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ABSTRACT
This paper studies Jonathan Swift’s satire Gulliver’s Travels (1726) and its Finnish translations published between 1876 and 1932. The paper examines how the social critique carried by allusions in the source text was dealt with in the Finnish translations. It compares the translators’ strategies and assesses their impact on the meanings and functions of the allusions. Connections are sought between the adopted strategies and the evolving norms governing translation in Finland at the time. The development of the Finnish literary system is visible in the translators’ attitudes towards the source text, target text readers, and the purpose and functions of literary translation – and in the translations themselves.
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Introduction

“It would be a meek and harmless kind of satire that avoided topical immediacy and specific allusion. And it is a diminution of literature to treat it as historically free-standing” (Roberts 2001:xviii).

Jonathan Swift’s book Gulliver’s Travels (1726) belongs firmly to the canon of Western literature. Yet most people today would primarily associate the book with its various children’s literature adaptations (or perhaps increasingly, its film adaptations). In this paper, Gulliver’s Travels (hereafter GT) is discussed not as a children’s book, but as a sharp political and social satire that functions on two levels: general and topical (Higgins 1994:154). The general satire is directed against the corrupt and weak nature of society, politics and mankind in general. The topical satire targets Swift’s contemporaries, men and women at the top of English politics and society. This paper focuses on the latter, topical satire, and more specifically, on the type of social and political critique GT presents in the form of allusions.¹

The paper presents the results of a study examining how Swift’s social critique carried by allusions was rendered in Finnish translations published between 1876 and 1932. The translation strategies adopted by the Finnish translators were examined at two levels. Global translation strategies were studied by analyzing various paratexts related to the translations, such as translators’ prefaces and notes, book reviews and other critical comments. This analysis covered all seven translations published between 1876 and 1932. Local translation strategies were studied by analyzing certain source-text allusions and their translations. This analysis covered two translations published in 1876 and 1926, and was limited to the first half of GT.

The paper aims to answer the following questions: What global and local strategies did the translators use in dealing with Swift’s satirical discourse? How did the translation strategies
used correspond to the norms governing translation in Finland at the time? How did these translation strategies affect the way target-text readers could participate in Swift’s social and political satire? It will be argued that the development of the Finnish literary system and of Finland as a nation is reflected in the translators’ attitudes towards the source text, target text readers, and the purpose and functions of literary translation – and in the translations themselves.

The paper contains five sections. Following this introduction, Section 2 provides a brief overview of the Finnish socio-cultural environment before and during the period examined, and sheds some light on the contemporary public discussion about the role and functions of literary translation. Section 3 presents the methods and materials used in the study. Section 4 presents the results of the study, and assesses the impact of the translation strategies on the meanings and functions of the allusions. Finally, Section 5 offers some concluding remarks.

Project Finnish Literature

“Transferring the best works of foreign literature into the mother tongue has throughout history proven to be the easiest route to creating a native literature.” (J. V. Snellman 1848/1996:178; my translation)

The period under examination (1876–1932) was crucial for the establishment of a Finnish national literature (Kovala 1996:122). Finnish literature was considered to include translated literature, and literary translation had an important role in the process: it was assumed to provide a model for and to enrich the newly created Finnish literature. At the end of the nineteenth century, the number of literary translations was still higher than the number of original works published in Finnish. This suggests that at the time, translated literature enjoyed a central position in the Finnish literary system (cf. Even-Zohar 1990a, 1990b). By the 1930s, the situation had changed considerably.

After being under Swedish rule for nearly 700 years, Finland was ceded to Russia in 1809. For centuries, the language of the ruling upper classes had been Swedish, while Finnish was the language of the lower social strata. In the new socio-political situation, there was a desire to weaken Finland’s close cultural and political ties with Sweden. The Finnish language was strongly promoted by Finnish and Russian authorities, and several cultural figures began to discuss the need to create a national Finnish literature. In 1831, the Finnish Literature Society was founded to promote Finnish language and literature. In addition to the collection of folk poetry, some of which was later published as the Kalevala, the society aimed to publish fiction and non-fiction in Finnish. This included translations of world literature classics.

The motive for translating world literature into Finnish is well illustrated by the epigraph of this section. The argument was made in the Swedish-language literary paper Litteraturblad för allmän medborgerlig bildning (3/1848) by a prominent cultural figure, Johan Vilhelm Snellman. As the comment suggests, literary translation was seen to have a key role in the creation of a Finnish national literature: it was assumed that by translating the best works of world literature into Finnish, one could create a model for Finnish literature. The function of literary translation was indeed mainly instrumental: the model was more important than the actual works introduced to Finnish readers (Kovala 1999:299). Snellman’s view of the function of literary translation continued to influence the publication of translated literature in Finland for nearly a century (Kovala 1999:301).
Until the first half of the nineteenth century, works translated into Finnish consisted mainly of religious texts. It was commonly assumed that the function of Finnish literature was to spread information and educate the masses (Helleman 1970:418, cf. Paloposki and Oittinen 2000, Paloposki 2002). The upper classes read literary works in their original language or in Swedish or French translations, and books published in Sweden also circulated widely among the relatively small reading public in Finland (Helleman 1970:422, Merisalo et al 1999:126–139, Hakapää 2002). On 27 November 1848, Sven Gabriel Elmgren wrote a long article in the Swedish-language newspaper *Morgonbladet* in favour of the establishment of a society that would undertake the translation of the best world literature:

> It is a recognized fact, that as long as it is at the age of infancy and strives to rise to the level of more advanced nations, every nation’s literature must first adopt the best works of foreign nations, before it can blossom on domestic soil. All national literatures have gone through a translation period, during which they have primarily aimed to assimilate foreign cultural elements, before the time of original works has arrived. (Elmgren 1848:1; my translation)

The above comment suggests an appropriative approach towards literary translation: a new national literature can only flourish once it has devoured the best of foreign literatures (cf. Vieira 1994:66–67; see also Paloposki 2001).

Until the early 1870s, the publication of translated literature was hindered by severe censorship. In addition, the selection of works to be translated into Finnish was mostly up to individual translators who would suggest a title to a publisher (Helleman 1970:425; Kovala 1999:302; Paloposki 2007a:126). To meet the lack of coordination in the publication of translated titles, the Finnish Literature Society launched an initiative in 1871 to produce model translations of world classics by 39 authors. On 13 March 1872, the society published an advertisement in the newspaper *Uusi Suometar*, listing the titles selected, as well as specific instructions and requirements for their translation. For example, the translations were to “correspond to the original works accurately and without alteration, but their language must be clear, fluent and beautiful” (Rothsten 1872:6; my translation). These requirements were accompanied by some liberties:

> On these conditions, the translator is given the necessary liberty in terms of grammar and the composition of words, as long as actual grammatical mistakes are avoided. As for individual terms, the translator should, whenever possible, use Finnish equivalents, while avoiding purisms that would make the style too clumsy. (Rothsten 1872:6; my translation)

The society offered a modest reward of 1,000 Finnish marks for translations that fulfilled those criteria. This list of world classics included one work by Jonathan Swift: *Gulliver’s Travels*. This was the background context for the first Finnish translation, which appeared five years later in 1876.

**Methods and Materials**

The theoretical approach of this paper is mainly descriptive. Translation is seen here as communication that takes place between different socio-cultural systems, which contain semiotic, literary, cultural and social structures. Moreover, each culture or society is seen as a heterogeneous, open, and dynamic network of systems: a polysystem (Even-Zohar 1990a). In this network of intersecting and partly overlapping systems, literature (which includes the literary institution, authors, translators, readers, as well as texts and translations produced in the culture) forms one system, and translated literature forms one of its subsystems.
Translated literature can have a weaker or stronger position in the polysystem at different times, depending on various cultural and social factors, and this position partly conditions the strategies adopted by translators working within the polysystem (Even-Zohar 1990b). Rather than focusing on source texts, this systemic approach emphasizes the study of target texts and their relationship with the target language and culture (see also Hermans 1999). An important role in this approach is played by the norms that affect the translation process. Norms are here understood as socio-cultural constraints that are located somewhere between rules and idiosyncrasies (Toury 1995:54; cf. also Toury 1998 and Chesterman 1997).

In addition to viewing translation as communication taking place between different socio-cultural systems, this paper emphasizes the translator’s role as a mediator of cultural information. Literary texts that are (rightfully or not) called translations are produced by real people: translators, often in cooperation with an editorial staff. While the human aspects influencing the translations examined in this paper could not be studied in detail, we should not forget that translating is an activity greatly influenced by the preferences and decisions of individual translators, even more so in the period under review than today. Indeed, recent historical research on the lives and work of Finnish translators has yielded interesting results on this issue (Riikonen et al 2007). Consequently, this paper also emphasizes the translator’s role as a decision-maker. Through this two-way approach, we can see the translator working in the target socio-cultural system, influenced above all by the translational, literary, linguistic and broader socio-cultural norms governing that system, but also by more practical issues, such as publication and payment policies and personal interests. In this study, both primary and secondary material was used to shed some light on this complex process in Finland in the examined period (cf. Pym 1998:112).

The material examined in this study includes seven Finnish translations of GT published in 1876, 1898, 1904, 1920–1921, 1923–1924, 1926 and 1932. The examined translations are presented in Table 1.

The headings in Table 1 specify the Finnish title, year of publication, the translator’s name, whether or not the translator’s name was mentioned in the Finnish edition, whether or not the translation included a preface or introduction, whether or not the translation was made using a mediating translation (and if yes, the mediating language), and whether or not the translation was published in a book series.

### Table 1: Finnish translations of Gulliver’s Travels 1876–1932

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Translator</th>
<th>Mentioned</th>
<th>Preface</th>
<th>Mediated</th>
<th>Series</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin matkustukset tuntemattomissa maissa</td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>P. Wäyrynen</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES (SWE)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin retket ja seikkailut kääpiöiden ja jättiläisten maassa</td>
<td>1898</td>
<td>S. Reijonen</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES (GER)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin matkat kaukaisilla mailla</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td>S. Suomalainen</td>
<td>PSEUD.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES (*)</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin matka peukaloisten maahan</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>T. Zidbäck</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin matka jättiläisten maahan</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>A. Setälä</td>
<td>INITIALS</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>UNKNOWN</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin matka kääpiöitten luo</td>
<td>1923</td>
<td>A. Kupiainen</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin retket</td>
<td>1926</td>
<td>J. Hollo</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gulliverin matkat</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>A. Kupiainen</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Suomalainen used editions in English, Swedish and German as source texts for his translation.
The analysis of global translation strategies covered all seven translations. The analysis of local translation strategies covered the translations published in 1876 and 1926, because they were the only ones whose actual source texts (a mediating Swedish translation and an annotated English edition) could be located with certainty. Furthermore, since the 1876 translation only contains parts one and two, this part of the analysis was limited to the first half of *GT*. It is, of course, possible to study assumed translations “even in the absence of a source text” (Toury 1995:35). This type of research may, for example, focus on comparing translated and non-translated texts in the target language (e.g., Baker 1993, Laviosa 2002, Olohan 2004). However, such an approach would have been impossible in this study simply because my research focuses on describing the translation strategies adopted for specific elements (certain allusions) present in the source text – in other words, the relationship between the source and target texts (cf. Stewart 2000:210). Nevertheless, as this paper will illustrate, the concept of *source text* can be very elusive and thus requires careful consideration from the researcher.

The global translation strategies were studied by analyzing various paratexts related to the translations: translators’ prefaces and notes, book reviews and other critical comments. Following Genette’s (1987/1997:5) terminology, the term *paratext* here refers to both *peritexts* (textual elements within the book, such as the preface or introduction, notes, comments, etc.) and *epitexts* (textual elements outside the book, such as reviews, correspondence, diaries, etc.). Furthermore, the concept of paratext is mainly applied here to *translational paratexts* – that is, peritexts presumably added by translators and epitexts related to the translations. For two translations (1876 and 1926), the analysis of peritexts was extended to the source texts. Special attention was paid to elements revealing translators’ conceptions of the source text, the target audience and the purpose of the translation, as well as to comments justifying the adopted translation strategies.

The local translation strategies were examined by analyzing certain source-text allusions and their translations. Since the frequent allusions in *GT* have been interpreted in contradictory ways over the centuries, I limited the examined allusions to topical cultural, social or political allusions explained in the endnote of a modern, annotated or critical edition of *GT*. To cover as many allusions as possible, I used four modern editions (Norton, the Modern Library, Penguin, and Wordsworth). Several classical and more recent studies provided background on *GT* and its author, as well as on the historical and still ongoing debate over the interpretation of the book. Although the validity of some interpretations of *GT* made over the centuries can be questioned, the interpretations themselves have become important and inseparable epitexts to the book, because they continue to influence the way people read the story.

In classifying the different types of allusions in the source text, I used the categorization offered by Leppihalme (1997). In this categorization, allusions are divided into proper-name (PN) allusions and key-phrase (KP) allusions. In a PN allusion, a proper name triggers a network of meanings; in a KP allusion, the network is triggered by a familiar phrase.

The two Finnish translations (1876 and 1926) examined in more detail were, and still remain, the most complete editions of *GT* published in Finnish, and they are targeted at a broader audience. The other five Finnish editions were all targeted at children or adolescents, and were all abridged or adapted significantly. Discussion of the abridged translations focuses on illustrating what was considered appropriate for the intended readers of the target texts in Finland during the period in question.
The analysis of the allusions was divided into four stages. First, the allusions in the source text were located, analyzed, and categorized into PN allusions and KP allusions. Second, the Finnish translations of the allusions were located (where applicable) and compared to their source-text counterparts. Third, the translation strategies used for the allusions were categorized according to Leppihalme (see Leppihalme 1997:78–85 for her quantitative results). Fourth, the adopted translation strategies were analyzed in terms of their impact on the meaning of the allusions and on the text as a whole.

Analysis

This section presents the analysis, discussion and results of the study. The first subsection addresses the global translation strategies, while the second examines the local translation strategies.

Global Strategies

This section briefly introduces each translation and describes the global translation strategies adopted by the translators. The analysis covered the translators’ prefaces and other paratexts.

Swedish Interference (1876)

The first Finnish edition of *GT* was translated from a Swedish edition by P. Wäyrynen, although the translator’s name was not mentioned in the book. This policy was common in Finland among translations of popular fiction, but not among translations of classics (Kovala 1996:126). However, the policy did not consistently apply to the translations of *GT*: the translator’s name was missing in the nineteenth-century Finnish translations (1876 and 1898), but was presented in the twentieth century translations (1904, 1920–1921, 1923–1924, 1926 and 1932). This may suggest a gradual change in the status and visibility of translators. The 1923–1924 translations (each containing one part of *GT*) only indicated the translator by her initials (A. S.). One possible reason for this was that this edition was published and marketed as children’s literature, which would naturally fall under the category of popular fiction.

The fact that the translation was made from a Swedish mediating source text followed the contemporary norm in Finland, where it was common for translators to use a mediating language until the end of the nineteenth century. One reason for this was that few people in Finland were competent in English at the time: the position of English in Finnish schools was nonexistent or minimal during Finnish autonomy, and those interested in the language had to learn it privately (Kovala 2007:142). This 214-page translation was published by G. W. Edlund, the biggest publisher in Finland at the time. The book contained the first two parts of *GT*; apparently the intention was to publish the latter two parts in a second volume. The layout and most of the illustrations of the source text were reproduced in the translation.
Published in Stockholm in 1872, the Swedish source text was the more complete of two Swedish editions available at the time (Tarkka 1983:14). Although it was marketed as a translation of the English original, the book was in fact a sanitized children’s version of *GT* typical of the late nineteenth century. In these versions, references to topics such as excrement or urine were regularly omitted or changed (Smedman 1990).

The translator provided the Finnish readers with a six-page preface, which was translated from the Swedish source text (except for one paragraph at the end). The preface begins with a short biographical account of Swift’s life emphasizing, on the one hand, his skill as a writer of sharp social critique, and on the other hand, his bitterness in life that resulted from unhappy childhood experiences, failure to pursue a religious career successfully, and a failed marriage. We are told that the tragedy of his marriage eventually led to misanthropy and madness at old age (cf. Kelly 2002:109). The preface also describes the different levels of satire in the book. This is followed by an explanation of different aspects of the book:

> At first glance it may appear as if *Gulliver’s Travels* only presents well-told fairytales, for both of the first two parts of the book describe nothing more peculiar and mythical than the narrator arriving in a land where people are so small that he can put dozens of them in his pocket, and at another time in a land where people are so large that he in turn appears like a midget. In these brilliantly created opposites the author wants to show us that all greatness is relative and that the pride and conceit of men are follies that deserve the greatest scorn; but in the journey to Lilliput, he turns that scorn against the court and politics of England, and he refers to prominent persons and politicians, such as Robert Walpole, Bolingbroke and the Prince of Wales, who, like many others, find their miniature portraits in Lilliput. In the account of the life and doings of the giants of Brobdingnag, the scorn has a more general application and is targeted at common human weaknesses. This, in addition to the references to specific individuals, is also the purpose of the description of Lilliput. This is why so much clear truth has been and will be found in both of these stories. (Wäyrynen 1876:VI–VII; my translation)
Genette (1987/1997:196–236) divides the functions of prefaces into *themes of the why* and *themes of the how*. The former aim to convince readers about *why* they should read the book in the first place by emphasizing its importance and value. The latter aim to instruct readers about *how* they should read the book – that is, to ensure that the book is read properly. According to Genette’s categorization, this paragraph (except for the last sentence) clearly presents *themes of the how*, that is, instructions on how to read the text (1997b:209). The paragraph explains some of the more complex and culture-specific aspects of the text, and moves the Finnish reader closer to Swift’s text and context. Finally, the Finnish translator added the following closing paragraph:

As the reader can understand from the above preface, many civilized peoples of Europe have translated this book into their language; therefore, one hopes that the book will become popular also in Finnish families, especially since we have very few if any books of this quality. There exists an abridged edition of this book, at least in Swedish, but since the audience for whom it was written does not usually read the book to judge it, but for their own amusement, this Finnish translation is made from the more complete edition, in which a critic would find contradictions and disproportion. The translator took the liberty of omitting one paragraph (not a full page) in the second part, because he deemed its contents inappropriate for young readers. (Wäyrynen 1876:VII–VIII; my translation)

Here, the translator begins by presenting motives for reading the book (*themes of the why*). In other words, the translator states the *skopos* or purpose of the translation (Reiss and Vermeer 1984). In addition to the obvious marketing aspect, the comment reflects the contemporary socio-cultural context of Finland. Furthermore, a clear connection can here be made to the Finnish Literature Society’s model translation project, which listed *GT* among the world classics to be translated into Finnish. The translator then on the one hand justifies his use of the more complete Swedish edition (the rejected edition was targeted at children), but on the other admits to omitting a paragraph from the translation because of its content (explicitly sexual material) that was deemed inappropriate for children. The preface and the adopted global translation strategies suggest that the translation was targeted at both adults and children: the same broad audience that had enjoyed Swift’s text since its publication in 1726.

Adaptation from German (1898)

The second Finnish version of *GT* was translated from a German edition by Sohvi Reijonen, although the translator was not mentioned anywhere in the book.11 The mediating German source text was a children’s adaptation, and the Finnish translation contained parts one and two of *GT*. This heavily abridged 62-page Finnish edition was published by the publisher Werner Söderström, and the title appeared in the children’s series *Joutohetkinä* [During spare moments]. Publishing the translation in a book series followed a contemporary trend that was strengthening at the time. This practice was made possible by the emergence of a “broad reading public and the establishment of new distribution channels”, which allowed publishers to introduce larger editions and lower prices (Kovala 1996:124). Indeed, from this translation onward, all Finnish editions of *GT* examined in this study were published in book series, except for the 1926 edition, which was nevertheless published as part of a project involving several world classics.

The translation included a preface, which replaced the first paragraphs of Swift’s text (Part I, Chapter 1), adding and changing details quite extensively. The preface ends with a description of the book written by ‘Mr. Gulliver’:
It was a large and handsome volume, which received much attention when first published in England, and was read avidly by young and old, poor and rich. Probably you, too, my young friends, would like to know about Mr. Gulliver’s peculiar travels. That is why in this book, I have chosen to tell you his most important adventures. (Reijonen 1898:4; my translation)

The last sentence is quite revealing, because it states to the reader that some adventures have been highlighted while others have been left out in the present edition. In terms of its narrator and author, the preface is an intriguing combination of metatextual commentary and a liberal adaptation of Swift’s work.

A Special Case (1904)

The third Finnish translation, which also contained parts one and two of *GT*, is a special case. It was made by a prolific translator, Samuli Suomalainen, who was mentioned on the title page as “Samuli S.”. According to his correspondence with the publisher, Suomalainen used several editions of *GT* as source texts to produce the Finnish translation. These included at least one, presumably unabridged English edition, one Swedish edition, and two German editions (both unabridged and abridged editions). Thus, the use of several source texts makes this edition a special case, since it incorporates both direct and mediated translation. Furthermore, it would appear that Suomalainen used not one but two English editions as source texts. This 189-page edition was published by the first Finnish-speaking publisher, Otava, and the title appeared in the series *Nuorten kirjoja* [Juvenile literature]. Although the translation was reviewed only as a children’s book, in its catalogue of published books the publisher described it as follows:

This is one of the most curious books ever written. In the book, flooding playfulness rolls over the cliffs of bitterness. Adolescents read it as an exciting adventure book; adults find in it a marvellous social satire. (Kustannusosakeyhtiö Otavan kirjaluettelo 1890–1908:49; my translation)

The publisher clearly saw the text as having two distinct levels: one for children (adventure) and one for adults (social satire). This would suggest that while *GT* was marketed until 1926 as a children’s book in Finland, publishers recognized the more serious side of the book and assumed that even the more or less sanitized versions of Swift’s text could still be read as social satire by adult readers.

*Figure 2: Cover of the 1904 translation of Gulliver’s Travels*
This edition provided no introduction or preface. However, unlike the earlier translations, it contains footnotes providing Finnish equivalents for English weights, measures and currency, and explaining certain words (e.g. fob, a small watch pocket) or concepts (e.g. *lingua franca*, *Whigs and Tories*). In addition, there is an important remark about one of the several source texts. In this comment, which follows a passage describing Gulliver’s fire-fighting by means of urination, the translator notes that the “fire scene was completely omitted from the edition with a preface by Henry Craik. Other editions seem to contain various adaptations of the scene. We have taken this scene mainly from the edition published by George Routledge” (Swift 1904:69; my translation). This would suggest that the translator was working with at least two English source texts, one of which could be *Travels into Several Remote Regions of the World* (preface by Henry Craik) published in New York by Macmillan in 1894, and the other one *Gulliver’s Travels into Several Remote Regions of the World* published in London by George Routledge and Sons in 1880. Another important comment by the translator is a footnote on the articles of impeachment against Gulliver: “As the reader can see, here the author mocks old-fashioned, wordy legal language. Unfortunately, even the modern legal language here [in Finland] is not wholly free of such elaborateness. *Trans. note*” (Swift 1904:82; my translation; emphasis in original). This footnote explains the satirical level of the text. In addition, the translator connects the satire to the Finnish context. Since the source texts used by the translator could not be obtained for analysis and some remain unknown, it is uncertain whether Suomalainen added the comment himself or translated it from one of his source texts.

**Mediated Satire for Children (1920–1921)**

According to its title page, this abridged two-part Finnish edition was “adapted for children from Jonathan Swift’s work by Toini Zidbäck” (Swift 1920:1; my translation). It contained parts one and two of *GT*. The source text of the translation is not mentioned, and it is uncertain whether the translation was made from an English edition or through a mediating language. The edition was published by Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö (WSOY) in two parts (30 and 36 pages) in the children’s series *Satupirtti* [Story cabin].

The first part of the translation included a brief translator’s preface, which describes Swift as an intelligent, bitter man, who in *GT* tried to educate his fellow men through satire (*themes of the how*). The characterization of the author does not differ from most biographies and commentaries on Swift. Indeed, many would state that Swift fell into lunacy in the latter part of his life – this was also done in the preface of the 1876 translation.

**Modernized Children’s Edition (1923–1924)**

This abridged two-part Finnish edition was translated by Annikki Setälä, although only the translator’s initials A. S. were provided on the title page. The edition was published by Otava in two parts (30 and 29 pages) in the children’s series *Mailta ja meriltä* [From lands and seas], and it contained parts one and two of *GT*. Again, the source text of the translation is not mentioned, so it is uncertain whether the translation was made directly from English or through a mediating language. There was no introduction. Part One included one footnote, which is probably from the same publisher’s 1904 edition: “Note: The articles of impeachment mock the turgid style in which English laws are written, and the laws are here imitated with typical phrasing” (Swift 1923:24). Part Two also contains a footnote familiar from the 1904 edition: “Whig and Tory are the main parties in England” (Swift 1924:15).
National Project Completed (1926)

The first complete, unabridged and annotated Finnish edition of *GT* was published in 1926. The translation work was partly funded by the Finnish Literature Fund, which had been established in 1908 to promote the translation of quality literature into and from Finnish. Indeed, during the first decades of the twentieth century, the fund was a major force in influencing the publication of Finnish translations (Kovala 1999:301). The translator of this 515-page Finnish edition, Juho Aukusti Hollo, was one of the most prolific translators in Finland. Hollo worked as a literary critic and a university professor, and translated into Finnish over 170 works of fiction and non-fiction from several languages. The edition was published in the series *Kuuluisia kirjoja* [Famous books]. The source text of this translation is *The Prose Works of Jonathan Swift, D.D.*, Vol. VIII, edited by G. Ravenscroft Dennis and published in London in 1905 by George Bell and Sons. The translation is still the only complete Finnish edition of *GT*. The translation was first published by Kansanvalta, a leftist (social democratic) publisher.

Figure 3: Title page of the 1926 translation of Gulliver’s Travels

Hollo provided an extensive 32-page introduction, in which he discusses the nature of art and works of art in general as well as their connection to the author’s life and times. He presents a brief biography of Swift, and refers readers interested in the author to the Swift biography by Hirn (1918), whom he also acknowledges as the source of his introduction. After summarizing Swift’s personal life and political and literary career, Hollo describes the importance, background and colourful history of *GT* (*themes of the why*), including the complaints Swift had made about printing errors and the list of corrections he had delivered to his friend, Charles Ford (Hollo 1926:xx). Hollo then continues:

[T]he source of this translation, an edition published by G. Ravenscroft Dennis (London: George Bell & Sons, 1905), includes the aforementioned corrections. This critical edition is also the source.
of most of the explanations added to the end of this translation. It is needless to say that Swift’s novel is presented here in its entirety; not even the ‘dubious’ parts have been left out.

The idea that Gulliver’s Travels is specifically a work of children’s literature probably results from the fact that most of Swift’s readers have, at an early age, become familiar with the first two parts of the book or adaptations thereof. According to one view, the first half of the book does indeed form a coherent whole: it recounts, in a rather convivial manner, stories about dwarfs and giants, plays with the relativity of human dimensions, and the author apparently tries to invent as many amusing turns and events as possible. It contains many fairytale-like passages, and the general tone could be described as humoristic. However, this is only one side of the matter. A more detailed examination reveals that this fairytale contains hidden, partly quite severe ridicule against religious conditions and especially political life in England, as well as the ridiculous smallness of mankind, who take pride in their great achievements.

And even though the stories about rope dancing, high and low heels, big and small ends, etc., can be amusing as such, especially to very young readers, who are grateful for everything graphic and peculiar, these allegorical descriptions are nevertheless meant especially for adult readers, primarily, of course, for Swift’s contemporaries, and a modern reader can only understand the author’s real intentions by studying the conditions of Swift’s age. One cannot argue that the comical tone of the story necessarily suffers if the seemingly impulsive playfulness is explained as being sharp mockery of Swift’s contemporaries; on the contrary, occasionally an explanation only brings out the full humour or comedy of the passage.

So, when we read that the Lilliputian Treasurer Flimnap would have infallibly broken his neck, if one of the king’s cushions had not saved him, the comicality of this story only increases when we learn that Flimnap is Prime Minister Walpole, who dances on the highest rope in politics, and the king’s cushion on which this virtuoso falls is a powerful lady-in-waiting, the king’s mistress, who helps the minister back into office. (Hollo 1926:XX–XXII)

Here, Hollo describes his global strategies (choice of source text, not omitting anything), and discusses the book’s two narrative levels (and two target audiences, children and adults), thus establishing the context of the source text for Finnish readers (themes of the how). He states the author’s intentions, and finally justifies his strategy of using notes, and mentions persons alluded to in the text. Commenting on Hollo’s use of endnotes, Kovala (1996:129) states that “Hollo takes great pains to contextualize passages that the reader might otherwise pass by. He pays special attention to references to contemporary events and persons and to instances of parody.” This would suggest that the endnotes were Hollo’s own additions. However, as the translator modestly admitted, his minor notes of twelve pages were mostly translated from the notes of the source text. Nevertheless, Hollo adopted a liberal approach to the translation of endnotes: he rephrased the endnotes and added or deleted information or entire endnotes where he felt it necessary. Consequently, in this paper, Hollo’s use of endnotes is not categorized as a strategy of minimum change (see B, Table 3), but as a strategy of providing explanations for some of the allusions examined (see D, Table 3). Hollo also makes a passing reference to a possible purpose of the translation by stating that “some aspects of [Swift’s] critique (fashions in natural sciences, the parliament, etc.) have perhaps more application today than during his lifetime” (Hollo 1926:XXIII).

World Literature for Finnish Youth (1932)

This translation again contained parts one and two of GT. According to the title page, the translation was made by Alpo Kupiainen from an English children’s adaptation by Sarita L. Ricardo. The edition was published by Karisto in the series Kariston nuorisonkirjoja [Karisto’s juvenile books]. The translation contained the highest frequency of omissions when compared to Swift’s text. As a result, the story is fragmented, difficult to follow, and far from Swift’s version.
The appearance of this particular translation after several more enjoyable and more complete Finnish editions can be explained by the fact that at the time little attention was paid to the quality of translated literature. From the late 1920s to the end of the Second World War, cultural politics in Finland was dominated by nationalism, cultural stagnation and xenophobia – in literary circles it was even argued that all Finnish literature should originate from the noble roots of Finnish mythology while rejecting the apparently false fashions and influences of foreign literatures (Hellemann 1970:435). In addition to the cultural climate, the publication of translated literature was affected by a more practical issue: after Finland signed the Berne Convention in 1928\textsuperscript{13}, it became more expensive to publish translated works (Sev{"a}nen 2007:383). As a result of these two factors and the economic depression that began at the end of the 1920s, the ratio of non-translated vs. translated literature published in Finland changed from 128 vs. 206 titles in 1925 to 180 vs. 102 titles in 1935 (Sev{"a}nen 2007:386).\textsuperscript{14}

### Local Strategies

This section examines the local translation strategies applied to certain allusions, as categorized in Leppihalme (1997:79, 84), present in \textit{GT}. This part of the analysis was limited to the 1876 and 1926 translations. The two translators are referred to as Trr1 (1876) and Trr2 (1926).

#### Proper-Name Allusions

With my definition of an allusion, I located 14 PN allusions in the Swedish mediating source text of the first translation (ST1), and 16 in the English source text of the second translation (ST2). The difference in the figures resulted from omissions or differences in the source texts used. The translation strategies used for PN allusions are illustrated in Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Trr1 1876</th>
<th>Trr2 1926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Retain</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) as such</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) add some guidance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) add explanation (e.g. note)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Replace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) with SL name</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) with TL name</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Omit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) but replace by common noun</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) omit entirely</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As we can see, the predominant strategy of Trr1 was to retain the PN allusion as such (71\% of all cases). For Trr2, this was also the most frequently adopted strategy (50\%), but here an endnote explanation was adopted much more frequently (31\%). Of the five endnote explanations provided by Trr2, three were translated literally from ST2 and two were adapted by the translator. In addition, Trr2 omitted the endnote provided for one allusion in ST2 and retained the allusion as such.
Key-Phrase Allusions

There were 50 KP allusions in ST1 and 52 in ST2. The translation strategies used for KP allusions are illustrated in Table 3:

Table 3: Translation strategies used for KP allusions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Trr1 1876</th>
<th>Trr2 1926</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A) Use standard translation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B) Minimum change (literal translation)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) Add extra-allusive guidance (e.g. typography)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) Add a note, preface or other explanation</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Add simulated familiarity or internal marking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F) Replace by preformed TL item (e.g. allusion)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G) Reduce to sense by rephrasing</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H) Re-create passage</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I) Omit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>50</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In KP allusions, the difference in the adopted strategies is much clearer. Trr1’s almost exclusive strategy was literal translation (or minimum change), while Trr2 provided an endnote in 27 out of 52 cases (52%); this was a strategy never used by Trr1. Of the 27 endnote explanations provided by Trr2, 10 were translated literally from ST2 and 17 were adapted, repositioned and/or rephrased by the translator. In addition, Trr2 omitted the endnotes provided for three allusions present in ST2 and translated the allusions using the strategy of minimum change (B).

Let us take a look at some examples. Example 1 is from a scene describing the court of Lilliput, where high political positions are obtained by jumping on a tightrope, or by leaping or creeping over or under a stick held by the emperor, or sometimes his “first Minister”.

---
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**Example 1: Tightrope-jumping scene from Part I, Chapter III of Gulliver’s Travels**

**ST1**
Man försäkrade mig, att Flimnap ett eller par år före min ankomst ovilkorligen skulle ha brutit nacken af sig, om icke en af konungens dynor, som händelsevis låg på marken, hade mildrat stöterns häftighet. (Swift 1872:36)

**Gloss:**
I was assured, that Flimnap, a year or two before my arrival, would have definitely broken his neck, if one of the king’s cushions, that accidentally lay on the ground, had not weakened the force of the fall.

**TT1**
Minulle sanottiin että Flimnap vuosi tai kaksi ennen minun tuloani olisi epäilemättä taittanut niskansa, ellei keisarin tyynyistä, joita sattui olemaan maassa, olisi lieventänyt täräyksen kovuutta. (Swift 1876:39)

**Gloss:**
I was told that Flimnap, a year or two before my arrival, would have undoubtedly broken his neck, if one of the emperor’s cushions, that happened to be on the ground, had not weakened the force of the fall.

**ST2**
I was assured, that a year or two before my arrival, Flimnap would have infallibly broke [sic] his neck, if one of the king’s cushions, that accidentally lay on the ground, had not weakened the force of his fall. (Swift 1905:39)

[Footnote] A reference to Walpole’s resignation in 1717. The ‘King’s cushion’ is supposed to be the Duchess of Kendal, one of the mistresses of George I, by whose interest Walpole was restored to office on the death of Stanhope in 1721. (Swift 1905:39)

**TT2**
Minulle vakuutettiin, että Flimnap olisi pari vuotta ennen minun tuloani auttamattomasti taittanut niskansa, ellei eräs Hallitsijan tyyny, joka sattui makaamaan maassa, olisi lieventänyt iskun tuimuutta. (Swift 1926:40)

[Endnote] Flimnap olisi... auttamattomasti taittanut niskansa... Koskee Walpolen eroa v. 1717. ‘Hallitsijan tyyny’ on todennäköisesti eräs Yrjö I:n rakastajattarista, Kendalin herttuatar, jonka toimesta Walpole pääsi jälleen virkaansa hänen seuraajansa Stanhopeen kuoltua v. 1721. (Swift 1926:499)

**Gloss:**
I was assured, that a couple of years before my arrival, Flimnap would have infallibly broken his neck, if one of the Monarch’s cushions, that happened to lie on the ground, had not weakened the fierceness of the impact.

[Endnote] Flimnap would have... infallibly broken his neck... Refers to Walpole’s resignation in 1717. The ‘Monarch’s cushion’ is probably one of George I’s mistresses, the Duchess of Kendal, by whose efforts Walpole was restored to office after his successor Stanhope died in 1721.

Both translators presented the proper name (Flimnap) as such, although earlier on the same page Trt2 provided an endnote explaining that Flimnap referred to “Sir Robert Walpole, whom Swift hated from the bottom of his heart” (Swift 1926:499). For the key-phrase allusion (the king’s cushion), Trt1 used the strategy of minimum change, while Trt2 provided an endnote explaining the topical meaning of the allusion. The endnote was translated quite literally from the source text endnote, linking the translator’s local strategies to the global strategy (choice of a ST that includes notes). An interesting example of a domesticating translation strategy is that Trt1 changed the king of the Swedish source text to emperor (Finland was ruled by the Emperor of Russia at the time).

Example 2 is from a scene where Gulliver heroically extinguishes a fire in the royal palace of Lilliput by urinating on it. The passage describes the Lilliputian empress’s reaction to Gulliver’s act.
Example 2: Fire-fighting scene from Part I, Chapter V of Gulliver’s Travels

ST1
... under hand fikk jag veta att kejsarinnan, som blifvit i hög grad uppskakad öfver den skymf, som tillfogats hennes bostad, flyttat till den aflägsnaste delen af palatset, fast besluten att aldrig mer inflytta i sin förra våning. Slutligen tillade man, att hon i kretsen af sina förtrogna undfälle sig yttranden om att hon nog skulle veta att hâmnas skymfen. (Swift 1872:62)

Gloss:
...later I found out that the empress, who was to a high degree upset by the insult, which was made against her residence, moved to the furthest part of the palace, firmly inclined never again to move back to her old apartment. Finally they added, that among her trusted friends she had remarked that she would know how to avenge the insult.

ST2
And I was privately assured, that the Empress, conceiving the greatest abhorrence of what I had done, removed to the most distant side of the court, firmly resolved that those buildings should never be repaired for her use: and, in the presence of her chief confidants could not forbear vowing revenge. (Swift 1905:57)

[Footnote] Queen Anne was so much disgusted with the ‘Tale of a Tub’ that, in spite of Swift’s political services, she could never be induced to give him preferment in the Church. (Swift 1905:57)

TT1
... jälkeenpäin sain tietää, että keisarinna, joka oli hyvin kauhistunut siitä häväistyksestä, joka oli tehty hänen asunnollensa, oli muuttanut syrjäisimpään osaan palatsia, liujasti päättäen ei koskaan enää muuttavansa entiseen asuntoonsa. Lopuksi lisättiin että hän ystävien seurassa oli sanonut, että hän kyllä tietää kostaa häväistyksen. (Swift 1876:67)

Gloss:
...later I found out, that the empress, who was greatly appalled at the insult that had been made against her residence, had moved to the most distant part of the palace, firmly deciding never to move back to her old residence. Finally they added, that she had said in the company of her friends that she knew how to avenge an insult.

TT2
Yksityisesti sain tietää, että Keisarinna, jossa menettelyni oli herättänyt mitä syvintä inhontunnetta, oli muuttanut linnan etäisimpään osaan liujasti päättäen, ettei entistä huoneistoa millionkaan korjattaisi hiemen käytettäväkseen. Lähimpien uskottujensa piirissä hän oli vielä uhannut kostaaakin. (Swift 1926:70)

[Endnote] oli vielä uhannut kostaaakin. Swift oli joutunut kuningatar Annan kaikkeinkorkeimpaan epäusoisoon varsinkin aikaisemmin julkaisemansa eri kirkkokuntia ivailevan ‘Tynnyritarinan’ vuoksi siinä määrin, ettei kuningatar tahtonut suostua häntä ylentämään kirkollisella virkauralla. (Swift 1926:501)

Gloss:
Privately I found out, that the Empress, in whom my method had raised the deepest abhorrence, had moved to the most distant part of the castle, firmly deciding never to have her old apartment repaired for her use. In the presence of her closest confidantes, she had even threatened to take revenge.

[Endnote] had even threatened to take revenge. Swift had fallen into the highest disrespect of Queen Anne especially because of his previously published mockery of different churches, ‘A Tale of a Tub’, to the extent that the queen refused to promote him in his clerical career.

Here, both translators use a strategy of minimum change for the key-phrase allusion (the empress’s revenge of Gulliver’s heroic albeit unconventional firemanship). Trr1 provides a rendering without any explanation or guidance, the satire of the passage only retains its general aspects. Trr2, by contrast, provides an endnote explaining the topical meaning of the allusion; even though the endnote is carried over from the source text, it is altered considerably.
Example 3 is an endnote from a scene in which Gulliver is about to be examined by two officers of the Emperor of Lilliput. The entire search episode alludes to the Committee of Secrecy set up by the Whigs in 1715 “to impeach members of the previous Tory administration headed by Swift’s friends Oxford and Bolingbroke” (Swift 1726/2002:28n). The allusion was translated literally (see B, Table 3) by Trr1 from ST1 which did not include an endnote, while Trr2 provided the following endnote adapted from the endnote present in ST2.

**Example 3: Bodily search of Gulliver from Part I, Chapter II of Gulliver’s Travels**

**ST2**

[Footnote] Walpole had appointed a secret committee to inquire into the movements and intentions of the Jacobite party both in England and France. As Bolingbroke was proved to have had connections with this party, and as he was mainly instrumental in bringing about the Treaty of Utrecht, this committee had special instructions to see into the secret negotiations that led to the signing of that Treaty. Walpole was Bolingbroke’s rival and enemy—Swift was Bolingbroke’s friend. Hence, probably, the ridicule which this inventory is intended to throw on Walpole’s committee (Swift 1905:33).

**TT2**


**Gloss:**

_I translated the document…_ The Stuarts had lost the crown of England when James II was replaced by William of Orange, but the “Jacobites” continued their efforts to bring the Stuarts back to power during the reigns of William, Anne and even George I. During the reign of Queen Anne, the _Tory_ party, which favoured the Stuarts and whose influential members included Lord Bolingbroke, Swift’s friend, had dominated politics. George I dissolved the Tory ministry and replaced it with one composed entirely of the members of the _Whig_ party and headed by Robert Walpole. The last-mentioned set up a secret committee to keep an eye on the activities of Jacobites in England and France, where Bolingbroke had fled. Bolingbroke had been particularly industrious in bringing about the Treaty of Utrecht signed in 1712, and the committee was given the special task of investigating the secret negotiations that had led to the signing of the Treaty. — Swift is presumably mocking the actions of Walpole’s committee in the inventory.

Here, Trr2 adapted the endnote of the ST considerably. He provided additional information on the political history of England, thus explaining the context of Swift’s satire to Finnish readers who might otherwise be unfamiliar with it.

**Discussion**

The analysis of the global translation strategies indicated three trends in the period examined. The first is a shift from mediated translations to direct translations. While the first two
translations were mediated, and Samuli Suomalainen used editions in several languages for his 1904 translation, the last two were translated directly from English (the source texts of the 1920–1921 and 1923–1924 translations could not be located). This trend can be explained partly by the fact that more people competent in both English and Finnish were available for translation projects – especially women, who had studied English in girls’ schools (Kovala 2007:146).

The second trend is a gradual clarification of the purpose of translation and the intended target audience. While the 1876 translator paradoxically aimed to provide Finnish readers with a complete version of *GT* and yet used a sanitized Swedish source text, and censored material ‘inappropriate for young readers’, all subsequent translations until the unabridged 1926 edition were clearly targeted at young readers and the adopted global translation strategies complied with the intended audience (choice of source text, purpose of translation, censoring of inappropriate material).

The third trend is that translations targeted solely at children or adolescents (1898, 1904, 1920–1921, 1923–1924 and 1932) rarely contained a preface or introduction, while the two translations (1876 and 1926) targeted at a broader audience (adults and children) both included an introduction presenting both *themes of the why* and *themes of the how*.

The analysis of local strategies revealed that for PN allusions, the predominant strategy of Trr1 was to retain the proper name as such without adding any guidance or explanation in 10 out of 14 cases (71%). Trr2 employed a more varied range of strategies, adding explanations for PN allusions that he perhaps considered too difficult for Finnish readers to recognize and appreciate as such. In KP allusions, the difference between the translators’ strategies is much clearer. Trr1 used minimum change (literal translation) in 49 out of 50 cases (98%). This strategy ignored the topical aspects of Swift’s allusions entirely and provided readers with no means to interpret them. Trr2, however, used minimum change in only 24 out of 52 cases (46%) and provided an endnote in 27 cases (52%). Since Trr2 adapted most of the endnotes from the source text, i.e. altered them considerably, and since these explanations provided in the endnotes became available to Finnish readers as a result of Trr2’s global strategy (choice of source text with notes), these instances are categorized as “provide a note/explanation” (see D, Table 3).

This frequent use of endnotes explaining the topical meanings of the allusions allowed monolingual Finnish readers to access the topical aspects of the satire and thus to participate in Swift’s contemporary social critique. As the two examples illustrate, the 1876 translation successfully conveyed the general aspects of the satire, but the 1926 translation also managed to convey the topical aspects. Both translations offer enjoyable reading, but the second provides an additional dimension to Swift’s narrative. As was stated earlier, this historical dimension is the product of centuries of interpretation of *GT*. These interpretations have affected the way people perceive and read the book since it was first published in 1726.15 Indeed, Swift’s contemporaries “spent hours puzzling out references, allusions, and possible coded meanings in the text” (Hunter 2003:216). Regardless of the accuracy or validity of the interpretations, by providing the historical context, Trr2 enabled Finnish-speaking readers to enjoy Swift’s social and political satire in the way speakers of other languages had done for two centuries. Even in Finland, the Swedish-speaking upper classes had enjoyed *GT* as a brilliant political satire since the 1740s (Merisalo et al 1999:137).16
The local strategies adopted by the two translators are, of course, closely connected to the global strategies. The choice of source text naturally influenced the entire translation process and the end product, as did the purpose and the intended target audience of the translation.

The two translations examined in more detail were produced in different cultural and literary climates. The 1876 translation was connected to a major national project that aimed to enrich the new Finnish literature and language, and above all, establish a model for Finnish literature through the translation of classics. The fact that the translator of the 1876 edition was concerned about the effects of the book on younger readers reflects contemporary norms regarding the instrumental function of literary translation: it was considered important to educate Finnish-speaking children and youth to become proper citizens through the publication of morally uplifting works of literature. It is not clear how the decision to use a children’s edition as the source text of the translation of a world classic served the objectives of the national literature project. Indeed, the apparently poor sales figures (the two latter parts of the book were not published) and the criticism regarding the language of the translation suggest that the first arrival of Gulliver into Finnish was not particularly triumphant. However, the adopted global translation strategies can perhaps be partly explained by fear of censorship by Russian authorities. After all, GT, at least in its unabridged versions, offers plenty of material for accusation of seditious activity on the part of the publisher. Consequently, in the precarious political and cultural climate of late 19th-century Finland, the decision to publish a harmless Finnish edition targeted at children seems quite understandable, especially since the publisher belonged to the Swedish-speaking and more conservative cultural camp.

The circumstances in Finland were entirely different during the publication of the 1926 translation. Finland had become independent in 1917, followed by a bloody civil war fought between socialists and non-socialists in 1918. The ideology of the non-socialist Whites who won the war dominated increasingly over the socialist Reds also in the cultural debates and climate of Finland during the 1920s and 1930s (cf. Sevänen 2007:382–384). In this situation, the leftist publisher Kansanvalta resisted the dominant ideology by seeking to publish literary classics that contained social criticism. In 1926, Finland was ready for the arrival of a complete Gulliver. The Finnish publishing industry had grown rapidly since the 1890s, but the quality of translations had not improved largely owing to the minuscule fees paid to translators. The language of many earlier translations had become outdated, and the public had come to expect higher quality from Finnish translations (Hellemann 1970:433). Consequently, the role of the Finnish Literature Fund was pivotal for the success of Gulliver’s arrival in Finland in 1926: it enabled the publisher to hire perhaps the best translator in Finland for the job.

In a sense, the 1926 translation both followed and resisted contemporary norms governing translation in Finland. On the one hand, after 1905 the dominant norm in the publishing industry had been to print light, commercially viable novels of questionable literary quality in large numbers (and especially in series). On the other hand, there had been a voiced demand among publishers and the public for high-quality translations of world classics. Indeed, this could be characterized as a less formally organized sequel to the world classics project initiated in the 1870s. The translation of GT in 1926 met the latter expectations but rejected the former. One could say that the translator, the literary critic and university professor Hollo, catered to more sophisticated tastes and readers. His decision to use a scholarly, annotated edition as the source text and to target the translation at adult readers clearly followed the latter of the above two conflicting norms. After all, the previously published Finnish editions
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had all been abridged and targeted at children. The fact that there existed a readership and the demand for an unabridged Finnish edition of *GT* demonstrates the rapid development of the Finnish culture since the earlier 1876 translation: within fifty years, Finnish literature and culture had come of age, and had become so stratified as to accommodate different tastes, audiences, and publishers catering to different customer segments.

The study raised two significant methodological problems. First, in the 1876 and 1926 translations, the concepts of *source text* and *author* were difficult to define: the source text of the 1876 translation was a Swedish translation of an unspecified English source text, while for the 1926 translation, the source text was a critical edition with the editor’s introduction and notes (thus, source text plus its paratext). In addition, the history of *GT* as a text is itself a controversial issue, with authority being attributed to different editions. How should these issues be addressed in the study of translation history? While no definitive answers can be provided here, at least one recommendation can be made: the translation historian should pay attention to such problems and address them openly. Particularly in the case of translation strategies, ignoring these issues may easily lead to false assumptions and wrong conclusions.

The second problem is related to the functions of allusions. The readers of the 1876 translation had access to the general aspects of Swift’s political and social critique, but not to the topical dimensions. The topical level of the satire only became available to monolingual Finnish readers through the 1926 translation. Consequently, the political allusions functioned on a general level for the readers of the 1876 translation (they might have recognized the allusions as such because of the information provided in the preface), but they did not have access to the topical level (specific individuals and events). This indicates that allusions often function on at least two levels. Should we therefore re-evaluate the nature and function of allusions in the study of their translation?

Concluding Remarks

This article has examined the journey of Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels* into Finnish between 1876 and 1932. The paper sought to describe how the Finnish translators dealt with Swift’s allusive political and social satire. The paper has shown how the translators’ attitudes towards the source text and the target audience were influenced by the project to establish a Finnish literature among world literatures. The translators’ comments indicate a gradual change in attitudes towards the purpose and functions of literary translation. In addition, the local strategies adopted by the translators partially reflect changes in norms governing translation in Finland.

The analysis of the global translation strategies indicated that the choice of source text, the purpose of the translation, and the intended target audience had a great impact on the translation of the satire carried by the allusions. The analysis of local translation strategies showed that the use of endnotes was the most important factor in determining the extent to which target-text readers could enjoy Swift’s topical satire. Together, the global and local strategies determined the extent to which Finnish-speaking readers could participate in Swift’s political and social satire.

This small-scale study carried out in the Finnish context invokes several questions regarding Gulliver’s travels into other ‘remote regions of the world’. It would be interesting to find out how the book has been translated in other socio-cultural contexts: what strategies translators
have adopted in other countries, how common the use of annotation has been elsewhere, how
*GT* has been used for ideological purposes, and how the norms of different target cultural
systems have affected the translation strategies adopted. The study of translations and
retranslations of world classics such as *GT* will undoubtedly provide a wealth of information
on the development of national literatures and translational norms.
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Notes

1 In this paper, the term allusion refers to “an enunciation whose full meaning presupposes the perception of a relationship between it and another text, to which it necessarily refers by some inflections that would otherwise remain unintelligible” (Genette 1982/1997:2). The term text is here understood in a broad sense, covering literary and non-literary works, persons, places and events – and the networks of meaning that they trigger.
2 The same advertisement was published several times in the following years (Paloposki 2007a:118).
3 In this paper, both are referred to as source texts.
4 However, the book reviews could not be discussed in this paper due to space constraints.
5 E.g., Firth 1920, Case 1945, Orwell 1950, Lock 1980.
7 Most studies of GT argue that Swift’s contemporaries were well aware of the satirical dimensions of the book. Thus, it is assumed that most readers would have recognized the KP allusions examined in this paper.
8 In this paper, even the more liberally adapted Finnish versions of GT are referred to as translations, because they were marketed and presumably read as translations, and can therefore be regarded as “assumed translations” (Toury 1995:32). Also the central position of translated literature in Finland at the time supports this decision (cf. Even-Zohar 1990b:50).
9 Wäyrynen is indicated as the translator in the National Bibliography of Finland.
10 English was, however, taught in specialized schools, such as business or navigation schools due to the importance of the language in international trade and navigation. In addition, some English was taught along with other modern languages in girls’ schools since the mid-19th century (Kovala 2007:141).
11 Again, the translator’s name is provided in the National Bibliography of Finland
12 On 21 January 1904, Suomalainen wrote to the publisher requesting an unabridged edition and an abridged children’s edition of GT in English, also stating that he did not trust the Swedish translation he had already received. On 19 March 1904, he again wrote to the publisher, this time requesting similar editions in German translation. (I am grateful to Outi Paloposki for providing me with this information.)
13 First signed in Berne, Switzerland in 1886, the Berne Convention for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works aims to “protect the rights of authors in their literary and artistic works” across national boundaries in the signatory countries (Article 1; see <http://www.wipo.int/export/sites/www/treaties/en/ip/berne/pdf/trtdocs_wo001.pdf>). Before its adoption in...
Finland in 1928, a Finnish publisher could publish a translation of a foreign work without having to pay any royalties to the copyright owner of the source text.

14 The figures exclude small publications containing less than 49 pages.

15 In fact, the first “key” supposedly explaining the topical allusions was published by Edmund Curll within a month after the book’s publication (Lock 1980:91). An excerpt of Curll’s notorious *A Key, Being Observations and Explanatory Notes, upon the Travels of Lemuel Gulliver*, which he published under the pseudonym “Signor Corolini” is republished in Swift (1726/2002:288–291). The publication of *GT* on 28 October 1726 was followed by “an enormous groundswell of Gulliver-related items”: 26 publications in 1726 and 68 publications in 1727 (Kelly 2002:66).

16 It should be noted that the first Swedish translation (1744–1745) contains numerous footnotes to help readers follow the topical satire. In fact, the footnotes frequently filled a page almost completely. It could be argued that without the footnotes a great deal of the topical political satire in *GT* would have remained obscure to Swift’s Swedish-speaking contemporaries.

17 In addition, it was hoped that Swedish-speaking children of upper-class families would learn and adopt Finnish by reading Finnish translated literature (Lassila 2003).