sources it refers to in this context are not unlike some of the sources used in many of the less mainstream sub-fields of academic history. As stated before in chapter 1, paratext was simply considered a useful shorthand, already known by most readers within translation studies.

There was also a much more practical reason for not choosing a more typical translation studies methodology for this particular study: In three out of four cases, the source texts of the translations in question were not available (see chapter 5 for more details), which made using any methodology that puts an emphasis on making comparisons between source and target texts impossible. While such methods are by no means universally used within translation studies, they are quite common, even in

historically inclined studies that are generally more interested in the context of the translations than the texts themselves. These availability issues also, in a way, pushed the research into another direction, because the non-standard routes these texts had taken from English to Finnish were actually part of what made them interesting. While it would have been possible to include an analysis of the one translation where a clear source text *was* available (Upton's *Finland in Crisis / Väliarauha*), that also happened to be a translation in which the original author and the translator had collaborated on the translation (see chapter 5 for more details), and it seemed unlikely that any particularly interesting changes or other such features would have been found. A cursory reading of both texts seemed to support this assumption, and any plans of including textual analysis were thus abandoned.

To avoid any possible confusion, it is worth elaborating here that while this is a historical study in the sense that it focuses on specific translations at a specific point in time, it is actually more of a study on historiography. The aim is not to study the role of translation in the Continuation War itself (for an excellent example of a study that does exactly that, see Kujamäki (2012)) but in the *historiography* of the Continuation War and the public discourses about the subject. However, as it is generally the historians themselves who write about the historiography of a subject (in this case e.g. Tommila (1989), Herlin (1998), and Soikkanen (2007)), the same general neglect of translation in all its forms that many researchers within translation studies (e.g. Burke and Hsia 2007, quoted in the previous chapter) have commented on, is certainly present in the historiographical texts as well, and here also, a researcher with an interest in translation, as well as the historical subject itself, may be able to enrich the existing discourses with a new point of view.

### **3.2 Defining the Scope of the Study**

Before explaining in more detail how the scope of this study was defined, a brief summary of the research materials is in order, especially considering that the exclusions discussed towards the end of next section will only make sense in light of the inclusions. All of these sources are discussed in more detail in the chapters in which they are described and analysed; this listing is provided mostly for the sake of clarity.

The core of this study is formed by four translations, which are *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* (Lundin 1960), *Välirauha* (Upton 1965), *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* (Krosby 1966), and *Suomen valinta 1941* (Krosby 1967). For more information on the translations, see chapter 5, “Lundin, Upton, and Krosby in Finnish”, and on the historiographical significance of these texts, chapter 4 “Historical and Historiographical Background”. The main research materials of this study are, however, presented in chapters 8 and 9, which discuss the paratexts and reviews of these four books.

In this study, the potentially quite complicated question of deciding which translations should and should not be included was, in a way, avoided by first picking a relatively narrow subject, the historiography of the Continuation War, which made the number of translations that could potentially be included quite small. However, this particular subject was actually found by first engaging in preliminary research on a much wider one, the Finnish translations of Anglo-American (i.e. English-language) history texts about the history of Finland in general. A search in the Melinda library database, maintained by the National Library of Finland, with the parameters ‘history’ and ‘Finland’ as subjects, with English as the source language (“alkuteoksen kieli”) and Finnish as the target language (“teoksen kieli”), excluding all entries that are not classified as books (journals, audio recordings etc.), resulted in total of 113 entries. Looking through this list, the Second World War seemed to quite clearly be among the most popular individual subjects, which came as no surprise given the continued interest in all things war-related in popular history. However, after taking a closer look at the physical copies of a dozen or so of these books (picked mostly for their ease of availability), the Lundin, Upton, and Krosby translations clearly stood out. Unlike most of the others, they were not popular military history, with glossy pages and detailed maps, but serious, ‘dry’, academic history, a genre which seemed to be quite rare on this particular list, and is not a very popular one within translated non-fiction in general (Mänttari 2013). There had clearly been a specific set of reasons for publishing these translations. This first impression of their significance was quickly verified by looking at a selection of influential Finnish academic articles about the historiography of the Continuation War and the so-called Driftwood Theory (e.g. Soikkanen (2007), Herlin (1998), Tommila (1989)), all of which mentioned at least two out of three of these foreign historians. This

is particularly noteworthy considering that the writings of non-Finnish historians are often not considered to be a part of the overall historiography of Finland (Tommila 1989: 248).

Out of the four books chosen, Lundin's *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, Upton's *Välirauha*, and Krosby's *Suomen valinta 1941* were clearly influential enough to warrant their inclusion, as they form the core of the 'foreign influence' on Finnish historiography of the subject. Krosby's first book *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* is not mentioned in historiography quite as often as the other three, likely due to it having a much more narrow scope (the 1940–41 dispute over Petsamo nickel mines) than the other studies, but it is still an important part of the chronology of the debate, and was included for the sake of completeness. As for studies that could have been included, but were not, a possible inclusion would have been American Earl F. Ziemke's *The German Northern Theater of Operations 1940–1945* (1959), which was published in Finnish as *Saksalaisten sotatoimet Pohjolassa 1940–1945* by WSOY in 1963 (translated by Matti Santavuori). It is mentioned as one of the earliest studies which considered Finland as having been an ally of Germany by Tommila (1989: 229) and Jokisipilä (2007: 170-171), but is not mentioned at all by Herlin (1998) or Soikkanen (2007), nor is it generally mentioned in the more recent historiographical studies of the subject, such as Meinander (2011). Ziemke's book was not included in this study, in addition to not being included in some of the most important Finnish historiographical sources (i.e. its relevance to the subject was in question), because, as the book's title implies, its subject is not the history of Finland specifically, which was considered to be an important criterion for inclusion, and because in terms of the 'genres' or sub-disciplines of academic history writing, it is much closer to military history than the political or general history of the four studies that were included.

As stated above, the choice to focus only on history texts which were translated from English was the starting point of the whole study. The decision was originally dictated by simply my own linguistic capabilities and the department for which this Master's thesis is being written, but limiting the scope of the study to only English-language history texts actually fits very neatly with the chosen subject matter: The foreign input to Finnish history writing on this particular subject came specifically from Anglo-American historians, and the same three researchers would have been at the centre of it even without the linguistic limitations. Historians from the Soviet Union (and later Russia) have, of course, written about the Continuation War (although using a different

name for it), but those studies have not, for quite obvious political reasons, have had much of an impact in the general discourses in Finland. Some of these Russian-language texts were studied by Kemppanen (2008) in his corpus-based study of translated history texts (see chapter 2 for more details). One possible inclusion outside of English-language texts would have been Leif Björkman's *Suomen tie sotaan 1940–41* ("Finland's Road to War"), which was published in 1975 by Kirjayhtymä (edited and translated from Swedish by Kullervo Killinen). However, this book very clearly does not meet the requirement of having been considered important by Finnish historiographers, as it is barely mentioned anywhere in the relevant literature. From a purely translation studies perspective this translation would actually have been quite an interesting inclusion, because the text seems to have undergone a significant transformation from its Swedish-language original, published in 1971 by Allmänna Förlaget with the title *Sverige inför Operation Barbarossa: svensk neutralitetspolitik 1940–1941* ("Sweden before Operation Barbarossa: The Swedish Politics of Neutrality"), as the original title points to it having been written from another national perspective altogether. Maybe further research on the translation (and transformation) of history texts will take a closer look at this one?

## **4 Historical and Historiographical Background**

This chapter presents the historical context of the study, focusing on the historiography of the Continuation War, i.e. what was published on the subject and when, particularly by foreign historians, but also briefly discusses the Finnish contributions to the subject in the cases where they are relevant as opponents of the foreign historians or otherwise especially significant. Because history is not my main area of expertise, this chapter is almost completely based on Finnish historiographical studies, not on my own interpretations of the relevant studies, and for that reason, the references generally point to more recent Finnish sources, not to the influential foreign studies themselves. After the groundwork done in this chapter, the next chapter will come back to the same foreign studies, but this time from the viewpoint of translation history, focusing on how and when these studies which had Finland as their subject were actually brought into the wider Finnish society (as opposed to just the academic community and the political elite) by translating them into Finnish.

### **4.1 The Driftwood Debate**

Wars are always one of the more contentious parts of a nation's history, especially when said nation was not amongst the so-called victors of a war and thus not able to dictate how the history of that war is written. Finland found itself in such a position after the Continuation War of 1941–44 where it fought as a de-facto ally, or 'cobelligerent', of Hitler's Germany against the Soviet Union. Having been on the same side as the Reich, even if not technically allied with it as no official treaty was ever signed, was extremely awkward for Finland, that would much rather have been seen as part of the western forces of democracy, fighting against communism, than as an ally to the forces of totalitarianism. The question of whether or not Finland had indeed been an ally of Germany and whether its leaders had made a conscious choice of joining forces with Hitler or not, was, and in some ways still is, probably the most contentious and hotly debated question in the history of Finland, only other serious contender for that title being the Civil War of 1918 (Soikkanen 2007: 101). So much has been written about it that the debate surrounding the subject has been said to have 'created a historiography of its own' (Kivimäki 2012: 13).

The term 'Driftwood Theory' comes from a quote from the German ambassador to Finland, Wipert von Blücher, and was made famous by professor Arvi

Korhonen in his book *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi* (“The Barbarossa Plan and Finland”, published in 1961): “Finland was drawn into the rapids of great power politics like a rushing stream captures a piece of driftwood” (Soikkanen 2007: 111, English translation based on Kinnunen and Jokisipilä 2012: 442). It refers to the school of thought that the Finnish leaders never had any real choice in the matter, and therefore bore no responsibility for having ‘ended up’ on the same side of the war as Germany. In the late 1940s and well into the 1950s and 1960s, this interpretation was very much the general consensus in Finland, both among the academia and the general public, although it was not the state-level ‘official truth’, as certain concessions to the Soviet Union had to be made. It was based on the official statements made by the defendants in the war-responsibility trials. The trials were held under strict censorship and were very much a political event, instead of legal proceedings in the usual sense, and there was (and is) a certain ‘martyrdom’ commonly associated with the former Finnish leaders who stood as defendants in these trials. The defence had very little room for manoeuvre, as any mentions of, for example, the Soviet actions during 1939, or anything that would have reflected negatively on marshal Mannerheim, who was not among the defendants, were off-limits for political reasons. Therefore, Finland having been involuntarily drawn into the war was the only plausible defence left available (Soikkanen 2007: 105).

The first academic historical study on the subject, *Finland and World War II: 1939–1944*, was published in the United States in 1948, written by “an anonymous Finn” and edited and translated by Finnish-American John H. Wuorinen. This anonymous Finn was actually the abovementioned professor Arvi Korhonen, who had, according to Ilkka Herlin (1998: 202-203), written the book immediately after the war, but did not want to publish it due to the sensitivity of the subject matter, or because, as Wuorinen (1948: 3) writes in his foreword, “conditions in Finland have been such as to prevent the publication of serious, objective studies of Finland’s part in the war” and continues that “Russian sensibilities cannot be hurt or suspicions aroused” (ibid.). Timo Soikkanen also refers to the book as having been written by Korhonen and “published under his own name by John H. Wuorinen” (2007: 106). Both Herlin (1998: 206) and Soikkanen (2007: 106) note that the book was not really aimed for the academic community, its purpose was instead to influence the general public opinion in the West. Herlin refers to it as “a part of the defence’s campaign in the war-responsibility trials” (1998: 203; my translation), while Päiviö Tommila simply calls it a “brief summary of the defence’s



arguments” (1989: 229; my translation). It categorically denied any political or military ties between Finland and Germany (Soikkanen 2007: 106). Korhonen would later refine these arguments in his aforementioned book *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi*, this time published in Finnish and under his own name in 1961.

## 4.2 Counterarguments from Abroad

The first non-Finnish historian to publish original research on the subject of Continuation War was American professor Charles Leonard Lundin. His 1957 book *Finland in the Second World War* was the first serious challenge to the Finnish narrative, and more or less a direct response, or a “counter-report”, as Tommila (1989: 229; my translation) calls it, to the similarly named book (see previous section) by Wuorinen and Korhonen, the latter of whom was still referred to as “an anonymous Finn” at this point (Lundin 1957: 6). It is unclear if Lundin was aware of the identity of the book’s real author or not, but in any case he did not compromise their anonymity. Unlike the later Finnish historians Soikkanen and Herlin, Lundin refers to the book explicitly as a translation from Finnish to English by Wuorinen.

Lundin’s study presented a version of the events where Finland had consciously sought an alliance with Hitler’s Germany and failed to foster any kind of confidence with the Soviet Union, both of which were terrible mistakes made by the Finnish leadership (Soikkanen 2007: 109). The book was met with what could be described as an outrage by Finnish historians and parts of the political elite. Besides some of Lundin’s claims as a professional historian going against the Finnish consensus, his moralistic tone did not sit well with the Finnish readers either (Soikkanen 2007: 109). When Lundin gave a presentation on the subject in Helsinki, several notable figures from the Finnish wartime leadership who were in attendance, stood up and left in protest when Lundin got to his more contentious interpretations (Soikkanen 2007: 109-110).

Lundin’s study suffered from scarcity of reliable primary sources, as many of the relevant archival documents were still classified at that time, and had to rely on memoirs and other secondary sources, which were not considered to be proper historical sources by most historians at the time. This, together with some rather obvious factual errors, made it somewhat easy for Lundin’s Finnish opponents to discredit him (Soikkanen 2007: 109). Most important of these opponents was Arvi Korhonen with his

book *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi*, which has been briefly discussed above. Lundin's study is very much notable in being first of its kind and initiating the whole debate, but the other Anglo-American historians that came after him made much more of an impact on Finnish historiography.

To briefly recap the above, by the early 1960s Arvi Korhonen had, first anonymously in English and later under his own name in Finnish, formulated what was to become known as the Driftwood Theory, and Charles Leonard Lundin had published the first historical study on Continuation War not based on the viewpoint of Finnish nationalism.

The next foreign historian to take interest in the subject was Anthony F. Upton from the United Kingdom with his book *Finland in Crisis 1940-1941: A Study in Small-power Politics*, published in 1964. Soikkanen and Herlin have both argued that the arguments presented in Upton's study were not actually that different from Korhonen's (i.e. they were relatively pro-Finland), but his style was seen by many Finns as arrogant, which they attribute to the differences in Finnish and English traditions of history writing (Soikkanen 2007: 112, Herlin 1998: 213). Upton did, however, challenge the determinism of the Finnish narrative. The Finnish leaders may not have had any good options available to them at the time, but choices were still made, and those choices had moral implications. This 'moralising' was precisely the aspects of his study that was at odds with the Finnish tradition of history writing, which was heavily influenced by the more empiricist German tradition. Upton's interest in the history of Finland is often credited to him being married to a Finn (e.g. in Herlin 1998: 213), and Upton does indeed thank his wife Sirkka in the introduction of his book (Upton 1964: 14). Sirkka Upton also translated her husband's study into Finnish, although some sources imply that Anthony Upton spoke Finnish himself. This question, and others related to the translations mentioned here, will be explored in significantly more detail in chapter 5.

Hans Peter Krosby, with his 1967 book *Finland and Operation 'Barbarossa': The Making of a German Cobelligerent, 1940–1941* (better known by its Finnish name *Suomen valinta 1941*), is often referred to as the historian "who sunk the driftwood", i.e. discredited the Driftwood Theory, at least in the form it was originally presented by Korhonen (see Herlin 1998: 213, Soikkanen 2007: 112 and Meinander 2011: 59). Krosby had previously written about Finnish history of that period in a more narrow

context in his Ph.D. dissertation in 1966, entitled *Petsamo in the Spotlight: A Study in Finnish-German Relations, 1940–1941*, that dealt with the so-called Petsamo nickel crisis. Krosby got his MA from University of British Columbia in Canada but later moved to the US and got his PhD from Columbia University (University of Albany 2015), where he was a student of John H. Wuorinen (Soikkanen 2007: 113), who as mentioned previously, was a friend of Arvi Korhonen, and had helped publish Korhonen’s anonymous book in the US two decades earlier. Krosby did not, however, share his mentor’s pro-Finland bias, and was highly critical of the earlier Finnish studies on the subject. He criticized Korhonen and other Finnish historians for their selective use of archive documents: The use of proper archival sources was emphasized, but German documents had often been disregarded if they contradicted a Finnish memoir (Soikkanen 2007: 113, Herlin 1998: 214), despite these same historians having been extremely critical of Lundin’s use of memoirs as a source a decade earlier. In Krosby’s narrative, Finland was not a piece of driftwood, but more like a boat that was purposefully steered into the same stream as Germany, for the purposes of political and military gain. The Finnish academic community had to reluctantly accept Krosby’s findings (Herlin 1998: 214), and the theories that posited Finland’s wars during the Second World War as having been separate from the rest of Europe had little scientific credibility anymore.

### **4.3 Later Developments**

The proverbial final nail in the coffin of the Driftwood Theory, at least in the context of serious academic history, was Mauno Jokipii’s 1987 study *Jatkosodan synty* (“The Origins of the Continuation War”), a massive book of over 600 pages that utilised an equally massive range of sources, both civilian and military, to prove that there had indeed been a *de facto* military alliance between Finland and Germany, despite the lack of an official treaty, and the ‘inner circle’ of Finnish leaders had known about Operation Barbarossa in advance and agreed to participate in it. Jokipii begins the foreword for his book by listing “accomplished previous studies on why Finland got involved in the war in 1941” (Jokipii 1987: 6; my translation), which, along with four Finnish studies, also includes Upton’s *Välirauha* and Krosby’s *Suomen valinta 1941*. Lundin is absent from the list, which highlights how his legacy will indeed be mostly as an instigator of the debate, rather than as someone with a lasting contribution to the subject. Jokipii continues by asserting the relevance of his study by arguing that despite all these previous studies,

other literature on the subject still sometimes includes views that are, in scientific terms, outdated (ibid.), and in the public debates and opinions the old ideas still flourish, “as if nothing had been written on the subject” (ibid.). Besides the scope and overall quality of Jokipii’s study, his main contribution was recognising the agency of the Finnish leaders in seeking an alliance with Germany (Soikkanen 2007: 115), as opposed to seeing Finland as “a piece of driftwood” that had simply ended up where it did.

Jokipii wrote the introduction (referenced above) in 1987, but many of the same things could still be said now, three decades later. The convenient myth of an entirely separate and defensive war still remains strong within the public discourse, even if academic history has, in general, moved on a long time ago. One relatively recent example is a speech given to an international audience at IFRI (French Institute of International Relations) by president Tarja Halonen in 2005, in which she, according to Jokisipilä (2007), gave an even more blatantly patriotic version of historical events than is usually heard from politicians, invoking the ‘defensive victory’, the ‘separate war’ *and* the ‘driftwood theory’, “all in less than a minute” (Jokisipilä 2007: 155; my translation). It is worth pointing out that Halonen was/is a Social Democrat, which aptly demonstrates how the use of nationalist historical narratives for (possible) political gain is by no means exclusive to conservative or right-wing politicians.

This chapter has presented the historiography of the Continuation War from the Finnish perspective, which is also the perspective chosen for this study in general. However, there is also another perspective that needs to be mentioned, that of Anglo-American historiography. Quite understandably, Finland tends to have a very minor role in the overall narratives of the Second World War that are presented in the Anglo-American history writing. Aira Kemiläinen (2006) has analysed the ways in which Finland was generally presented in Western history writing, and most of her examples are from studies published during the same time period as the Finland-specific studies presented above (1950s – 1970s). Kemiläinen (2006: 11-12) claims that Finland was often misrepresented and misunderstood, which she sees as evidence of both a general bias against small states, and against Finland specifically, because of its association with the enemy, i.e. Hitler’s Germany. While Kemiläinen’s own biases are quite obvious in the article (e.g. she includes any claims of a Finnish-German alliance in the “obvious mistakes” category), her analysis that Finland was generally represented as either completely insignificant or a German satellite, is still credible. This is worth keeping in

mind, as Lundin, Upton and Krosby, who from a Finnish perspective may have looked like iconoclasts, were actually quite sympathetic towards Finland, simply because they studied the history of Finland specifically, and sought to understand it, unlike most of their Anglo-American colleagues.

## 5 Lundin, Upton, and Krosby in Finnish

This chapter describes how these historical studies, written by Lundin, Upton, and Krosby, arrived from English into Finnish. Brief descriptions of other translated works by the same authors are also included. Short bibliographies of the translators whose names are mentioned in this chapter can be found in the next one.

### 5.1 Notes on Genre Definitions

Before delving deeper into the individual histories of these translations, a few words on how these texts are viewed in this study in terms of genre definitions may be in order. Obviously, the main defining feature of these texts is that they are all history texts, which makes them non-fiction texts in a wider sense. However, due to the narrative elements inherent to (almost) all history texts in general, they also have many features in common with literary texts. Kemppanen (2008: 22-23) calls them hybrid texts that have some features from both literature and non-fiction, and points out that in terms of the translation strategies employed, history texts may actually have more in common with literary than pragmatic or non-fiction texts (Kemppanen writes in Finnish and uses the term ‘*asiateksti*’, which can, depending on the context, refer to pragmatic texts only, or include non-fiction as well). These definitions are, however, much less important here than for Kemppanen, whose study focuses on the linguistic aspects of translated history texts. For this study, the most important factor is how these translations were *presented*, and in that respect there is no doubt that they were presented as non-fiction texts, as their ‘factual’ and ‘scientific’ nature is often emphasised (for more information on the publisher’s paratexts, see chapter 8).

If we want to pick a more exact category for these texts within the genre of historical writing, again following Kemppanen (2008: 20-21), political history would be the choice. Although the subject of these texts is the Continuation War, they are quite clearly not military history, as that sub-field of academic history focuses on the actual battles, often with a particular penchant for maps, not on the international political processes that led to the war, which are the whole point of these studies. Making a distinction between history and political history is not, however, necessary for the purposes of this study, and the terms are used interchangeably, as all history which is not specifically identified as belonging in a particular sub-field, such as the aforementioned

military history, tends to be political history in the sense that it is the history of states and international politics (Kemppanen 2008:20-21). All of the four historical texts discussed in this study certainly fit that description.

Third and final genre definition potentially relevant to this study would be the distinction between academic and popular history. Translated history texts are usually aimed for the general public, as opposed to just the academic readership (Tommila 1989, Mänttari 2013), which, judging by the way they were presented by their publishers, is certainly true for these four translations as well. However, that alone is not a sufficient reason to classify them as popular history. Tommila defines popular history as “historical texts that do not have presenting new research as their main function”, but “still tend to reflect the general tendencies present in the research literature” (1989: 279; my translation). Presenting new research most definitely *is* the main purpose of these books, although one could argue that the purpose of the translations is somewhat different from the purpose of the original versions, as it seems unlikely that the English editions found all that many readers outside the academic circles. However, the translations, as far as can be said without making proper textual comparisons (see chapter 3 on methodology of the study), are not ‘popularised’ in any noticeable way, which means that the difference is in whether or not the general public is interested in the subject matter of the texts (and whether or not it is therefore worth it to try and sell these books to a wider audience), not in any attribute of the texts themselves. For obvious reasons, there was much more of this sort of interest in Finland than there was in the countries where these studies were originally published.

## **5.2 Lundin**

*Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, the Finnish translation of Lundin’s *Finland in the Second World War*, was published in 1960, three years after the original English version came out in the United States. The publisher was Gummerus, one of the largest and oldest publishing houses in Finland. Two years before the Finnish translation, however, the book was translated into Swedish by Frank Jernström, and published in Finland by Ekenäs Tryckeri, a publishing house based in Ekenäs (also known as Tammisaari in Finnish), in 1958. The Swedish title was *Finland och andra Världskriget*. Lundin’s study had caused some debate in Finland, in both Finnish and Swedish language journals (e.g. *Suomalainen*

*Suomi* and *Finsk tidskrift*), when it first came out in 1957, but for some reason a translation was first commissioned by a Swedish-language publisher. The front matter of the Finnish edition includes the following note: “Translated from a 1958 Swedish-language edition, [which was] checked by the author” (Lundin 1960: 4; my translation), which indicates that Lundin spoke Swedish, as he was able to check the translation, which could be considered as a possible reason for a preference of Swedish over Finnish. There is, however, some evidence which indicates that Lundin spoke Finnish as well as Swedish: An article published in *Helsingin Sanomat* on 2 February 1957, about Lundin, his Fulbright scholarship in Finland, and his study, which had only been published in the US at that point, tells that although Lundin had never been to Finland before, he “has studied both Finnish and Swedish, and could read all his sources in their original language” (*Helsingin Sanomat* 1957; my translation).

The Swedish-language edition was used as a relay translation for the Finnish translation, which at first glance seems like a strange choice, especially as the translator in question, Jorma Aaltonen, has in other instances translated from English and clearly knew the language (see next chapter for translator profiles). However, Lundin wrote a new introduction for the Finnish edition, in which he explains that the 1958 Swedish-language edition contained some new details, added either in response to the criticism the original study had received in Finland, or due to new information he had uncovered after the original version was published (Lundin 1960: 10). Understandably, as a new English edition had not been published, or possibly even written as a complete manuscript, it was easier to incorporate these additions by basing the Finnish version on the Swedish one. These two versions are not, however, identical in terms of content either. Lundin continues his introduction by stating that “this [was] the third iteration of the book” and that “it ha[d] again changed considerably” (Lundin 1960: 10; my translation). The reasons given for these changes are the same as before, i.e. new sources and responding to criticism.

### **5.3 Upton**

Upton’s *Finland in Crisis* was originally published in the United Kingdom sometime towards the end of 1964, presumably in December (Kirjayhtymä 1965: 3), and its Finnish translation, *Välirauha*, came out in early 1965. Compared to the other three translations



described in this chapter, the process by which Upton's book arrived in Finland was relatively straightforward, i.e. it is the only one with a clear source text and a clear target text, which could be studied in terms of equivalence if one were so inclined. However, certain details make the translation atypical in its own way: The translator was Anthony Upton's Finnish-born wife, Sirkka Upton, whom Anthony thanks for "an exceptionally important share in the making of the book" (Upton 1964: 14) in the English edition's foreword, and continues "indeed, but for her it would never have been written" (ibid.). In the last paragraph of the foreword of *Välirauha*, in a section added to the Finnish edition (with a subtitle "Suomalaisen painoksen esittely"), Anthony Upton writes about the translation process. The quotation presented here is (presumably) a back-translation, as these words are only present in the Finnish edition:

My wife has translated the original text. I am certain that the close cooperation that took place in these unusually favourable conditions has resulted in a translation that is extraordinarily faithful to the spirit and intent of the original, and I am deeply grateful for the work my wife has put into this difficult task that demanded great precision.

(Upton 1965: 12; my translation)

Furthermore, Sirkka Upton's translations of her husband's texts may actually have been more akin to proofreading (or co-authoring) than translation in a strict sense of the word, because several different sources refer to Anthony Upton as someone who spoke Finnish. In the foreword of *Finland in Crisis*, Anthony writes that he "became acquainted with the Finnish language" (Upton 1964: 13). Upton also mentions that any Swedish language sources were translated to him by his wife (ibid.), which implies that Anthony Upton was able to read the Finnish language ones himself. Anthony Upton's Finnish skills are also mentioned in a number of Finnish reviews and other articles written about his book: In a review in *Historiallinen aikakauskirja*, T. V. Viljanen simply wrote "Anthony F. Upton, who speaks Finnish [...joka on suomenkielentaitoinen]" (Viljanen 1965: 42; my translation) when introducing the author. In *Suomalainen Suomi*, pseudonym "S.J." claims that Upton "is a great admirer of Finland, he has completely mastered our language [...hän hallitsee täysin kielemme]" (S.J. 1965: 445; my translation). In a markedly positive review of *Välirauha* in *Ulkopolitiikka*, Tuomo Polvinen comments that "as a Finnish speaker [suomenkielentaitoisena], Upton was better equipped for the task than many of his non-Finnish colleagues" (Polvinen 1965: 20; my translation).

Anthony Upton also wrote a few articles that appeared in Finnish journals and magazines. At least one of these, “Tarvitseeko Suomen historiantutkimus ulkomaalaisia” (“Does the study of Finnish history need foreigners?”), published in *Aika* in 1970, is marked as having been “translated by Sirkka Upton” (Upton 1970: 152). However, an earlier one from 1965, “Kuinka jatkosota olisi voitu välttää” (“How the Continuation War could have been avoided”), which appeared in *Suomen Kuvalehti* (issue 45, 5 November 1965) does not include any mention of a translator. The article is presented as having been written by Upton himself, without any mention of a translator or an editor, but it seems unlikely that Upton would have written it in Finnish, considering he chose to write in English in a similar situation five years later. The most likely explanation is, in my opinion, that this article was also translated by Sirkka Upton, but *Suomen Kuvalehti* did not consider it worth mentioning, possibly because Anthony Upton (or rather the Uptons) had submitted the text in an already translated form.

Upton later continued his research on the political history of Finland with two other studies, the first of which was *Kommunismi Suomessa* (orig. *Communism in Finland*), which was translated from a manuscript by Sirkka Upton, and published in Finnish by Kirjayhtymä in 1970. An English version, based on the same study but expanded to cover communism in Scandinavia, not just Finland, with contributions by Peter P. Rohde and Å. Sparring, was published later, in 1973, with slightly different titles in the UK and the US, the former being *The Communist Parties of Scandinavia and Finland* (published by Weidenfeld and Nicolson), and the latter *Communism in Scandinavia and Finland: Politics of Opportunity* (published by Anchor Press). The second one, *The Finnish Revolution 1917–1918*, from 1980, was translated by Antero Manninen, not Sirkka Upton like the previous ones. The Finnish edition, entitled *Vallankumous Suomessa 1917–1918*, was published by Kirjayhtymä in two parts, the first of which came out in 1980 and the second in 1981. The Finnish edition is marked as having been translated from a manuscript, but the English edition appears to be, more or less, the same text.

## 5.4 Krosby

Hans Peter Krosby’s Ph.D. dissertation, entitled *Petsamo in the Spotlight: A Study in Finnish-German Relations, 1940-1941*, was translated into Finnish and published as

*Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* by Kirjayhtymä in 1966, immediately after it was written. The book’s foreword is dated “September 1966”, which means that the translator Markku Järvinen must have started working on the translation quite early to make the publication of a Finnish version possible within the same year. The original English version the translation was based on is not publicly available, and Krosby’s CV on the University of Albany website refers to the book with its Finnish title, only giving the original title and the text’s status as a Ph.D. dissertation in parentheses (University of Albany 2015: 8). A revised English version, entitled *Finland, Germany, and the Soviet Union, 1940-1941: the Petsamo Dispute*, was published two years later in 1968. The aforementioned CV calls it a “[m]ajor revision and a new chapter, based on new research, of *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa*” (ibid.). Here, again, the book is listed with its Finnish title, not the original English one, indicating that Krosby (or whoever wrote the CV) considers the translated title to be the official one.

The original English version is even more clearly secondary to the Finnish translation in the case of Krosby’s second book on Finnish history, *Suomen valinta 1941*, published in Finland in the end of 1967. The Finnish edition states that it has been translated from a manuscript entitled *Finland and Operation ‘Barbarossa’* (Krosby 1967: 4). Krosby’s CV refers to the book by its Finnish title, and gives a longer version of the original English one, *Finland and Operation ‘Barbarossa’: The Making of a German Cobelligerent, 1940-1941*, in parenthesis after it (University of Albany 2015: 8). However, judging by the aforementioned CV, as well as a relatively thorough Google search, it seems that no book with that title has ever been published in English, which leaves the Finnish translation as the only version of the text printed and publicly available. A short article on Krosby, published in *Helsingin Sanomat* on 8 August 1967, includes some details about the book, which at the time was still forthcoming and is not mentioned by name. The article states that the book “will hopefully be released as soon as the next Christmas” (Helsingin Sanomat 1967; my translation), which did indeed happen. The most interesting piece of information in the article is, however, this direct quotation from Krosby: “In a way, I have to write two different books, one for Finland and one for the US. This is because many things that the Finns are familiar with are new to the American readers, who need more background information.” (ibid.). Based on this, it looks like Krosby’s plan was to have his study published in English as well, likely as a revised

version in a similar manner to his previous book (see above), which is mentioned in the article as “published in Finland” but “not out in the US until next Spring” (ibid.).

Like Upton, Krosby also carried on with his research of Finnish history, and in 1978, published a book on the more recent events in Finnish-Soviet relations, the Finnish title of which was *Kekkosen linja: Suomi ja Neuvostoliitto 1944-1978*. Like Upton’s *Vallankumous Suomessa*, this one was also translated from an English manuscript by Antero Manninen and published by Kirjayhtymä. However, unlike Upton’s book, which appears to have been translated from a manuscript simply to get the Finnish edition out sooner (i.e. the same year as the English one), and similarly to Krosby’s previous one (see above), this book has never been published in English. The original English title, as it appears in Krosby’s CV (University of Albany 2015: 8), is *Finland and the Soviet Union, 1944-1978: From War to Peaceful Coexistence*.

As has been seen in this chapter, all four of these translations differ in one way or another from the archetypical model of translation, where an original source language text is translated into the target language, like an object being taken from place A to B. With Lundin, there was a ‘progression’ from English into Swedish into Finnish, with the text being modified and added on in every step, by *the original author* as well as the translators. With Upton, there was a husband and wife team of author and translator, and an author with at least some knowledge of the target language, possibly making the translator, on the one hand, more of a proof-reader, and on the other hand, a co-author. With Krosby, there were blurred timelines, with original texts that either went unpublished or were published *after* the translated version. It is, however, important to keep in mind that the archetypical model is just that, an archetype, and most individual translation events in the real world differ from it in some way. Similarly, translation studies has long ago moved past the simplistic and linear definitions of translation that would find it difficult to classify these particular texts as translations.

## 6 The Translators

This chapter discusses the individual bibliographies of the translators who worked on the translations presented in the previous chapter. Anthony Pym (1998) has famously argued for a historical study of translation that is centred around the translators, as people and social agents, instead of just the translations as texts. “Only through translators and their social entourage (clients, patrons, readers) can we try to understand why translations were produced in a particular historical time and place” (Pym 1998: ix). The clients and patrons Pym refers to are, in the case of this study, mainly the publishers of the Finnish editions of these books. These publishing houses are discussed in a bit more detail in chapter 7. In addition to the bibliographical data used in this chapter, another kind of information about the translators can sometimes also be induced from the footnotes they have made in their translations. These are examined in section 8.2 of chapter 8 on paratexts.

Unfortunately, as often is the case, the information available on the translators, especially anything beyond just lists of books they translated, is very scarce. This is one of the reasons why, as stated above, their clients, i.e. the publishing houses, are also being looked at. When there is not much information available on the translators themselves, everything else related to them becomes more important. This section will document what little could be found about the translators, with the resources that were available. In addition to the information found in these four translated books themselves, the main source of information was the Melinda database, maintained by the Finnish National Library, that includes the Finnish national bibliography, as well as metadata about the materials in university libraries and various other Finnish libraries (Kansalliskirjasto 2015a). No bibliographical database of this scale can be truly comprehensive, but Melinda can be assumed to be reasonably close to that. Some additional information comes from *Kirjayhtymä 1958–1983* (Manninen, Nurmio and Paunonen 1983), the history of the publishing house that published three out of four of the translations this study focuses on, and the bibliography of the publisher of the fourth translation, *Gummerus: Bibliografia 1901–2000* (Gummerus 2001). Both of these books include lists of translators who worked for these publishers during the time periods indicated by the books’ titles.

It is important to note that the lack of a known resume of (other) translations does not necessarily imply that the person was not a professional translator, as all of the sources listed above only contain information on translations published in book form, i.e.

mostly literary or non-fiction texts, and some of these translators may have worked mainly on other types of texts, e.g. commercial or technical.

Although this study deals with a relative recent time period, during which translation was certainly already considered a profession of its own, albeit not quite to the extent it now is, Anthony Pym's notion that "[t]ranslators can do more than translate" (1998: 161) is still worth keeping in mind here. One of the things that the bibliographic data can tell us is whether or not there exist any other texts written by these people besides the translations that are the main reason of our interest in them, and if such texts exist, the subject matter of the texts can help us form a more complete picture of that particular translator's role and agency.

## 6.1 Jorma Aaltonen

Jorma Aaltonen translated Lundin's *Finland in the Second World War* for Gummerus in 1960. The translation used a Swedish translation, published in 1958, as its source text. The possible reasons for this are explained in the previous chapter, but not being able to find an English to Finnish translator was quite certainly not among them, as Aaltonen would go on to translate Edward Crankshaw's *Gestapo* from English, for the same publisher, just a year later. Aaltonen is credited as a translator in a total of six books, all of which are related to political history or social sciences. Besides Lundin and the World War II related Crankshaw translation mentioned above, Aaltonen translated two books on economic history of the Federal Republic of Germany, Ludvig Erhard's *Saksan ihme* ("The German Miracle") and Bernt Engelmann's *Ystäväni miljonäärit* ("My Friends, the Millionaires"), one on the Arab/Israel relations, John H. Davis' *Arabit vastaan Israel* (orig. *The Evasive Peace*) and one edited book on Finnish political history, originally written in Swedish, *60-luvun perspektiivi*. All of these were published by Gummerus, except *Arabit vastaan Israel*, which was published by Tammi in 1970. It should be noted that Jorma Aaltonen is a very common combination of first and last names, which unfortunately makes the library metadata concerning him somewhat unreliable. In theory, each "Jorma Aaltonen", of which there are quite a few, is supposed to be a different entry in the database, but if any books or other publications where Aaltonen was the original author instead of the translator do exist, the connection is not made in the database with

any consistency. The information on the translations listed above is, however, corroborated by *Gummerus: Bibliografia 1901–2000*.

## 6.2 Sirkka Upton

Sirkka Upton's bibliography as a translator consists solely of texts originally written by her husband Anthony F. Upton. Besides *Välirauha*, she also translated Anthony Upton's *Kommunismi Suomessa* ("Communism in Finland"), published by Kirjayhtymä in 1970, and an article entitled "Tarvitseeko Suomen historiantutkimus ulkomaalaisia" ("Does the study of Finnish history need foreigners?"), published in *Aika* in 1970. Sirkka and Anthony Upton are also both credited as translators in the English translation of Juhani Paasivirta's book *Suomi ja Eurooppa: autonomiakausi ja kansainväliset kriisit (1808–1914)*, edited and abridged by D. G. Kirby into an English edition entitled *Finland and Europe: international crises in the period of autonomy 1808–1914* and published in the United Kingdom in 1981.

## 6.3 Markku Järvinen

Markku Järvinen has translated one other book besides Crosby's *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941*, which was on a similar topic, i.e. political history of Finland, Krister Wahlbäck's *Mannerheimista Kekkoseen: Suomen politiikan päälinjoja 1917–1967* ("From Mannerheim to Kekkonen: The Main Points of Finnish Policy 1917–1967"), published by WSOY in 1968. He is also credited as one of the translators in parts four and seven of the *Suuri maailmanhistoria* -series of translated popular history anthologies (original German title *Die Grosse Illustrierte Weltgeschichte*). More prominent in Järvinen's bibliography, however, are his original works as a historian and an archivist. He has written several manuals for the Finnish National Archive, been one of the writers on two edited books, *Rauhanajatus historiassa* ("Pacifism in History") and *Itsenäisen Suomen taloushistoriaa 1919–1950* ("The Economic History of Independent Finland"), and recently written two self-published books on the local history of Askola municipality (2014 and 2017).

## 6.4 Erkki Ihanainen

Erkki Ihanainen translated six books for Kirjayhtymä during the 1960's and early 70's in addition to Krosby's *Suomen valinta 1941* in 1967. Among these was another translation of a book dealing with recent historical events, Alexander Werth's massive *Venäjä sodassa 1941–45* (orig. *Russia at War*), which was published in two parts, both in 1966, of over 700 pages combined. Ihanainen also translated John Kenneth Galbraith's *Sotilasmahdin valvonta* (orig. *How to Control the Military*), the memoirs of Olympic gold medallists Harold and Olga Connolly, *Vieraina Valloista* ("Visitors from the States"), and three books by Irish satirist Gerald V. Kuss on his travels in Finland, one of them in collaboration with Raimo Seppälä. The first of the Kuss translations, *Nauru Suomelle* ("A Laughter for Finland"), published in 1962 by Lehmus, was the only one of his translations not published by Kirjayhtymä. Unlike the other translators discussed in this chapter, Ihanainen also has one literary translation in his resume, Adam Hall's espionage thriller *Tuomitut lennot* (orig. *The Striker Portfolio*).

## 6.5 Ulla Pakkala

Ulla Pakkala translated the numerous archival documents that were reproduced in Krosby's *Suomen valinta 1941*. No other translations credited to her could be found from the Melinda database or *Kirjayhtymä 1958–1983*. Her involvement in the translation was likely due to the fact that most, if not all, of these documents were written in languages other than English (University of Albany 2015: 8), and the main translator for the book, Erkki Ihanainen (see above), seems to have only translated from English.



## **7 The Publishers**

This chapter serves mostly as background information for the next one, in which the promotional materials of the Lundin, Upton, and Krosby translations are being studied, along with other paratexts. It is an attempt to locate the publishers of these translations in the political map of the 1960s Finland, and as a preface for this, the political climate in which they operated is first discussed briefly. This first section of the chapter can also be read as a sort of companion piece to chapter 4, which details the historical and historiographical background of the study, including the so-called Driftwood Debate.

### **7.1 Political Climate in Finland during the 1950s and 1960s**

Finland's role in the Second World War was clearly a sensitive and highly politicised subject at the time when these translations were published. A major part of this was 'Finlandization', i.e. the Soviet Union's influence in Finnish politics, and the 'Paasikivi-Kekkonen doctrine' of foreign policy, the aim of which was ensuring Finland's sovereignty and neutrality by maintaining good relations with the Soviet Union, even when it meant making significant political concessions. Both of these terms do, in a way, refer to essentially the same thing, with the former being a pejorative term used by the critics of this line of policy, and the latter being the official term at the time. Acknowledging Finland's share of responsibility in the events that led to the Continuation War was an important political tool for supporters of the doctrine, and, for example, Lundin's study was often referenced in debates on Finland's foreign policy (Herlin 1998: 207). President Kekkonen even clashed in public with the Finnish historians whom he considered to be supporters of the Driftwood Theory (Soikkanen 2007: 114). The opinions on present-day foreign policy and the interpretations of historical events were divided along the same lines (Soikkanen 2007: 111).

It is important to remember that during the late 1950s and early 1960s, the consensus within the Finnish historians and the 'official truth' as dictated by president Kekkonen were very much at odds with each other, despite both parties undoubtedly considering themselves as having Finland's best interest in mind. This consensus within the academic community, however, began to slowly break down during the 1960s, due to an increasingly strong leftist current within the universities (Kivimäki 2012: 18). Furthermore, the Communists and other groups within Finland that were actually pro-

Soviet, not just perceived as such by some of their opponents, were also participating in the debate and sometimes using these same foreign historical studies for their own aims, despite the fact that these Anglo-American historians came from the opposite side of the Cold War. Herlin (1998: 207) and Soikkanen (2007: 110) mention a speech given in the Finnish parliament by Hertta Kuusinen, a high profile member of the Finnish People's Democratic League (SKDL), in which she referenced Lundin's study.

## 7.2 Kirjayhtymä

Against the background briefly detailed in the previous chapter, one might assume that publishing the Finnish translations of these studies would also have been first and foremost a political act, undertaken by politically committed publishers, possibly even a far-left affiliated one. This, however, was not the case, as neither of the publishers, Gummerus and Kirjayhtymä, fit that description. In his history of Kirjayhtymä, Pentti Nurmio, company's managing director from 1958 to 1985, specifically states that when Kirjayhtymä was established in 1958, it did not have a political or ideological affiliation, which Nurmio contrasts with the leftist origins of Tammi, another well-known Finnish publishing house (Manninen, Nurmio, and Paunonen 1983: 11). In his autobiography, Nurmio states that "politically, the company has been, and was always supposed to be, very pluralistic" (Nurmio 1990: 63-64), and continues that people sometimes had some difficulty in grasping this concept, which he attributes to the "highly politicised climate" (ibid.) of Finland in the 1960s. The following quotation from Nurmio's history of Kirjayhtymä offers some insight into the motives behind publishing these controversial and politically sensitive studies:

Publishing literature that is related to our recent past has become a very prominent part of the company's activities. This began during the mid-1960s when the company published the books *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* by Hans Peter Krosby and *Välirauha* by Anthony F. Upton. At that point it felt appropriate to make available in Finnish the works of these researchers, on the events that had affected our lives in so many ways during the early parts of the Second World War. It was felt that our position in international politics was still delicate, and that we had our own official version of the events that had led to the war, and the details and processes that were hidden behind that version had been proven difficult to uncover with domestic efforts alone.

(Manninen, Nurmio, and Paunonen 1983: 17; my translation, emphasis in the original)

Nurmio also wrote about the subject in his autobiography (Nurmio 1990), where he gives credit to Kirjayhtymä's publishing director Keijo Immonen for "having done the most work, out of all publishing directors in Finland, in charting those times that

were, in many ways, troubled and difficult” (Nurmio 1990: 65, my translation), referring to, of course, the Second World War. Here Nurmio actually mentions the Driftwood Theory, which he attributes to Arvi Korhonen, stating that commissioning a Finnish translation of Upton’s book was important because at the time, the Driftwood Theory was still the prevailing interpretation of the events, and “many historians seemed to insist upon it” (ibid.).

### 7.3 Gummerus

Gummerus, the publisher of Lundin’s *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, was (and still is) an old and prestigious publishing house, established in 1872. If it can be said to have ever had any political affiliation, it was probably leaning more towards the conservative Right than anything else. However, despite having been partially owned by the right-wing National Coalition Party (Kansallinen Kokoomuspuolue) at one point during the 1920s (Leino-Kaukiainen 1990: 107-108), by the time Gummerus published the Lundin translation in 1960, it was very much profiled as a generalist publisher, without any particular political agenda and plenty of both conservative and left-wing literature in its back catalogue. It even made it a point to sometimes publish political texts from different ideologies side by side, as was the case in 1959 when two ‘pamphlet-books’ from writers associated with the Agrarian Union (*Asiat ja asenteet* by Matti Kekkonen and Jouko Tyyri) and the Social Democrats (*Osakeyhtiö Isänmaa* by Pauli Burman and Matti Nieminen) came out simultaneously, as an attempt to promote public debate on contentious questions (Leino-Kaukiainen 1990: 213). As for the Lundin translation specifically, it is only mentioned in passing in Pirkko Leino-Kaukiainen’s history of the publishing house *Kirja koko elämä: Gummeruksen kustannustoiminnan historia* (1990: 230), as one example of World War II related literature, next to William L. Shirer’s *Kolmannen valtakunnan nousu ja tuho* (orig. *The Rise and Fall of the Third Reich*), without mentioning any kind of controversy in relation to it. Perhaps when it comes to the history of Gummerus specifically, the controversy that surrounded the publication of Henry Miller’s *Tropic of Cancer* in 1962 (*Kravun kääntöpiiri* in Finnish), which was both of a different kind and, possibly, of a different magnitude, tends to overshadow everything else that Gummerus published during the 1960s.

## 8 Paratextual Evidence

*Paratexts* are presentational elements that surround a published text, such as the image on a book's front cover or the text on its back cover, as well as other texts that are written about the book, such as an advertisement in a magazine. The term originates from Gérard Genette (1997), who, however, considered translations a *form of* paratext, which, as Şehnaz Tahir-Gürçağlar (2002) has argued, is not a very useful definition for translation studies, as it would undermine much of the work that has been done in translation studies by going back to a view of translation as a purely derivative activity, and also impose a restricted view of translation that would exclude pseudotranslations (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002: 46). This problem has not, by any means, prevented many researchers within translation studies from finding Genette's ideas very useful, and modifying them to better suit the needs of their discipline. For the purposes of translation history, and therefore the present study, paratexts can give "valuable insights into the presentation and reception of the translated texts themselves" (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002: 47). Presentation in particular is an important aspect of this study, because it can tell us the most about the role these translations had in the public discourses at the time of their publication, and in the first half of this chapter, which focuses on marketing paratexts, most of the attention is concentrated on that.

This chapter uses both 'peritexts' (Genette 1997: 5), i.e. paratexts that are located within the book itself, and 'epitexts' (ibid.), i.e. paratexts that are physically more remote from it, as its material. The back covers of the books themselves fall into the former category, while advertisements for the books are an example of the latter. In this study, both types are collectively referred to as *promotional material*, and they have been grouped together, because they are both paratexts that have been produced by the publisher. The second section of this chapter focuses on translator's footnotes, which are peritexts, but produced by the translators rather than the publishers. The third section focuses on the reviews of these books, which are epitexts, produced by the various reviewers, and are much more tangentially related to the presentation of the books than the types of paratexts examined in the first two sections of the chapter.

## 8.1 Marketing and Other Publisher's Paratexts

The ways in which these translations were presented by their publishers offers us a way of gaining some insight into the possible motives for commissioning and publishing them. The most obvious form of these presentations are the texts found in the dust jackets and back covers of these books. More material that served a similar function, and can also do so for the purposes of this study, can be found in the promotional magazines both Kirjayhtymä (publisher of Upton and Krosby) and Gummerus (publisher of Lundin) had for informing book retailers and libraries on their upcoming publications, *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* and *Gummeruksen tiedonantoja*. Each of the four books got their own advertisements in these magazines, promoting their publication. The publishers also used paid advertisements in newspapers and magazines to promote the books, and as examples of these, a few advertisements from *Helsingin Sanomat* were chosen for the study. These were usually very similar to the larger versions that appeared in the publishers' own magazines, using the same texts and graphics, but were generally much more condensed, due to more limited space available. As stated above, these serve as mere examples of the promotion that was done for these books, as conducting any kind of comprehensive survey of the advertising was not feasible for this study. For technical reasons, it is not even certain that all advertisements that appeared in *Helsingin Sanomat* were found, because the search function available for the newspaper's archives (a service called "Aikakone", available only for subscribers of the newspaper at [www.hs.fi/aikakone](http://www.hs.fi/aikakone)) appears to be based on automatic text recognition from scanned newspapers, which means that words that have been, for example, split between two lines or printed in an unusual typeface, are not necessarily picked up by the program. As examples, however, these few advertisements are likely to be representative of the style of advertising the publishers chose for these particular books. There were four advertisements for Lundin's *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* (4, 26, 29 October and 19 December 1960), two for Upton's *Välirauha* (28 September and 9 October 1965), one for Krosby's *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* (10 November 1966) and one for Krosby's *Suomen valinta 1941* (25 April 1968). In addition to these, some advertisements which included nothing beyond just the most basic information for the book (price, number of pages etc.) were also found, but were considered not to be useful for the purposes of this study.

In all four cases, the advertisements, both the ones from the publishers' own magazines and the ones that appeared in *Helsingin Sanomat*, are based on the same texts

that appear on the back covers of the books themselves. Kirjayhtymä clearly used the same texts, or at least fragments of them, in both, and the ones produced by Gummerus also share enough phrases and sentence fragments that one was clearly based on the other. Descriptions of all the promotional material for each book are, therefore, grouped together, and following the pattern established in chapter 5, arranged by author and presented in chronological order by the date of publication.

### 8.1.1 Lundin

Lundin's *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* was the first of these four books to be published, pre-dating Upton's *Välirauha* by five years. Its position was also unique, compared to the other three, in that its original English version had been out several years before the Finnish translation was published, and a Swedish-language translation had even been published in Finland two years prior (see chapter 5 for more details). It is, therefore, no surprise that one detail that is featured heavily in all promotional material for the book is the fact that it had received a lot of attention and caused significant controversy before its publication in Finnish. As an explanation for this stated controversy, an advertisement in *Gummeruksen tiedonantoja* (issue 10, 1960), as well as several advertisements in *Helsingin Sanomat* during November 1960, offer variations of the same phrase, which states that "the writer has had to touch upon certain things that we [i.e. the Finns] have considered to be, in some ways, 'taboo'" (Gummerus 1960: 88). In all of these, Lundin's approach is described as "ennakkoluuloton", which can be translated as "unprejudiced" or "broadminded", in any case implying a contrast with the domestic historians who have not dared to discuss these 'taboo' subjects. None of the advertisements go into any detail about what exactly these subjects were, instead just talking about the "murky details of Finland's recent past" (ibid.). The back cover of the book itself does, however, while including much of the same text as the advertisement from *Gummeruksen tiedonantoja*, also state that Lundin is "especially critical of Finland's military cooperation with Germany" (Lundin 1960; my translation).

One feature that is prominent in *Gummeruksen tiedonantoja*, but does not appear in most of the subsequent newspaper advertisements, is the use of third-party quotations. There are three of these quotations, two of which are taken from *Ylioppilaslehti*, the publication of University of Helsinki students' union, and a third one,

which is attributed to professor of political science Jan-Magnus Jansson, which also uses *Ylioppilaslehti* as an example of the “spirited debate” the book has caused (Gummerus 1960). One of the quotations that appear in the advertisement, in which Klaus Törnudd (Finnish diplomat and later professor of international politics) praises Lundin’s “democratic conviction”, was also used in the ‘back flap’ of the book’s dust jacket. Rest of the space in these ‘flaps’ is taken by a relatively long excerpt from the book’s introduction, in which Lundin first states that “free people deserve to know everything about their history” (Lundin 1960; my translation) and continues by lamenting the lack of sufficiently detailed historical studies of not only the events after 1939 but also those between 1919 and 1939 (ibid.). The choice of this quotation points to the publisher having been aware of the book’s role as something that could fill a gap in Finnish history writing.

### 8.1.2 Upton

While the delay between the publication of the English original and the Finnish translation was significantly shorter with Upton’s *Välirauha* than it had been with Lundin’s *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, just a few months instead of years, a similar statement about having already “received much attention in the Finnish press” before being published in Finland can still be found from the advertisement for *Välirauha* in *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* (issue 3, 1965). This point was not, however, present in any of the newspaper advertisements, nor is it mentioned in the book’s back cover.

The promotional texts for Upton’s *Välirauha*, including the back cover of the book itself, all feature quotations from the same review of the English edition of the book by professor E. A. Berg, originally published in *Helsingin Sanomat* on 8 January 1965. *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* (issue 3, 1965) has the longest version of the quotation:

The result is astounding in its clarity and multifacetedness. It is an objective synthesis which leaves almost nothing unexamined. The author’s outlook towards Finland is friendly and understanding, but at the same time coldly critical and revealing. In presenting his subject matter, he usually first presents the position of the Finnish leaders, and then follows with his presentation of the facts of the situation. Like the knife of a surgeon, his pen carefully pierces the tragedy of the events.

(Kirjayhtymä 1965; my translation)

The book’s back cover features the same exact quotation, but excludes the last sentence, while the advertisements in *Helsingin Sanomat* only include a smaller number of sentences from the beginning of the longer quotation, and in slightly edited forms. In one

case, published in *Helsingin Sanomat* on 9 October 1965, only the second sentence was used, and even that was shortened into “An objective synthesis which leaves nothing unexamined” (Helsingin Sanomat 1965; my translation). Besides omitting “it is” from the beginning, which is rather typical for the language used in advertisements and newspaper headlines, this version also removes the slight hedging from the original by omitting “almost” (the change is from “juuri mitään” into “mitään” in Finnish). The same slight misquoting is also present in an advertisement published on 28 September 1965, which otherwise uses the exact same first three sentences from the longer quotation above. The newspaper advertisements are, however, very much based on Berg’s words, as they do not include much (or in the case of the one from 9 October, any) other text besides them, except the book’s name and some basic details like the price and number of pages.

The advertisement in *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* and the book’s back cover are almost identical in terms of textual content. Besides using the same quotation, both feature the same text written by the publisher, with only a few words of difference between them. The text makes essentially the same point as Berg (see above) about Upton’s friendliness towards Finland, but without contrasting it with his critical outlook. It seems like the purpose was to convince the potential reader that Upton, despite being critical about the decisions made by the Finnish war-time leaders, was still a ‘friend’ and not ‘the enemy’. The text also lists the various sources Upton has used in his study and states that he has approached the topic “with the seriousness of a scholar”<sup>1</sup> (Kirjayhtymä 1965; my translation), likely seeking to establish the book’s status as proper academic history.

### 8.1.3 Krosby

Both the back cover of Krosby’s *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* and its advertisement in *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* (issue 4, 1966) present the book as a continuation of a series with Upton’s *Välirauha* as its predecessor, while also presenting it as something new and important by highlighting the previously unavailable sources that Krosby had used. The following two sentences appear with identical wording in both the back cover and the advertisement:

---

<sup>1</sup> The Finnish word ‘tiedemies’, which appears in the original quotation, is used for both ‘scientist’ and ‘scholar’, although its literal meaning is “a man of science”.



In writing the book, the author has had access to information and sources which have not been previously published in Finland. Therefore 'Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941' continues the same series of interesting history books that was started by Anthony F. Upton's controversial 'Välirauha'.

(Krosby 1966 and Kirjayhtymä 1966; my translation)

Only one advertisement for *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* was found in *Helsingin Sanomat*, but as stated above, this is not necessarily a reliable result in terms of the number of advertisements that were actually published in the newspaper. Besides the book's name, number of pages, and price, the advertisement only includes three short quotations from different magazines, with one from *Uusi Suomi* stating that "this is a book that is based on facts" (*Helsingin Sanomat* 10 November 1966; my translation), and two others, from *Kotimaa* and *Uusi Maaailma* just declaring the book "interesting" and "exciting" (*ibid.*), which for the purposes of this study, makes this particular advertisement seem less interesting or exciting, as it seems almost shallow compared to some of the others.

A similar point about new sources is also made in the promotional material for Krosby's second book, *Suomen valinta 1941*. Again, the same text is used in both the book's back cover and the advertisement in *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* (issue 7, 1967): "The book is based on previously unreleased documentary sources as well as interviews with the politicians and military leaders of the time" (Krosby 1967 and Kirjayhtymä 1967; my translation).

As was the case with *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941*, only one advertisement for *Suomen valinta 1941* was found in *Helsingin Sanomat*. It is also worth noting that the advertisement in question was published 25 April 1968, several months after the book had already come out. This advertisement includes the point about previously unreleased sources quoted above, but printed in a smaller typeface, while the main eye-catchers are two questions printed in a much larger one: "Why did Hitler change his mind and make Finland an ally? Why did the Great Powers take a different outlook towards Finland after the Continuation War?" (*Helsingin Sanomat* 1968; my translation). The first of these questions, which could be interpreted as either a rather bold move by Kirjayhtymä, or a sign of changing times, in the sense that claims of a Finnish-German alliance were not quite as controversial as they had been a few years earlier. Whichever the case, the earlier promotional material does not include anything about Hitler having made Finland an ally, but versions of the second question about the Great Powers' outlook

towards Finland do appear in both the back cover and in *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia*. Both use the same quotation, which is presented as having been taken from the book itself: “Most of the world gave its sympathy and respect to ‘the brave little Finland’ during the winter of 1939–1940, but after the Continuation War the virtuous nations did not respond with the same sincere sympathy as before” (Krosby 1967 and Kirjayhtymä 1967; my translation). However, that sentence is not actually a direct quotation from Krosby. Chapter one of the book starts with same words, but the latter half of the sentence, after ‘brave little Finland’, is different (Krosby 1967: 15), and the rest of the quotation appears, with slightly different wording, as a separate sentence a full page later (Krosby 1967: 16).

With *Suomen valinta 1941*, the ‘controversy angle’ is used only in the advertisement published in *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia*, but not in the back cover. The former proclaims the book as “one of this autumn’s controversial books” as well as “one of this autumn’s bestsellers” (Kirjayhtymä 1967). The advertisement uses a picture of a German-language military document as its background image, and also includes a Finnish translation of the document’s text. After the main text of the advertisement, which is very similar to the one that appears in the book’s back cover, the text goes on to claim that the book includes pictures of the original documents (“kiintoisa dokumenttikuvitus” in Finnish), of which there is an example in the advertisement (*ibid.*). However, the documents reproduced in the book are all in plain text, and no images of any kind are included. It seems that Kirjayhtymä’s original plans changed between printing the advertisement and the book itself. Only one printing of the book exists (Manninen, Nurmio, and Paunonen 1983: 87), which means that it truly was never printed in the form it was originally advertised to have. Interestingly, the advertisement credits Erkki Ihanainen as the translator, but does not mention Ulla Pakkala, who in the book itself is credited for translating the documents.

The specific document that is used in the aforementioned advertisement, a rather bombastic ‘order of the day’ for 29 June 1941 by German colonel general Nikolaus von Falkenhorst, is not actually even included in the book’s appendix. It is quoted almost entirely by Krosby in the main text (Krosby 1967: 230-231), but the advertisement includes one sentence that Krosby has not quoted. The translations also have clear enough differences that they were very likely done by different people. The colonel general’s name is misspelled as ‘Falkenforst’ in the advertisement, which, at a glance, seems to match his signature as it appears in the picture of the original document. This gives the

impression that whoever translated the text was not very familiar with subject matter, assuming the mistake was not made at a later stage by e.g. the graphic designer, as the commander of German forces in Norway between 1940–1944 (who was also in command of some Finnish troops during Operation Barbarossa) should likely be considered a rather well known figure in this context. As for the actual contents of the document, it is rather easy to see why it was chosen for the advertisement: Colonel general Falkenhorst's pompous words, aimed at the German and Finnish troops under his command, about "fighting against the hereditary enemy" as "close brothers-in-arms" will undoubtedly have caught the attention of Finnish readers, especially considering that he even invokes the year 1918 (i.e. the Civil War) and "our fathers" having done the same back then (Kirjayhtymä 1967; my translation).

#### **8.1.4 Common Themes in the Marketing Paratexts**

As has become apparent above, certain themes appeared multiple times in the promotional materials of these books. The most prominent or interesting among these are summed up below.

"Controversial" – This is the most obvious of the recurring themes, and appears in some way in relation to all four of these translations. Being the first one of these 'foreign voices', the promotion for Lundin's book emphasizes this point much more heavily than the others, but it is present in all four cases.

"Friendly towards Finland" – This theme can be found from the advertisements for the first two translations, Lundin and Upton, particularly the latter of the two. In Lundin's case, it only appears as a part of a mini-biography in *Gummeruksen tiedonantoja*, which states that "his outlook towards our country is favourable" (Gummerus 1960). Unlike most of the advertisement's text, this section is not found in anywhere in the book itself. As discussed above, this theme is relatively prominent in the promotional texts for Upton, featured as both original text and quotations. With both historians, this friendly outlook is paired with the notion that on the other hand, they are also highly critical and do not shy away from revealing details that may be considered uncomfortable by some Finnish readers.

"Based on new sources" – Lists of the types of sources these studies are based on appear in promotional texts for all of the books except Lundin. With both of

Krosby's books, these are explicitly called new sources, while in Upton's case the advertisement (Kirjayhtymä 1965) lists multiple examples of two types of sources, ones that the writer has considered typical for historians, as well as ones that were also used by Upton, the implication being that the latter are something new (court records from the war-responsibility trials are used as one of the examples here). The primary function of these is presumably to convince the potential readers that these books were indeed balanced and impartial historical accounts of the events, not some political pamphlets or Allied propaganda tracts. This theme is also very much based on facts, as each subsequent study did indeed use new and previously unreleased documentary sources, which is obviously a relevant detail for anyone interested in reading these studies.

## **8.2 Translator's Footnotes**

In this section, a very different type of paratext is being examined: The translator's footnotes. Unlike the advertisements and back cover blurbs, which offer clues about the publishers of these translations, these footnotes can tell us something about the translators themselves. Translator's footnotes "provide a window on translators' perceptions of their audience, and on their views of their own task and role" (Paloposki 2010: 90), and thus give us information on the types of agency the translators had, and particularly saw themselves as having. As noted by Paloposki (2010: 94), while the translator's footnotes are often explicitly marked as such, it is not always clear if a footnote was added by the translator or already present in the source text, and checking the source text is not always possible (or at least not feasible in practice). Any relevant unclarity is noted in each case.

### **8.2.1 Jorma Aaltonen**

Jorma Aaltonen's translation of Lundin's *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* contains a relatively large number of translator's footnotes, twenty-two in total, the most among these four books by a fairly large margin. All of these are explicitly marked as translator's footnotes ("Suomentajan huomautus"). Because the Finnish translation was done from an earlier Swedish translation of the text (see chapter 5), it is worth noting that the term "suomentaja" specifically refers to someone who translates into Finnish, which makes it unlikely that any of the footnotes marked as "suomentajan huomautus" (which, as stated above, includes all of them in this case) have been brought over from the Swedish

translation, a phenomenon which Paloposki (2010:94) mentions as a possible problem in researching translators' footnotes in texts which have been translated from an intermediary language. Most of the footnotes, thirteen in total, are translations or explanations of German-language terms that are untranslated in the main text. Similarly, three footnotes are translations of the titles of Swedish-language newspaper articles that are mentioned by their original names in the main text. Three footnotes offer translations of Latin phrases that are commonly used in academic English, such as *fait accompli*, that Aaltonen likely considered to be unfamiliar to many Finnish readers but still wanted to preserve from the source text, and one footnote explains a Finnish acronym related to military jargon.

In addition to these explanatory footnotes, the book also includes two footnotes where Aaltonen informs the reader that a part of the original text has been omitted because the author was explaining things that are already known to the Finnish readers. In the first one of these cases, a section, roughly two pages in the English edition, detailing the territorial and other losses suffered by Finland in the Peace of Moscow after the Winter War has been omitted (Lundin 1960: 132), and in the second one, the omitted section deals with the history of 'the Karelian question' (Lundin 1960: 235). The length and exact content of the second omitted section is a little harder to define compared to the first one, because the English and Finnish editions do not match each other paragraph for paragraph due to the changes that have been made to each subsequent version of the text (see chapter 5). By far the most common type of translator's footnote in the text was a note that offered a translation of something that was not translated in the main text. This type of usage of footnotes was also quite common in the older, late 19th and early 20th century, Finnish translations studied by Paloposki (2010: 103), so their prevalence here does not come as a surprise.

### **8.2.2 Sirkka Upton**

Sirkka Upton's translation of Anthony Upton's *Välirauha* contains no translator's footnotes, but the translations for a number of German-language quotations are untranslated in the main text, with Finnish translations being offered in footnotes. However, the German-language quotations are handled the same way in the English edition, which makes the footnotes part of the source text, not a 'second voice' in the text,

as translator's footnotes would be. Considering the close cooperation between translator and author (see chapter 5), the lack of any commentary by the translator is maybe to be expected.

### **8.2.3 Markku Järvinen**

Markku Järvinen's translation of Krosby's *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* contains no translator's footnotes, and the book only has a couple of footnotes in general, all of which look like they are clearly from the source text.

### **8.2.4 Erkki Ihanainen and Ulla Pakkala**

Erkki Ihanainen's translation of Krosby's *Suomen valinta 1941* contains only a few translator's footnotes, but they are particularly interesting, because in them, Ihanainen has corrected the information given in the main text or offers additional information related to it. There are four of these footnotes in total, plus a fifth one that is not marked explicitly as a translator's note like the rest, but was likely written by the translator, as it refers to 'the writer' in the third person, pointing out that "the writer probably means Reposaaari" (Krosby 1967: 91; my translation), when the main text mentions a port located near Pori. The other footnotes include more substantial additions that demonstrate how Ihanainen had done some historical research of his own during the translation process: On page 121 a relatively lengthy footnote explains how colonel Walter Horn, who was present during the conversation the main text refers to, corroborates most of the details given by Krosby (Krosby 1967: 121). No information about any kind of textual source is given, which implies that Ihanainen himself had interviewed the officer. Page 128 contains a similar footnote that again refers to colonel Horn. On page 170, another officer, this time rear admiral Svante Sundman, corroborates Krosby's information (Krosby 1967: 170). Page 86 includes a footnote that, in reference to the number of planes available to the Finnish Air Force, simply points out that the number given in a German document that Krosby quotes in the text is wrong (Krosby 1967: 86). This time the information is not attributed to anyone, but as the correct number was "less than half" (ibid.) of the number given, Ihanainen likely considered the fact to be obvious enough. He does not dispute anything written by Krosby as such, because the main text simply explains what was written in the

German documents, and Krosby declines to comment further on whether that information was correct or not.

Besides these footnotes, which are explicitly marked as translator's ("suom. huom.", a commonly used abbreviated version of "suomentajan huomautus"), the book contains a relatively high number of footnotes, most of which are just references (usually pointing to a document in the appendix of the book) and clearly part of the source text, but a few of them offer additional explanations of terms used in the main text, in a somewhat similar way to the footnotes used by Aaltonen in his translation of Lundin, and it is possible that some of these were added by the translator. However, as some of the footnotes are clearly attributed to the translator, the ones that are not were considered to have been part of the source text (besides the one exception detailed above). The appendix of the book, which consists of reproductions of original source documents, translated by Ulla Pakkala, contains no translator's footnotes.

### **8.2.5 Some Concluding Remarks on Footnotes**

Out of these five translators (the fifth being Ulla Pakkala), Jorma Aaltonen and Erkki Ihanainen were the only ones to use footnotes. In both cases, these footnotes significantly increase the translator's visibility. Aaltonen uses footnotes more often, and perhaps in a somewhat more 'traditional' way (cf. Paloposki 2010), making assumptions about what the reader does and does not know, and also what the reader needs or wants to know. It should be noted, however, that the omissions that Aaltonen informs the reader about in two of his footnotes may not have been made by his own decision but the publisher's. Still, leaving out several pages worth of text because the reader supposedly already knows everything that was written there definitely shows a willingness to make relatively significant changes to the original text.

Ihanainen, on the other hand, uses footnotes much more sparingly, and most of his footnotes actually have very little to do with translation *per se*, rather showing his expertise in the subject matter, and how he has himself engaged with the historical research presented in the translated text and gone a step further than just translating what Krosby had to say on the subject. It is rather amusing that one of these translators actually had a background in history (see chapter 6 on the translators' bibliographies), but it was *not* Erkki Ihanainen, whose footnotes would seem to imply an expertise in that field, but

Markku Järvinen, who did not use any footnotes or otherwise make himself visible in his translation of Krosby's *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* (see above).

### 8.3 The Reviews

To form a general impression of the discourses surrounding these studies at the time of their publication in Finnish, a selection of reviews from that era was needed. The best available way for collecting a selection that could be considered representative was using the Finnish Historical Bibliography (Suomen historiallinen bibliografia), which is maintained by the Finnish National Library, and is available as a part of their ARTO database, a "reference database and metadata reserve" for "Finnish periodical and monograph articles" (Kansalliskirjasto 2015b). The Finnish Historical Bibliography includes references from around 200 Finnish periodicals and serial publications and an undisclosed number of foreign ones, and is said to be 'comprehensive' from 1960 onwards (Kansalliskirjasto 2010). Searches in ARTO database can be targeted to only include the Historical Bibliography by using a specific web form (available at [arto.linneanet.fi/histbib.htm](http://arto.linneanet.fi/histbib.htm)).

The bibliography includes both articles written by Finnish historians, on any sub-field within history, and articles written by foreign historians that are related to the history of Finland or academic historical studies conducted by Finnish historians. The exact criteria for inclusion is, however, not spelled out in the website (Kansalliskirjasto 2010). This is slightly problematic for the present study, as it was clear from the search results that the bibliography did include more than just academic journals (relevant search results included, for example, *Sotilasaikaukauslehti*, a military periodical published by the Finnish Officers' Union), but on the other hand, they did not seem to include *Ylioppilaslehti*, a student magazine published by the University of Helsinki students' union, from which a number quotations were used in the promotional materials for Lundin's *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* (see chapter 8). The quoted articles were published sometime between 1957 and 1960, which means they might not be included simply because the bibliography does not (yet?) include all of the 1950s (Kansalliskirjasto 2010), but some test searches seemed to indicate that *Ylioppilaslehti* was not included from 1960 onwards either. However, as the number of different reviews that could have been included in the study was in any case limited by the time and resources available,



the decisions made by Kansalliskirjasto were considered authoritative enough that the ‘sampling’ of reviews found by using the bibliography could be considered sufficient for the purposes of this study. Also note that the review which was referenced in chapter 8 on paratexts, because it was quoted in the advertisements (E. A. Berg’s review of Upton in *Helsingin Sanomat*), was *not* used for this part of the study, as daily newspapers like *Helsingin Sanomat* are not included in the bibliography, and using it as the sole criteria of inclusion meant that reviews found by other means could not be used. This may seem slightly counter-intuitive, but being consistent with the stated criteria was considered to be more important in this case than the informal principle of ‘use everything you can find’ that has generally been followed in this study (see chapter 3 on methodology).

Searches in the Finnish Historical Bibliography were conducted using primarily the last names of the historians (Lundin, Upton, and Krosby) as search terms, but additional searches using the Finnish names of their books yielded a few additional results, as some reviews of Krosby’s *Suomen valinta 1941* had not apparently been properly keyworded, and thus did not show up in earlier searches. From these search results, after manually picking the results that were actually relevant to the study, everything that was either not published in Finland (as discussed above, the bibliography also includes references from some foreign periodicals) or not written in Finnish (which in this case meant English or Swedish), was excluded, which resulted in a total of sixteen reviews. These included three reviews of the original English edition of Upton’s book, which obviously could not contain anything about the Finnish translation specifically, but were still included, because they could serve as examples of the public discussion that preceded the publication of the Finnish translation (see chapter 8 for more on this theme and how it relates to the marketing of the translations). Also, as noted earlier in chapter 5, Upton’s *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941 / Väli rauha* is the only one out of these four translations in which the source and target texts are more or less equivalent in terms of content, which means that the reviewers’ remarks are, for the most part, equally applicable to both editions. No Finnish-language reviews of the English versions of any of the other books were found in the bibliography, which meant that there was no need to consider whether or not they would have been included.

The selection includes five reviews of Lundin’s *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, six reviews of Upton’s *Väli rauha* (half of which, as stated above, were actually of its English version, *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941*), only one review of

Krosby's *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* and four reviews of Krosby's *Suomen valinta 1941*. The reviews come from a total of eleven different publications. *Sotilasaikauslehti* (which was used as an example above) reviewed each of these books, and Upton even twice, first the English edition and later also the Finnish one, although the latter one is more of a rebuttal than a review, as it also presents some of the writer's (Martti V. Terä) own research as evidence for his counterarguments. *Suomalainen Suomi* is also featured twice (with reviews of *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941* and *Suomen valinta 1941*), but the other nine publications each appear only once in the sample. There is a variety of different kinds of publications, such as military 'trade journals' in *Sotilasaikauslehti* and *Reservin aliupseeri*, left-wing affiliated publications in *Kommunisti* and *Työläisopiskelija* (with the former being more far-left and the latter more moderate), publications with some right-wing leanings (but no official political affiliation) in *Nootti* and *Suomalainen Suomi*, politics and political science journals in *Politiikka* and *Ulkopolitiikka*, regional publications in *Satakuntalainen* and *Kaltio*, and finally one actual historical journal in *Historiallinen aikakauskirja*.

As the main purpose of this study is to add the perspective of translation studies to the Finnish historiography of the Continuation War, one of the main points of interest in these reviews was any mentions of the translatedness of these books. These are generally somewhat rare in book reviews (see e.g. Reiss 2000: 2), and the initial assumption was that they would be even less common here, because the reviewers of non-fiction books are likely to be very focused on the content of the text (i.e. the specific arguments of the original author and the findings of their study), as opposed to, for example, the stylistic aspects of the text. However, according to Paloposki and Riikonen (2013), comments about the translation are actually *more* common in reviews of non-fiction books, because they often include discussion of aspects like terminology and the level of expertise necessary for translating special field texts. These aspects are, however, much more central in translations of philosophical texts, the genre Paloposki and Riikonen mostly focus on in their discussion of 20<sup>th</sup> century Finnish translations, than they are in historical texts. It is also worth noting that the specific time period that is the most relevant for the present study, i.e. the 1960s, receives relatively little attention in their article, which focuses mostly on 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries (i.e. before the Finnish independence) but, on the other hand, also includes discussion of some recent examples

from the 2000s. Some basic tendencies noted by them are, nonetheless, still applicable here.

The other side of this phenomenon, i.e. the fact that reviewers do not always acknowledge the translatedness of the text they are reviewing (or are not aware of all the implications of the fact even if they do), is still, however, relevant to the present study, as some of the reviews include comments on such aspects of the texts as a specific word choice by the author, which in a translated text is, of course, actually a choice made by the translator, albeit based on the choice made by the original author. In some cases, the translation might be very literal, and thus the criticism might have been equally valid for the original text, but this is slightly besides the point here, as the main focus is on the reviewer's *awareness* (or the lack thereof) of the fact that the text is a translation, not so much any aspect of the translation itself.

Predictably, most of the reviews used in this study concentrate on critiquing the historical narratives presented in the books, and the specific arguments of the historians who wrote them. Because the actual history of the Continuation War is not the subject of this study, nor is it by any means my own field of expertise, the arguments made for or against the historians in these reviews are, for the most part, not discussed here. Besides looking for explicit mentions of translatedness in these reviews, the focus is on any acknowledgements of cultural exchange in a wider sense, i.e. whether or not the reviewers thought about these books as an outside influence on Finnish history writing, and whether they saw it as a positive or a negative thing (or a bit of both). Some other common themes in the reviews of each of these books are also discussed.

Before addressing the reviews of each of the translations individually, some general notes about the whole sample: Out of the total thirteen reviews (excluding the three reviews of the English version of Upton's book), all but three mention, more or less explicitly, that the reviewed book is a translation. In the three reviews that do not mention it, the translatedness is still, in a way, implied by referring to the book by its Finnish name, and in all three cases, the Finnish publisher is also named. The translator is named in seven out of thirteen reviews, i.e. in roughly half of them, with one review of Krosby's *Suomen valinta 1941* only mentioning Ihanainen but not Pakkala (two reviews mention both translators). The inclusion of the translator's name is, of course, counted as acknowledging the translatedness of the book, even if the fact is not otherwise mentioned

in the review, which means that the aforementioned three reviews that do not mention anything about the book being a translation are not, by definition, included in the latter group. This leaves three reviews that do not name the translator but mention the translatedness of the book in some other way: two Lundin reviews which mention the earlier Swedish translation, and one Upton review in which the translatedness is implied by mentioning that the book “has recently been published in Finnish” (Polvinen 1965: 20; my translation).

Please note that as all of the reviews discussed in this chapter are in Finnish, *all* direct quotations in the following subsections are *my own translations*. Due to the relatively large number of short quotations used here, this has not been mentioned separately in every one of them. This exception has been made to improve readability.

### **8.3.1 Lundin**

All five of the Lundin reviews are quite critical of his study, with the general tones ranging from downright scathing to relatively balanced. This comes as no surprise, as not only did Lundin cause a lot of controversy by challenging the narratives of Finnish history writing, but his study has in later historiography generally been considered rather poor in terms of methodology (see chapter 4), and its shortcomings were certainly noticed by the reviewers as well, who often made comments to the effect that Lundin’s study was more of a polemic than a proper historical study, as it made bold claims based on relatively thin evidence. However, in Lundin’s defence, very few reliable sources were even available at the time, and he was clearly aware of the limitations this caused for his study.

The slightly unusual route Lundin’s study took from English into Finnish, taking a ‘detour’ through Swedish (see chapter 5), is mentioned in three out of the five reviews, two of which also inform the reader about the fact that some changes have been made to the text between different versions. Unfortunately, none of the reviews offer any additional details about this, compared to the information that is available elsewhere (and has been discussed earlier in this study). One reviewer, Pauli A. Kopperi in *Politiikka*, compliments the translator in passing, and in a rather typical fashion, by stating that the book is available “as Jorma Aaltonen’s fluent [Finnish] translation” (Kopperi 1961: 93). None of the other reviews include any comments on the quality of the translation, nor do they include the translator’s name.

The theme of ‘outside influence’ is discussed explicitly in four of the Lundin reviews, which can be divided evenly into two distinct outlooks: Two of the reviewers, the aforementioned Kopperi and V. O. Veilahti in *Työläisopiskelija*, see it in a positive light, even if they do not necessarily see much value in Lundin’s study specifically. Veilahti states that until the historians have access to both Finnish and Soviet archives, the history writing of Finland’s wars “will remain both controversial and contested” (1961: 38), and continues that “even studies like Lundin’s are important preliminary works, and will at least help in defining the nature of the problems” (ibid.). Kopperi is similarly critical of Lundin’s own achievements, but thinks that “if the publication of this controversial study in Finnish gives an impetus to re-evaluating our war years, the book has served its purpose and an important objective has been reached” (Kopperi 1961: 93). He also states that “the search for the so-called ‘historical truth’ should not be monopolised by some narrow viewpoint” (ibid.) and asks for open competition within history writing.

Two other reviews feature the same theme, but with an outlook that is, in some ways, the inverse of the one described above: Pekka Harttila in *Satakuntalainen* and K. J. Mikola in *Reservin aliupseeri* are both worried about the way Finnish public discussion appears to the outsiders, including Lundin. Mikola (1961: 8) sees Lundin’s study as “useful” (ibid.) in the sense that it shows how differently the outsiders can view ‘our’ history, and serves as a warning against making “exaggerated accusations” (ibid.) against each other “in front of the whole world” (ibid.), the implication being that people like Lundin might take something out of context and use it as evidence against Finland. Harttila’s point might actually, in effect, have a lot in common with the ones discussed in the previous paragraph, but it is presented quite similarly to Mikola’s. He sees Lundin’s study as “a reminder to the Finnish research of political history” (Harttila 1961: 29), because if the Finnish historians continue to shy away from the critical study of this subject, the outsiders will think that there is “something to hide” (ibid.) or “something shameful” (ibid.) about “the hardest years of our independence” (ibid.), and similarly to Mikola, also sees a danger in letting foreign historians publish their “partially misleading” (ibid.) studies in the absence of Finnish ones. While Harttila sees Lundin’s study mainly in a rather negative light, he still seems to think that, as a warning example, it could have a positive impact on Finnish history writing, which is not that far from the status of an ‘instigator’ it was given by Veilahti and Kopperi (see above).

### 8.3.2 Upton

As stated above, the selection of reviews for Upton's *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941 / Välirauha* differs from the others in that half of the reviews are based on the English version. One of these three reviews, pseudonym "S.J." in *Suomalainen Suomi*, mentions that "a Finnish translation has recently been published" (S.J. 1965: 445), the other two, pseudonym RHn in *Sotilasaikakauslehti* and T. V. Viljanen in *Historiallinen aikakauskirja*, do not include anything about the translation, possibly because they did not (yet) know that there was going to be one. Viljanen's thoughts on the translation would have been interesting to know, because he considered *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941* to be "an impartial and generally speaking objective book *for foreigners*" (Viljanen 1965: 42; emphasis added), because he thought it did not add much to the Finnish history writing after studies like Arvi Korhonen's *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi* had already been published (ibid.). While it might seem strange at first, this statement does actually make sense, as some historiographers (Soikkanen 2007: 112, Herlin 1998: 213) have also noted that the historical narrative Upton presented was not that different from Korhonen's. The controversy was mostly about the moral judgements Upton made in the last chapter of his book, to which Viljanen comments that "such baseless claims undoubtedly fit into propaganda, but hardly into history writing" (Viljanen 1965: 45). Viljanen's review also includes a list of factual errors that he has found in Upton's book, which he prefaces by stating that "when a foreigner writes about the situation in Finland or its neighbouring areas, it must be considered almost natural that he will make mistakes, like Upton has" (Viljanen 1965: 46).

The general tone of the other one of the aforementioned reviews, by pseudonym RHn, is quite a bit more positive. The reviewer begins by pointing out that the causes of the Continuation War have been studied a lot more by foreigners than by Finnish historians (RHn 1965: 588). Two possible reasons for this are proposed in the review: One is the political sensitiveness of the subject, which is less of a problem for foreign historians, who are not personally involved (ibid.). This theme came up relatively often in these reviews, but this one also includes a less common take on the subject, namely the Finnish tradition of history writing, which according to the writer, has typically not included recent events, for which the lack of historical inquiry into the events of 1918, "until recently" (ibid.), is used as an example. It would seem that the same point about political sensitiveness applied even more to this subject, which makes the example

look a little less convincing. The point itself, however, is quite interesting as another example of how differences in traditions of history writing may have made these studies look more foreign. This review takes a clearly positive stance on the theme of ‘outside influence’ on Finnish history writing, not only stating that Upton’s study is the most balanced study on the subject, but also continues that the often stated remarks about the foreigners being unable to understand the situation in Finland and the Finnish politics “have been proven false by experience” (RHn 1965: 590), and that the foreign historians are often better at situating the history of Finland within the international context (ibid.).

Upton’s book also got another, less positive, review in *Sotilasaikakauslehti*, this time based on the Finnish translation. It was written by Martti V. Terä, who had in 1962 published his own study on the subject of the Second World War, *Tienhaarassa: Syksyn 1940 tapahtumat Barbarossa-suunnitelman taustaa vasten* (“In the Crossroads: The Events of Autumn 1940 in relation to the Barbarossa Plan”), and would go on to publish another one, *Kesäkuun kriisi 1944* (“The June 1944 Crisis”) in 1967. Terä’s article, published in late 1965, presents some preliminary findings from his own upcoming study, which he contrasts with Upton’s version of the events. The result is a kind of rebuttal, which is significantly longer (ten pages) and more detailed than most of the other reviews. Terä begins by mentioning the review by pseudonym RHn in the previous issue of *Sotilasaikakauslehti*, and continues by stating that Upton’s study has received generally positive reviews, which have not, however, paid enough attention to Upton’s use of “factual sources“ (Terä 1965: 647), and for that reason he is “almost forced” (ibid.) to present certain “viewpoints, facts and thoughts” (ibid.) based on his own upcoming study. The article includes quotations from the Finnish translation of Upton’s study, from which Terä has sometimes picked out individual words that he thinks are misrepresenting the facts. While the same, or at least very similar, points could have been made by quoting the English version of the text, one has to wonder whether or not Terä was conscious of the fact that he was, technically speaking, criticising the word choices of Sirkka Upton, not Anthony Upton. Terä does, at least, mention that “the Finnish translation is the handiwork of the author’s Finnish-born spouse Sirkka Upton” (Terä 1965: 647).

While Terä’s assessment that the reviews of Upton’s book had generally been positive seems to be at odds with how the reception of his study has usually been viewed in retrospect, the selection of reviews chosen for the present study does include

some that can quite clearly be considered positive. Even more so than the one by RHN (see above), Tuomo Polvinen's review from *Ulkopolitiikka* clearly belongs in this category. Polvinen, himself also a historian, considers the outside influence on Finnish history writing to be a positive thing, and criticises the domestic discourse on history for "emotional and in a certain sense Finnocentric approach" (Polvinen 1965: 20). He also states that there has been a call for an objective inquiry into Finland's war time policies, which would "take facts as facts" (ibid.), and continues with implied criticism of Finnish historical research for failing to fully meet these expectations. Polvinen mentions Lundin, whose study he considers rather poor but still valuable, because it forced the "sceptical" (ibid.) Finnish historians to admit that enough time had passed, and the Second World War could be seen as a legitimate subject of historical inquiry (ibid.). The point about enough time having passed is similar to RHN's observation (see above) that contemporary history had not been a part of Finnish tradition of history writing. Interestingly, considering the way many others saw certain aspects of Upton's study, Polvinen states that Upton's objective has been "to approach his subject as an outside observer, without any prejudice or judgement" (ibid.), the implication being that he thinks Upton has succeeded in this. Polvinen ends the review with a statement that indicates that he is a supporter of the Paasikivi-Kekkonen Doctrine (see chapter 7), as in his opinion, Upton should have emphasised the climate of mutual mistrust between Finland and the Soviet Union even more, and states that this mistrust is the explanation for many actions, by both parties, that are difficult to understand from the contemporary perspective, and continues that the building (of trust, presumably) that started after the war, "has yielded results that could hardly have been imagined in 1940–41" (ibid.).

Leo Puurunen begins his review of *Välirauha*, published in *Kaltio* in 1966, with a familiar point by stating that foreign historians, including Upton, have an advantage over the domestic ones in that they usually do not have an emotional attachment to their subject. Puurunen, however, continues that in his assessment, the reception of Upton's study has "seemed confused" (1966: 99), by which he seems to mean that the reviews have been mixed. Much of Puurunen's relatively short review is dedicated to criticising the last three chapters of Upton's study (the ones with moral judgements, see above), accusing him of too much speculation (ibid.). Puurunen also comments on the differences between traditions of history writing by stating that a Finnish historian could not, as Upton did, include a section where he writes as a private



person instead of a historian, as it would undermine the credibility of the whole study (ibid.). The most interesting detail of the review in the context of translation studies is Puurunen's criticism of a specific word choice on page 403 of the Finnish edition of the book (the page number is not given in the review, only a quotation), where it is stated that as a result of the Continuation War, the 'riippumattomuus' of Finland has been diminished ('kaventunut'). The word 'riippumattomuus' is usually translated as 'independence', and the corresponding phrase in the English version of Upton's text is indeed "restriction of its [i.e. Finland's] political independence" (Upton 1964: 293). However, Puurunen states that in political science, 'riippumattomuus' means the same as 'suvereniteetti', the Finnish word for sovereignty, and continues that "according to Morgenthau", sovereignty either is or is not, and therefore it cannot diminish, and suggests that another word, such as 'autonomy' should have been used instead (Puurunen 1966: 100). It is unclear whether or not Puurunen would have had an issue with the original version of Upton's statement, but it seems like he has not considered the possibility of it having been changed in translation, or the fact that words simply do not always have exact equivalents in different languages. Sirkka Upton is named as the translator in a separate lead paragraph at the beginning of the review, but the translatedness is not discussed in the rest of the text in any way.

### **8.3.3 Krosby**

Only one review of Krosby's *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* was found from the Finnish historical bibliography. Considering the narrower and more specialised nature of the study, it seems likely that it received less attention in the Finnish publications than the other three, but the number of references in the historical bibliography alone cannot be taken as evidence of this as such. This review was published in *Sotilasaikakauslehti*, which, as discussed above, was the most featured publication in this selection of reviews. Like the review of Upton's *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941* published earlier in the same journal (see above), this one was also written under a pseudonym, in this case Custos. In terms of translation related content, this is likely the most interesting review used in this study. Custos (1966: 553) prefaces the review by making several comments about the way Krosby's book has been presented by its publisher: First, its status as a doctoral thesis is brought up as something the publisher has presented it as, which is later in the reviews used as justification for being rather pedantic with the details of Krosby's study. The

review also includes comments on the Finnish title, which Custos thinks is “too modest” (ibid.) because it implies that the diplomacy only took place in Petsamo (ibid.). This is followed by discussion of the way Kirjayhtymä has presented the book as belonging in the same series as Upton’s *Välirauha* (see chapter 8 on paratexts), which in Custos’ opinion is not appropriate, as Krosby’s study is “immeasurably” (ibid.) more accomplished than Upton’s, and therefore should not be in any way thought of as belonging in the same category (Custos 1966: 554). The comparison between the two historians is carried on throughout the first half of the review, with Custos being extremely critical of Upton while generally taking a much more positive stance on Krosby. The review ends with a statement about the positive impact Krosby’s study is likely to have on Finnish history writing, the atmosphere of which Custos describes as “stuffy” (1966: 556).

The aforementioned review of *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* by pseudonym Custos also includes comments that are the closest to actual translation criticism that can be found in any of these reviews. The review includes a long list of minor mistakes made by Krosby, which is prefaced by stating that they do not diminish Krosby’s overall achievements, but need to be pointed out because the book has been presented as a doctoral thesis by its publisher (Custos 1966: 555). After this list Custos continues, again bringing up the book’s status as a doctoral thesis, that the publisher and the translator also need to be given some notes, the first of which is about inconsistent use of ‘Great Britain’, ‘Britain’, ‘England’, ‘the British’, and ‘the English’, and the second one is about incorrect or inaccurate translations of German military terms, of which a rather long list is provided (ibid.). For some reason, a note about inaccuracies in the book’s index, which includes micro-biographies of persons relevant to the study, is located between the aforementioned first two notes that are directed at the translator and the publisher, and a final note, which criticises the publisher for the perceived lack of proofreading, stating that the book includes “at least fifty printing errors” (ibid.). It is unclear whether Custos thought the mistakes in the index were also the publisher’s and/or the translator’s fault, but considering that one of the mistakes listed is using the word ‘mouthpiece’ instead of a more neutral and/or accurate term (ibid.), this might indeed have been the case.

Krosby’s second book, *Suomen valinta 1941*, was also reviewed in *Sotilasaikakauslehti*, this time by Sampo Ahto. Krosby is introduced in the review as

someone who has “penetrated the language barrier that surrounds our country” (Ahto 1968: 311), and his previous study, *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941*, is presented as a book that has “received the unqualified recognition of its Finnish readers” (ibid.). For the most part, Ahto makes the usual points about the foreign historians having the advantage of not being emotionally invested in their subject, but also adds that part of what is difficult about the subject for the domestic historians is that it still has “political relevance, at least in a propagandistic way” (ibid.), and continues that “Krosby, like many other Western historians have done, emphasises on multiple occasions that Finland’s post-war [political] situation has influenced the Finnish research” (ibid.). Ahto’s review is not, however, all positive, as he heavily criticises Krosby for disregarding many potential Finnish sources and not being critical enough of the German sources he has used (Ahto 1968: 312-313). Ahto ends his review by stating that while Krosby himself could have been more critical, his book will perhaps help its readers to adopt a more critical stance towards the Finnish contributions on the subject (ibid.)

Two different reviewers of *Suomen valinta 1941*, Tuomo Polvinen in *Suomalainen Suomi* and Heikki Jalanti in *Nootti*, took issue with the book’s name (the literal English translation of which would be “Finland’s Choice 1941”), because in their opinion, the narrative presented in Krosby’s study did not actually include a ‘choice’, as no other realistic options for Finland, besides joining forces with Germany, were given (Polvinen 1968: 498, Jalanti 1968: 150). However, the point is presented somewhat differently by the two reviewers: For Polvinen, the perceived discrepancy between the book’s name and its contents is mostly just an observation, while for Jalanti, it is an explicit criticism, which he actually seems to direct more towards the publisher than Krosby himself:

The book’s name is slightly misleading. It does not reflect the title of the original manuscript, ‘Finland and Operation Barbarossa’, although a slavish translation could hardly be demanded as that name has already been used, nor [does it] even [reflect] the position clearly stated by Krosby.

(Jalanti 1968: 150; my translation).

The ‘already used’ name Jalanti refers to is almost certainly Arvi Korhonen’s *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi*, the title of which would indeed be a very close Finnish translation of Krosby’s original title. Jalanti compares Korhonen’s and Krosby’s studies on multiple occasions in his review, and concludes that “Krosby manages, although only partially, to challenge Arvi Korhonen’s pioneering study” (Jalanti 1968: 152). Jalanti had

also published his own study on the subject in 1966, *Suomi puristuksessa 1940–1941* (“Finland Under Pressure”), but unlike Martti V. Terä in his review of Upton’s *Välirauha* (see above), Jalanti does not bring up his own research at all.

Both Polvinen’s and Jalanti’s reviews include comments on the large number of studies that has already been published on the subject (Polvinen 1968: 498, Jalanti 1968: 150). Polvinen begins his review by stating that this is one of the most studied subjects in the history of Finland, and that one could ask whether Krosby’s study actually contributes anything new to it, although his own answer is that it definitely does (Polvinen 1968: 498). In contrast, Erkki Kauppila’s review in *Kommunisti* gives a rather different view on the situation. In his opinion, the domestic research on this subject is “still extremely scarce” (Kauppila 1968: 375), and “the best studies that illuminate our fateful years are still [written by] foreigners” (ibid.). This review was paired with another one Kauppila wrote on Martti V. Terä’s *Kesäkuun kriisi 1944* (see above), which he considered “flimsy” (Kauppila 1968: 376) compared to Krosby’s study, for which he gave a relatively positive review. Perhaps when Kauppila writes about the scarcity of domestic research, he actually means quality (in his opinion) instead of quantity. Otherwise Kauppila does not mention anything related to the outside influence on Finnish history writing in his review.

## 9 Conclusion

The main purpose of this study has been to bring the viewpoint of translation into the Finnish historiography of the Continuation War, and the main reason behind this pursuit has been the prominent place non-Finnish studies have been granted in this historiography, while their translatedness has universally been ignored in it. While this is certainly quite understandable, as translation in general is not a phenomenon that academic history usually pays much attention to, it was still felt that something was missing from these representations of the academic debates that took place in Finland during the middle decades of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

This study has sought to fill in some of the missing details, mostly by looking into the texts that surround the Finnish translations of these influential historical studies, as well as by documenting the timelines of their publication and translation. Much of this could, using Anthony Pym's terminology (1998: 5), be classified as *translation archaeology*, i.e. finding, cataloguing, and then describing the details of the translations, as well as similar information about the translators themselves. This has, indeed, been the main purpose of the study. However, amongst this, there is also a smaller portion of what Pym (1998: 6) might call *explanation*, attempts to answer the 'why?' of these translations in addition to just 'when?' or 'by whom?'.

As generally is the case with 20<sup>th</sup> century translations, the most important reasons for their existence are likely to be financial, but the examination of the extratextual material related to the publishers, both the marketing paratexts and other sources, such as (auto)biographies, has in this study clearly shown that their motives also included a component of social consciousness, of being aware of the significance of these studies and the role they could have in shaping the ways in which the Continuation War is thought of in Finland. A similar awareness was also shown by many of the reviewers, who realised that the writing of Finnish history was being influenced by these foreign studies, even if they often did not agree with much of what had been written in these studies. Whether the translators thought of their work in these terms, or of themselves as having any agency in enriching the Finnish historical discourses, unfortunately still remains unclear. The small amount of visibility some of them had in the translations through their footnotes gives us only a fraction of the full picture of their role in bringing these texts into Finland, although it certainly offers details that are interesting to translation scholars, especially Erkki Ihanainen's own contributions and corrections to

the study he translated. It is possible that some other, more ‘personal’, sources, e.g. manuscripts or letters, could still exist, and with the discovery of such sources, further studies could continue to illuminate the translators’ role in these events.

The achievements of the present study are, mostly due to the types of sources used in it, more in the area of translation as a social phenomenon, rather than the level of inquiry which can give us information on the translators as individuals. This is not, however, necessarily a problem, because the stated point of interest for this study is the role *translation* in the historiography of this particular subject, and in the discourses related to it, not so much the role of the individual *translators* in it. Furthermore, these two levels, which can be seen as the macro and micro levels, are not separate but interrelated, as the actions of individual translators, publishers, and other agents are all components of the overall social phenomenon of translation. An inquiry into any part of the totality of the phenomenon will, almost automatically, yield some information on the other parts as well. Despite its abovementioned slight shortcomings in highlighting the role of individual translators, I would argue that this study has, considering the resources that were available, achieved its goals in collecting translation-related details that were missing in the historiography of this subject.

In a philosophical sense, because of the impossibility of exact equivalence, the original literary or scientific work and its translation are never the same text, even if their names are sometimes used interchangeably. However, as this study has demonstrated, the difference may also be of a more obvious and practical kind, and texts can sometimes, during their transfer from one language into another, undergo changes in more ways than simple equivalence, or the lack thereof, would dictate. Sometimes a book’s original name actually refers to a much earlier version of it, as is the case with Lundin’s *Finland in the Second World War / Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, and sometimes the original name only refers to an unpublished manuscript, as is the case with Krosby’s *Finland and Operation ‘Barbarossa’ / Suomen valinta 1941*. While these differences may seem unimportant to most historians, and while referring to the Finnish editions the same way one would refer to the English originals will continue to be sufficient in most cases, this study has shown that there are plenty of translation-related details and intricacies for those who want to go looking for them.

One interesting connection between translation and history writing that came up during the research, but has not really been explored in this study as it was clearly outside its scope (due to the focus on historiography), is the use of translated primary sources in historical research. All three of the Anglo-American historians discussed in this study had some degree of difficulty in conducting research in Finland, where many of the sources they needed were written in Finnish, and they occasionally commented on this issue, but their exact linguistic skills, and the degree to which being able to read a certain source or not affected the research, were rarely discussed at all. More importantly, historians may sometimes use translators when they do not themselves know all the languages needed during their research, but they very rarely mention it anywhere. Anthony Upton, who credited his wife Sirkka for this type of assistance (Upton 1964: 13), is an exception that makes one wonder whether some other translators have gone uncredited in similar situations. Furthermore, the idea that translation makes sources less reliable, and that in an ideal situation a historian should thus be able to read everything in the language it was originally written in, occasionally comes up in discussions about the historical method. However, the insights translation studies could offer to these methodological discussions is generally missing, and there is certainly still space for a dialogue between the two disciplines.

## References

- Adamo, Sergia. 2006. "Microhistory of Translation." In *Charting the Future of Translation History*, edited by George L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia, 81-100. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Ahto, Sampo. 1968. Review of *Suomen valinta 1941*, by H. P. Krosby. *Sotilasaikakauslehti* 6-7: 311-313.
- Baár, Monika. 2010. "From General History to National History: The Transformations of William Guthrie's and John Gray's 'A General History of the World (1736–1765)' in Continental Europe." In *Cultural Transfer Through Translation: The Circulation of Enlightened Thought in Europe by Means of Translation*, edited by Stefanie Stockhorst, 63-82. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Baker, Mona. 2006. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge.
- Bandia, Paul F. 2006. "The Impact of Postmodern Discourse on the History of Translation." In *Charting the Future of Translation History*, edited by George L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia, 45-58. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Bandia, Paul F. 2014. "Response." *The Translator* 20, no. 1: 112-118.
- Burke, Peter, and R. Po-chia Hsia. 2007. "Introduction." In *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia, 1-4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Burke, Peter. 2007. "Translating Histories." In *Cultural Translation in Early Modern Europe*. Edited by Peter Burke and R. Po-chia Hsia, 125-141. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castro, Nayelli. 2014. "Merging the Narratives: A Historical Study of Translated Philosophy in Mexico (1940s-1950s)." *The Translator* 20, no. 1: 81-94.
- Custos [pseud.]. 1966. Review of *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941*, by H. P. Krosby. *Sotilasaikakauslehti* 11: 553-556.
- D'hulst, Lieven. 2010. "Translation History." In *Handbook of Translation Studies Online*.
- D'hulst, Lieven. 2012. "(Re)locating Translation History: From Assumed Translation to Assumed Transfer." *Translation Studies* 5, no. 2: 139-155.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.



- Gummerus. 2001. *Gummerus: Bibliografia 1901–2000*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Hannoum, Abdelmajid. 2003. "Translation and the Colonial Imaginary: Ibn Khaldûn Orientalist." *History and Theory* 42, no 1: 61-81.
- Harttila, Pekka. 1961. "Muuan arviointi", review of *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, by C. L. Lundin. *Satakuntalainen* 1: 14-15.
- Helsingin Sanomat. 1957. "Amerikkalainen tutkimus Suomen osuudesta sotaan". *Helsingin Sanomat* 2 February 1957.
- Helsingin Sanomat. 1965. Advertisement for *Välirauha* by Anthony F. Upton. *Helsingin Sanomat* 9 October 1965.
- Helsingin Sanomat. 1967. "Luen vaikka suomea, jos tarve vaatii". *Helsingin Sanomat* 8 August 1967.
- Helsingin Sanomat. 1968. Advertisement for *Suomen valinta 1941* by Hans Peter Crosby. *Helsingin Sanomat* 25 April 1968.
- Herlin, Ilkka. 1998. "Suomi-neidon menetetty kunnia – Ajopuuteorian historia." In *Historiantutkijan muotokuva*, edited by Päiviö Tommila, 199-238. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.
- Jalanti, Heikki. 1968. "Suomen vaikea valinta?", review of *Suomen valinta 1941*, by H. P. Crosby. *Nootti* 8/68: 150-152.
- Jokipii, Mauno. 1987. *Jatkosodan synty: tutkimuksia Saksan ja Suomen sotilaallisesta yhteistyöstä 1940-41*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Jokisipilä, Markku. 2007. "'Kappas vaan, saksalaisia!' – Keskustelu Suomen jatkosodan 1941–1944 luonteesta." In *Sodan totuudet: Yksi suomalainen vastaa 5.7 ryssä*, edited by Markku Jokisipilä, 153-181. Helsinki: Ajatus.
- Kansalliskirjasto. 2010. "Suomen historiallinen bibliografia." Accessed 25 February 2018. [arto.linneanet.fi/histbib.htm](http://arto.linneanet.fi/histbib.htm).
- Kansalliskirjasto. 2015a. "Melinda." Accessed 23 November 2017. [www.kansalliskirjasto.fi/en/services/metadata-reserve-services/melinda](http://www.kansalliskirjasto.fi/en/services/metadata-reserve-services/melinda).
- Kansalliskirjasto. 2015b. "ARTO service description." Accessed 25 February 2018. [www.kansalliskirjasto.fi/en/services/metadata-reserve-services/arto](http://www.kansalliskirjasto.fi/en/services/metadata-reserve-services/arto).
- Kauppila, Erkki. 1968. "Kaksi sotatutkimusta", review of *Suomen valinta 1941*, by H. P. Crosby. *Kommunisti* 7-8: 375-376.
- Kemiläinen, Aira. 2006. "Toinen maailmansota ja Suomen maine 'lännen' arvioimana: Pienen kansan asema suurvaltojen sodassa." *Tieteessä tapahtuu* 24, no. 5: 5-16.

- Kemppanen, Hannu. 2008. *Avainsanoja ja ideologiaa: käännettyjen ja ei-käännettyjen historiatekstien korpuslingvistinen analyysi*. Joensuu: Joensuun yliopisto.
- Kinnunen, Tiina, and Markku Jokisipilä. 2012. "Shifting Images of 'Our Wars': Finnish Memory Culture of World War II." In *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretation*, edited by Tiina Kinnunen and Ville Kivimäki, 435-482. Leiden: Brill.
- Kirjayhtymä 1965. "Anthony F. Upton Väli rauha." *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* 3: 3.
- Kirjayhtymä 1966. "Hans Peter Krosby Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa." *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* 4: 8-9.
- Kirjayhtymä 1967. "Hans Peter Krosby Suomen valinta 1941." *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* 7: 6-7.
- Kivimäki, Ville 2012. "Introduction: Three Wars and their Epitaphs." In *Finland in World War II: History, Memory, Interpretation*, edited by Tiina Kinnunen and Ville Kivimäki, 1-46. Leiden: Brill.
- Kopperi, Pauli A. 1961. "Charles Leonard Lundin: Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa." *Politiikka* 1: 93-94.
- Krosby, Hans Peter. 1966. *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940-1941*. Translated by Markku Järvinen. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- Krosby, Hans Peter. 1967. *Suomen valinta 1941*. Translated by Erkki Ihanainen and Ulla Pakkala. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- Krosby, Hans Peter. 1968. *Finland, Germany, and the Soviet Union, 1940-1941: the Petsamo Dispute*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Kujamäki, Pekka. 2012. "Mediating for the Third Reich. On Military Translation Cultures in World War II in Northern Finland." In *Languages and the Military: Alliances, Occupation and Peace Building*, Edited by Hilary Footit and Michael Kelly, 86-99. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Leino-Kaukiainen, Pirkko. 1990. *Kirja koko elämä: Gummeruksen kustannustoiminnan historia*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Lundin, Charles Leonard. 1957. *Finland in the Second World War*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lundin, Charles Leonard. 1958. *Finland och Andra Världskriget*. Translated by Frank Jernström. Ekenäs: Ekenäs Tryckeri.
- Lundin, Charles Leonard. 1960. *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*. Translated by Jorma Aaltonen. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.

- Manninen, Kerttu, Pentti Nurmio, and Leena Paunonen. 1983. *Kirjayhtymä 1958–1983*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- Meinander, Henrik. 2011. “A Separate Story? Interpretations of Finland in the Second World War.” In *Nordic Narratives of the Second World War: National Historiographies Revisited*, edited by Henrik Stenius, Johan Östling and Mirja Österberg, 55-77. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Mikola, K. J. 1961. “Suomen sodat ‘länsimaisliberaalisessa’ kaukoputkessa”, review of *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, by C. L. Lundin. *Reservin aliupseeri* 1: 7-8.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2014. “Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns.” *The Translator* 20, no. 1: 64-80.
- Mänttari, Pia. 2013. “Historiantutkimus.” In *Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia: 1800-luvulta 2000-luvulle*, edited by Outi Paloposki and H. K. Riikonen, 221-241. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Nornes, Abé Mark. 2010. “‘Pöru Rūta’/Paul Rotha and the Politics of Translation.” In *Critical Readings in Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker, 96-112. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Nurmio, Pentti. 1990. *Kirjoja, ihmisiä*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- O’Sullivan, Carol. 2012. “Introduction: Rethinking Methods in Translation History.” *Translation Studies* 5, no. 2: 131-138.
- Paloposki, Outi. 2010. “The Translator’s Footprints.” In *Translators’ Agency*, edited by Tuija Kinnunen and Kaisa Koskinen, 86-107. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Paloposki, Outi, and H. K. Riikonen. 2013. “Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden kritiikistä.” In *Suomennetun tietokirjallisuuden historia: 1800-luvulta 2000-luvulle*, edited by Outi Paloposki and H. K. Riikonen, 599-616. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Polvinen, Tuomo. 1965. “Välirauha 1940–1941”, review of *Välirauha*, by A. F. Upton. *Ulkopolitiikka* 2: 20-21.
- Puurunen, Leo. 1966. Review of *Välirauha*, by A. F. Upton. *Kaltio* 3: 99-100.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome.
- Reiss, Katharina. 2000. *Translation Criticism - The Potentials and Limitations: Categories and Criteria for Translation Quality Assessment*. Manchester: St. Jerome.

- RHn [pseud.]. 1965. "Finland in Crisis 1940–1941 (suomeksi Välirauha)", review of *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941: A Study in Small-power Politics*, by A. F. Upton. *Sotilasaikakauslehti* 11: 588-590.
- Rundle, Christopher. 2012. "Translation as an Approach to History." *Translation Studies* 5, no. 2: 232-240.
- Rundle, Christopher. 2014. "Theories and Methodologies of Translation History: The Value of an Interdisciplinary Approach." *The Translator* 20, no. 1: 2–8.
- S.J. [pseud.]. 1965. "Uptonin kriisi", review of *Finland in Crisis 1940-1941: A Study in Small-power Politics*, by A. F. Upton. *Suomalainen Suomi* 7: 445-446.
- Soikkanen, Timo. 2007. "Objekti vai subjekti – Taistelu jatkosodan synnystä." In *Sodan totuudet: Yksi suomalainen vastaa 5.7 ryssää*, edited by Markku Jokisipilä, 101-124. Helsinki: Ajatus.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem. 2006. *Theories on the Move: Translation's Role in the Travels of Literary Theories*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2002. "What Texts Don't Tell: The Use of Paratexts in Translation Research." In *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, edited by Theo Hermans, 44-60. Manchester: St. Jerome Pub.
- Terä, Martti V. 1965. "Anthony F. Uptonin teos 'Välirauha' ja historia", review of *Välirauha*, by A. F. Upton. *Sotilasaikakauslehti* 12: 647-657.
- Tommila, Päiviö. 1989. *Suomen historiankirjoitus: Tutkimuksen historia*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- University of Albany. 2015. "H. Peter Krosby Full Curriculum Vitae." Accessed 22 November 2017. [www.albany.edu/history/assets/Krosby\\_CV-November\\_2015.docx](http://www.albany.edu/history/assets/Krosby_CV-November_2015.docx).
- Upton, Anthony F. 1964. *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941: A Study in Small-power Politics*. London: Faber and Faber.
- Upton, Anthony F. 1965. *Välirauha*. Translated by Sirkka Upton. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- Upton, Anthony F. 1970. "Tarvitseeko Suomen historiantutkimus ulkomaalaisia?" Translated by Sirka Upton. *Aika* 3: 140-152.

- Veilahti, V. O. 1961. "Kiisteltyä ja kiistanalaista historiankirjoitusta", review of *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, by C. L. Lundin. *Työläisopiskelija* 2: 36-38.
- Viljanen, T. V. 1965. "Suomen kriisi 1940–1941", review of *Finland in Crisis 1940-1941: A Study in Small-power Politics*, by A. F. Upton. *Historiallinen aikakauskirja* 1: 42-46.
- Wuorinen, John H., ed. 1948. *Finland and World War II: 1939–1944*. New York: The Ronald press company.

## Finnish Summary – Lyhennelmä

### **Ulkomaalaiset Suomen historian kirjoittajina: Kääntämisen rooli jatkosodan historiografiassa**

Jatkosota on yksi Suomen historian tutkituimpia ajanjaksoja, niin varsinaisen historian tutkimuksen kuin näitä tutkimuksia käsittelevän historiografisen tutkimuksenkin osalta. Eräiden 1950- ja 1960-luvuilla julkaistujen angloamerikkalaisten tutkimusten keskeinen merkitys tälle tutkimukselle tunnustetaan hyvin yleisesti (esimerkiksi Tommila (1989), Herlin (1998) ja Soikkanen (2007)), erityisesti niin sanotun ajopuuteorian kumoamisen osalta, mutta näiden tutkimusten ”käännettyys” on historiografisessa kirjallisuudessa jokseenkin poikkeuksetta jätetty huomiotta. Kääntämistä voidaan tässä kontekstissa tarkastella sekä laajemmin kulttuurien välisen vuorovaikutuksen muotona että konkreettisesti sinä asiana, joka mahdollisti näiden ulkomaisten tutkimusten pääsyn osaksi laajempaa yhteiskunnallista keskustelua Suomessa. Tässä tutkimuksessa keskitytään erityisesti jälkimmäiseen tasoon, mutta sen taustalla vaikuttaa ajatus kulttuurien välisen vuorovaikutuksen, ja siis osaltaan myös kääntämisen, välttämättömyydestä vastavoimana nationalismille ja muille sen kaltaisille ilmiöille, jotka saavat kansallisvaltion sulkeutumaan omaan ”yhden totuuden” kuplaansa.

Edellä mainitun kaltainen ilmiö oli havaittavissa 1950- ja 1960-lukujen suomalaisessa jatkosotatutkimuksessa, joka esitti Suomen yksinäisenä selviytyjänä, joka oli ilman merkittävää ulkopuolista apua jälleen torjunut Neuvostoliiton hyökkäyksen. Suomen *de facto* sotilasliitto Hitlerin Saksan kanssa joko kiellettiin kategorisesti tai selitettiin väistämättömäksi tapahtumaketjuksi, jossa Suomi oli suurvaltojen politiikassa kuin ”ajopuuna virrassa”. Kolmen angloamerikkalaisen historioitsijan, Charles Leonard Lundinin, Anthony F. Uptonin ja Hans Peter Krosbyn, rooli tämän tulkinnan haastamisessa oli keskeinen. Tässä tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan heidän alun perin englanniksi julkaistujen tutkimustensa saapumista Suomeen. Kyseiset tutkimukset ovat *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* (Lundin 1960), *Välirauha* (Upton 1965), *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* (Krosby 1966) ja *Suomen valinta 1941* (Krosby 1967). Enemmän kuin näihin kirjoihin itseensä, huomio kiinnittyy kuitenkin niitä ympäröiviin teksteihin, kuten mainoksiin, arvosteluihin sekä käännoksistä löytyviin kääntäjien alaviitteisiin. Tutkimuksen kohteena on kääntämisen historia, ja toisaalta myös

historian kääntäminen (genrenä), mutta se pyrkii myös tarjoamaan käänöstutkimuksen näkökulman suomalaiseen jatkosodan historiografiaan, josta se on, kuten edellä todettu, tähän mennessä puuttunut. Historiografialla tarkoitetaan tässä tutkimuksessa ”historiankirjoituksen historiaa”, eli aiempaa historiantutkimusta käsitteleviä tieteellisiä tekstejä.

### **Lyhyt katsaus aiempaan tutkimukseen**

Kääntämisen historia on 1990-luvulta alkaen muodostunut omaksi tutkimusalakseen käänöstieteen sisällä, ja sen kautta käänöstutkijoiden mielenkiinto on yhä enemmän kohdistunut historiaan. Historiantutkimus ei kuitenkaan, kuten Burke ja Hsia (2007: 3) toteavat, ole ollut läheskään samassa määrin kiinnostunut kääntämisestä. Historian näkökulmasta kääntämistä voidaan tarkastella yhtenä mikrohistorian mahdollisista tutkimuskohteista (Adamo 2003: 85) yhdessä muiden sellaisten ilmiöiden kanssa, joita perinteinen, lähinnä valtioiden välisiin suhteisiin keskittyvä, historiankirjoitus on pitänyt enemmän tai vähemmän merkityksettöminä. Mikrohistorialla on paljon yhteistä käänöstieteen piirissä tehtävän historiantutkimuksen kanssa myös sen käyttämien lähteiden ja metodien osalta.

Eräs verrattain marginaalinen, mutta tämän tutkimuksen kannalta hyvin mielenkiintoinen, kääntämisen historian tutkimusalue on historiatekstien kääntäminen. Yksi ensimmäisistä tämän aihealueen tutkimuksista oli Abdelmajid Hannoumin (2003) tutkimus keskiaikaisen arabihistorioitsija Ibn Khaldûnin tekstien kääntämisestä ranskaksi Algeriassa Ranskan siirtomaahallinnon aikana. Hannoum kuvaa artikkelissaan miten Khaldûnin eri ihmisryhmien määrittelemiseen käyttämät kategoriat muuttuivat käänöksessä kolonialismin kontekstiin soveltuviksi ”roduiksi” ja ”kansoiksi”, mikä on vaikuttanut siihen, miten Khaldûnia edelleen tulkitaan, jopa jälkikolonialistisen tutkimuksen piirissä (Hannoum 2003: 81). Historiateosten käänöksiä ovat tutkineet myös Baár (2010) ja Burke (2007); ensin mainitun tutkimus käsittelee käänöksiä valistusajan ja jälkimmäisen taas esimodernin ajan Euroopassa.

Kääntämistä kulttuurien välisenä vuorovaikutuksena on tutkittu verrattain paljon ja monista eri näkökulmista. Esimerkkejä siitä ovat vaikkapa D’hulstin (2012) tutkimus käänöskirjallisuudesta Belgiassa sen itsenäisyyden ensimmäisinä vuosikymmeninä, Susam-Sarajevan (2006) Roland Barthesin vastaanottoa Turkissa ja

Hélène Cixous'n vastaanottoa Yhdysvalloissa käsittelevä tutkimus tai Nornes'n (2010) tutkimus elokuvateoreetikko Paul Rothan, ja nimenomaan hänen teostensa käännösten, roolista dokumentti- ja propagandaelokuvien kehityksessä 1930- ja 1940-lukujen Japanissa.

Toisenlaisesta näkökulmasta mainitsemisen arvoinen on myös Kemppanen (2008), jonka tutkimuksessaan käyttämä aineisto, Jatkosotaa käsittelevien historiatekstien suomennokset, on hyvin saman kaltaista kuin ne teokset joihin tämä tutkimus keskittyy. Kemppasen tutkimus eroaa kuitenkin korpuspohjaisten metodiensa osalta merkittävästi tästä tutkimuksesta. Kemppasen käyttämän aineiston lähtökielenä on venäjä, mikä tekee siitä mielenkiintoisen vastaparin tämän tutkimuksen aiheena oleville angloamerikkalaisille historiateksteille, vaikkei tutkimusten suora vertailu niiden erilaisten metodien ja tavoitteiden vuoksi olekaan mahdollista.

### **Käännösteokset osana jatkosodan historiografiaa**

Ajopuuteorialla viitataan Arvi Korhosen kirjassaan *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi* (1961) esittämään historiantulkintaan, joka oli pitkälti jatkoa sotasyllisyys-oikeudenkäynnissä esitetyille puolustuksen argumenteille. Sen mukaan Suomi oli ajautunut jatkosotaan ja Saksan "kanssasotijaksi" kuin "vuolaan virran mukaansa tempaama ajopuu". Neuvostoliiton valvonnan alla järjestetyssä poliittisessa oikeudenkäynnissä tällaiseen väistämättömyyteen vetoaminen oli ainoa käytettävissä oleva puolustus (Soikkanen 2007: 111).

Korhonen oli esittänyt samankaltaisia argumentteja jo paljon aikaisemmin, mutta anonyymisti. Hänen käsikirjoituksensa julkaistiin Yhdysvalloissa vuonna 1948 nimellä *Finland and World War II: 1939–1944* John H. Wuorisen toimittamana ja englanniksi kääntämänä, mutta Korhosta ei kirjassa nimetä vaan sen kirjoittajaksi mainitaan vain "anonyymi suomalainen", joka ei Suomen poliittisesta tilanteesta johtuen halunnut julkaista tutkimustaan kotimaassaan. Herlinin (1998: 202-203) mukaan Korhonen kirjoitti teoksen heti sodan jälkeen, "osana sotasyllisten puolustuskampanjaa" (ibid.). Kääntäminen oli siis mielenkiintoisella tavalla osana tapahtumaketjua jo ennen tämän tutkimuksen varsinaisena aiheena olevien teosten ilmestymistä suomeksi.



Yhdysvaltalaisen Charles Leonard Lundinin tutkimus *Finland in the Second World War* (1957) oli eräänlainen vastaus Korhosen edellä mainittuun kirjaan. Lundin kritisoi voimakkaasti Suomen sodanaikaista johtoa ja esitti tapahtumista version, jossa Suomi oli tietoisesti hakeutunut Saksan liittolaiseksi. Lundinin tutkimus kärsi saatavilla olleiden lähteiden vähäisyydestä, ja sitä pidetäänkin yleensä melko heikotasoisena (Soikkanen 2007: 109). Tutkimus perustui suurelta osin muistelmiin ja muihin toissijaisiin lähteisiin, mikä yhdessä muutamien ilmeisten asiavirheiden kanssa teki Lundinin väitteiden kumoamisen melko helpoksi hänen suomalaisille vastustajilleen. Lundinin tutkimus onkin nykypäivän näkökulmasta tarkasteltuna erityisen merkittävä nimenomaan keskustelunavauksena, ei niinkään varsinaisen sisältönsä osalta.

Gummerus julkaisi Lundinin teoksen suomeksi vuonna 1960 nimellä *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*, mutta se oli ilmestynyt Suomessa jo aikaisemmin Ekenäs Tryckerin vuonna 1958 julkaisemana ruotsinkielisenä käännöksenä nimellä *Finland och andra Världskriget*. Varmuutta siitä, miksi teos käännettiin ruotsiksi aikaisemmin kuin suomeksi ei ole, mutta suomenkielisen laitoksen nimiösivun ilmoitus siitä, että suomennos perustuu ”tekijän tarkastamaan” ruotsinkieliseen laitokseen viittaa siihen, että Lundin itse osasi ruotsia, mikä on saattanut vaikuttaa käännöskielen valintaan. Helsingin Sanomissa 2.2.1957 julkaistussa artikkelissa tosin kerrotaan, että Lundin on ”opiskellut sekä suomea että ruotsia”. Ruotsinnosta on todennäköisesti käytetty suomennoksen pohjana sen vuoksi, että Lundin oli tehnyt teokseen käännöksen yhteydessä muutoksia ja korjauksia, jotka haluttiin luonnollisesti saada mukaan myös suomennokseen. Lundin kertookin suomenkielisen laitoksen esipuheessa (1960: 10), että myös se sisältää muutoksia verrattuna teoksen kahteen aikaisempaan versioon. Englantia osaavan kääntäjän puuttuminen ei ainakaan ole ollut syynä välikielen käyttöön, sillä teoksen sen ruotsinkielisen käännöksen pohjalta suomentanut Jorma Aaltonen käänsi samalle kustantajalle Edward Crankshaw’n *Gestapon* englannista suomeksi heti seuraavana vuonna.

Lundinia seurasi vuonna 1964 isobritannialainen Anthony F. Upton teoksellaan *Finland in Crisis 1940-1941: A Study in Small-power Politics*. Uptonin tutkimus ei tutkimustulostensa puolesta oikeastaan eronnut kovinkaan radikaalisti Arvi Korhosen 1961 julkaistusta tutkimuksesta ja sen esittämästä ajopuuteoriasta (kts. edellä), mutta sai silti Suomessa osakseen ankaraa kritiikkiä, suurelta osin moralisoivan sävynsä vuoksi (Soikkanen 2007: 112, Herlin 1998: 213). Uptonin Suomen historiaan kohdistuvan

kiinnostuksen syyksi mainitaan usein hänen suomalaissyntyinen puolisonsa Sirkka Upton (esim. Herlin 1998: 213), jota Anthony Upton kiittääkin kirjansa esipuheessa (Upton 1964: 14). Sirkka Upton myös suomensi aviomiehensä tutkimuksen, ja Kirjayhtymä julkaisi käännöksen vuonna 1965 nimellä *Välirauha*. Anthony Uptoniin itseensä viitataan monissa lähteissä suomenkielentaitoisena (esim. Viljanen 1965: 42, Polvinen 1965: 20), mikä herättääkin kysymyksen, oliko Sirkka Upton oikeastaan teoksen kääntäjä vaiko enemmänkin oikolukija tai toinen kirjoittaja?

Kolmas, ja jälkikäteen yleensä tutkimustensa sisällön puolesta merkittävimmäksi katsottu, ulkomainen tutkija, joka osallistui Suomen jatkosotaa koskevaan keskusteluun oli Hans Peter Krosby. Hänet mainitaan usein historioitsijana, joka ”upotti ajopuun” (Herlin 1998: 213, Soikkanen 2007: 112, Meinander 2011: 59). Hänen tutkimustensa jälkeen väitteillä Suomen jatkosodan ”erillisyydestä” ei enää ollut juuri tieteellistä uskottavuutta. Norjalaistaustainen Krosby aloitti opintonsa Kanadassa, mutta väitteli tohtoriksi Yhdysvalloissa, ja häneen viitataan vaihtelevasti eri lähteissä joko kanadalaisena tai yhdysvaltalaisena. Krosbyn ensimmäinen aihepiiriin liittyvä tutkimus oli hänen väitöskirjansa *Petsamo in the Spotlight: A Study in Finnish-German Relations, 1940-1941* vuodelta 1966, joka julkaistiin heti samana vuonna myös suomeksi nimellä *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941*. Kääntäjänä toimi Markku Järvinen. Teos pääsi laajempaan levitykseen englanniksi vasta vuonna 1968, kun siitä julkaistiin päivitetty laitos nimellä *Finland, Germany, and the Soviet Union, 1940-1941: the Petsamo Dispute*. Uptonin *Välirauhan* tapaan myös Krosbyn suomalainen kustantaja oli Kirjayhtymä. Krosbyn ensimmäinen tutkimus käsittelee koko jatkosodan sijaan pelkästään sen taustoihin liittyvää Petsamon nikkelikriisiä, mutta se on kuitenkin tärkeä osa jatkosotatutkimukseen vaikuttaneiden ulkomaisten tutkimusten jatkumoa.

Krosby tutki jatkosotaa ja sen syitä huomattavasti laajemmin vuonna 1967 julkaistussa toisessa teoksessaan *Finland and Operation 'Barbarossa': The Making of a German Cobelligerent, 1940–1941*. Teos tunnetaan kuitenkin huomattavasti paremmin sen suomenkieliselä nimellä *Suomen valinta 1941*, koska tutkimuksen englanninkielistä alkuperäisversiota ole koskaan julkaistu. Ainoa teoksesta julkisesti saatavilla oleva versio on sen Kirjayhtymän julkaisema Erkki Ihanaisen suomennos. Nide sisältää myös yli sata sivua kopioita tutkimuksen lähteinä käytetyistä saksalaisista asiakirjoista, joiden suomentajaksi on merkitty Ulla Pakkala. Syynä kahden eri suomentajan käyttöön on oletettavasti eri lähtökieli (Ihanaisella englanti, Pakkalalla pääasiassa saksa), mutta myös

tekstilajien eroavuus on saattanut vaikuttaa ratkaisuun. *Helsingin Sanomissa* 8.8.1967 julkaistussa artikkelissa, jossa Crosby kertoo siinä vaiheessa vielä julkaisemattomasta tutkimuksestaan, hän mainitsee, että joutuu kirjoittamaan Suomen ja Yhdysvaltojen markkinoille käytännössä eri kirjan, koska yhdysvaltalaisille lukijoille täytyy selostaa niin paljon enemmän asioiden taustoja (*Helsingin Sanomat* 1967). Ilmeisesti *Suomen valinta 1941* oli siis tarkoitus julkaista myös englanniksi, mahdollisesti samaan tapaan päivitettyinä kuin hänen edellinen tutkimuksensa, mutta syystä tai toisesta näin ei koskaan tapahtunut. Tämä muuttaa mielenkiintoisella tavalla käännökseen ja lähtötekstin keskinäistä suhdetta verrattuna tyypilliseen tilanteeseen: *Suomen valinta 1941* on epäilemättä käänнос, mutta se on silti teoksen 'pääversio' koska englanninkielistä alkuteosta ei koskaan julkaistu.

### **Paratekstit**

Parateksteillä tarkoitetaan julkaistuun tekstiin tavalla tai toisella liittyviä muita tekstejä, kuten esimerkiksi kirjan takakansitekstiä tai kirjaa esittelevää mainosta. Termin kehittänyt Gérard Genette (1997) laski myös käännökset parateksteiksi, mikä ei käännostieteen näkökulmasta ole kovin käyttökelpoinen määritelmä (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002), koska se edustaisi paluuta käsitykseen, jonka mukaan käänнос on ainoastaan alkuteoksen jäljitelmä eikä itsenäinen teksti. Tämä ei kuitenkaan ole estänyt myös monia kääntämisen tutkijoita hyödyntämästä Genetten ideoita omiin tarkoituksiinsa paremmin sopiviksi muokattuina. Kääntämisen historian tutkimuksessa paratekstit voivat tarjota arvokasta tietoa esimerkiksi siitä, miten käännökset on esitelty yleisölle ja minkälainen niiden vastaanotto on ollut (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002: 47).

Tässä tutkimuksessa tarkastellaan sekä Lundinin, Uptonin ja Krosbyn kirjojen takakansitekstejä ja niiden Suomessa julkaistuja mainoksia, siis kustantajien tuottamia paratekstejä, että kyseisissä kirjoissa olevia kääntäjän alaviitteitä, eli kääntäjien tuottamia paratekstejä. Ensin mainitut voivat tarjota tietoa siitä, miten teokset esiteltiin niiden potentiaaliselle lukijakunnalle, ja myös siitä, millaisia motiiveja niiden julkaisun taustalla mahdollisesti oli, kun taas jälkimmäiset antavat viitteitä siitä, minkälaisen roolin kääntäjät ovat prosessissa ottaneet. Näiden lisäksi tarkastellaan myös kirjojen Suomessa julkaistuja arvosteluja, jotka voidaan nähdä "kolmannen osapuolen" tuottamina parateksteinä.

Kaikkia tarkasteltavien kirjojen suomalaislehdissä julkaistuja mainoksia ei pyritty keräämään, vaan tutkittavana oli vain esimerkin omainen valikoima, johon sisältyi kustantajan omissa esitteissä (*Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* ja *Gummeruksen tiedonantoja*) julkaistujen mainosten, joita oli yksi per kirja, lisäksi muutamia *Helsingin Sanomissa* julkaistuja mainoksia, vähintään yksi jokaisesta kirjasta. Kaikki mainokset perustuvat selvästi ainakin osittain kyseisten kirjojen takakansissa käytettyihin teksteihin, joten mainoksia ja takakansitekstejä on loogista tarkastella yhdessä.

Lundinin *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* suomennettiin vasta useita vuosia sen jälkeen kun teos oli julkaistu englanniksi, ja se oli ehtinyt herättää Suomessa vilkasta keskustelua jo ennen suomennoksen ilmestymistä. Tämä seikka on hyvin keskeisessä osassa myös kaikessa Lundinin teoksen markkinointimateriaalissa. Sekä kirjan takakansiteksti että useimmat sen mainoksista sisältävät maininnan siitä, että teos on ”herättänyt jo ennen suomenkielisen laitoksen ilmestymistä suurta huomiota”, koska sen tekijä on käsitellyt asioita jotka ”ovat meillä olleet eräällä lailla ’tabuja’” (Gummerus 1960). Näitä ’tabuja’ ei mainoksissa sen tarkemmin määritellä, vaan niissä puhutaan ainoastaan ”historiamme hämäristä kohdista”, mutta kirjan takakansitekstissä mainitaan lisäksi Lundinin arvostelevan erityisesti Suomen sodanaikaista yhteistyötä Saksan kanssa (Lundin 1960). *Gummeruksen tiedonannoissa* julkaistu mainos eroaa myöhemmistä *Helsingin Sanomissa* julkaistuista mainoksista siinä, että se hyödyntää runsaasti lainauksia kirjaa koskevasta keskustelusta. Kaksi lainauksista on peräisin *Ylioppilaslehestä*, ja kolmannessakin professori Jan-Magnus Jansson mainitsee *Ylioppilaslehden* esimerkkinä viimeaikaisesta keskustelusta (Gummerus 1960).

Vaikka Uptonin *Välirauhan* ja sen englanninkielisen alkuteoksen julkaisujen välillä kulunut aika oli vain muutamia kuukausia, eikä vuosia kuten Lundinin tutkimuksen tapauksessa, *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksissa* julkaistu mainos viittaa samaan tapaan teoksen jo sen ennen sen suomennoksen julkaisua saamaan huomioon (Kirjayhtymä 1965). Tätä teemaa ei kuitenkaan esiinny *Välirauhan* takakannessa tai kirjan *Helsingin Sanomissa* julkaistuissa kahdessa mainoksessa. Kaikille näille sen sijaan on yhteistä professori E. A. Bergin *Helsingin Sanomissa* julkaistun teoksen englanninkielisen laitoksen arvion lainaaminen. Edellä mainittu *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksissa* julkaistu mainos sisältää pisimmän version lainauksesta, jossa Berg kommentoi positiiviseen sävyyn teoksen objektiivisuutta ja toteaa Uptonin olevan kriittisyydestään huolimatta Suomelle myötämielinen (ibid.). Kirjan takakannessa on

käytetty muuten samaa lainausta, mutta sen viimeinen virke jossa Berg vertaa Uptonin kynää kirurgin veitseen, on jätetty pois. *Helsingin Sanomissa* julkaistut mainokset sisältävät vain virkkeen tai pari samasta lainauksesta, mutta perustuvat silti hyvin vahvasti Bergiltä lainattuun tekstiin, sillä juuri muuta niissä ei kirjan nimeä ja perustietoja lukuun ottamatta ole.

Krosbyn *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* -teoksen mainos *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksissa* esittelee sen osana sarjaa, jonka Uptonin ”suurta kohua aiheuttanut” *Välirauha* aloitti (Kirjayhtymä 1966). Mainoksessa ja kirjan takakannessa on käytetty samaa tekstiä, jossa myös kerrotaan tutkimuksen perustuvan uusiin, aikaisemmin Suomessa julkaisemattomiin lähteisiin. Ainoa *Helsingin Sanomista* löytynyt teoksen mainos perustuu kolmeen eri aikakauslehdistä otettuun lyhyeen lainaukseen, jotka korostavat lähinnä kirjan mielenkiintoisuutta ja jännittävyttä.

Krosbyn *Suomen valinta 1941* -teoksen markkinointiteksteissä, näkyvimmin kirjan takakannessa ja *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksissa* julkaistussa mainoksessa, esiintyy myös samankaltainen maininta uusista lähteistä. Myös tässä tapauksessa kirjan mainonnasta löytyi *Helsingin Sanomista* vain yksi esimerkki. Se sisältää saman maininnan uusista lähteistä kuin edellä mainitut tekstit, mutta selvästi pienemmällä kirjasimella painettuna kuin kysymykset ”Miksi Hitler muutti mieltään ja teki Suomesta liittolaisen?” ja ”Miksi suurvaltojen asenteet Suomea kohtaan muuttuivat jatkosodan jälkeen?” (*Helsingin Sanomat* 1968). Ensimmäistä näistä kysymyksistä voidaan pitää melko provokatiivisena, koska se antaa suoraan ymmärtää Suomen olleen Saksan liittolainen. Joko Kirjayhtymä on halunnut muotoilla mainoksen niin, että se varmasti herättää huomiota tai kenties kyseinen väite ei enää vuonna 1968 ollut yhtä kiistanalainen kuin muutamia vuosia aikaisemmin. Vastaavaa virkettä ei esiinny kirjan muissa markkinointiteksteissä, mutta suurvaltojen suhtautumista Suomeen koskevan kysymyksen sisältö löytyy hieman toisenlaisessa muodossa myös kirjan takakannesta ja *Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksissa* julkaistusta mainoksesta. Molemmissa on käytetty samaa hieman muokattua lainausta Krosbyn tekstistä, jossa kommentoidaan Suomen nauttimaa kansainvälistä sympatiaa talvisodan aikana, ja sen puutetta jatkosodan jälkeen (Krosby 1967 ja Kirjayhtymä 1967).

*Kirjayhtymän tiedotuksia* mainostaa, että *Suomen valinta 1941* -teoksessa on ”kiintoisa dokumenttikuvitus” (Kirjayhtymä 1967), josta myös esitellään yksi

esimerkki. Kirjaan sisältyvät alkuperäisten dokumenttilähteiden suomennokset ovat kuitenkin pelkästään tekstimuodossa, eikä kirjassa muutenkaan ole minkäänlaista kuvitusta. Vaikuttaa siis siltä, että Kirjayhtymän suunnitelmat muuttuivat mainoksen ja itse kirjan julkaisun välillä. Mainoksessa ei myöskään mainita dokumenttiosion suomentanutta Ulla Pakkalaa, vaikka Krosbyn kirjoittaman osuuden suomentanut Erkki Ihanainen on mainittu. Mainoksen kuvitukseksi valittu dokumentti, josta tarjotaan myös suomennos erillisessä tekstilaatikossa, on myös sikäli mielenkiintoinen, ettei tätä nimenomaista dokumenttia edes löydy kirjan liitteistä. Crosby tosin viittaa tähän kenraalileversti Falkenhorstin päiväkäskyyn tekstissään, ja esittää suorana lainauksena suurimman osan dokumentin sisällöstä, mutta yhden virkkeen osalta sen suomennos löytyy ainoastaan kirjan mainoksesta, ei kirjasta itsestään.

Suomennosten markkinointimateriaalissa keskeisinä teemoina nousevat esiin teosten kiistanalaisuus, johon viitataan tavalla tai toisella kaikkien neljän kohdalla, tutkijoiden myönteinen suhtautuminen Suomeen, johon viitataan Lundinin ja Uptonin teosten parateksteissä sekä tutkimuksissa käytetyt uudet lähteet, joihin viitataan molempien Krosbyn teosten tapauksissa ja epäsuoremmin myös Uptonin kohdalla.

Kääntäjän alaviitteitä löytyi ainoastaan kahdesta suomennoksesta, Sirkka Upton ja Markku Järvinen eivät olleet käyttäneet alaviitteitä lainkaan, kuten ei myöskään *Suomen valinta 1941* -teoksen dokumenttiliitteet kääntänyt Ulla Pakkala. Jorma Aaltonen sen sijaan on Lundinin teoksen suomennoksessaan käyttänyt melko paljon alaviitteitä. Suurin osa niistä on suomennoksia tai selityksiä saksankielisille termeille ja nimille, jotka on varsinaisessa tekstissä jätetty kääntämättä. Vastaavia tekstissä vieraskielisiksi jätettyjen asioiden selityksiä on käytetty myös ruotsinkielisten sanomalehtiartikkeleiden nimien ja akateemiselle englannille tyypillisten latinankielisten fraasien tapauksissa. Näiden selittävien alaviitteiden lisäksi teoksessa on myös kaksi alaviitettä, joissa Aaltonen kertoo jättäneensä tekstistä pois kohtia, jotka suomalainen lukija Aaltosen käsityksen mukaan jo tietää. Poistetut osiot ovat kumpikin pituudeltaan noin kaksi sivua, eli kyseessä on melko rohkea lähtötekstin muokkaaminen. On tosin syytä huomioida, että tämän valinnan on saattanut tehdä kustantaja eikä Aaltonen itse.

Toinen alaviitteitä käyttänyt kääntäjä oli Erkki Ihanainen, mutta hänen alaviitteensä ovat varsin toisenlaisia kuin Aaltosen: Ihanainen täydentää tai korjaa Krosbyn tekstiä neljässä alaviitteessä, jotka osoittavat hänen tehneen omaa historiallista

tutkimustaan käännösprosessin yhteydessä. Yhdessä alaviitteistä Ihanainen vain korjaa tekstissä lainatun saksalaisen dokumentin antamaa virheellistä numeroa, mutta kolmessa muussa hän kertoo ilmeisesti itse haastattelemiensa suomalaisten sotilashenkilöiden, joiden nimet ja sotilasarvot hän myös mainitsee, vahvistavan Krosbyn tekstissä olevan tiedon.

Tutkimuksen kohteena olevista kirjoista käytyä julkista keskustelua pyrittiin tutkimuksessa hahmottamaan tarkastelemalla niistä kirjoitettuja arvosteluja. Parhaaksi tavaksi hankkia edustava valikoima arvosteluja katsottiin Kansalliskirjaston ylläpitämän Suomen historiallisen bibliografian käyttäminen, sekä apuna arvostelujen löytämisessä että niiden valintaperusteena. Mukaan hyväksyttiin siis ainoastaan arvosteluja, jotka löytyivät bibliografiasta. Suomen historiallinen bibliografia kattaa noin 200 kotimaista aikakauslehteä ja muuta kausijulkaisua, sekä joitakin ulkomaisia julkaisuja, joiden tarkempaa määrää ei kuitenkaan bibliografian kuvauksessa ole kerrottu (Kansalliskirjasto 2010). Bibliografian kokoamisessa käytettyä kriteeristöä ei ole julkaistu, mutta hakutulosten perusteella oli pääteltävissä, että bibliografiaan on kelpuutettu muitakin kuin varsinaisia akateemisia julkaisuja, kuten esimerkiksi *Sotilasaikakauslehti*, mutta se ei taas toisaalta sisällä *Helsingin Sanomien* kaltaisia päivälehtiä.

Hakutuloksista karsittiin pois arvostelut, jotka oli julkaistu muualla kuin Suomessa tai jollakin muulla kielellä kuin suomeksi. Uptonin *Välirauhan* kohdalla mukaan hyväksyttiin myös sen englanninkielistä laitosta koskevat arvostelut, joita oli yhteensä kolme kappaletta. Kaikki muut bibliografiasta löydetty arvostelut koskivat suomennoksia. Näillä kriteereillä aineistoksi valikoitui yhteensä kuusitoista arvostelua varsin laajasta otannasta erilaisia julkaisuja, esimerkiksi *Sotilasaikakauslehti* ja *Suomalainen Suomi*.

Tutkimuksessa kiinnitettiin huomiota erityisesti siihen, olivatko arvioijat huomioineet tekstin olevan käännös (pois lukien tietenkin edellä mainitut Uptonin kirjan englanninkielisen laitoksen arvostelut), sekä myös laajemmin siihen, kommentoitiinko arvosteluissa teosten roolia osana kulttuurien välistä vuorovaikutusta, eli käytännössä yleensä sen vaikutusta suomalaiseen historiankirjoitukseen. Teoksen käännettyys oli mainittu suurimmassa osassa arvosteluista, vain kolmesta maininta siitä puuttui

kokonaan. Kääntäjä sen sijaan oli nimetty noin puolessa arvosteluista, eli vain seitsemässä arvostelussa kolmestatoista.

Lundinin *Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa* -teoksen arvioita oli yhteensä viisi. Kolmessa niistä mainittiin teoksen epätavallinen ”kiertotie” ruotsin kautta suomeksi ja kahdessa myös mainittiin teokseen sen eri versioissa tehdyt muutokset. Arvioijien käsitykset ulkomaisen tutkimuksen vaikutuksesta Suomen historiankirjoitukseen voidaan jakaa kahteen ryhmään: Pauli A. Kopperi *Politiikka*-lehdessä ja V. O. Veilahti *Työläisopiskelijassa* suhtautuivat Lundinin tutkimukseen kriittisesti, mutta pitivät ulkomaista tutkimusta ylipäätään positiivisena asiana, koska se pakottaa kotimaiset historioitsijat uudelleenarvioimaan käsityksiään. Pekka Harttila *Satakuntalaisessa* ja K. J. Mikola *Reservin aliupseerissa* sen sijaan olivat huolissaan siitä, miltä Suomessa käytävä keskustelu lähihistorian tapahtumista näyttää ulkopuolisten silmin, ja pitivät Lundinin tutkimusta lähinnä varoittavana esimerkkinä, jolla kuitenkin saattoi olla myös positiivista vaikutusta suomalaisten omaan historiantutkimukseen.

Kuten edellä mainittiin, Uptonin *Välirauhan* kuudesta arvostelusta kolme perustui sen englanninkieliseen alkuteokseen *Finland in Crisis 1940–1941*. Yhdessä näistä mainittiin, että teos on hiljattain julkaistu myös suomeksi, mutta kaksi muuta arvioijaa ei joko tiennyt suomennosaikeista tai pitänyt niitä mainitsemisen arvoisina. Toinen heistä, T. V. Viljanen *Historiallisessa aikakauskirjassa* julkaistussa arvostelussaan, oli sitä mieltä, ettei Uptonin teos tarjonnut suomalaisille juurikaan uutta, mutta että se oli kuitenkin ”puolueeton ja kokonaisuutena katsoen asiallinen teos ulkolaisten käyttöön” (Viljanen 1965: 42). Viljanen myös listaa teoksessa olevia virheitä, joita hänen mukaansa ”on pidettävä melkein luonnollisina” kun ulkomaalainen kirjoittaa Suomen asioista (ibid.). Nimimerkki RHn sen sijaan suhtautuu *Sotilasaikakauslehdessä* julkaistu arvostelussaan positiivisemmin sekä Uptonin tutkimukseen että erityisesti ulkomaisten historioitsijoiden rooliin Suomen historian tutkimuksessa. RHn (1965: 588) esittää kaksi syytä sille, miksi ulkomaalaiset ovat tutkineet Suomen jatkosotaa enemmän kuin suomalaiset itse. Ensimmäinen näistä syistä on monessa muussakin arvosteluissa (esimerkiksi Tuomo Polvinen *Ulkopolitiikka*-lehdessä) esille tuleva tunneperäisen aiheeseen suhtautumisen puuttuminen, mutta RHn mainitsee myös historiankirjoituksen traditioiden väliset erot. Hänen mukaansa Suomessa ei yleensä ole ollut tapana ylipäätään tutkia lähihistoriaa (ibid.).



*Sotilasaikakauslehti* julkaisi *Välirauhasta* myös toisen arvostelun sen suomenkielisen laitoksen pohjalta, tosin tämä Martti V. Terän kirjoittama pitkä artikkeli on enemmänkin Terän omaan tutkimukseen pohjautuva ”vastaväite” kuin perinteinen kirja-arvostelu. Terä kritisoi teoksen varsinaisen sisällön ohella myös joitakin Uptonin sanavalintoja, joiden hän katsoo antavan tosiasioista virheellisen kuvan. On kuitenkin epäselvää, onko hän tiedostanut teoksen olevan käännös, ja sanavalintojen olevan siis oikeastaan Sirkka eikä Anthony Uptonin tekemiä. Toisaalta Terä mainitsee kyllä arvostelunsa alussa, että ”käännöstyö on tekijän suomalaissyntyisen puolison, rouva Sirkka Uptonin käsialaa” (Terä 1965: 647).

Samankaltaisia kysymyksiä herättää Leo Puurunen (1966) *Kaltiossa* julkaistu arvostelu, jossa hän kritisoi Uptonin käyttämää sanamuotoa ”riippumattomuuden kaventuminen” sillä perusteella, että riippumattomuus tarkoittaa samaa kuin suvereniteetti, joka joko on tai ei ole, eikä siis voi kaventua. Epäselväksi jää, olisiko Puurunen suhtautunut samoin alkuteoksessa käytettyyn ilmaukseen ”restriction of political independence”. Tässäkin tapauksessa Sirkka Upton on arvostelun alussa nimetty teoksen kääntäjäksi, mutta kääntämistä ei arvostelussa muuten käsitellä.

Krosbyn ensimmäisestä kirjasta *Nikkelidiplomatiaa Petsamossa 1940–1941* löytyi Suomen historiallisesta bibliografiasta vain yksi arvostelu, joka on julkaistu *Sotilasaikakauslehdessä* nimimerkillä Custos (1966). Tämä arvostelu oli kuitenkin kenties aineiston mielenkiintoisin, sillä se sisältää myös suoraan kääntäjälle ja kustantajalle suunnattuja kommentteja. Custos perustelee pikkutarkkaa arvosteluaan sillä, että kustantaja on esittänyt teoksen tohtorinväitöskirjana, minkä vuoksi hänen on mielestään ollut pakko puuttua jokaiseen pieneen epäkohtaan, vaikka ne eivät hänen mukaansa vähennäkään tutkimuksen kokonaisarvoa (Custos 1966: 555). Kustantaja ja kääntäjä saavat kritiikkiä esimerkiksi Ison-Britannian eri nimitysten sekalaisesta käytöstä ja saksalaisten sotilastermien epätarkoista käännöksistä. Kustantajaa kritisoidaan myös huolimattomasta oikoluvusta. Custos kritisoi arvostelunsa alussa myös tapaa, jolla kustantaja on esittänyt Krosbyn teoksen osana Uptonin aloittamaa sarjaa, koska tutkimusten välillä on hänen mukaansa ”lähes mittaamaton” ero Krosbyn hyväksi. Uptonista ei Custoksella ole juuri mitään hyvää sanottavaa.

Myös Krosbyn toinen kirja, *Suomen valinta 1941*, arvosteltiin *Sotilasaikakauslehdessä*. Arvostelun kirjoittanut Sampo Ahto mainitsee hänkin

ulkomaisen historioitsijan helpomman aseman, joka johtuu paitsi siitä, ettei heillä ole henkilökohtaista suhdetta tutkimiinsa tapahtumiin, myös siitä, että näillä tapahtumilla on Suomessa ”edelleen ainakin propagandistisesti poliittista merkitystä” (Ahto 1968: 311). Kaksi eri arvioijaa, Tuomo Polvinen *Suomalaisessa Suomessa* ja Heikki Jalanti *Nootissa*, kritisoivat kirjan suomenkielistä nimeä sillä perusteella, ettei Krosby heidän mielestään varsinaisesti esitä tutkimuksessaan mitään valintaa, koska ei esitä toista vaihtoehtoa Suomen tekemälle ratkaisulle (Polvinen 1968: 498, Jalanti 1968: 150). Jalanti suuntaa kritiikkinsä nimenomaan kustantajalle ja kommentoi myös kääntämistä kirjoittaessaan, ettei ”orjallista käännöstä” (Jalanti 1968: 150) teoksen nimestä voida vaatia, koska kyseinen nimi on jo käytössä. Tällä viitataan epäilemättä Arvi Korhosen *Barbarossa-suunnitelma ja Suomi* -teokseen, jonka nimi on varsin lähellä sanatarkkaa käännöstä Krosbyn tutkimuksen alkuperäisestä nimestä. Sekä Polvinen että Jalanti kommentoivat arvosteluissaan jatkosota-aiheisten tutkimusten suurta määrää, mutta päätyvät kuitenkin siihen tulokseen, että Krosbyllä oli vielä uutta annettavaa. Heidän kanssaan jokseenkin päinvastaista mieltä on Erkki Kauppila *Kommunistissa* julkaistussa arvostelussaan, jonka hän aloittaa toteamalla, että suomalainen sotavuosia koskeva tutkimus on ”yhä edelleen äärimmäisen niukkaa” (Kauppila 1968: 375) ja parhaat tutkimukset ovat edelleen ulkomaisia (ibid.).

## **Loppupäätelmät**

Anthony Pym (1998) termein määriteltynä suuri osa tästä tutkimuksesta on ollut kääntämisen arkeologiaa, eli tiettyihin käännöksiin ja kääntäjiin liittyvien faktojen etsimistä, listaamista ja kuvailua, mikä on toki ollut myös tutkimuksen ensisijainen tarkoitus. Samalla kuitenkin tutkimuksessa on saatu myös viitteitä siitä tasosta, johon Pym viittaa termillä selittäminen. Siis siitä, mikä näiden nimenomaisten käännösten olemassaolon syy mahdollisesti on.

Vaikka näidenkin teosten julkaisun pääasiallinen motiivi on epäilemättä ollut taloudellinen, voidaan kustantajiin liittyviä paratekstejä ja muita lähteitä tarkastelemalla havaita, että taustalla on selvästi ollut myös tietoisuus teosten yhteiskunnallisesta merkityksestä ja niiden mahdollisista vaikutuksista siihen, miten jatkosodasta Suomessa puhutaan. Valitettavasti se, minkälaisena näiden teosten kääntäjät ovat oman toimijuutensa tässä prosessissa nähneet, jää pitkälti epäselväksi.

Kokonaisvaltaisemman kuvan muodostamiseksi tarvittaisiin ”henkilökohtaisempia” lähteitä, kuten kääntäjien kirjeenvaihtoa tai käsikirjoituksia, joita ei tietenkään välttämättä ole säilynyt. Tämän tutkimuksen kannalta se ei kuitenkaan varsinaisesti ole ollut ongelma, koska tutkimuksen tavoitteet olivat enemmän makrotasolla, eli kysymyksissä jotka liittyvät kääntämiseen laajempina yhteiskunnallisena ilmiönä, ei niinkään yksittäisissä kääntäjissä eli ilmiön mikrotasolla. Kyse ei toki myöskään ole tiukasta jakolinjasta, vaan molemmat tasot ovat osa samaa ilmiötä, ja kumpaan tasoon tahansa keskittyvä tutkimus antaa lähes väistämättä tietoa myös koko ilmiöstä.

Vaikka alkuteoksesta ja sen käännöksestä usein käännöstieteen ulkopuolella puhutaan ikään kuin samana teoksena, ne eivät täydellisen ekvivalenssin mahdottomuuden vuoksi koskaan varsinaisesti sitä ole. Tämä tutkimus tarjoaa hyvän muistutuksen siitä, että alkuteos ja käännös voivat olla eri teos myös paljon konkreettisemmin, kuten käännöshistoriansa eri vaiheessa muuttunut Lundinin *Finland in the Second World War- / Suomi toisessa maailmansodassa*. Joskus myös alkuteos voi olla pelkkä julkaisematon käsikirjoitus, kuten Krosbyn paremmin *Suomen valinta 1941:nä* tunnettu *Finland and Operation ‘Barbarossa’*.