

JYU DISSERTATIONS 174

Kenneth Partti

Taking the Language of the Past Seriously

**The Linguistic Turns in Finnish and
Swedish History Dissertations, 1970–2010**



UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND
SOCIAL SCIENCES

JYU DISSERTATIONS 174

Kenneth Partti

Taking the Language of the Past Seriously

**The Linguistic Turns in Finnish and
Swedish History Dissertations, 1970–2010**

Esitetään Jyväskylän yliopiston humanistis-yhteiskuntatieteellisen tiedekunnan suostumuksella
julkisesti tarkastettavaksi yliopiston vanhassa juhlasalissa S212
tammikuun 10. päivänä 2020 kello 12.

Academic dissertation to be publicly discussed, by permission of
the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences of the University of Jyväskylä,
in building Seminarium, auditorium S212 on January 10, 2020 at 12 o'clock noon.



JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO
UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

JYVÄSKYLÄ 2020

Editors

Pasi Ihalainen

Department of History and Ethnology, University of Jyväskylä

Ville Korkiakangas

Open Science Centre, University of Jyväskylä

Copyright © 2020, by University of Jyväskylä

Permanent link to this publication: <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7991-1>

ISBN 978-951-39-7991-1 (PDF)

URN:ISBN:978-951-39-7991-1

ISSN 2489-9003

ABSTRACT

Partti, Kenneth

Taking the Language of the Past Seriously: The Linguistic Turns in Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations, 1970-2010

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2020, 183 p.

(JYU Dissertations

ISSN 2489-9003; 174)

ISBN 978-951-39-7991-1 (PDF)

The linguistic turn in historical research has shifted the interest of an increasing number of historians into problematizing the nature of past language. In this study the linguistic turn has been divided into five different approaches—conceptual history, linguistic contextualism, discursivity, linguistically constructed gender, and narrativity. This categorization is based on the senior theorists R. Koselleck, Q. Skinner, M. Foucault, J. Scott, and H. White, and the first wave of linguistic turns their works impacted within historical studies. Thus, these linguistic turns have foreign background and they have been gradually imported into Finland and Sweden. It is an interplay between local historical traditions and foreign scholarly adaptations. By analyzing doctoral dissertations of history defended in Sweden and Finland in 1970–2010, and the reviews of them, similarities but also differences are seen between ways to conduct historical research in these countries. Less than 10 percent of the dissertations in both countries included references to linguistic turns: in the Finnish case circa 9% and in the Swedish case 6%. Linguistic turns themselves have become diversified, both in international and national debates. Their impact on Finnish and Swedish historiography has been notable, but not comprehensive. The role and essence of language has been acknowledged more widely and deeply during the last few decades, but the applications of linguistically oriented approaches remain within a limited number of scholars. The pace of adopting and elaborating linguistic turns tells also about the historiography of these countries more widely. In Finland, the discipline of general history (*yleinen historia*) has a long tradition of being internationally oriented, and the applications of linguistically oriented methods validates this fact. In turn, the discipline of the history of ideas and science (*idé- och lärdoms historia*) in Sweden has created links between their methodological starting points and linguistic contextualism or conceptual history. Historians from both countries have contributed to linguistically oriented methods with their local and national applications, but the pace and coverage has been quicker and more extensive in Finland. This reflects openness to international debates in a smaller nation state.

Keywords: Historiography, Linguistic Turn, Methodology, Reception, Finland and Sweden, Dissertations, Comparative History, 1970–2010

TIIVISTELMÄ (ABSTRACT IN FINNISH)

Partti, Kenneth

Menneisyyden kieli vakavasti otettuna: Kielelliset käänneet suomalaisissa ja ruotsalaisissa historian väitöskirjoissa, 1970–2010

Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2020, 183 s.

(JYU Dissertations

ISSN 2489-9003; 174)

ISBN 978-951-39-7991-1 (PDF)

Kielellinen käänne on siirtänyt historiantutkimuksen kiinnostusta selvemmin kohti menneisyyden kielen problematisointia. Tässä tutkimuksessa kielellinen käänne on jaettu viiteen eri lähestymistapaan: käsitehistoriaan, lingvistiseen kontekstualismiin, diskursiivisuuteen, sukupuolen kielellisen konstruoinnin historiaan sekä narratiivisuuteen. Tämä jaottelu perustuu kansainvälisiin senioriteoreetikoihin (etupäässä R. Koselleck, Q. Skinner, J. Scott, H. White, M. Foucault) sekä heidän töihinsä, jotka edustavat kielellisten käänneiden ensimmäistä aaltoa historiantutkimuksessa. Kielellisillä käänneillä on siis ulkomainen alkuperä, ja ne ovat rantautuneet asteittain Suomeen ja Ruotsiin. Menetelmä- ja teoriasovellukset ovat jo täällä olemassa olleiden perinteiden ja ulkopuolelta tulleiden metodivirtausten sekoitusta. Analysoimalla näissä maissa puolustettuja historian väitöskirjoja vuosilta 1970–2010 sekä arvioita niistä havaitaan maiden välillä eroja ja yhtäläisyyksiä historiantutkimuksessa. Alle 10% kaikista väitöskirjoista sisältää viittauksen kielellisiin käänneisiin: Suomen tapauksessa luku on noin 9%, Ruotsin tapauksessa 6%. Kielelliset käänneet itsessään ovat monimuotoistuneet sekä kansainvälisissä että kansallisissa debateissa. Niiden vaikutus suomalaiseen ja ruotsalaiseen historiantutkimukseen on ollut huomattava mutta ei kokonaisvaltainen. Kielen rooli ja olemus on tunnustettu yhä laajemmin ja syvemmin viime vuosikymmeninä, mutta kielellisesti suuntautuneet menetelmälliset sovellukset ovat pysyneet vähemmistön suuntauksena. Kielellisten käänneiden omaksumisen tahti ja muuntautuminen kertoo myös maiden historiografisesta tilanteesta laajemmin. Suomessa yleisen historian oppiaine on pitkän tradition myötä kansainvälisesti suuntautunut, ja kielellisesti suuntautuneiden menetelmien soveltaminen osoittaa myös osaltaan tämän. Ruotsissa puolestaan aate- ja oppihistoria (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*) on luonut linkkejä menetelmällisten lähtökohtiensa ja kielellisen kontekstualismin tai käsitehistorian välille. Molemmissa maissa historiantutkijat ovat käyttäneet kielellisesti suuntautuneita menetelmiä paikallisissa ja kansallisissa sovelluksissaan, mutta tahti ja kattavuus on ollut Suomessa nopeampi ja kattavampi. Tämä heijastaa pienemmän kansallisvaltion avoimuutta kansainvälisten keskustelujen suuntaan.

Asiasanat: historiografia, kielellinen käänne, menetelmät, vastaanotto, Suomi ja Ruotsi, väitöskirjat, vertailu, 1970–2010

Author

Kenneth Partti
Department of History and Ethnology
P.O. Box 35 (H)
40014, University of Jyväskylä, Finland
kenneth.partti@gmail.com
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2709-8776>

Supervisors

Professor Pasi Ihalainen
Department of History and Ethnology
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Senior Researcher, Title of Docent (Adjunct Professor) in
Intellectual History, D.Phil. Anssi Halmesvirta
Department of History and Ethnology
University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Reviewers

Professor Henrik Björck
Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion
University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Postdoctoral Researcher, PhD Jani Marjanen
Department of Digital Humanities
University of Helsinki, Finland

Opponents

Professor Henrik Björck
Department of Literature, History of Ideas, and Religion
University of Gothenburg, Sweden

Postdoctoral Researcher, PhD Jani Marjanen
Department of Digital Humanities
University of Helsinki, Finland

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The journey to this point has been long and it has not always been an easy one. But now, when the work is completed, it is time to express my gratitude. I have received support and encouragement from a great number of individuals over the past several years.

First and foremost, I want to thank my supervisors. Professor Pasi Ihalainen has guided me since my master's studies until this stage of finalizing my dissertation. Pasi has read many versions of my texts and manuscripts, often not-so-ready creations, and always helped me to clear my thoughts and intentions. This research would not exist without his support. The guidance provided by Senior Researcher, D.Phil. Anssi Halmesvirta, my second supervisor, has also been helpful and encouraging. I appreciate the time and effort you both have invested in me. It has been demanding, but also rewarding to work with you.

I appreciate the work of my reviewers, Professor Henrik Björck and Postdoctoral Researcher, PhD Jani Marjanen. You have provided valuable feedback and I am glad that both of you agreed to act as my opponents at the public defence. My study is now more coherent, thanks to your insightful comments and corrections. The Scribendi Editing and Proofreading Service helped me to correct my English. Nevertheless, I am responsible for all the possible errors and mistakes in this final version of the study.

My research has been funded by several funding bodies. Thus, I want to thank the Foundation of Kone, Foundation of Ellen & Artturi Nyyssönen, Foundation of Ella & Georg Ehrnrooth, Foundation of Alfred Kordelin, and the then Faculty of Humanities for funding my dissertation project. The Finnish-Swedish Cultural Foundation and the Department of History and Ethnology have awarded me travel grants. The staff both in the University of Jyväskylä Library and National Library of Sweden (*Kungliga biblioteket*) has been very helpful for me. Thank you all.

Further, it has been pleasure to work in the Department of History and Ethnology since the Heads of our Department, Jari Ojala and Heli Valtonen, have created inspirational atmosphere and surroundings for my scholarly activities during the past years. There are too many people to name here who have helped me in the different stages of this process. Thus, I want to jointly thank everyone who has ever commented my works in various seminars and conferences.

However, I want to especially express my gratitude to some of my nearest co-workers: Postdoctoral Researcher Matti Roitto advanced this study considerably with his comments in my final doctoral seminar. I have also enjoyed the many conversations we have had, as you are the one who has sat next to me in room H110 most often. Professor Petri Karonen has trusted in me by inviting me into his research project of "Shared Past, Different Interpretations" (*Yhteinen menneisyys, erilaiset tulkinnat*, briefly *Hirsu*). The other members of the *Hirsu* research group (Anu Koskivirta, Miia Kuha, Antti Räihä, Petteri Impola, and Marja Kokko) have also commented my ongoing research in an insightful way on several occasions. Ville Häkkinen and Teemu Häkkinen, your comments and

opinions have made me to re-think the focus of this study, and you have been close companions as well. Our theoretically and philosophically oriented reading circle (Tuomas Laine-Frigren, Konsta Kajander, Jukka Nissinen, and Aarni Virtanen) has offered inspirational thoughts about the discipline of history and its borders. And finally, a group of younger colleagues, Zachris Haaparinne, Juho Saksholm, and Joonas Tammela, has not only commented my research in our more or less formal conversations, but also coined the splendid concept of *bölex* and developed a brilliant semantic field around it. Besides, our methodological starting point is clearer now – everything must be included.

As said, I appreciate both official and unofficial help from my colleagues in our department. Nevertheless, I highly value also my friends who have made me to concentrate on things outside my academic everyday life. The reading circle of classical Greek, *greekistit*, has offered me a chance to concentrate on what really interests me. So, thank you Aulikki Pietinhuhta-Toikka, Kirsi Kiviniemi, Kari Pöntinen, and Jouni Kauppinen for offering and sharing moments when I had to think on something else than just work and research. *εὐχαριστῶ πολὺ, νῦν οἰνώμεθα ἡμεῖς ὅλην τὴν νόκτα!* Further, the group of enthusiastic Latinists, *humalatinistit* (Tuomo-Paavo Salokas, András Molnár-Varga, and Laura Paukkala), has been inspirational for me as well, often discussing also other topics than just Latin language. *Gratias vobis ago!* The “Gang of the G-spot” (Aku Talikka, Henri Heinonen, and Toni Turpeinen) has, in turn, offered some of the best laughs of my life in our both learned and unlearned discussions (*ällymölö!*). Her Royal Highness Princess Nina Korpela de Lutakko, along with her lovely entourage (especially Elias Kahila and Helena Piispanen), has time to time led my thoughts totally elsewhere than to my research, for which I am very grateful (*Många hälsningar också från Ronny!*). And my circle of Hungarian friends has offered an opportunity to return to my old hobby of language learning and language using: András (*még egyszer*), Bella Lerch, Brigitta Varga, Andrea Balogh, Beatrix Neer, Melinda Szarvas, László Péter, and Kristóf Fenyvesi, *köszönöm szépen a finn-magyar barátságot!* All of you above have helped me through the past years in a greater way you can imagine. Without you my life would have been considerably emptier and duller.

Finally, I want to express my gratitude and love to my family and relatives, both in Finland and Estonia. *Kiitos teille kaikille! Aitäh teile kõigile!* I owe my greatest debt to my mother Ellen, who has always supported me, and I have always been able to rely on her. Now I can present the finished work to you.

I dedicate this book to the memory of my late grandfather, Tõnis Kägu (1928–2018). Without him I would not be the person I am today.

Jyväskylä, 26 November 2019, on Quentin Skinner’s 79th birthday.
Kenneth Partti

TABLES

TABLE 1	References to the Linguistic Turns in Dissertations.	22
TABLE 2	The Total Number of the Contributions in Journals That Contain a Reference to a Senior Scholar	56
TABLE 3	Dissertations with Reference to Conceptual History	66
TABLE 4	References to the Cambridge School.	94
TABLE 5	References to M. Foucault and Discursivity.....	108
TABLE 6	References to Gender History.....	123
TABLE 7	References to H. White and F.R. Ankersmit.....	132
TABLE 8	Linguistic Turns in Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations.....	142
TAULUKKO 9	Viittaukset kielellisiin käännteisiin väitöskirjoissa.....	152

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

TIIVISTELMÄ (ABSTRACT IN FINNISH)

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

TABLES

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	11
1.1	From Linguistic Turn to Linguistic Turns.....	11
1.2	The Focus of the Study and Research Questions	16
1.3	Primary and Secondary Sources.....	21
1.4	Methodological and Theoretical Starting Points.....	25
2	FOREIGN METHODOLOGICAL DEBATE ON THE LINGUISTIC TURNS	36
2.1	Main Features and Varieties of the Linguistic Turns' First Wave	36
2.2	Reactions, Debates, and Attitudes toward the Linguistic Turns	43
3	THE LINGUISTIC TURNS IN FINNISH AND SWEDISH HISTORICAL JOURNALS 1970–2010.....	51
3.1	The Used Finnish and Swedish Journals.....	52
3.2	The Linguistic Turns in the Journals – How Much and When?	55
3.3	Contributors behind the References	61
4	CONCEPTUAL HISTORY IN FINNISH AND SWEDISH DISSERTATIONS	65
4.1	From 1970 to the mid-1980s: Early Interest in the Concepts	68
4.2	Conceptual History and Contextualism Rises in Finland: 1985– 1999	72
4.3	Concepts More Acknowledged in Sweden, 1985–1999.....	77
4.4	The 2000s: The Strengthening Position of Conceptual History in Finland.....	80
4.5	The Conceptual Turn and Consolidation in the Swedish Dissertations: The 2000s.....	85
5	CAMBRIDGE-STYLE LINGUISTIC CONTEXTUALISM.....	94
5.1	Finnish Adaptions of Linguistic Contextualism	96
5.2	The Contextualist Method in Sweden	101
6	THEORETICAL APPROACHES WITHIN LINGUISTIC TURNS: DISCOURSE, GENDER, NARRATIVITY.....	108
6.1	Michel Foucault and Discourse in Finnish Dissertations.....	108
6.2	Discursive Approaches Inspired by Michel Foucault in Sweden....	116
6.3	Joan Scott and Gender Constructed with Language	122

6.4	Gender History in Sweden— A Selective Linguistic Turn?	127
6.5	Hayden White, Frank Ankersmit, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Other Theoretical Orientations	132
7	DISCUSSION	141
	SUMMARY IN FINNISH	150
	SOURCES.....	158
	APPENDIX A: The Studied Dissertations in Chronological Order and their References to the Linguistic Turns.	181

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 From Linguistic Turn to Linguistic Turns

What is a method and how has it been understood, especially within historical studies? Among the vast number of diversified and competing methodological approaches, this study concentrates on the linguistically oriented approaches used in the field of historical studies. The study will analyze the impact of linguistically oriented methods in Finland and Sweden by examining their applications in the dissertations of history between 1970 and 2010. The purpose of this meta-analysis of one field of historical research is to provide a new perspective to present-day state-of-the-art historical research, facilitating methodological innovation by supporting reflection on methodological developments, and to offer a concrete research on methodological debates for other researchers of the humanities to rely on as well. Thus, I want to benefit the methodological debates and dissertation processes in the future by demystifying theoretical discussions.

As is the case among most research areas in the field of the humanities, linguistic turn has had a notable influence on historical research, too. Although it has not been quite so fundamental as the focus on language has been, for example, in the social sciences much more considerable than in historical studies, and, in comparison with political theory or language research, language-oriented perspectives have been rather marginal within historical research.

When the term *linguistic turn* is mentioned, historians understand it in various ways. It is not always easy to give an explicit answer to the question what the linguistic turn is exactly and what it really consists of. So, in the first place we could instead say what it *rejects*: in most general terms linguistic turn rejects the view that language is a neutral medium for transmitting what is given in experience. Language, which before tended to be seen as a neutral medium, can now be understood as a phenomenon that itself creates and constructs reality.

The complex relationship between language and reality has since been exposed to at least three kinds of general debates: first, what we can know and say about reality at all; second, what is or should be the nature of science in general and human or historical studies in particular; and third, new methodological approaches developed in the view of the new linguistic paradigm.¹ I am particularly interested in the third one and, as I argue later in this introduction, linguistic turn should not be comprehend only as one great entity. The phrase “linguistic turn”, especially when preceded by a definite article, lends itself to homogenization, as historian Judith Surkis has pointed out.² Thus, I explicate linguistic turn in a more expanded way as a series of plural turns. Hence my application of the plural form, *linguistic turns*³, throughout this study.

In brief, the linguistic turns have affected almost all subjects within the studies of the humanities, but in the historical sciences it has been most clear in the field of intellectual history. Here the linguistic turn consists of a shift in historical explanation toward an emphasis on the role of language in creating historical meaning.⁴ The epistemological question behind this new, linguistically oriented thought was how to acquire more authentic information on the meanings given to past phenomena by past actors. Accordingly, the starting points include one of the basic questions of history: To what extent are objectivity and truth reachable through language? The so-called postmodernists (which are treated later in this introduction) may propose that history does not have reference to outside texts but practicing historians seldom have gone so far.⁵

In this study, I have separated the various linguistic turns into five different analytical categories: conceptual history, linguistic contextualism by the Cambridge School, narrative turn, discursively oriented studies, and finally gender history. Accordingly, I use the term *linguistic turns* broadly and thus include all methodological viewpoints that deal with the language as a starting point for my study, and where language has not been considered only as a neutral instrument for describing events. That is why I recognize multiple smaller linguistic turns, not only a single large and coherent one. My main focus is on the practical methods that have value in an empirical research, but I also notice the linguistic dimension of the theoretical and postmodernist discussion.

Senior scholars who have introduced linguistic methods in historical research include Quentin Skinner, Reinhart Koselleck, Joan Scott, Hayden White, Frank Ankersmit, and Michel Foucault, who undoubtedly represent very different viewpoints empirically and theoretically. This diversity together with different waves in the discussion makes it justified to speak rather about *linguistic turns* in the plural, not just about a *turn* in the sense of a single methodological

¹ Piirimäe 2011, 33–34. See also Ihalainen & Saarinen 2015 and Steinmetz & Freeden 2017.

² Surkis 2012, 712.

³ The term “linguistic turns”, has been applied in plural form, for instance, by historian and philosopher Martin Jay: Jay 1982, 106. The plural form is also used in philosophy sometimes, e.g. Losonsky 2006.

⁴ Iggers 2005, 120; Munslow 2000, 151. For the difficulty of interpreting the phrase linguistic turn, see, e.g., Canning 1994, 369–371. For an overview of linguistic turn in the humanities, see, e.g., Bonnell & Hunt (eds.) 1999. See also Whatmore 2016.

⁵ See, e.g., Iggers 2005, 100 or Munslow 2000, 151–152.

approach. The above-mentioned researchers had their methods described in articles or monographs published between the 1960s and 1980s and represent the first, larger wave of the linguistic turns, validating also the starting year of 1970 for my research.⁶ Naturally, there are also other scholars who have contributed to this field. But these five main categories are chosen for this study, to keep the theme and analysis coherent.

However, linguistically oriented methodologies have developed greatly ever since. The new contemporary methodology includes inter- and transnational turns and interest in spatiality, materiality, mobility, and multi-sited discourses, for instance.⁷ The linguistic turns have also partially been mixed with cultural turns, especially in Sweden, and the wider interest in language has been rising—according to Kari Väyrynen and Jarmo Pulkkinen, philosophical and theoretical discussions concerning history have been lively during the past few decades and the newest discussion started after the linguistic turn in the 1950s and 1960s.⁸ In addition, the linguistic turns have had an influence in many areas of historical studies, most notably in the history of ideas⁹ but also in the fields of gender and new political history.¹⁰ The historical research has become more diverse during the past few decades and the linguistically oriented approach is one alternative method besides other research trends. Still, linguistic turns are relevant for all historical research since they challenge historians to think about the historicity and political nature of language.

But, as my perspective is to study a time span of 40 years, and from comparative viewpoint focusing on two nation states, my starting point builds on the first wave of the linguistic turns and its authors within historical studies.

Quentin Skinner has had notable success in renewing the methodology of the history of ideas. In his famous article “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas” (briefly “Meaning and Understanding”) in 1969 he criticized researches for researching timeless conceptions without conceptualizing them according to contemporary language use. He and J.G.A. Pocock belong to the history of political thought of the Cambridge School, which focuses on the intentions of single agents and also problematizes what is intellectual history.¹¹ On the contrary, Reinhart Koselleck, the most significant researcher of the German conceptual history *Begriffsgeschichte*,¹² saw the concepts with a longer

⁶ Clark 2004, 87–88. All these senior scholars are discussed more specifically in Chapter 2.

⁷ All these are discussed, e.g., in Halonen et al. 2015. See also Pikkanen 2012 for a successful narrativist application of history.

⁸ For a recent contribution to the linguistic turn as a part of the theory of history in the past few decades, see, e.g., Väyrynen & Pulkkinen 2016 and the collected work *Historian teoria* edited by them. See also Chapter 2. For the Swedish equation of linguistic and cultural turns, see, e.g., Ekström 2008, 292–293 and Österberg 2012, 180.

⁹ The term “history of ideas” is wide and is considered to be a field with relationship to the history of mentality, intellectual history, history of political theory, and German conceptual history *Begriffsgeschichte*. Melve 2006, 377. See also Kelley 1987.

¹⁰ Especially Willibald Steinmetz and his colleagues at the University of Bielefeld have concentrated on the conceptual and linguistic side of political texts: Steinmetz & Haupt 2013.

¹¹ For a good overview of contextualization by Skinner and Pocock, see Hampsher-Monk 2001. See also Chapter 2 for a more precise discussion on Skinner and other senior scholars.

¹² For the history of *Begriffsgeschichte* and its applications in recent years, see Hansson 2008, Steinmetz & Freeden 2017, and Marjanen 2018.

history, containing medium- and long-term structures, changes, and interactions between language and society to create different and new meanings for concepts.¹³

Joan Scott cannot be ignored when talking about linguistic turns because her article “Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis,” (briefly “Gender”) published in 1986, made a breakthrough in gender history and also introduced the theory that gendered identity is constructed, among other actions, also through language.¹⁴

Michel Foucault, Hayden White, and Frank Ankersmit are relevant representatives of the French (post-)structuralism and Anglo-American analytic philosophy, accompanied by Dutchman Ankersmit and his contribution to the narrativity of history. Foucault was primarily a philosopher, but he has had a notable influence on the field of history also with his methodological work *The Archaeology of Knowledge*.¹⁵ Foucault is also a noteworthy person in this research because he spent three years in the 1950s at the University of Uppsala as a French language teacher. He introduced some of his ideas about the history of diseases and medicine to local historians, but the response at that time was highly negative.¹⁶ His later reception has been more positive, especially when referring to him in the case of discourse and discourse analysis.¹⁷ As stated, Foucault was not—unlike all the other senior theorists chosen for this study—a historian himself, but his influence on historical studies cannot be denied, especially in the case of discursive applications. This is why Foucault is included in this group of key theorists concerning the first wave of linguistic turns within history.

Hayden White has substantially contributed to the linguistic turn in historical studies by his famous monograph *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* (briefly *Metahistory*) in 1973, in which the historical presentations were presented as verbal structures in the form of a telling prose. For him, historical knowledge was as equally “made” through the linguistic usage of the historian as “found” in the sources, as Frank Ankersmit has also emphasized.¹⁸ In turn, Ankersmit has developed narrativistic historiography since his first work *Narrative Logic* in 1983.¹⁹ Nevertheless, White and Ankersmit have followed the debates of philosophy of history mainly from outside the history as a discipline. Thus, their discussions have remained as well outside of historical research.

The influence of these works was quick and almost immediate in the international discussions. For example, Skinner received various comments for

¹³ Iggers 1997, 126–127. For an overview of *Begriffsgeschichte* and its relationship with the linguistic contextualism of Skinner, see, e.g., Richter 2001. See also Dutt & Laube 2013, Hoffmann 2010, Ifversen 2011, Joas & Vogt 2011, and Olsen 2012.

¹⁴ Scott 1986, 1056–1057, 1063.

¹⁵ See Megill 1987, which is a good introduction for describing Foucault’s status among historical studies.

¹⁶ Frängsmyr 2004, 365; Peltonen 2008, 169–170; Broberg 1985.

¹⁷ See further Chapters 2 and 7 of this study for the reception of Foucauldian discourse.

¹⁸ Ankersmit 2001, 29–30; Clark 2004, 98; White 1973a, 2. For White’s later career see White 1978, White 1987a, and White 1999.

¹⁹ For the most important works, see Ankersmit 1983, Ankersmit 1989, Ankersmit 1994, and Ankersmit 2001.

his article at the beginning of the 1970s, because it represented a strong critique of the traditional research represented notably by Arthur Lovejoy, which put the emphasis on unit-ideas and continuation as its main agenda.²⁰ Skinner also has been criticized frequently through the decades.²¹ Kathleen Canning has written that after Scott's article "Gender" women's history became gender history, and the historians have noticed the usage of concepts—especially *gender*—more accurately.²² White had in no time responses to his *Metahistory* in the United States, but in Europe the linguistic discussion started by him did not generate such interest, other than among a few French philosophers.²³ For example, John Nelson referred to *Metahistory* as a clearly adventurous book that had remarkable strengths with some weaker points.²⁴ Until that date, the discussion about narrative had consisted mainly of the views of Arthur Danto, Morton White, Maurice Mandelbaum, and W.B. Gallie and mainly focused on narrative as an explanatory structure, but after *Metahistory*, narrative was seen more clearly as a constructed form by a historian.²⁵

In some sense, *Metahistory* by White was misinterpreted, and afterwards a more skeptical line emerged that can be seen today as postmodernism—the equation of history with literature. The debate about "facts" and "objective knowledge" has since been sometimes very rough and harsh when the historians of empirical research have felt a need to defend historical studies from the accusations of stigmatizing history as literature, and this is visible also in the case of linguistically oriented empirical research being suspected of not studying facts but "mere" rhetoric.²⁶ In the end, postmodernism is different from linguistically oriented historical research; it is a kind of negative interpretation of the linguistic turn, as Matti Peltonen has stated.²⁷

Thus, as *postmodernism* I understand the literature-affected research view of Hayden White, which equates historical research with literature and emphasizes a constructed narrativity.²⁸ Not all linguistically oriented historians accept the theories constructed by White. Postmodernism should thus be distinguished from linguistically oriented historical research. Nevertheless, linguistic turns have been interpreted in many ways. Not all linguistically oriented research is

²⁰ For a historiographical overview of the different schools in the history of ideas in the turn of the 1970s, see Gunnell 1979 and Dunn 1996.

²¹ Clark 2004, 140–145. See also Schochet 1974, Bevir 1992, and Bevir 1997 as examples of the critique toward Skinner.

²² Canning 1994, 372, 374–378.

²³ Iggers 1997, 135.

²⁴ Nelson 1975, 74.

²⁵ Lorenz 2011, 23–25. For the discussion about narrative in the turn of the 1970s, see Paluch 1968, Louch 1969, Dray, Ely & Gruner 1969, Olafson 1970, and Dray 1971.

²⁶ Clark 2004, 100–101. For extreme theoretical thinking and questioning the purpose of the historical research, see, e.g., Jenkins 1991 and Jenkins 1995.

²⁷ Peltonen, Matti 2007.

²⁸ According to Jouni-Matti Kuukkanen, narrativism has had a considerable effect on the theory and philosophy of history, but we should move beyond it toward postnarrativism, which sees historiography as a rational practice and discursive process of argumentation rather than an endless discussion about what is "true" or "fact." Kuukkanen 2015, 67, 198–201.

postmodern and not all that is postmodern is linguistic, although there are connections and correlations between the two.

Postmodernism has been equated—and sometimes mixed—with linguistically oriented methods used in the empirical research in the field of the history of ideas and political thought. That is why I include so many different viewpoints of the linguistic turn in my study, because the methodological debate has been very mixed. To understand the full reception of the linguistic turns, it is necessary to view the backgrounds and main features of all the aspects as a whole. The backgrounds of these foreign linguistic turns and responses to them are presented more specifically in Chapter 2.

Before entering the discussion of narrowing my topic and explicating the research questions, the meaning of the concepts like “international” or “foreign” has to be clarified. In this study Sweden and Finland constitute two units, and together an entity also, and with the words international and foreign I mean discussions and actors outside these two countries. I prefer the word *foreign* in this case, as the concept of international may be misleading in some situations.

1.2 The Focus of the Study and Research Questions

The themes of this dissertation are restricted and bordered by three major areas of focus. The main concentrations are on a study of the cases of Finland and Sweden, the sources are restricted to history dissertations defended in these countries, and the research focuses only on historical studies, that is, defended within the disciplines of history.²⁹ The aforementioned restrictions have their own justifications, as follows: first, Finland and Sweden are a good pair to compare, the comparison supporting the avoidance of so-called methodological nationalism³⁰, as the targets of comparison can be seen as an outsider, through the eyes of a foreigner. Second, dissertations offer a large-scale insight into the research themes and methods, especially when the time span is four decades. Third, linguistically oriented methods have been used in many fields of research but concentrating only on historians also gives valuable information about them and their relationships with other researches—especially given the multidisciplinary role of history as an applier of methods borrowed from other scholarly fields to the empirical material of the past.

I acknowledge the restrictions of using dissertations as source material, since there exist a vast number of other notable studies, potentially with more considerable methodological contributions, and scholars have researched different themes during their career. However, the chosen dissertations offer a regulated corpus, which is most evidently comparable, not only across the time

²⁹ For the specific subjects of history in Finland and Sweden which are included in this study, see the first paragraph of Chapter 1.2.

³⁰ For a recent contribution to Nordic countries not from the national but in a greater context altogether, see Larsson, Jalava, & Haapala 2017. Comparison as research method is described in Chapter 1.3.

of four decades but also between Finland and Sweden. Additionally, dissertations are mainly written by young scholars and thus potentially reflect ongoing changes of research themes and emphasis. And, unlike studies published later during an individual's career, dissertations must take a stand on methodology.³¹ Further, dissertations are connected with historiographical discussions of their time or recent past, and thus they are expected to renew the discipline. At the same time, they also recycle older traditions as well.

In my research I am not so much interested in the question what is the situation of the linguistically oriented methods and theories today, but rather *when* did the linguistic turns appear in Finland and Sweden, *what* was written about them, *how* were they applied in the dissertations, and *why* were the situations and events of these processes like they were. The aim is to study this reception or transformation as a long process of a methodological debate in the inner methodological trends and developments, as a kind of disciplinary history: first it was mainly following the international discussions and later using its own innovations and applications.³² The linguistic turn, or turns, has not been a rapid and quick phenomenon, especially not in the Nordic countries on the side of the reception, but I consider it to have been a long process for which the final analysis gives us more valid information about the nature of the methodological discussions. In the end, it is an interplay between local historical traditions and foreign scholarly adaptations.

As stated, historical research has become more diverse thematically and methodologically during the past several decades and linguistically oriented approaches offer just one set of alternative methods within it. Still, the contemporary research would be vastly different without linguistic turns, which shifted interest toward the many-sided language of the past. However, we do not know exactly how the linguistic turns were introduced into the historical studies in Finland and Sweden. The discussion about methods also reflects the prevalent notions and views within the historiography and research cultures of these countries more generally. This dissertation provides a new perspective to present-day historical research and analyses it against the backdrop of the previous methodological discussion. This may give rise to methodological innovations or reconsiderations as well. For instance, understanding the nature of methodological debates and the problems concerning them will likely help avoid these challenges in the future.

Concentrating on the linguistic turns in these Nordic countries not only provides information on their reception, it also offers an interesting and helpful approach to the analysis of recent historiographical discussions and trends in Finland and Sweden. My aim is to study this as a long process of transformation within the methodological debate and developments and provide a case study on how "smaller" countries adopt international research trends, adapt and apply them, and also make methodological innovations based on them. The patterns of

³¹ See, e.g., Peltonen, Markku 2009, 84–85. Dissertations as primary source material is discussed further in this chapter.

³² For different kinds of reception, see Leonhard 2011 and the following sub-chapter 1.3.

reception and adoption of the linguistically oriented approaches will also reveal the strength of the older and alternative—and still dominant, often nation-specific research traditions. Generally speaking, linguistically oriented methods and theories have a clear international—and also transnational and transdisciplinary—background, and they have been transferred gradually to the Nordic countries over recent decades. Yet there had already been some interest in the research through language and concepts in the Nordic countries previously.³³ Transnational features in research, the same actors in Finland and Sweden, are also traceable. This is because the countries have had a shared past for centuries, from mid-medieval times until 1809, and in many ways also after 1809. Thus, cooperation and research visits between the historians of these countries have a long tradition as well.

My aim is to study the impact of the linguistic turns as the long process of a methodological debate in the inner methodological trends and developments within historical scholarship. Analyzing the linguistic turns and their reception in Finnish and Swedish historical research is worthwhile, as there are only a few analyses³⁴ of the inner development of the field of the history of ideas in these countries, and none of them are as systematic as this study. My research questions are the following:

- (i) When and how were linguistically oriented methods applied in the dissertations of history in Finland and Sweden, and what has been their contribution to historical research as well as reception among other historians?
- (ii) What are the main similarities and differences between these countries and the effects on historical research? Moreover, what is the explanation behind these differences and similarities, if there are any?

The starting year of 1970 is based on the publication of Skinner's influential article "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas" in 1969, but also other publications support the turn of the 1970s: besides Skinner, the German conceptual history series *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* edited by Reinhart Koselleck and his colleagues started to appear in 1972, and Hayden White published his famous monograph *Metahistory* in 1973. Yet at that time there had already been some interest in the research through language and concepts in the Nordic countries previously, most notably in Finland by Aira Kemiläinen and Osmo Jussila.³⁵ Extending the study to the year 2010 is also justified, because my

³³ Stenius 2007. The first Finnish pioneers of conceptual history, Aira Kemiläinen and Osmo Jussila, are treated more precisely later, as well as the Swedish discipline of history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdoms historia*).

³⁴ E.g., Frängsmyr 2004, who belongs more to the history of science and ideas. See also Andersson & Björck (eds.) 1994, Olausson (ed.) 1994, Kallinen 2003, and Peltonen Markku 2009.

³⁵ Jussila 1969a; Jussila 1969b, Kemiläinen 1956; Kemiläinen 1964a; Kemiläinen 1964b. See also Hietala 2006a. Kemiläinen contributed to the studies of nationalism and its concept while Jussila's dissertation in 1969 was the first conceptual-historical dissertation in Finland. See Chapter 5.1.

previous findings from the journals so far suggest that the linguistic turns did not make their real breakthroughs until the beginning of the twenty-first century. Comparing and relating this with the trends in the Anglophone world, the delay seems to be at least 20 years.³⁶

In my master's thesis (*Kielellisten käännteiden vastaanotto Historiallisessa Aikakauskirjassa ja Historisk Tidskriftissä 1970–2005*, April 2013), I already examined the discussion on the linguistically oriented methods in the two main Finnish and Swedish historical journals, *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* and *Historisk Tidskrift*, between 1970 and 2005. My findings so far have shown that the discussions on the linguistic turns in Finland and Sweden have been multilayered and that several differences within the research cultures between the countries can be found. The main findings can be summarized as that, in most cases – except the gender history (*genushistoria*) in Sweden – the linguistic turns have been adopted in Finland with less delay than in Sweden, plus the reception has been more diverse there. So far it seems to be that the international connections have been stronger in Finland, partially caused by the internationality of general history (*yleinen historia*) since the time of Arvi Korhonen and his internationally oriented seminar³⁷ at the University of Helsinki after the Second World War. Nevertheless, in both countries the clear breakthroughs in the applications of linguistically oriented methods happened at the beginning of the 2000s.³⁸

Now, this study seeks causes for the time lag and demonstrates that the linguistic turns may have had an earlier influence. Still, the linguistic turns have been different in Finland and Sweden, and the several forms have undergone changes because of the diverse adaptations of the original international forms.

Concentrating on the linguistic turns offers an interesting and helpful viewpoint to the recent historiographic discussions and trends in Finland and Sweden. The discussions surrounding the linguistically oriented methods also reflect the prevalent notions and views within the historiography and research cultures of these countries. The linguistic element even emphasizes this, as often theoretical and language-based methods have been seen with suspicion by historians who do not apply these methods themselves; these types of methods can be mixed with postmodernism for instance and the older tradition may not have been particularly keen toward linguistically oriented research. In other words, the patterns of delay and adoption of the linguistically oriented approaches will reveal also the strength of alternative research traditions and maybe even an unwillingness to turn to the direction suggested by the linguistic turns.

Yet, linguistic turns and narrativity have already had some attention in recent studies.³⁹ Besides the more general studies there have been some single

³⁶ Partti 2013, 66–67, 76, 87–89.

³⁷ For the significant role of A. Korhonen within general history, see Kero, Kostiainen, & Virtanen 1982, 165 and Tommila 1989, 219–220.

³⁸ Partti 2013, 87–89.

³⁹ Edenheim 2009; Hyvärinen 2006; Kalela 1991; Lehti-Eklund et al. 2009; Nilsson 2005, Peltonen Matti 2009; Salomon 2009; Winberg 1990; Zander 2001.

research reports about different international scholars and/or the reception of their works in Finland and Sweden. For example, Skinner,⁴⁰ Koselleck,⁴¹ Scott,⁴² White,⁴³ and Foucault⁴⁴ have been studied so far. The examples above show that the secondary source material is quite wide and diverse, but they nevertheless contain some starting points for this research to lean on.

Reportedly, no wide analysis has been made about the reception of the linguistic turns in Finland or Sweden so far. Historiographical and methodological themes, though, have been popular in these countries, and secondary sources in these areas are naturally many. The newest purely historiographical works⁴⁵ were written around the year 2010, but previous studies⁴⁶ are also worthwhile for tracing the reception of the linguistic turns. At the same time, there have been reports of various general debates⁴⁷ and specific articles about the inner development of the history of ideas⁴⁸ or conceptual history.⁴⁹ The internationalization of historical research has also been a subject of some more specific research.⁵⁰ In conclusion, there have been studies and contributions about methodologies, but not about their reception.

For example, Swedish cultural historian Eva Österberg has said that text and conceptual analysis to study discourses or narratives has been rising over the last few decades in Swedish historiography, and the citations of international scholars (including Michel Foucault, Reinhart Koselleck, and Joan Scott) have increased.⁵¹ Furthermore, Richard Whatmore, a British professor of modern history, sees the Cambridge authors as establishing the dominant approach within intellectual history, but this is not the case in Sweden – according to him, history students in Sweden, especially in the University of Umeå, did not know Pocock or the methodological essays of Skinner, but relied entirely on Foucault for inspiration for the research.⁵² Swede Jonas Hansson wrote in 2008 that transnational conceptual research was rising, especially in the neighboring country of Finland. He also stated that conceptual history within *idé- och lärdomshistoria* started in the mid-1990s, and it has flourished at the universities of Lund and Gothenburg.⁵³

These are agreeable claims, yet they have not been demonstrated and fully proven in empirical studies. Linguistically oriented methods, especially

⁴⁰ Liedman 1979–1980; Bjerstedt 1993; Palonen 2003; Westberg 1998.

⁴¹ Hyrkkänen 1994; Palonen 1997a.

⁴² Edenheim 2012; Hirdman 1988; Östman 2000b.

⁴³ Peltonen 2008.

⁴⁴ Alhanen 2007; Nilsson 2000; Peltonen Matti 2009.

⁴⁵ Björck 2009; Peltonen Markku 2009; Vahtola 2009.

⁴⁶ E.g., Tommila 1989, 250, 292, noticed that the history of ideas (*aatehistoria*) was still young in Finland but narrativity and the resisting of it was making its way here already.

⁴⁷ Aronsson 1998; Zander 2001.

⁴⁸ Andersson & Björck (eds.) 1994; Kallinen 2003; Manninen 2000; Peltonen Markku 2009.

⁴⁹ Kurunmäki 2004; Kuukkanen 2006; Mikkeli 1990; Hansson 2008; Marjanen 2018. See also the theme number of *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* 1/2007, which concentrated on conceptual history in Nordic countries: Lindberg 2007; Marjanen 2007; Nevers 2007; Stenius 2007.

⁵⁰ Eklöf Amirell 2006; Hietala 2002; Hietala 2006b; Mörner 1985; Nevala 2003.

⁵¹ Österberg 2012, 176.

⁵² Whatmore 2016, 11.

⁵³ Hansson 2008, 283, 290.

conceptual history, have been growing gradually in Europe and have gained more visibility, applicators, and advocates. However, there has been no study about this process. In what follows I wish to demonstrate the rise of linguistically oriented studies in a case study concerning Finland and Sweden, and this will hopefully lead to a clearer discussion also in the international contexts.

1.3 Primary and Secondary Sources

My main primary sources are rather exceptional: doctoral dissertations of history. The historical subjects in this study consist of the subjects of history (*historia*) and history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*) in Sweden. From the Finnish side, the subjects of Finnish history (*suomen historia*), general history (*yleinen historia*), Finnish/Finnish and Scandinavian history (*Suomen/Suomen ja Skandinavian historia*), political history (*poliittinen historia*), cultural history (*kulttuurihistoria*), economic and social history (*talous- ja sosiaalhistoria*), economic history (*taloushistoria*), history of ideas and science (*aate- ja oppihistoria*), and the Swedish-language history subjects at the universities of Helsinki and Åbo Akademi are included.⁵⁴ Thus, the dissertations defended in the fields of art, church or legal history are not included in this study.

Between 1970 and 2010 a total of 658 history dissertations were defended in Finland while during the same time the number in Sweden was 1072.⁵⁵ Out of all the 658 defended dissertations of Finland during 1970–2010, 63 were inspired by linguistic turns at least at some level and are used here as primary sources. During the same time, there were a total of 1072 dissertations in Sweden, of which 70 are included for further research. This means that less than 10 percent of the dissertations in both countries included references to the linguistic turns: in the Finnish case a bit more than 9% and in the Swedish case about 6 and half per cents. This is the starting situation for this dissertation and one of the key findings

⁵⁴ The amount of historical subjects seems to be high and diversified in Finland, but basically all the universities have the subjects of Finnish and general history. This is the main feature in the Finnish case. Other historical subjects listed here are taught only at one or two universities. For instance, political history is a separate subject in the Universities of Helsinki and Turku. Economic and social history (Helsinki), economic history (Jyväskylä), cultural history (Turku), and history of ideas and science (Oulu) exist only in one university. See Pihlaja & Päivärinne 2009, 108.

⁵⁵ These numbers are calculated using the list of dissertations defended in Finland 1908–2008 by Pihlaja & Päivärinne 2009 and using the dissertation announcements in the numbers of *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 4/2009 and 4/2010. The total number of Swedish dissertations is based on the information given by the electronic database DokHist of the history department in the University of Gothenburg, and it does not list dissertations written on economic history. It does not cover the years 2008–2010, so the information about those years is added from the numbers of 4/2009, 4/2010, and 4/2011 of *Historisk Tidskrift*. The information about Swedish dissertations of history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*) are from Nilsson 2014. The databases of Melinda and Libris are also used to complete the information. See also Pikwer 1980, Strömberg 1994, Eklöf Amirell 2007, and Karonen 2019.

as well so far. In conclusion, the linguistic turns have been a minority movement and, because of this, frequently misunderstood.

The 63 Finnish and 70 Swedish dissertations including a reference to linguistic turns have appeared in the following manner:⁵⁶

TABLE 1 References to the Linguistic Turns in Dissertations. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations, 1970–2010.

Period	Finland			Sweden		
	All	LT	Amount	All	LT	Amount
1970-1979	64	3	4,7 %	180	2	1,1 %
1980-1989	83	6	7,2 %	159	5	3,1 %
1990-1999	205	17	8,3 %	271	21	7,7 %
2000-2010	306	37	12,1 %	462	42	9,1 %
Total	658	63	9,6 %	1072	70	6,5 %

These 63 Finnish and 71 Swedish dissertations from all the historical dissertations have been chosen in the following manner: all the dissertations have been reviewed at least by reading the title, and the ones that may contain a linguistically oriented method have been examined by their source list. Especially dissertations that have had a clear word referring to language or speech in their title (e.g., “concept,” “debate,” and “discussion”) have been looked at more closely.

It needs to be emphasized that these dissertations include only *references* to a certain scholar or methodological/theoretical framework. Further, a reference may be anything from a single mention (and even rejection) to a wide citing and my own application of a certain method. For example, a reference to the works of conceptual history does not automatically mean that conceptual history itself has been applied in the dissertation, it may have been only a reference to possible and alternative methods or used as research literature. Or, when someone has referred to J. Scott’s article “Gender,” it does not mean that the linguistic side of her theory has been noticed in the dissertation, and so on. These substantive issues are discussed in the following chapters when the contents of the dissertations and their methodological parts are in the focus. At this moment it is the overview to build on and certain conclusions can be made.

At the same time, one has to be aware that not all research has been made in the departments of history, because the methods of Q. Skinner, R. Koselleck, and J. Scott are used also, for example, by social and political scientists to reconstruct social developments (including Ehrnrooth 1992, Kurunmäki 2000, Renkama 2006, Boréus 1994, Jacobsson 1997, and Westberg 2003) through linguistically oriented political research. Additionally, the numbers above indicate only the dissertations defended in these two countries while there have

⁵⁶ Abbreviations: All: all dissertations of history; LT: dissertations including a linguistic turn and an object of this study; Amount: the proportion of dissertations with a reference to linguistic turns from all of the dissertations of history.

been dissertations written also abroad (e.g., Halmesvirta 1990, who had direct reception of linguistic turns while studying in Sussex) and scholars studying and staying in Europe, for example, in the European University Institute (e.g., Kainulainen 2009 and Marklund 2008).

Concerning the selected dissertations for this study, they are not read and researched completely but with a focus mainly on their methodological sections. However, the summaries of the dissertations are also examined to see what kind of results the dissertations produced and to demonstrate the applications of the methods. After that I reconstruct the reactions to the linguistic methods represented in them. For this I use reviews as they contain a more direct evaluation of the usefulness and successfulness of the linguistic methods. Dissertations presumably represent the newest themes and methods that are “in” and recommendable at each moment, though their role as demonstrations of knowledge of scholarly conventions also needs to be considered. It must be highlighted here that when I read dissertations, I focus only on their possible linguistic side. I do not evaluate the whole work itself and show only what reviewers have said. The reviews I use are published in journals, and I have included them in the analysis if there has been an explicit statement about the linguistically oriented methods or their utility.⁵⁷

At the same time, it is important to keep in mind the status of the dissertations and the reviews of them: the dissertations may not always include the newest innovations but rather conservative viewpoints, as they are usually the first demonstrations of the grasp of conventions and scholarly rhetoric. Accordingly, they may not contain the most radical and innovative approaches but some safer themes and approaches first. More courageous themes outside of the regular academic trends may not have been supported by the right of the postgraduate to study and/or funding or supervision. They are nevertheless valuable for tracing the roots of the reception of the linguistic methods and alternative methodological approaches because PhD candidates need to consider methods properly, since dissertations in Finland and Sweden must contain a methodological chapter. Further, a comparative study requires that the targets of comparison must be sufficiently comparable with each other, and this will support my choice to concentrate mainly on the dissertations. Even if they may not include the most groundbreaking research methods, but those that are less risky, dissertations are suitable for this kind of longer-term study from the comparative viewpoint.⁵⁸

The practices in supervising must also be considered as there probably have been different aspects in both countries concerning the amount of supervision and the final influence of the supervisor(s). Also, account must be taken of who has written the review about the dissertation. The reviews are written by different people on different occasions, but most of the time by the opponent, sometimes a colleague, which extends the variation in styles of the reviews from

⁵⁷ There is one exception, Quentin Skinner’s review of Markku Peltonen’s dissertation. Skinner’s review was not published, but I have included its archival version as Skinner is one of the key scholars in this study.

⁵⁸ Comparison as a method in this study is discussed more deeply in the next sub-chapter.

challenging to accommodative and less critical. Using reviews is otherwise valid, since they are usually easily available: for example, in the 1990s and 2000s more reviews were published in the journals about the dissertations than other types of books since at least the opponent had an opportunity to publish a review based on his/her evaluation report as a record of done work. Although the themes and methods of the dissertations may have been slightly conservative at the time of their defending, in the four decades covered there has been traceable movement toward linguistically oriented methods. Besides, through the reviews the senior scholarly generation enters the discussion about the linguistic turns, since they had to express an opinion about the usability of linguistically oriented approaches.

The methodologists advocating the linguistic turns as mentioned, Q. Skinner, R. Koselleck, and others, are also listed as primary sources, because I treat their works as a starting point, which researchers in Finland and Sweden either follow or ignore.

As supporting primary sources, to relate the methodological trends applied in the dissertations, I will use a variety of scientific works reflecting and contributing to the historiographical discussion on methodology. These supportive primary sources include mainly journals, such as Finnish *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* and *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, while from the Swedish journals the most important are *Historisk Tidskrift*, *Scandia*, and *Lychnos*.⁵⁹ I use my analysis of these to relate the topics with the current trends visible on the dissertations. Strictly speaking, *Lychnos* is not a journal but a yearbook of the Swedish History of Science and Ideas Society, but it is equated in this study with other journals.

From the viewpoint of my study, I concentrate on national journals, but acknowledging the status of the *Scandinavian Journal of History* (published from 1976 onwards) would be interesting because of its purposes. It has shown the current research themes that the Nordic historians have wanted to share with their international colleagues. One potential source group would also have been the evaluations of the pre-examiners, but using them would have raised some technical and ethical questions.⁶⁰ At this point it is good to master one primary source material group, that is, dissertations rather than various different source types in a less comprehensive way.

There have not been so many methodological or theoretical works on history⁶¹ in Finland and Sweden during the past four decades, but the existing volumes still contain valuable information about evolving attitudes toward linguistic methods. Secondary sources include general studies about the historiographical development in Nordic countries and internationally, while I

⁵⁹ These journals have formed a forum for national historical discussion for many decades and thus have been selected as a context for the methodological discussions in Finland and Sweden. In this research, they are used as supportive primary sources and studied explicitly in Chapter 3.

⁶⁰ There have been researches using evaluation forms as source material in Sweden, but with the focus on the first half of the twentieth century: Larsson 2010.

⁶¹ E.g., Nordin 1978, Forser 1978, Dahlgren & Floren 1996, Kalela 1976, Kalela 2000, Hyrkkänen 1984, and Hyrkkänen 2002.

also use more background information about varieties of the linguistic turns. Contextualization is one of the key features of this kind of study, because the relationships of the researchers and more or less official “schools” reveal relevant information, and the field is very diversified. To reconstruct these relationships, I will use a vast background material of secondary sources about historians and historiography. Since one side of my work is about reception, it is also important to analyze the development of the international networks of Finnish and Swedish historians, such as the History of Concepts Group since 1998, which itself is a demonstration of the growing interest in linguistically oriented approaches. It must also be mentioned that in historiographical research a single source can be either a primary or secondary source, or both, depending on its usage, and this is the case also in this study.

The relationships between scholars make up one interesting point but tend to be hard to prove. Studying abroad, in this case especially in Great Britain, Germany, the United States, or France, is also significant in the case of reception. The time frame comes all the way to the present day, and there are not so many sources to look for information on certain historians. Some professor registers have been published, but otherwise this is one challenge of the newest history when there may be a lack of up-to-date sources. I still believe the newest articles and papers also give enough information about this, and one solution lies in the dissertations themselves: reading the possible preface and acknowledgement sections reveals information about the doctoral student’s supervisors, other background information, and possible study abroad.

The academic community has published a vast amount of materials in the last few decades. To select, use, and clarify the importance of those for a historiographical and methodological research is another aspect to take into account. One reason for the trend of academic sources lies in their amount and diversification: the study of history and its methodological debates have become so diverse and broad during the past decades that no-one can be aware of every single area of our study. At the same time, the number of the publications has risen greatly, and this leads us to consider the methodological and theoretical questions more precisely.

1.4 Methodological and Theoretical Starting Points

The main methodological and theoretical background in this study includes reception theory and comparative research, with a consideration of conceptual analysis and transnational aspects as well. These methods have been used mainly in the field of new political history and philosophy, still outside of the mainstream, but they produce valuable information also in this kind of historiographical research. In this sub-section I will deal with each of my theoretical and methodological starting points separately – first describing their main theoretical features and then applying them directly to my research theme. I have promoted their most relevant features concerning my topic, and I also give

some details at certain times to demonstrate the applicability of these methods for this study.

In short, after collecting my main primary source material, dissertations of history with references to linguistically oriented approaches, I have analyzed their methodological sections and after that I reconstruct the methodological debates about the linguistic turns by reading the reviews of these dissertations as well. The comparisons make it possible to see the situation in Finland and Sweden from the perspective of an outsider. Further, the historians in Finland and Sweden are seen as an audience that follows (or does not) international discussions and gradually imports the linguistic turns into these countries. Yet, the role of this audience is not only passive but also attending.

Reception theory was first introduced to historical research by Hans Robert Jauss, but Martyn P. Thompson's subsequent article "Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning" was a clear breakthrough in its usage. Before that, reception theory was used mainly in the literature studies within the literary reception. In historical studies it is applied mainly to the research of political history or thought while the starting point of Thompson's article was a critique toward Quentin Skinner and his methods, which over-emphasized the importance of the texts themselves and neglected the role of the readers.

The main point of Thompson's article was to combine the theories wherein either readers or the authorial intended meanings created the meanings of the texts. Thompson divided the two main lines of German literary reception theory into two different theories, substantialist and pragmatic theory. The former emphasizes the text as constructed by the author and containing only the information restricted by the author, while the latter focuses on the role of the readers and giving new meanings to the texts when read by different readers at the same time, the same reader at different times, and different readers at different times. Thus, according to pragmatic theory, the same text can be understood differently at different times by different readers, and that is why the role of the audience must be considered more deeply when one has to be conscious about these complex interactions. According to Thompson, reception history emphasizes the changing horizons of expectations of readers, with a background of everyone's own personal experience also. Thompson also stated, based on Edward Said, that texts are active and put limits on the interpretation.⁶²

In a more direct methodological suggestion, Thompson stated that the longer the text's life and the broader the geographical and cultural spreads of the text's impact, the greater are the differences between the groups of the readers and their interpretations. Thompson noted the need to also take account of publishing practices, advertising policies, and so on, because these have an impact on transmitting literature to readers. Further, the role of the cultural institutions is notable when they select, criticize, promote, or condemn texts. Some different horizons of ideological beliefs and rhetorical expectations of readerships may also have an effect. All these must be considered, in order to

⁶² Thompson 1993, 251, 255-256, 258.

make remarks about the past meaning and the present significance.⁶³ The main argument was that one has to think about every possible thing that either furthers or prevents – or generally directly affects – the possible reception.

Leidulf Melve extended the use of reception theory in historical research by combining its features with German conceptual history, *Begriffsgeschichte*, and linguistic contextualism by Skinner and J.G.A. Pocock. An important core of Melve's method was the importance of distinguishing the *intended meaning*, *received meaning*, and *language* from each other. In these the intended meaning consists of the intentions of the writers, the received meaning of the interpretation(s) by the public, and the language at the time the conceptual innovations started to be visible in the texts or in the interpretation(s) of them. This suggests that the reception and importance of a text consists of the nexus of the author's meaning, the role of the audience and the text itself, which all have an influence on its meaning over time. Melve also has suggested that the reception may vary depending on whether the text is applied straight after its publication or after many interpretations of different generations. The received meaning can also vary during the passage of time so the role of the audience and readers is clearly an active one.⁶⁴

As the starting point of the reception analysis, I treat the historians in Finland and Sweden as an audience, which follows and actively engages – or does not – international discussions on the linguistic methods and later applies these methods on one's own. A direct link with the linguistic turns would be a clear notification to one of the thinkers, for example, to Skinner, while indirect representation would be like using linguistic methods already on one's own. As Jörn Leonhard has suggested, there are three levels of reception: imitation, adaptation and application through discursive integration.⁶⁵ So, the role of Swedish and Finnish historians as audience is not merely passive and referring one but also active and applicative. Influences originating from the other methodological approaches to history also need to be considered. In some sense reception is linked with active actions, and the PhD candidates and reviewers are active participants.

There are many possible matters that have influenced the reception in Finland and Sweden. Since the linguistic turns have an international background, the international networks are one clear focus. The secondary sources suggest so far that the international relationships, especially with German scholarship, were more visible in Finland, while Sweden's relationships with German scholars started to gradually weaken already after the First World War, or the trend for that had already started back at that time.⁶⁶ Briefly summarized, German connections appeared to broke more clearly in Sweden than Finland after World War II.

⁶³ Thompson 1993, 269–270, 272.

⁶⁴ Melve 2006, 390–394.

⁶⁵ This can be seen also like a translation process, Leonhard 2011, 256–257. Leonhard presents three stages of this process: imitation, adaptation, and discursive integration.

⁶⁶ E.g., Hietala 2006b; Eklöf Amirell 2006, 260–262; Mörner 1985, 432, 437, 441; Ihalainen, Nuolijärvi & Saarinen 2019, 38, 41.

The historians in the Nordic countries also had the local readership to satisfy in the journals, monographs, and dissertations: the newest linguistically oriented methodological discussion was perhaps not the most interesting one to report back in the journals. From the journals, it also must be remembered that referee and peer review standards have been used perhaps only from the 2000s. Before that the editorships of the journals may have chosen the published articles and trusted to less riskier themes, which have caused the editorial policies and the statuses of the journals to sometimes be disputed.⁶⁷

Even the knowledge of languages has had an influence on the level of reception, because it leads to the question of how much historians had the preconditions to follow the international discussion. At the same time, the diversification of history and its methodological debates play a considerable role here because the study of history and its methodological debates have become so diverse and broad during the past decades that no-one can be aware of every single area of our study. This evokes a penetrating question about how much a historian is willing and ready to understand discussions, new applications, and methodological approaches outside of one's own specific area of study. The impact of this may be that other subfields are not read or referred to. At the same time the number of dissertations has greatly risen and their forms of publication changed over the decades.

Mixing linguistically oriented methods with postmodernism is also a quite common feature, especially in Sweden,⁶⁸ although it runs the risk of a certain misunderstanding on the main part of historians, who do not use linguistically connected methods: they may regard every research with linguistic elements as a form of postmodernism. This also prevents the reception of such linguistically oriented methods when all linguistically conducted research may have been seen as a challenge to traditional historical studies. The outcome is a selective reception that may also exclude useful methods and prevent discussion about them. Some of the new linguistically oriented methods may also have been more complicated to easily understand and thus potentially ignored.

The reception not only reveals the applications of new methods but also the strength of the so-called older traditions, mainly the political, social, and economic history, in these countries. For example, the subject of general history (*yleinen historia*) in Finland was already internationally oriented at the beginning of the 1970s and there were also some Germany-based traditions of conceptual history (already-mentioned A. Kemiläinen and O. Jussila).

The status of general history in Finland is rather unusual and exceptional from the international point of view. It was established in the nineteenth century when Finland was part of the Russian Empire. The professorship of history was divided in two at the beginning of the 1860s: the history of Russia, Finland, and Scandinavia (*Suomen ja Skandinavian historia*) and every other history was named as general history, *yleinen historia*. General history is understood as a research that concentrates on topics outside of Finland, but it may have contacts with Finnish

⁶⁷ The editorial policies of the journals are treated more precisely in Chapter 3.1.

⁶⁸ Partti 2013, 84–85, 87.

history. Also, the history of Russia, of Swedish foreign policy, and of Sweden after 1809 have been considered general history.⁶⁹ As a subject, general history has never been outside of the departments of history in Finland, but always belonged to them. This is different from Sweden where the subject of history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*) operates separately from the departments of history.

So far it seems the case that the international connections have been stronger in Finland, partially caused by the internationality of general history since the times of Arvi Korhonen and his seminar when Finland searched for its direction more toward Western Europe. Korhonen highlighted themes that were temporally and spatially diverse, internationally influential, and remarkable. This was also the way to attend directly to international discussions. Almost all professors of general history appointed between 1950s and 1970s were students of Korhonen.⁷⁰

Sometimes there are works that are dealt with again continuously also in the methodological discussion, which leads to different interpretations of them at different times. The most famous and expressive examples would be the articles "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas" by Skinner in 1969, and "Gender" by Joan Scott in 1986, and the books *Metahistory* by Hayden White in 1973 and *Vergangene Zukunft* by Koselleck in 1979. After decades, historians and PhD candidates have returned to these almost "canonical scriptures" when explaining their methodological and theoretical approaches and thus have interpreted these texts in various ways at different times. This is also a clarifying indicator that this reception or transfer has been clearly a long-term process.

Through the received meanings we come across in the field of conceptual history and intellectual history, we are able to see how the linguistic turns have been understood in Finland and Sweden. Conceptual history can be understood also as a history of conceptions, and these comprehensions change over time, so the conceptual history gives further valid viewpoints to my research—to understand the linguistic turns and the meanings of their methods and contents is conceptual history itself, which in turn is an essential part of the linguistic turns.⁷¹

While analyzing the reception of the linguistically oriented methods, I also apply some of their features myself, as for example Kari Palonen, a political scientist from the University of Jyväskylä, has done in the case of *Begriffsgeschichte* or Q. Skinner.⁷² Practically, I use the contextual approach, which includes the analysis of both the micro and macro levels of the discussions and long-time concepts; in this area, Q. Skinner and R. Koselleck have been the two most prominent scholars. Skinner emphasizes the intentions of the writer and texts as intended acts of communication in certain situations. Thus, he focuses more on the individual and unique conception of usage at a certain moment when the writer is doing something while saying something. To reveal the probable

⁶⁹ Tommila 1989, 97. See also Lauerma 1967.

⁷⁰ Tommila 1989, 219–220.

⁷¹ Conceptual history as a history of comprehension: see, e.g., Hyrkkänen 2002, 112–113.

⁷² Palonen 1997a; Palonen 2003.

intentions of the writer, it is necessary to contextualize the text with its contemporary texts and social context to see the possible linguistic background available at that time.⁷³ On the contrary, Koselleck sees the concepts with a longer history, containing medium- and long-term structures, changes, and interactions between the language and society to create different and new meanings for concepts. The meanings of the concepts change much more slowly in the theory of Koselleck because without common concepts there would be no society and no activity.⁷⁴

I combine these viewpoints so that both short- and long-term changes in the concepts use are valid. Some of the concepts used by historians have been general, some in unique application, and historians use them in an individual way in certain situations. The audience of Finnish and Swedish historians would be here the “society” where the unique usage of the language is made and visible in certain situations. The macro level represented by Koselleck is important in my case, since this study deals more with communities of historians than individual researchers. Still, the micro level must also be considered, because some of the language usage was unique, and thus it reveals also the thoughts of one at a certain moment. The importance of institutions (universities and forms of dissertations) and networks between the researchers is used to contextualize the language usage of a single historian. Thompson also mentioned the general horizons of expectations and personal experience in his theory of reception, and this supports dividing my treatment of reception between both the micro and macro levels.⁷⁵

Otherwise, I will rely on the contextualizing starting point, which includes the analysis of both the micro and macro levels of the discussions: for example, historians mainly use the same concepts when talking about linguistic methods, but some of the usage is still individual. In the case of linguistic turns, the individual usage of concepts is also partly expectable, as not all of the historians understood (or even cared) about the distinction between postmodernism and linguistic research within conceptual history and thus used the same concepts from both.

One good possibility relies on observing the long-time use of the concepts related to the linguistic methods, like *käsittehistoria/begreppshistoria*, the history of concepts. The contents and meanings of these concepts have varied over the last few decades, since the linguistic turns have added some aspects to those. Besides, even the term *linguistic turn* itself is not a clear and unanimous term at all, because it can contain a wide spectrum of connotations from empirical to theoretic views, and it can be seen as a synonym for postmodernism. When mentioning the linguistic turn, for most historians it may mistakenly mean only Hayden White and/or Michel Foucault.

The usage of these concepts is partly individual, and it reflects the thoughts of the commentator at a certain time and situation. For example, in the pages of

⁷³ Skinner 2002, 86–89.

⁷⁴ Koselleck 1979/1985, 75–89. See also Koselleck 1989, 657–661.

⁷⁵ For macro and micro levels, see Halonen, Ihalainen, & Saarinen 2015.

the *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* and *Historisk Tidskrift*, concepts like “rhetorical turn,” “narrativistic turn,” “revision,” “post-structuralism,” or simply “textual analysis” were used from the linguistic turns. Furthermore, both Skinner and White have been seen as a “textual analyst” at the same time (Pär Frohnert, HT 2/1998), and the theories of Scott and Foucault have been described with the term of “post-structuralism” (Monika Edgren, HT 4/1991; Roddy Nilsson, HT 2/2000) in the writings of *Historisk Tidskrift*. In *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* the linguistic turn itself was described also as purely “narrativistic” (Juhani Mylly, HAik 1/1997), which, as we shall see, is a major simplification.⁷⁶ Further, also in the research literature of the 2010s, there have been statements that the postmodern challenge is noted within historical studies in the form of linguistic and cultural turns, among others.⁷⁷ These examples reveal a certain confusion between postmodernism and a linguistically oriented methodology. That is why four decades should be enough to see some changes of significance in the conceptual usages, especially when the linguistic turns have been viewed in so various ways. This is reminiscent also of the historical connections between past and present interpretations of texts by the reception theorist Thompson.⁷⁸ That is why a more detailed and extensive conceptual research about the methodological discussions is needed.

Further, the questions arises of what to include—and exclude: long-term concepts like *aatehistoria/idéhistoria* (“history of ideas”) or *kielellinen käänne/språkliga vändningen* (“linguistic turn”) themselves during the past several decades, for instance? The research literature of different times is used to contextualize these to their own times. Tracing the usage of the concept of *discourse* is also relevant here, because it can contain many possible meanings – from the Foucauldian sense of discourse as the frames of possible saying or speaking to the more complex ideas of consecutive speech acts and their networks. Thus, discourse can be divided into soft and hard versions of constructivism, based on the restrictive nature given to it.⁷⁹ In some sense, the more abstract and theoretical the use of concepts is, the more possible variations of meaning they contain. I consider that linguistic turns have different connotations. Concentrating on language and concepts and taking them seriously is clearly an approach which helps to study the language of the past empirically. Postmodernism represents a different perspective, but it has not had so many tools to offer when doing research.

As mentioned above, often-used concepts have different meanings for historians, and this kind of research focusing on this diversity will have worthwhile results concerning the historiographical tendencies in Finland and Sweden. In the future, my results may help researchers to understand methodological development as a discursive process of debates. This process has not taken place at the same time or in the same manner as on the other levels and nation states. The social context should also be remarked here. The themes and

⁷⁶ Partti 2013.

⁷⁷ Österberg 2012, 180.

⁷⁸ Thompson 1993, 272.

⁷⁹ Ihalainen & Saarinen 2019.

methods of the dissertations may have been conventional at the time of their defending, but during the past four decades, there has been some movement toward the inclusion of linguistically oriented methods. The methodological discussions have also been diverse within linguistic contextualism. For example, concentration on spatiality, mobility, and materiality have introduced new insights for research.⁸⁰

While the methodological and theoretical applications mentioned above lead to one sort of research, I also adopt a new viewpoint to interpret them in a wider context. For this I use comparative methods, because they reveal new information beyond the traditional national borders. More than that, they are also valuable because of their transnational aspects. They partially challenge and supplement comparative research as not only national states are seen as units. Because my target is two countries and two different national lines of trends, it is justified to also apply comparative methods. On the other hand, when doing a comparative study, the cases for comparison must contain some unity for successful results. The doctoral dissertations are close enough to each other in these countries, which will provide a fruitful comparison between them.

For example, Jürgen Kocka has emphasized the role of comparison to get rid of national foregone conclusions by comparing single cases with each other. At the same time, the cases should not only be divided, usually into two, different cases, but the units of comparison should also form an entity as components of a larger whole, in the meaning of a transnational *entangled history*.⁸¹ In addition, Peter Baldwin has also stressed the values of comparison because the national histories are going the way of nationalism. He also has mentioned that a comparison in history does not need to be as generalized as in the social sciences. Comparison should be used to formulate arguments about differences and similarities among a range of cases that allow its general pattern to be understood. The dangers of these methods lie in the relationship between the unique cases and the general one, because the generic concept may exist only in the ideas, not in the cases themselves. For this a general pattern of the particular phenomenon has to be created based on the secondary sources.⁸²

Heinz-Gerhard Haupt has in turn pointed out that comparison does not work only in one direction, but it must be mutual and two-sided.⁸³ Raymond Grew has suggested that the processes are the most interesting cases to study by comparison. Comparing the developments of two different countries at the same time helps to see other, alternative ends and thus to ask, why was the development different in the first country from that in the second one. One important aspect is also to test one's own hypotheses through comparison.⁸⁴

⁸⁰ Halonen et al. 2015.

⁸¹ Kocka 2003, 41–44. See also Kocka & Haupt 2009 for entangled history, history of connections, such as crossing of borders between nations, regions, continents or other spaces in all kinds of encounters, perceptions, movements, relations, and interactions between them.

⁸² Baldwin 2004, 3, 11, 13.

⁸³ Haupt 2007, 703.

⁸⁴ Grew 1980, 764–765, 768, 769–771; Grew 2006, 104–106.

Concerning previously mentioned starting points, my research of reception and methodological updating can also be seen as a study of a process or processes.

Nevertheless, comparison further raises the question whether the situation was the same in both countries and why. As a Finn, the historiographical situation is, in principle, already familiar to me, but through comparison it is possible to see the situation in Finland from an outside perspective. In the case of Finland and Sweden, comparison is particularly justified and valid since these countries are close enough to each other due to their historical, scientific, and institutional developments.⁸⁵ For example, Finnish historians have worked in Sweden and the Swedish research has especially affected studies of the early modern period. This brings to my research also a transnational viewpoint as there has been considerable cooperation between the countries for a long time. Especially interesting is the feature that there are Swedish-speaking universities or programs of historical studies (e.g., Åbo Akademi, University of Helsinki) and a Swedish-speaking journal in Finland (*Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*), which use the same language as Finland is constitutionally bilingual for historical reasons. There are also scholars with Finnish background in Sweden as well.

Naturally there are always differences—for example, in the level of international contacts and some Swedish departments concentrating more on the history of ideas and especially the history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*) than on conceptual history. This subject of history of science and ideas is studied also in Finland—for example, within the discipline of intellectual history (*aatehistoria*) in Oulu—but it is closer to the history of science than to political philosophy. Intellectual history, history of political thought, and history of political discourse are popular also elsewhere and sometimes the research within general history (*yleinen historia*) has been more diverse than the one practiced in the actual departments of intellectual history.⁸⁶

In brief, my methodological starting points are these: I sort out the role of the Finnish and Swedish historians as an active audience that engages and reflects the linguistic turns in these Nordic countries. I will do this by examining the promoting and preventing features of this reception. Practically, I concentrate on the dissertations that deal with the linguistic turns and on the reviews of them. To help study this I use conceptual analysis to reveal comprehensions, while also taking account of the changes and continuities of the analytical concepts. The comparative research approach in turn helps to see Finland from the perspective of an outsider and promotes valid questions to clarify the reasons between the different development lines. The final goal is to create a coherent picture about the methodological process concerning the impact of the linguistically oriented methods.

⁸⁵ For an example of comparing Finland and Sweden, see Ihalainen 2017 and Karonen 2019.

⁸⁶ For the internationality of the general history, see Peltonen Markku 2009 and Vahtola 2009. The role of the general history in Finland was also widely discussed in the numbers of the *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* in 1982: Hietala & Setälä 1982; Kero, Kostainen & Virtanen 1982; Hovi 1982; Kemiläinen 1982; Kero & Virtanen 1982. For *idé- och lärdomshistoria*, see Nilsson 2014 and Lindberg 1980.

Simply put, the starting point of my research can be imagined as focusing on a nexus or crossroads: on the one side we have the audiences of historians in Finland and Sweden with their national traditions—for example, about conceptual history and the internalization of historical research (or lack thereof)—and on the other side, international debates concerning linguistic turns. In the middle of the intersection these encounter each other and lead to a methodological renewal and updating. This renewing happens in both countries at different times, with foci on different aspects, but the transnational feature creates links between the countries. The linguistic turn has not been a rapid and pervasive phenomenon, at least not in the Nordic countries on the side of the reception, but I consider it to be a long process, final analysis of which gives us more valid information about the nature of the methodological discussions as a whole.

The methodological and theoretical approaches introduced above should form a useful and relevant starting point for this research. Usually these types of methods are used more in the field of political philosophy or political studies, but they prove their value also in this kind of methodological and historiographical topic since I also focus on the national, international, and transnational lines of development. The research method of reading dissertations and reviews of them gives information about the reception of linguistic turns, and through the comparison between Sweden and Finland this study brings new information about the newer historiography of these countries. Moreover, researching the methods and themes in the dissertations and more general professional discussion would be useful for almost any research area and subject, not only within historical studies.

Concluding, I will follow these three major arguments throughout my dissertation: (i) the comparative viewpoint is valuable also in the field of historiography and reveals results that have otherwise gone unnoticed; (ii) the cooperation between different scientific and scholarly disciplines has grown during the last few decades and, at the same time, history has always taken methodological and theoretical standing points from other fields of research, and in the case of Finland and Sweden increasing transnationality and interdisciplinary; and (iii) the nature of academic transfers and receptions is multi-level and highly complex, drawing benefit from large scientific entities to the level of single scholars, all of which operate on many levels and beyond national borders, relying upon entanglement as a key feature in this kind of multi-sited interaction.⁸⁷

The study and the structure of the analysis continues in the following manner.

After the introduction, Chapter 2 gives a brief overview of the linguistic turns and the senior scholars behind them as a background. Reactions, both foreign and Nordic, to their works are also discussed.

⁸⁷ For multi-sitedness, see Halonen, Ihalainen, & Saarinen 2015, 3, 13–16.

Long-time Finnish and Swedish historical journals occupy the main role in Chapter 3. This chapter operates as a context for the themes discussed in the dissertations. There is no separate background chapter of Finnish and Swedish historiography before the year 1970, but it is treated in suitable points through the research literature.

The following Chapters 4, 5, and 6 are the core of this study and present the appearance and impact of the linguistic turns in the main primary sources; how they have been visible and applied in the dissertations. The handling of these is made in the first place separately in different sub-sections, but there are also overlapping methodical and theoretical perspectives. Principally, conceptual history and linguistic contextualism inspired by the Cambridge School are treated in Chapters 4 and 5. The other linguistic turns, discursivity, gender, narrativity, and philosophical standing points are discussed in Chapter 6.

The study ends with discussion in which ideas of the possible development of linguistically oriented methods in the future are also considered. My hypothesis is that historical studies have always borrowed methodological inspirations from outside of the discipline, and this could be more likely in the case of linguistic turns as well.

All the translations into English are my own, as well as the choices to translate certain concepts in the way they are presented in the analysis section.

2 FOREIGN METHODOLOGICAL DEBATE ON THE LINGUISTIC TURNS

2.1 Main Features and Varieties of the Linguistic Turns' First Wave

Before analyzing the transfer of the linguistic turns into Finland and Sweden, it is necessary to discuss these briefly on the international level, so that these can be compared later with the situations of the two study countries. As already mentioned, linguistic turns have been interpreted in many ways during the past few decades. Knowing the backgrounds and main features of all the sides is important to understand the reception and applications of the linguistic turns fully.

The periodicity of the theoretical trends within historical studies includes the dominant roles, as follows: The analytical philosophy of history was strong between 1945 and 1970 and dealt with the issue of historical explanation. From 1970 on the narrative philosophy of history was superseded by the turn of 1990s, and the main issue was historical representation. After 1990, the last dominant trend has included the trend of paying attention to the subjects of representation and their different representational codes—for example, who represents the past of certain genders, classes, or races, and why. This last trend yet lacks a clear name, but it includes the issue of the use of the language as a form of action.⁸⁸

The term *linguistic turn* has been used since the 1960s,⁸⁹ but it can be understood in many ways. Even though the term was invented at that time, interest toward language has a longer tradition. As stated, the afore-mentioned researchers on whom I will concentrate (Q. Skinner, R. Koselleck, J.G.A. Pocock,

⁸⁸ Lorenz 2011, 22, 26. For narrativity in history, see, e.g., Carr 1986, Chapter II: Temporality and Narrative Structure, Hyvärinen 2006 and Kuukkanen 2015.

⁸⁹ See the famous introduction by Richard Rorty, where he adopted the term *linguistic turn* from Gustav Bergmann: Rorty 1967/1992.

J. Scott, M. Foucault, H. White, and F.R. Ankersmit) had their methods described in articles or monographs published between the 1960s and 1980s and represent the first wave of the linguistic turns. Some of their theories trace back to the works of W.H. Walsh and J.L. Austin and more narrativist theories by Arthur Danto and Louis Mink in the 1950–60s or even to the linguistic theories of the analytical philosophy of language of Ludwig Wittgenstein, as interest in language has a long history.⁹⁰

At the same time, it must be noted that although the term used is *turn*, the turning toward language has not been rapid and sharp. Some scholars note that what has happened is more like a “slow turn, endless discussion,” as Caroline Steedman has put it.⁹¹ The term *endless discussion* is very representative here and describes perfectly the continuous theoretical debates around the theme, both outside and in Scandinavia.

Further, according to American historian Judith Surkis, the actual temporality of the linguistic turn as a progressive process is less known, even worldwide. This means that little attention has been paid to the implicit temporality of turn talk itself. Thus, Surkis has asked, and quite rightfully, what does it mean to describe a historical moment as a turn. For her it was difficult to clearly pinpoint a singular or coherent “turn” as having taken place, and the temporality of turn talk presumed a supersession of one disciplinary trend by another.⁹² Besides Surkis, American historian and philosopher Martin Jay distinguished several linguistic turns already in the early 1980s. These affected within historical studies and in humanities general, and Jay suggested that these turns may take different directions. The main thing was that there was no single turn for him.⁹³

For Surkis the complex debates that took place in the 1980s and 1990s—about discourse and subjectivity, or the relationship between “linguistic” structures, agency, and experience—showed that there was no singular “turn”. These discussions did not occur once and for all, in an orderly logic of progression and supersession, or uniformly across the discipline. Thus, Surkis recommended that the linguistic turn might be better understood as specifically located, imaginatively cast, at once multiple, overlapping, and dynamic constellation.⁹⁴

Surkis and Jay concentrated, besides Q. Skinner, H. White, and M. Foucault, also on scholars like Clifford Geertz and Jürgen Habermas, who have also been influential within historical studies. Thus, it is highly relevant question, who belongs (or has been seen to belonging) to the group of linguistically oriented

⁹⁰ Clark 2004, 87–88. See also Walsh 1951/1964, Austin 1962, Danto 1965, Wittgenstein 1921/1961 and Wittgenstein 1953/1980. Lorenz considers Danto’s work of 1965 to be the transition between the analytical and narrative periods within the debates of historical theory: Lorenz 2011, 23.

⁹¹ Steedman 2001, 143.

⁹² Surkis 2012, 702. See also Vernon 1994 for the lack of interest toward theoretical discussions about the linguistic turn.

⁹³ Jay 1982, 106. See also Surkis 2012, 706.

⁹⁴ Surkis 2012, 717–718, 722.

scholars. I apply the five categories, presented above, and introduce the main scholars in this chapter.

Quentin Skinner (b. 1940) has had notable success in renewing the methodology of the history of ideas, because in his famous article “Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas” (briefly “Meaning and Understanding”) in 1969 he criticized researchers for studying timeless conceptions without conceptualizing them with contemporary language use. Skinner emphasized the intentions of the writer and texts as intended acts of communication in certain situations. Thus, he focused more on the individual and unique conception of usage at the certain moment when the writer is doing something while saying something. To reveal the real intentions of the writer, it is necessary to contextualize the text with its contemporary texts and social context to see the possible linguistic background usable at that time. Later he has also been more skeptical about the histories of concepts and unit ideas. Skinner also attacked the so-called model of influence.⁹⁵

Even though Skinner’s article became famous and significant, his theories were not totally new but rather adopted from the works of J.L. Austin and John Searle in the 1950s and 1960s concerning speech acts. This kind of methodological thinking also has been referred to as the *performative turn*, wherein the performative function of language comes first through the speech acts and the context of action will be known.⁹⁶ Summarizing the thoughts of Skinner, it is all about contextualization and contemplating the intentions of the writers in the texts, so, for example, Elizabeth Clark has classified Skinner rather as a contextualist: the writing is just an extension of speech for him and the contexts are readily discernable.⁹⁷ Later, Skinner has turned also toward rhetorical methods, especially after his work about Thomas Hobbes in 1996.⁹⁸

Skinner and J.G.A. Pocock (b. 1924)—as well as also, for example, John Dunn (b. 1940)—belong to the so-called Cambridge School, which has been focused on the intentions of single agents.⁹⁹ They have been significant applicers of the linguistically oriented methods to research ideas, because they all focus on language as a guide to reality, and their main focus is on the long-time discursive structures, whatever these are.¹⁰⁰ The Cambridge School nevertheless does not always study politics as a discursive process, as some historians today do, but undoubtedly the Cambridge School is in the mainstream of the English-speaking

⁹⁵ Skinner 1969, 48–50, 52–53. See also Skinner 2002, an updated article of “Meaning and Understanding.” Skinner 1988.

⁹⁶ Clark 2004, 138; Kuukkanen 2015, 158–161; Lorenz 2011, 27–28; Palonen 2003, 57, 134–137. From the notable works of Austin and Searle, see, e.g., Austin 1962 and Searle 1969. Austin has also been seen as a link between Wittgenstein and Skinner.

⁹⁷ Clark 2004, 138–139.

⁹⁸ Skinner 1996.

⁹⁹ For a good overview of contextualization by Skinner and Pocock, see Hampsher-Monk 2001.

¹⁰⁰ See, e.g., Pocock 1962 and Pocock 1989.

world concerning the history of political thought.¹⁰¹ There are still some differences between scholars, because Pocock, for example, had different authors and theories to lean on than did Skinner – Kenneth Burke, structural linguistics, and Thomas Kuhn. Pocock approached language as social constructions, and he developed his thoughts further in Sussex, where language was seen as an instrument, for example, in the use of public moralism. The nature of using language in argument and studying historical contexts are still the main viewpoints for both of them.¹⁰²

On the contrary, Reinhart Koselleck (1923–2006), the all-time most significant researcher of the German conceptual history *Begriffsgeschichte* saw the concepts as having a longer history, containing medium- and long-term structures, changes, and interactions between the language and society to create different and new meanings for concepts. According to him, the meanings of concepts change slowly, and without common concepts there would be no society and no action there. Within these, Koselleck emphasized the studying of the history of basic concepts (*Grundbegriffe*) – the concepts, which are highly central, cover a broad field of meaning, and are contested repeatedly. While some of the concepts have been in use for a long time, this does not mean that their meaning has always been the same – for example, *Bürger* from the meaning of “burgher” to “citizen” and eventually “bourgeois”. These are the chains of word-meaning-object wherein the concept is connected to a word, but it is at the same time more than a word. Transformation in the meanings of words has been important for *Begriffsgeschichte*, while the notion of counter concepts must also be noted.¹⁰³

Koselleck’s career started with his dissertation *Kritik und Krise* in 1954, which later was published as a study of the same name at the end of the 1950s. His famous teachers, among them Carl Schmitt, Martin Heidegger, and Werner Conze, already had a considerable influence on his research interests from the early stage of his studies. Koselleck’s most notable methodological work *Vergangene Zukunft – Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*¹⁰⁴ was published in 1979 in German and in 1985 in English under the name *Futures Past – On the Semantics of Historical Time* and translated by Keith Tribe. It contained a collection of his methodologically notable articles published before, such as “Begriffsgeschichte und Sozialgeschichte,” which was written originally in 1972. Koselleck contributed also as a planner and editor with the eight-volume lexicon of

¹⁰¹ For the mainstream role of the Cambridge School, see, e.g., Palonen 2003, 175. Other notable contributions of the British school of intellectual history are from Sussex, most notably represented by J.W. Burrow and Stefan Collini, who have studied texts as it were entering into a conversation: Halmesvirta 2012.

¹⁰² Clark 2004, 139–140; Halmesvirta 2012.

¹⁰³ Iggers 2005, 126–127; Koselleck 1979/1985, 75–89. See also Koselleck 1989, 657–661. For an overview of *Begriffsgeschichte* and its relationship with the linguistic contextualism of Skinner, see, e.g., Richter 2001.

¹⁰⁴ Koselleck, Reinhart (1979), *Vergangene Zukunft – Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe,¹⁰⁵ which is seen as the main work of *Begriffsgeschichte* as a compilation of the central key concepts, with a total number of 119 of them from “Adel” to “Zivilisation,” containing longer articles about the history and usage of each.

Besides concepts, Koselleck’s other main activity has been seen in the context of the renewed interest in the history of historical time, because later on in his career Koselleck was interested in the theory of historical times: chronology must accommodate to history, not vice versa. Different time layers (*Zeitschichten*) of the concepts link them to different contexts. The famous concepts used by him include the following: the synchronicity of the non-synchronous (*die Gleichzeitigkeit des Ungleichzeitigen*), whereas the space of experience (*Erfarungsraum*) and horizon of expectation (*Erwartungshorizont*) break up – past and future become asymmetrical. One advantage that Koselleck has over Skinner is that Koselleck’s methodology works also when researching words and concepts, not only the use of them.¹⁰⁶ The main focus of the Cambridge School was on political philosophy and on great thinkers, not on single concepts. In Continental Europe the interests were quite different, as the example of Reinhart Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte* shows. One reason for this perhaps lies in the meaning of the words for concept: *concept* in English does not fully correspond with the German *Begriff* or Swedish *begrepp*, as the last two have been used in the meaning of a word.¹⁰⁷

Joan Scott (b. 1941) and her deconstructive viewpoint is also crucial when talking about linguistic turns in historical studies. Scott’s article “Gender – A Useful Category of Historical Analysis” (briefly “Gender”) in 1986 made a breakthrough in gender history so that it, too, would concentrate more on language. Ever since, the article has been widely cited. Scott criticized how the term *gender* was frequently a synonym for *women*, although *gender* emphasizes an entire system of relationships that may include sex. Among the inspirations for Scott were the linguistic theories of the French structuralist philosopher Jacques Lacan, who had seen language as a key to the symbolic structures made by a child. The main point of Scott was that gendered identity is constructed through language because language and concepts maintain the relationships between power and sexes. At that time, political theory did not include gender as an approach, but according to Scott it would clarify the power relationships from a new viewpoint, especially the hierarchic relationships when studying equality and inequality.¹⁰⁸

The article “Gender” appeared also in Scott’s nine-essay collection *Gender and the Politics of History* published in 1988. In the articles of that book she endorsed Jacques Derrida’s conception of language and Michel Foucault’s

¹⁰⁵ Otto Brunner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck (eds.), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. 8 vols. (Stuttgart, 1972–1993).

¹⁰⁶ Palonen 1997, 46a. For a short Finnish summary of *Begriffsgeschichte*, see, e.g., Hyrkkänen 2002, 113–132.

¹⁰⁷ Marjanen 2018, 104.

¹⁰⁸ Scott 1986, 1056–1057, 1063, 1067–1070, 1072–1073.

conception of power. According to these, traditional language posited a hierarchical order (especially in the case of subjugated women) and this knowledge constituted power and domination; thus, gender was not given by nature but constituted by language.¹⁰⁹ Scott has since been of great importance to scholars interested in gender studies, including gender history, for having identified how gender discourses were constructed through the language of dichotomies relating to masculinity and femininity. This shows up in her methodology with a deconstructive starting point. Her main contribution has been to convincingly argue that the word *women* does not simply indicate a group to be studied, but the main issue is the representation of women—how they have been defined and how gender relations were constructed in these representations.¹¹⁰

So, for Scott, the texts that historians were working on had no direct relation to an actual past, because the language did not reflect but created reality.¹¹¹ This was already closer to the so-called postmodernist view, which in the same way denied the relationship between language and reality as simple. For Scott the role of language was certainly bigger in its constructive role than, for example, to the historians of intellectual history.

When we move away from empirical research toward a more theoretical direction, French Michel Foucault, American Hayden White, and Dutch Frank Ankersmit have been relevant representatives of the French (post-) structuralism and Anglo-American analytic philosophy. Michel Foucault (1926–1984) was primarily a philosopher but he also has had a notable influence on the historical fields, including linguistically oriented historical research. His most significant methodological work was *L'archéologie du savoir* (*The Archaeology of Knowledge*, in brief, *Archaeology*) in 1969, in which he compared finite discursive fields with infinite language. This book was deeply theoretical and philosophical, and it did not gain as much attention as his other, more empirically oriented studies—for example, *Surveiller et punir* (*Discipline and Punish*).¹¹²

In *The Archaeology of Knowledge* Foucault explained his attempt to describe knowledge and its relationship to history. Foucault wrote about fields of discursive events, which are finite entirities and restricted by the formed linguistic periods, while at the same time language itself is infinite. Through this Foucault tried to explain how in certain discourses there appeared a certain statement/enunciation and nothing else. He referred also to speech act theory and illocutionary acts and analyzed the relationship between language and reality.¹¹³ Foucauldian discourse did not mean that language was neutral, nor was the subject active, but it referred to language as a field that can use the force and rules to which it was subjected. In other words, this kind of discursive practice was not about the activity of a subject but instead about the rules to

¹⁰⁹ Iggers 205, 131.

¹¹⁰ Lindberg 2001, 43–44.

¹¹¹ Iggers 2005, 150–151.

¹¹² Megill 1987, 119, 125. Megill's article is also a good introduction for describing Foucault's status among the historical studies.

¹¹³ Foucault 1969/2005, 41, 112–113, 120–122.

which it was restricted.¹¹⁴ The roots of Foucault's archaeology have been said to have been founded on Anglo-American language philosophy and on Wittgenstein's idea of language games.¹¹⁵

Hayden White (1928–2018) increased the public awareness of the linguistic applications in historical studies with his famous monograph *Metahistory – The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* (in brief, *Metahistory*) in 1973, wherein the historical presentations were presented as verbal structures in the form of a prose, and thus history operated like literature for him.¹¹⁶ White presented the acting of great historians and philosophers of the nineteenth century mainly from the viewpoint of literary theory and tropology. Historical accounts were for him verbal structures, which performed the role of telling (or narrative) prose. These were the models that explained past structures by representation.¹¹⁷ In brief, White interpreted past as a text (or in other words, art), which required a literal interpretation, and in the end history operated in the same way as literature.¹¹⁸

For White, historical knowledge was as equally “made” through the linguistic usage of the historian as “found” in the sources, which is also similar to how Frank Ankersmit and Alun Munslow have put it.¹¹⁹ There was no longer a considerable difference between writing history and the philosophy of history because there are no truth criteria in historical narratives. However, from the perspective of empiricist historical studies, these are two different matters. This in turn was already close to the basic assumption of postmodernism that language is a self-referential system that does not reflect but creates reality.¹²⁰ For narrativistic, telling theory, the main feature is that narrative is not a neutral form but is ideologically loaded.¹²¹

Frank Ankersmit (b. 1945) has developed narrativistic historiography since his first work *Narrative Logic* in 1983 and he is, together with White, another significant scholar of narratology, while he has also declared himself to be a follower of White.¹²² Ankersmit based this starting point on the fact that our research is (usually) limited to written texts, so we have to pay attention to their characteristics.¹²³ Among the other notable works of Ankersmit should be mentioned his article “Historiography and Postmodernism” from the year 1989, where he continued emphasizing the role of language and postmodernist theoretical formations about the reconstruction of the past. He pointed out that

¹¹⁴ Clark 2004, 119.

¹¹⁵ Alhanen 2007, 49. See also White 1973b.

¹¹⁶ This can be described also as a *literary turn*: Iggers 2005, 160.

¹¹⁷ White 1973a, 2.

¹¹⁸ Clark 2004, 98.

¹¹⁹ Ankersmit 2001, 29–30; Clark 2004, 98; Munslow 2003, 19, 148–149; White 1973a, 2. For White's following career, see White 1978, White 1987a, and White 1999, where White moved from the theory of different literal tropes toward the ideological function of language. See also Roth 1992 for empiricist accounts of White's theories.

¹²⁰ Iggers 2005, 118, 149.

¹²¹ Clark 2004, 86. See Pikkanen 2012, 27–48 for a summary and further developments of narrativity within historical studies.

¹²² Ankersmit 1994, 20.

¹²³ Ankersmit 1983, 11–12.

we should rather think about than research the past, as in his famous tree parable, which showed that fallen leaves from a tree could not have been attached to their original place anymore; from the leaves on the ground we can compile only some reconstructions that do not respond to the original situation anymore.¹²⁴ The compilation of articles, *Historical Representation* in 2001, which had the main theme of the description of the historical account, summarized Ankersmit's career as a narratologist.¹²⁵ One of his main points is the representational gap between things and language from the viewpoint of representation.¹²⁶

To summarize, the linguistically oriented starting points have varied from empirical studies to theoretical ones. Different viewpoints were highlighted, and most of the movements were not in a dialogue with each other, despite the fact that language was the original inspiration and starting point for all of these. One common thing was that every one of these clearly challenged the starting point that language is neutral and only a medium of communication. This is exemplified, for example, by how *Begriffsgeschichte* has concentrated on concepts and how the Cambridge School has studied the use of language. J. Scott in turn demonstrated that widely used words, like *gender*, are not at all unanimously understood. But soon all of these senior authors received feedback and reactions from other scholars, as we can see in the next chapter.

2.2 Reactions, Debates, and Attitudes toward the Linguistic Turns

The linguistic theories of the history of thought spread at first mainly in the English-speaking areas, but in Europe also historians in the German- and French-speaking countries became interested in linguistically oriented approaches before the Nordic countries. The influence of the works introduced in the preceding chapter was quick and almost immediate in international discussions, but the linguistic turns still remained minority movements in the larger countries as well.

Quentin Skinner received various comments for his article "Meaning and Understanding" in the beginning of the 1970s, because it was strongly critical toward traditional research, represented notably by Arthur Lovejoy with unit-ideas and continuation (for example, Platonism as an unchangeable phenomenon across the centuries or even millennia, or republicanism with a tradition of centuries) on its main agenda. Skinner first had some problems in getting his article published, because it attacked, among others, some famous studies that were also considered fundamental at the time.¹²⁷

¹²⁴ Ankersmit 1989, 143–144, 149–151, 152.

¹²⁵ Ankersmit 2001. See also Ankersmit 1994 and Zammito 2005.

¹²⁶ Ankersmit 2001, 236–237. See also Kuukkanen 2015, 21–29 for reading White and Ankersmit.

¹²⁷ For a historiographical overview of the different schools in the history of ideas in the turn of the 1970s, see Gunnell 1979 and Dunn 1996.

In the decades after the turn of the 1970s, Skinner also has been frequently criticized.¹²⁸ At times, like in the 1970s in an article by Gordon J. Schochet, Skinner was massively criticized about over-interpreting intentions and focusing only on the canonical thinkers, such as Machiavelli, Hobbes, and Locke.¹²⁹ Mark Bevir has been a notable critic of Skinner, while a forward exporter of Skinner's methodology as well. According to him, texts also include beliefs that were related to intentions.¹³⁰ The numerous critics of the contextualism of the Cambridge School and/or Skinner include also, for example, Dominick LaCapra, David Harlan, and Jacques Derrida. According to them, the contextualist method is too fundamentally focused purely on texts and the contextualization of the studied texts is short when only canonical thinkers are included.¹³¹

Still, the undisputable merit of Skinner is that besides propounding theories and explicating his method, he has also successfully applied them himself in his practical research work. One of his most significant works is *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* (briefly *Foundations*) in 1978 wherein he already in the foreword wrote about his new way of reading texts and contextualizing them, which challenged the "traditional textual method." At the same time he openly wrote his famous nuclear question: What did people do when writing something?¹³² According to political scientist Kari Palonen from the University of Jyväskylä, Skinner moved from the concepts to research on their usage in his own thinking while writing the *Foundations*.¹³³

Reinhart Koselleck's main activity in turn has been seen in the context of the renewed interest in the history of historical time, and he has contributed mainly on this area.¹³⁴ Considering the long career of Koselleck and his many attempts, neither he nor *Begriffsgeschichte* ever made a real breakthrough in the Anglophone world. Koselleck many times made visits abroad, starting from the position of a visiting lecturer at the University of Bristol during 1954–1956. And when he retired from his profession at the University of Bielefeld, he was invited to an office as a visiting professor in Chicago. There he spent a few years but did not get a renewed contract.¹³⁵

One of the reasons for his reception lies also in the language: many of Koselleck's works have been translated into other languages, for example, *Futures Past* and *Critique and Crisis* during the 1980s, but on the contrary, other notable historians with linguistically oriented methods—mainly Skinner and Pocock from the Cambridge School of political philosophy who also dealt with early modern time—were not able to read all the works of Koselleck and thus understand his methodological thinking fully. This in turn has increased the

¹²⁸ Clark 2004, 140–145. See also Schochet 1974, Bevir 1992, and Bevir 1997 as examples of the critique toward Skinner.

¹²⁹ Schochet 1974, 264, 266–267, 270, 272.

¹³⁰ Bevir 1997, 174–176.

¹³¹ See Clark 2004, 140–145 for a short summary about the critique toward contextualism presented by the Cambridge School.

¹³² Skinner 1978, x–xi, xii.

¹³³ Palonen 2003, 88–89.

¹³⁴ Lorenz 2011, 30.

¹³⁵ For the life and achievements of Koselleck, see, e.g., Hoffmann 2010 and Olsen 2012.

misunderstandings and ignorance with the lack of high-quality translations.¹³⁶ In the end it is a question about the *German* method, or at least having been seen as such, and thus is not fully known or recommended to foreign scholars.

Melvin Richter especially has made Koselleck known in the Anglophone world. At the same time, he worked to recognize the variants of the German/Bielefeld and Anglophone/Cambridge conceptual histories with somewhat shared methodological aims, but still the separation of these conceptual histories is more common in North America than in Europe. Richter, for example, arranged a seminar on the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* in Washington in 1992, giving Koselleck a chance to talk directly with Pocock as a means of making him more popular among the Cambridge School.

Yet conceptual history has appeared also in North America on its proponents' own terms, most notably by Terence Ball from Berkeley, highlighting the history of conceptual changes and transformations. The main feature of North American conceptual history, yet still history of political thought, is that it is more interested in the history of political discussion than in concepts or using them. German scholars like Jürgen Habermas and Hans-Georg Gadamer tended to be more interesting for the historians across the ocean, while Koselleck himself cannot be said to have been the most notable historian in Germany either.¹³⁷

One sign about the mixed reception of Koselleck in America is that Hayden White wrote a very positive review about *Futures Past* and described the work of Koselleck as signaling a new era of conceptualization.¹³⁸ In a way, Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte* have had supporters, but he never made a real breakthrough. According to Richard Whatmore, an English version of conceptual history has yet to be realized, although attempts have been made in that direction, for instance the contributions of Richter and several non-English historians.¹³⁹ After Koselleck's death there has been some upsurge and the new generation may be turning to him, for example, in his own University of Bielefeld and Willibald Steinmetz in the 2000s.¹⁴⁰ Conceptual history has also lacked large cooperative projects. For example, there has not been the same kind of large project as *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* in Great Britain or the United States. National conceptual projects, such as *Käsitteet liikkeessä* in Finland, have instead appeared in the Netherlands, in Spain, and Portugal, and there is also a project for translating *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* into Korean. The Ibero-American Conceptual History Project (IBERCONCEPTOS) studies concepts in the Ibero-

¹³⁶ E.g., as far as I know, only the introduction and one article of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* have been translated into English and published: Koselleck, Reinhart (2006), "Crisis." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 67, no. 2, 357–400; Koselleck, Reinhart & Richter, Michaela (2011), "Introduction and Prefaces to the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*." *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, vol. 6, no. 1, 1–37.

¹³⁷ For today's Bielefeld school and the role of Koselleck in it, see Steinmetz & Haupt (2013), *The Political as Communicative Space in History – The Bielefeld Approach*. In: *Writing Political History Today*, Steinmetz, Gilcher-Holtey, & Haupt (eds.), 11–33. New York/Frankfurt: Campus Verlag.

¹³⁸ White 1987b.

¹³⁹ Whatmore 2016, 33.

¹⁴⁰ See e.g. Steinmetz & Haupt 2013; Steinmetz & Freeden 2017.

American world. A somewhat similar kind of project is under preparation in Sweden as well.¹⁴¹

Thus, the reception of conceptual history, especially in its purest German form of *Begriffsgeschichte*, has not been smooth in the Anglophone academic world, but the popularity of J. Scott has in turn been more obvious. In gender history studies, the influence of the linguistic theories was considerable after Scott's article "Gender." So far, widely used concepts—especially *gender*—and ideas or images of them were noted and discussed more specifically. The background of those features was also under research as a more critical habit. Kathleen Canning has written that after Scott's article "Gender," *women's* history became for good *gender* history, although the latter concept was already coming. The linguistic theories of Scott have also affected historians who themselves do not work on gender history. Scott highlighted the importance of the concepts in her later works, and like Skinner, she applied her own theories in practical research. In her research she focused, among others, on workers and their experience.¹⁴² In addition, performativity, taking its roots from the speech act and linguistic theory, also has been one point in gender studies in the turn of the 2000s, most notably represented by Judith Butler in her research of gender identities and performing them.¹⁴³ At the same time, postmodernist ideas of connections between language and reality played a greater role in feminist and gender theory than in other areas of historical studies and thought.¹⁴⁴ Scott's works have also included a discursive nature, but Michel Foucault has contributed more on how discourse has been understood.

As stated, Foucault has become widely cited among historians. For example, searches in the database of *Historical Abstracts* show the great visibility of Foucault within historical studies; in historical texts between 1970 and 2010 there were a total of 606 results for Foucault, while for Skinner and Koselleck the corresponding search results were 141 and 66. During the same period, Google Scholar gave as a result 2529 citations for Skinner's "Meaning and Understanding," 3150 for Koselleck's *Futures Past*, and 32,896 for Foucault's *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Of course, these are only single examples, but these results give some kind of grasp about the popularity of Foucault among historical studies. In some sense, Foucault has replaced Karl Marx as the main analyst of power and of its relation to knowledge, gaining him a position as a widely cited scholar.¹⁴⁵ Besides Foucault, the other more theory-oriented senior scholars, Hayden White and F.R. Ankersmit, also have had a considerable influence on discussions about the nature of history.

Hayden White as well, in no time received responses to his *Metahistory* in the United States. However, the linguistic discussion started by him did not

¹⁴¹ Whatmore 2016, 33. Finland has had its conceptual project in the form of *Käsitteet liikkeessä - Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*, 2003 (Concepts in Motion – Conceptual History of Finnish Political Culture). See Chapter 4.4.

¹⁴² Canning 1994, 372, 374–378. See also Surkis 2012, 713–714.

¹⁴³ Lorenz 2011, 29.

¹⁴⁴ Iggers 2005, 152.

¹⁴⁵ Iggers 2005, 99. The numbers of the database searches represent the situation in November 2018.

generate such interest in Europe during the 1970s or 1980s.¹⁴⁶ For example, John Nelson in his review of *Metahistory* described it as a clearly adventurous book that had remarkable strengths but also some weaker points.¹⁴⁷ The discussion after *Metahistory* was vivid, and White also has been thanked for raising methodological and epistemological questions that no historian can ignore anymore.¹⁴⁸ In fact, White did not consider the linguistic and literary theories of *Metahistory* as the most important part of his work, but *Metahistory* has still risen to be a milestone in the field of linguistic turns. There is also a paradox here, because the book was not about the linguistic turn and White did not even use the term *linguistic turn* in it at all.

In some sense, *Metahistory* was interpreted misleadingly and afterwards a more skeptical line emerged that is recognizable today as *postmodernism* – equating history with literature and including also narrativistic theories and theories with a postmodernist orientation. What White did, was only to apply the theories of literature studies to a historical account, because the philosophy of history or even philosophy of language lacked the necessary theories for clarifying the nature of historical representation.¹⁴⁹ Postmodernism has since raised important epistemological questions that have radically challenged the possibility of objective knowledge when the immediacy of historical knowledge was denied. The view of White that history assumed a narrative form with the qualities of literary texts was generally accepted, but not his conclusion that history, like all the other forms of literature, was primarily a fiction-making operation. The historian is still operating always with a notion of truth, whatever that is in the first place.¹⁵⁰

Matti Peltonen has stated that *Metahistory* was mentally written already in the 1960s and it contained mainly a structuralist starting point. Afterwards in his career White dropped out the structural part and focused more on his narrativist conception about content, which is determined by the form. When the literal contents were the main aspect, all texts were equally true, because their literal form had nothing to do with the past. Still, almost all of the so-called postmodernists, except Keith Jenkins, have become milder over the passage of decades – for example, Ankersmit now stresses the experiencing of the past. The basis of White and Ankersmit is that single historical events can be true or untrue but overall presentations do not refer to the past anymore on that level, that they could be described as true or untrue.¹⁵¹ On the contrary, for example, Frank Ankersmit denies White to be a postmodernist but claims he is a structuralist.¹⁵² The lines between the sides are certainly not clear and even the nominations and categorizings of different scholars are widely debated issues. Problematizing the

¹⁴⁶ Iggers 2005, 135.

¹⁴⁷ Nelson 1975, 74.

¹⁴⁸ Lorenz 2011, 23–26. For a discussion about narrative in the turn of the 1970, see Paluch 1968, Louch 1969, Dray, Ely & Gruner 1969, Olafson 1970 and Dray 1971.

¹⁴⁹ Ankersmit 2001, 281–282.

¹⁵⁰ Iggers 2005, 139–140.

¹⁵¹ Peltonen 2009, 64–65.

¹⁵² Ankersmit 2001, 252.

historian's language has had its effect as it can restrict the debates and discussions about methods.

The debate about "facts" and "objective knowledge" has since been sometimes very rough and harsh when the historians of empirical research have defended historical studies from the accusations of stigmatizing history as literature. The counterparties include certain postmodernistic sceptics who call into question the role of history and empirical historians who just want to do historical research and not to be so keen on the theories. For example, *Metahistory* was not seen as a real and concrete historical study but rather as a work of the philosophy of history. The focus on language was also a reason for empirical historians to ignore *Metahistory*, as Elizabeth Clark has stated.¹⁵³

As one consequence of the discussions described above, the so-called pomophobia¹⁵⁴, a fear of postmodernity and/or postmodernists, was born. This was one feature that has had a restrictive influence on the reception of the linguistic turns, because historians got tired of heavy and dismissive tone of postmodernism and (mistakenly) associated it with any linguistic methods. This is also remarkable from the perspective that this study concentrates on the Nordic reception of linguistic turns, and this may be one of the reasons for rejecting linguistically oriented methods in Finland and Sweden.

Some historians have heavily criticized the claims of the postmodernists and the role of language as the ruling figure. For example, Arthur Marwick stated that language does not rule us, but we can control language if we focus on it enough.¹⁵⁵ The main message of these debates is that historians use language in a different way from writers. Again, Marwick also wrote, provocatively, that postmodernists—for him mainly White and Jenkins—try to fade out all the historical knowledge and the achievements of the historical studies so far.¹⁵⁶ The accusations and exaggerations between empirical historians and proponents of theoretical postmodernism have been many; for example, Keith Windschuttle titled his book about the postmodernist linguistic turn provocatively as *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists Are Murdering Our Past*.¹⁵⁷

Also, not only have these standing points been far from each other, but the theoretical discussion within the philosophy of history has become more diverse, and the specializations in empirical study of history are still defined by their implicit characteristics.¹⁵⁸ Nevertheless, there is still a clear difference between a theory that denies any claim to reality and a historiography that is fully aware of the complexity of historical knowledge, but still assumes that the actions of real people, within certain limits, can be known and reconstructed and that language plays a role in that reconstruction.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵³ Clark 2004, 100–101. For extreme theoretical thinking and questioning the purpose of historical research, see, e.g., Jenkins 1991 and Jenkins 1995.

¹⁵⁴ A term coined by Beverley Southgate; Southgate 2003.

¹⁵⁵ Marwick 2001, 10.

¹⁵⁶ Marwick 2001, 19.

¹⁵⁷ Windschuttle 2000.

¹⁵⁸ See, e.g., Lorenz 2011, 14.

¹⁵⁹ Iggers 2005, 119.

Georg Iggers has also stated that the linguistic discussion started by White stayed in the 1980s mainly in North America on the pages of the *American Historical Review*, and it did not inspire interest so much in Europe.¹⁶⁰ The radical postmodern position was largely restricted to the United States and, to a lesser extent, to Great Britain, although it borrowed much from French poststructuralism.¹⁶¹ Still, the Anglophone and French intellectual worlds, especially in the humanities, had minimal contacts at the beginning and middle of the twentieth century, and, for example, French structuralism—for instance the earlier works of Ferdinand de Saussure¹⁶²—did not have much of an effect on American theory while it had played a great role already in France. In addition, only a few French historians attended to Anglo-American philosophers' interests in narrative.¹⁶³ This is also a sign that the theoretical discussions already have been for a long time diversified and fragmented between the cultural and linguistic areas. A pattern of further mixture may appear when they are eclectically consulted and combined in smaller countries.

Besides, for example, Skinner had received almost instant responses to his theories and methods, but they came mostly from the area of the history of ideas, not from history at large. Concluding on this, the perspectives brought by Skinner stayed mostly in the inner discussion of intellectual history and did not break through to the core areas of the linguistic turn into the debate focused mostly on analytical philosophy, which appeared first in the work of Hayden White and Frank Ankersmit.

If we instead look at other general historiographical textbooks and such, we will not always find Skinner's name in some of them.¹⁶⁴ This indicates that he is recognized and treated more as a representative of history of political thought than history, belonging to the departments of political theory rather than history proper.

The discussions between empirical historians and theoreticizing postmodernists have also raised a phenomenon that, according to Frank Ankersmit, has appeared especially strongly only in the field of historical studies; the philosophers of history and historians totally disagree on the nature and importance of historical research, and historians conducting empirical research may not even take into account the theoretical notions about the nature of language. This has created a situation in which fertile interaction between the

¹⁶⁰ Iggers 2005, 135.

¹⁶¹ Iggers 2005, 149.

¹⁶² For de Saussure and his main theories about language as a linguistic system (*langue*) and speech acts (*parole*), see, e.g., Clark 2004, 44–47.

¹⁶³ Clark 2004, 4, 70.

¹⁶⁴ It is worth mentioning that the works about the linguistic turn and historiography differ a lot from each other by the themes each deals with. E.g., from the secondary sources I have used, Jenkins 1995, Munslow 2000, Ankersmit 2001, or Munslow 2003 do not even include the name of Skinner. Marwick 2001 mentions only the name of Skinner among other Cambridge historians, but does not talk about their linguistically based approach. In contrast, Iggers 2005 introduces many examples about empirical research with a linguistic background, and so the Cambridge School, Koselleck and Scott are on its pages. Iggers' perspective is mainly focused on the North American and English-speaking world. Besides Iggers, Clark 2004 also shows empirical research in a more specific manner.

two is missing. In other scientific fields (for example, linguistics – philosophy of language, social sciences – social philosophy) the interaction between the philosophy of the discipline and empirical research has been obvious and helpful to carry on the tradition of the research, but the relationship between the historians and philosophers of history has not been so easy.¹⁶⁵ Also, Markku Hyrkkänen has pointed out that the historians and the philosophers of history do not always understand each other, because historians do not always recognize themselves in the texts of the history of philosophy.¹⁶⁶ Furthermore, a shared language of historical theory does not exist either.¹⁶⁷

Some of the texts presented above have been widely known and almost “canonized” in their own fields. In particular, Skinner’s article “Meaning and Understanding,” Koselleck’s book *Vergangene Zukunft*, Scott’s article “Gender,” and White’s monograph *Metahistory* have been again and again discussed and revived in the debates concerning linguistic turns and not only on the international level but also in the Nordic countries. They have been re-evaluated and the discussion has partially been around these works, while of course also new trends and turns with new agents have emerged over the decades. One of these is, for example, Gabrielle Spiegel and the rise of the semantic structure of the texts and the social view of language where the so-called consciousness of the text is traced by listening for silences, ruptures, absences, and displacements.¹⁶⁸

As a whole, the discussions and debates about the role of language in historical studies have been sometimes avid and offered new perspectives. In the end it must be stated that the linguistic turn(s) as a whole has not been a stable and homogeneous phenomenon at all, as the methods have been greatly developed over the last 40 years. Linguistic turns have also occurred in diverse areas of history – social, intellectual, and cultural – but nowhere has the belief that language refers to reality been given up. Also, the linguistic turn in its widest possible sense has not been seen as a new paradigm but more like expanded pluralism. In the end, the radical form of postmodernist epistemological relativism has also had little influence on historiography.¹⁶⁹ So far, we can assume that the theoretical and methodological discussion within historical studies is not proceeding yet beyond the linguistic turns, rather some new applications within the linguistic theories will show up. This of course concerns only historians who have an interest in the language of the past, because the majority of historians are not that focused on language.

In this chapter I have used the words “foreign” or “international.” International has meant here mostly other than Finnish and Swedish reactions to the rise of linguistic turns, but from now on it is their turn to be in the focus. Finnish and Swedish contributions in the field of various linguistically oriented approaches have also been prominent at times, as we can see in the following chapters.

¹⁶⁵ Ankersmit 2001, 247, 249–250; Lorenz 2011, 16.

¹⁶⁶ Hyrkkänen 1993, 39.

¹⁶⁷ Lorenz 2011, 14–15.

¹⁶⁸ Clark 2004, 162–165. See also Spiegel 2005.

¹⁶⁹ Iggers 2005, 126, 140, 150.

3 THE LINGUISTIC TURNS IN FINNISH AND SWEDISH HISTORICAL JOURNALS 1970–2010

Before analyzing the main primary source group, dissertations, I analyze the discussions in long-term journals to provide a context for local discussions. These main journals include the Finnish *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* and *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, while from the Swedish journals the most important have been *Historisk Tidskrift*, *Scandia*, and *Lychnos*. There are also other Scandinavian journals, most importantly the *Scandinavian Journal of History* (established in 1976). Besides these journals mentioned above there are more specialized journals in the other fields of research, like the philosophically oriented *Niin&näin* in Finland and *Häften för kritiska studier* and *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift/Tidskrift för genusvetenskap* in Sweden, to name only a few that also offer a forum for historians to have methodological and theoretical discussions.

Nevertheless, I will concentrate on the leading national historical journals to make a more systematic comparison—the targets of comparison need to be sufficiently comparable to each other, and these journals with decades of traditions form a coherent source group for this purpose. It must also be mentioned that in historiographical research a single source can be either a primary or secondary source, or both, depending on its usage.¹⁷⁰

¹⁷⁰ I am using a quite different reference technique in this chapter. I will refer to the contributions of journals in the footnotes as follows: the abbreviation of the journal, the name of the writer(s), the title of the writing, and page numbers. Since many book reviews lack a title, I refer to the reviews always like this on the behalf of their title: “review of (name of the work) by (author’s name).”

When necessary to refer to a particular content in the texts, I will give the page numbers in the body text. This kind of reference apparatus will also help the reader to distinguish the primary and secondary sources from each other in this section.

3.1 The Used Finnish and Swedish Journals

Historiallinen Aikakauskirja (HAik) is published by the Finnish Historical Society (*Suomen Historiallinen Seura*) and was established in 1903. In the same manner the leading academic journal in Sweden, *Historisk Tidskrift* (HT), is published also by the national historical society (*Svenska Historiska Föreningen*) and was already established in 1881. Neither journal is the oldest one in the Nordic countries as the Danish *Historisk Tidsskrift* and the Norwegian journal of the same name were already established in 1840 and 1870, functioning as examples for others.¹⁷¹ The ultimate foreign model for all of these has been of course the *Historische Zeitschrift*, since its first publication in Germany in 1859.

In the 1970s *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* was published by two operators: the Finnish Historical Society (*Suomen Historiallinen Seura*, established in 1875) and the Alliance of the History's Friends (*Historian Ystäväin Liitto*, established in 1925). It is an academic journal though these publishers tend to also have tendencies toward popularization. The first issue came out in 1903, and it was not originally thought to be a professional journal, because the audience of the historians was narrow in Finland at that time. Still, the editor-in-chief between 1970 and 1982, Eino Jutikkala, considered that the journal had already by his days become professional, and the academic writings were suitable also for the broader public outside professional historians.¹⁷²

Historiallinen Aikakauskirja, as well as its counterpart in Sweden, *Historisk Tidskrift*, has produced four issues in a year, and they have contained not only articles and reviews, but also conference reports, debates, oversights to recent research, and information about the current teaching of history in the universities. The writers and the editorial staff consisted and consist of known professors and other scholars, and the editors-in-chief were usually long-serving historians, at least in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*. Still, in the first decades of my study (the 1970s and the 1980s, even in the 1990s), the modern peer review referee system was not used, which gives rise to questions about the publication policies.¹⁷³ Besides, the audience of these journals may not always be the most specific of their area, rather somewhere near mainstream because part of the readers come from outside academic historians. Nevertheless, these publications are essential for researching national trends in a historiography. One key role for the journals is to present and spread new historical viewpoints, research results, and methods. These journals sometimes have been described as the most important journals in their study area, which they undoubtedly are.¹⁷⁴

¹⁷¹ See, e.g., Karonen 2019.

¹⁷² Jutikkala 1978, 99, 100.

¹⁷³ Ohto Manninen revealed in the column of the editor-in-chief (no. 3/2000) that the referee system had been introduced recently. According to Jonas Nordin, the editor-in-chief of *Historisk Tidskrift* at the time, an evaluation group was formed in the 1980s. During the few intermediate steps the use of a modern double blind peer review was established in the first years of the 2000s: Nordin 2008, 602–606.

¹⁷⁴ Rommi 1978, 114; Leino-Kaukiainen 2003, 84.

The editors-in-chiefs of *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* during our research period were as follows: Eino Jutikkala (1970–1982), Päiviö Tommila (1983–1990), Ohto Manninen (1991–2000), Juha Sihvola (2001–2005), and Pirjo Markkola (2006–2010). It is notable that Sihvola was the first ever editor-in-chief who was not a professor of Finnish (and/or Scandinavian) history but from the area of general or European history (*yleinen historia*). The accelerating interest toward international topics had nevertheless already started during the editorship of Pentti Renvall in the 1960s. With Päiviö Tommila as editor-in-chief, a separate foreign reporter was also hired. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* tended to have become more interested in the international debates in the 1980s.¹⁷⁵

Although considered to be a significant journal in Finnish historical research, *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* has not always occupied a positive and central position among some historians. For example, there circulates a well-known anecdote of *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* as a “Historic devotional book” (“*Historiallinen hartauskirja*”), a term that even the editor-in-chief at the turn of 2000 dared to use on the pages of his own journal.¹⁷⁶ Maybe the most severe attack against *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* has been the contribution by Marjo Kaartinen and Anu Korhonen wherein they criticized it for being an in-group and male-centered journal, discriminatory toward women (mentioning, for example, that in the volume of 1992 there was a full year without any article written by a woman), and the journal also had too narrow a view of the national and international historical research.¹⁷⁷ The newly started editor-in-chief, Juha Sihvola, acknowledged the criticism of Kaartinen and Korhonen and promised to take a closer look at recruiting more contributions from women, as well as developing the journal for the better.¹⁷⁸

Another historical journal in Finland with a longer tradition is *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* (HTF, established in 1916) and published by the Historical Association (*Historiska Föreningen*, established in 1914). Between 1970 and 1986, it came out twice a year and since 1987 produces four issues per year. The themes have been mainly the same as in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, but the language has always been Swedish. One notable feature is that *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* had had until 2010 only five editors-in-chief from the beginning of its entire history: Per Olof von Törne (1916–1924), Eric Anthoni (1925–1969), Jarl Gallén (1970–1981), Max Engman (1982–2000), and Lars-Folke Landgrén (2001–). The journal adopted the referee-system in 2006.¹⁷⁹

As already mentioned, *Historisk Tidskrift* came out first in 1881 by the Swedish Historical Association (*Svenska Historiska Föreningen*, founded in 1880). The members of the society and journal were in the beginning mainly from Stockholm and Uppsala. The editorship in the 1970s and 1980s was different from the above-mentioned Finnish journals, because there were at least two main editors until 1991. Over the decades the editors-in-chief have been notable

¹⁷⁵ Mikkeli 1990, 263; Vahtola 2009, 36.

¹⁷⁶ Sihvola 2001, 86.

¹⁷⁷ Kaartinen & Korhonen 2001, 80–82.

¹⁷⁸ Sihvola 2001, 86–87.

¹⁷⁹ Landgrén 2006, 1.

historians as well, for example, Hans de Geer (1979–1985), Lars Magnusson (1988–1993), Arne Jarrick (1994–1997), Lars M. Andersson (2002–2005), Jonas Nordin (2005–2008), and Stefan Eklöf Amirell (2009–). Still, in comparison with the *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, the main editors tend to be somewhat younger in their academic career than their Finnish counterparts.

Historisk Tidskrift has also received some criticism, for example, by Jonas Nordin during his time as editor-in-chief: based on a readership survey in 2007, *Historisk Tidskrift* was somewhat boring to read for the audience and the standard was not as high as in foreign journals. The journal editors had also picked their articles to be published and as late as in the 1980s, a group was formed for evaluation. During a few intermediate steps, the use of a modern double blind peer review was established in the first years of the 2000s.¹⁸⁰ Still, it was not considered as limited as *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* in Finland: *Historisk Tidskrift* had some 30 percent of its articles during the 1990s written by women while, according to Kaartinen and Korhonen, the same amount in the pages of *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* was only 17 percent.¹⁸¹

One considerable difference between Finland and Sweden is that while the historians in Finland operated through *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* and *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, there were two significant journals in Sweden with different places of printing, such as *Historisk Tidskrift; Scandia* and *Lychnos* do not have a real Finnish counterpart. The barriers between these journals were not extreme as many historians wrote for different journals during his/her career. Again, some scholars tend to write more willingly for one journal than another.

Scandia was established by Lauritz Weibull in 1928, mostly to promote his own research interests and those of likeminded colleagues in terms of research focus. It comes out twice a year and the place of publication is Lund. It was already in the beginning meant to be a challenger to *Historisk Tidskrift* – the Swedish Historical Society was until the 1960s run mostly by the historians of Stockholm and Uppsala and Weibull wanted a forum for the scholars in the universities of Lund and Gothenburg.¹⁸² In the 1970s, there were no book reviews in *Scandia*, only mainly articles, but reviews have been published since issue no. 2 of 1995.

Lychnos was founded by the first professor of *idé- och lärdomshistoria* in Uppsala, Johan Nordström, in 1936.¹⁸³ After him, Sten Lindroth, a notable professor of history of science and ideas in the University of Uppsala, was a long-time editor-in-chief of the journal, between 1950 and 1980. Editors since are Gunnar Eriksson (1980–1990), Karin Johannisson (1990–2000), Sven Widmalm (2000–2006), and Bosse Holmqvist (2007–). Unlike *Scandia*, *Lychnos* has always contained articles and a great number of book reviews about books on the history

¹⁸⁰ Nordin 2008, 602–606.

¹⁸¹ Aronsson 1998, 60, 66; Kaartinen & Korhonen 2001, 80–82.

¹⁸² Lönnroth 1998, 308; Svenstrup 2009, 365; Torstendahl 1981, 117. For the significance of the so-called Weibull School and their purist source criticism as a method, see, e.g., Torstendahl 1981 or Svenstrup 2009.

¹⁸³ For the background of Nordström and founding of *Lychnos*, see Frängsmyr 2008, especially pp. 273–278.

of science and ideas and some intellectual history, which makes it a good source for this kind of study such as my own. *Lychnos* is not actually a journal, but a yearbook, but it is treated here as a journal.

Common to the above-mentioned journals is that they operate mainly with the national languages of their countries, but nevertheless also use other Nordic or so-called world languages. The division is clearest in Finland, where there is one main journal in Finnish and the other one is invariably published in Swedish. On the contrary, *Historisk Tidskrift*, *Lychnos*, and *Scandia* have not been publishing contributions only in their national language, in Swedish, but also the colleagues from Norway and Denmark could have used their own languages. The amount of the contributions in English varies, but it is the most used language after these, and used in articles, book reviews, or at least in abstracts in recent decades. Publishing texts in German, Icelandic, or other languages was rare.

The general conclusion is that the biggest difference between the countries is that there are three major journals in Sweden, and only two in Finland – and where the other one is in the Swedish language.

3.2 The Linguistic Turns in the Journals – How Much and When?

Every academic journal presented above has had a line of its own when considering the appearance of the linguistic turns – the delay, density, and number of the contributions may have been considerably different. Nevertheless, the journals represent one side of the discussion of the historians that constantly goes on. Besides articles and reviews, they are also applicable for their other writings and contents as well.

I will next point out the number of all the texts in these journals that made references to the theorists associated with the linguistic turns. First, I am interested in the total amount of these writings, and not so much about their nature or place. For example, the conference reports may prove the presence and possible connections between historians, sometimes even the advertisements,¹⁸⁴ or the front covers¹⁸⁵ may give a piece of information about the influence of the linguistic turns. Even though these may tend to be at the first sight only a small matter, these kinds of signs still tell something about the reception of the linguistic turns in Finland and Sweden.

The most crucial findings so far are represented on the following table. This shows the total number of writings that include a reference to Q. Skinner, R. Koselleck, J. Scott, H. White, and F.R. Ankersmit, who I have picked for more specific targets by browsing the journals manually and noted mentions of them:

¹⁸⁴ HAik 1985, *Ideas in Context. Philosophy in History*. An advertisement by Akateeminen Kirjakauppa, 2.

¹⁸⁵ *Lychnos* 2008, under the theme “Teorireception,” had *L’archéologie du savoir* by Foucault on the front cover.

TABLE 2 The Total Number of the Contributions in Journals That Contain a Reference to a Senior Scholar (Q. Skinner, R. Koselleck, J. Scott, H. White, and F. Ankersmit) 1970–2010. Sources: HAik 1970–2010, HTF 1970–2010, HT 1970–2010, Scandia 1970–2010, Lychnos 1969–2010.

	HAik	HTF	HT	Scandia	Lychnos	Total:
Skinner	29	11	13	3	28	84
Koselleck	30	22	34	12	14	112
Scott	16	10	50	21	7	104
White	28	5	21	8	13	75
Ankersmit	28	4	7	3	10	52
Total:	131	52	125	47	72	

These numbers indicate the quantity of any *contributions* (one per article) that contain a reference to the named scholar. It is only about referencing and citing, how slight or extensive that ever is, and it ranges from short texts only mentioning the name of the scholar once to articles or book reviews dedicated thoroughly to their works or ideas. The most notable contributions about these authors were methodological articles that introduced them, book reviews, or some other direct contribution.

Few striking conclusions can be drawn on the basis of the numbers above, as the visibility of these scholars clearly varied greatly between the journals and countries. For example, Skinner appeared in 29 contributions in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, while at the same time the number in *Historisk Tidskrift* was lower than a half of this. *Scandia* almost ignored Skinner on their pages, with only three contributions, but on the contrary, *Lychnos* had the considerable number of 28 pieces of text containing a reference to Skinner. This demonstrates how the discipline of the history of science and ideas has been interested in the history of political thought, and the discipline of history has almost ignored it. In contrast, *Historisk Tidskrift* contained the considerable count of 50 different contributions referring to Scott, but the total amount in the Finnish journals for her was still only about half that, which further underlines the popularity of the gender history (*genushistoria*) in Sweden. In the following sub-section I will bring up hypotheses and possible reasons for these.

Notable theme issues were also published contributing to linguistic turns during the researched period and clearly closer to the year of 2010. The most notable ones from the theme numbers were *Scandia* 1/2009 dealing with history and postmodernism and *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* 1/2007 with the title of “*Begrepp, språk och historia.*” *Lychnos* in 2006 was named as “*Filosofihistoriens idé,*” while the issue of 2008 concentrated on the reception of theories. *Scandia* 2/06 was partially devoted to Foucault, hence the title “*Foucault och psykiatrihistorien.*” The theme number of *Historisk Tidskrift* 2/2003 dealt with syntheses and partially talked also about postmodernism and narratives. The extensive theme number

of *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 1/2003 presented the situation of the current historiography in Finland, with many references to the linguistic turns among other historiographic trends.

Two direct links to Skinner already appeared in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* in 1970. Both of these articles¹⁸⁶ were written by Antero Heikkinen who introduced principal parts of Skinner's articles, and the latter one was fully about "The Meaning and Understanding" article. In the Swedish journals, Skinner's work *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought* was extensively reviewed¹⁸⁷ in *Lychnos* in the volume of 1979–1980 by Sven-Eric Liedman, including comprehensive background information about the research activity of Skinner and promoting his works actively. On the pages of *Historisk Tidskrift*, Skinner was introduced in a broad article¹⁸⁸ by Jacob Westberg (who came from political studies) only in 1998. The high number of eight writings in the *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* is explained by the theme number of "Begrepp, språk och historia." The notable methodological compilation *Visions of Politics* was reviewed¹⁸⁹ by Max Edling for *Historisk Tidskrift* in a positive manner in 2004. Still, *Lychnos* seems to be the biggest promoter of Skinner, with steady references since the beginning of the 1980s, mostly by reviewers like Bo Lindberg, Mats Persson, and Sven-Eric Liedman. The single mention of Skinner in *Historisk Tidskrift* in 1971 was only a reference¹⁹⁰ to the aforementioned article of Heikkinen in the *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* a year before.

As noted, Koselleck had already started his academic career in the 1950s and continued it until his death in 2006. There was still a significant delay in his reception in Finland when looking at the discussions about him in notable historical journals, in the Finnish case *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* (HAik) and *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* (HTF). Between 1970 and 2010 there were a total of 30 different instances in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* and 22 contributions in *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, which contained information about him and *Begriffsgeschichte*. Proportionally, this was not much less than the total number of pages and contributions in these journals, but toward 2010 his popularity rose also within these discussions. *Vergangene Zukunft/Futures Past* was first scarcely mentioned in the Finnish journals, but its English edition was reviewed¹⁹¹ in *Historisk Tidskrift* in 1987. Further, Koselleck was extensively cited in the theme number "Begrepp, språk och historia" of *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* in 2008. Koselleck's other works were reviewed as well.¹⁹²

¹⁸⁶ HAik 1970, Antero Heikkinen: Piirteitä nykyisestä kriittisestä historianfilosofisesta keskustelusta, 23–34; HAik 1970, Antero Heikkinen: Oppihistorian harhapolkuja, 294–300.

¹⁸⁷ *Lychnos* 1979–1980, Sven-Eric Liedman: Quentin Skinner och den politiska idéhistorien, 280–287.

¹⁸⁸ HT 1998, Jacob Westberg: När ord får mening – författarskap och tolknings-sammanhang i Quentin Skinners analys av språkanvändning hos Bolingbroke, Machiavelli och Hobbes, 159–186.

¹⁸⁹ HT 2004, Max Edling: review of *Visions of Politics – Volume I* by Quentin Skinner, 942–943.

¹⁹⁰ HT 1971, Pia Sovio: *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 1970, 320–322.

¹⁹¹ HT 1987, Lennart Lundmark: review of *Futures Past* by Reinhart Koselleck, 286–290.

¹⁹² E.g. HT 2006, Johan Östling: review of *Erfarenhet, tid och historia* by Reinhart Koselleck, 577–579.

Despite starting his career early and contributing much to the conceptual history with his essays and editing the volumes of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* from 1972, the mentions of Koselleck started only at the beginning of the 1980s in the Finnish historical journals. The mentions about the Bielefeld School and the compilation of his essays, *Vergangene Zukunft/Futures Past*, were first scarcely mentioned in the Finnish journals, but since the turn of 1990, Markku Hyrkkänen has contributed to making Koselleck known in Finland by introducing his works¹⁹³ and a further biography of his personal career.¹⁹⁴ Besides Hyrkkänen, Jorma Kalela also frequently discussed time in history based on Koselleck's viewpoints during the 1980s and 1990s, and also in the twenty-first century.¹⁹⁵

The articles of Hyrkkänen and Kalela were mainly positive and they encouraged other historians to take a closer look at Koselleck's works. Hyrkkänen emphasized the role of language in the newest methodological trends within conceptual and intellectual history when he introduced the theories of Koselleck and Quentin Skinner together.¹⁹⁶ Hyrkkänen was also promoting a four-part seminar series of Koselleck in Finnish universities in 1994–1995, organized by the Finnish Historical Society. The seminar ended with a session where Koselleck himself was visiting Helsinki.¹⁹⁷ The reception of Koselleck was not restricted only to the introduction of and applying his ideas; he himself travelled occasionally to Finland, as the example of his attendance in the seminar with his name shows.

Historians from the elder generation contributed also to the discussion about concepts and conceptual history, as examples from Aira Kemiläinen show.¹⁹⁸ She did not refer to Koselleck directly in her articles, but problematizing concepts like “nationalism” (*nationalismi*), “revolution” (*vallankumous*), and “constitution” (*perustuslaki*) were exemplars of conceptual history. German scholars also took part in promoting Koselleck in Finnish journals, though this was not so general.¹⁹⁹ One interesting observation is that a couple of reviewers recommended Koselleck's viewpoints of time and temporality for dissertations that were not fully successful in that particular area.²⁰⁰

¹⁹³ HAik 1989, Markku Hyrkkänen: Aatehistorian mieli, 325–336.

¹⁹⁴ HAik 1994, Markku Hyrkkänen: Reinhart Koselleck – sosiaali- ja käsitehistorioitsija, 328–333.

¹⁹⁵ HAik 1987, Jorma Kalela: Historiallisen prosessin käsitteellistäminen ja historiallinen aika, 119–127; HAik 1990, Jorma Kalela: Onko historian aika mennyt sijoiltaan?, 39–57; HAik 1991, Jorma Kalela: Narratiivi ei ole kertomus, 146–155; HAik 2010, Jorma Kalela: Historiantutkimus vaikuttavuusyhteiskunnassa, 232–237.

¹⁹⁶ HAik 1989, Markku Hyrkkänen: Aatehistorian mieli, 325–336, pp. 331–334.

¹⁹⁷ Hyrkkänen 1994, 333.

¹⁹⁸ HAik 1989, Aira Kemiläinen: Nationalismi ja patriotismi Ranskan vallankumouksen aatemaailmassa, 275–295; HAik 1989, Aira Kemiläinen: Ranskan vallankumouksen käsitteiden tutkimusta, 317–324; HAik 1999, Aira Kemiläinen: Korotettuna kansakuntien joukkoon – 1809 ja 1899, 102–113. The articles of Kemiläinen were extensions from her study of nationalism: Kemiläinen 1964a.

¹⁹⁹ E.g. HTF 2002, Hendriette Kliemann: Ett mångfaldigt begrepp – August Ludwig Schlözers konstruktion av Norden, 315–336.

²⁰⁰ HAik 1993, Matti Männikkö: review of Evolutionaarinen tulevaisuudentutkimus by Matti Männikkö, 63–66; HAik 1994, Jorma Kalela: review of Purjeet kohti Guineaa by Ilkka Ruohonen, 174–175.

During the 2000s scholars from political science joined the conversation about Koselleck with historians, like Kari Palonen, Jussi Kurunmäki, and Jouni Tilli.²⁰¹ This is also an example of how Koselleck has been applied not only by historians but also by political scientists. Further, at this point Koselleck was more regularly associated with Skinner and analyzed beside him, as part of a bridge being constructed between the Bielefeld and Cambridge Schools. Much of this work has been made by Kari Palonen, while the yearbook *Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought* (from 2003 *Redescriptions – Yearbook of Political Thought and Conceptual History*) served as a special forum for conceptual historians. Previously the journal of the political scientists, *Politiikka*, was also an optional place to publish one's thoughts about conceptual approaches. With his efforts Palonen—alongside of Tuija Pulkkinen (later University of Helsinki)—has made Jyväskylä one of the centers of conceptual history, strengthening the interest in concepts also for historians there. A good example of this is that the *Festschrift* of Koselleck for his 80th birthday in 2003 was published in Jyväskylä, not in Bielefeld.²⁰² Besides Jyväskylä, Helsinki has also been a solid ground for conceptual history, since Henrik Stenius and the introductory courses of conceptual history by the Concepta group have increased the knowledge and information about these methodologies further. The role of Palonen as a combiner of conceptual history with rhetorical analysis also has been acknowledged in Sweden.²⁰³

The death of Koselleck in 2006 was visible on the themes of certain academic works as well: the theme number of *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* 1/2007 with the title of *Begrepp, språk och historia*, (Concept, Language, and History, edited by Henrik Stenius and Jani Marjanen) in which Koselleck was widely cited in various contributions, making a total number of nine articles dealing with him and *Begriffsgeschichte* at some level. The philosophical journal *Ennen&Nyt* also had a theme number under the comical title of *Kässääks käsittei, bonjaaks begriffei* (roughly “Do Ya Comprise Concepts, Behold Begriff’sm” edited by Jaro Julkunen, Anu Lahtinen, Heli Rantala, and Alekski Salmi) in 2006.

The discussion about Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte* remained quite vivid also in Swedish academic journals. Between 1970 and 2010 there 34 articles about him in *Historisk Tidskrift* (HT), 12 in *Scandia*, and 14 in *Lychnos*. Again, the real conversation about Koselleck's methodology started in the 1980s: *Vergangene Zukunft* was not discussed in Swedish academic journals, but its English edition was reviewed²⁰⁴ in a positive and encouraging manner by Lennart Lundmark in *Historisk Tidskrift* in 1987, which is revealing of the changed language-orientation of Swedish scholarship. Lundmark also promoted Koselleck in his other

²⁰¹ HAik 2004, Kari Palonen: Poliittinen ajattelu politiikan ulottuvuutena, 80–89; HAik 2004, Jussi Kurunmäki: Käsitteiden venyttämisestä, 90–93; HAik 2009, Jouni Tilli: Tiloja, linjauksia, retoriikkaa – historiapolitiikan ulottuvuuksia, 280–287.

²⁰² Marjanen 2007, 134–135, 138.

²⁰³ Hansson 2008, 290.

²⁰⁴ HT 1987, Lennart Lundmark: review of *Futures Past* by Reinhart Koselleck, 286–290.

articles²⁰⁵ concerning historical time during the turn of the 1990s. Later, Koselleck was noticed also by other historians and with reviews of new translations.²⁰⁶ Koselleckian approaches were recommended also in Sweden for a few dissertations for a more precise conceptual expression.²⁰⁷ In addition, selected essays from *Vergangene Zukunft* were translated into Swedish under the title of *Erfarenhet, tid och historia* in 2004.

Considering the larger picture, Koselleck became better known and cited by the larger group of Swedish historians in the twenty-first century; before that he tended to receive remarks by single scholars only infrequently, almost like in the case of Finland. Koselleck's name has become quite well known within historical studies in Sweden, but conceptual history has still not made a real breakthrough there in the sense of a large-scale research. A few studies have been done from a conceptual viewpoint that usually deal with the formation of the Swedish state, nation, and empire during the nation-building time, bringing up a new generation of historians like Jonas Nordin, Mikael Alm, and Andreas Sundin. In the field of *idé- och lärdomshistoria*, especially Mats Persson and Bo Lindberg have adopted a conceptual approach. Within political science, the interest toward concepts has been somewhat milder than in Finland, leaving the field to individual researchers such as Henrik Enroth and Peter Hallberg.²⁰⁸

Scott's *Gender and the Politics of History*, which includes her article "Gender, was reviewed²⁰⁹ early in *Historisk Tidskrift* at the beginning of the 1990s. The amount of citations of Scott has been clearly more numerous in the Swedish journals, which is explained by the fact that gender history has been very popular there. In particular, Monika Edgren has been active as she has reviewed Scott's other works²¹⁰ as well. Based on the contributions in journals, same kind of individual interest in Scott has been lacking in Finland. The gender perspective has not been so dominant in public discourse or academia as in Sweden, or has been more directed toward social history.

²⁰⁵ HT 1989, Lennart Lundmark: *Historisk tid*, 496–515; HT 1991, Lennart Lundmark: *Tiden, uret och kronologierna*, 43–58; Scandia 1990, Lennart Lundmark: *Berättande och verklighet i historieskrivningen*, 127–138.

²⁰⁶ E.g. HT 1990, Henrik Berggren & Lars Trägårdh: *Historikerna och språket – teoretiska ambitioner och praktiska begränsningar*, 357–375; HT 1994, Håkan Thörn: *Modernitet och "revolution,"* 44–79; HT 1997, Torbjörn Nilsson: *Historielöshet på hemmaplan – om historiografi och andra glömda traditioner*, 46–60; Lychnos 2000, Mats Persson: *Upplýsningen och historismen*, 59–105; HT 2006, Johan Östling: review of *Erfarenhet och tid* by Reinhart Koselleck, 577–579; Lychnos 2007, Mats Persson: *Nietzsche och revolten mot historien*, 95–128.

²⁰⁷ HT 2000, Lars Berggren: review of *Den förståndiga viljan* by Göran Salmonsson, 277–284; HT 2003, Pär Frohnert: review of *Hushållningens dygder* by Leif Runefelt, 68–75; HT 2005, Bo Stråth: review of *Mellan tillväxt och trygghet* by Jenny Andersson, 330–336; HT 2002, Nils Edling: *Replik till Jonas Olofsson*, 475–480.

²⁰⁸ Lindberg 2007, 124–128.

²⁰⁹ HT 1991, Monika Edgren: review of *Gender and the Politics of History* by Joan Scott, 616–619.

²¹⁰ Scandia 1/2007, Monika Edgren: review of *Parité!* by Joan Scott, 153–155; Scandia 2/2008, Monika Edgren: review of *The Politics of the Veil* by Joan Scott, 156–158.

The earliest mentions of White are from the late 1970s, when Rolf Torstendahl referred in two separate texts²¹¹ briefly to *Metahistory*. White also had a discussion with Roger Chartier and this was translated²¹² to Swedish and published in *Historisk Tidskrift*. Matti Peltonen reviewed²¹³ White's work *The Fiction of Narrative*. Otherwise the mentions of White were quite steady after the turn of the 1990s. The reviews of White's works were mainly positive and the main message was that he had brought up certain questions about the nature of history.

Narrative Logic was mentioned as part of an article²¹⁴ in *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* already in 1985, but the citations in the Swedish journals started to a greater extent just at the beginning of the 2000s. One of the most notable appearances of Ankersmit was when Kalle Pihlainen made an interview²¹⁵ with him under a very intriguing title ("*Me historiateoretikot olemme aivan vaarattomia*" – "We theorists of history are totally harmless"). The work of *Historical Representations* was reviewed²¹⁶ a short time after its publication by Torbjörn Gustafsson Chorell, who in the reviews of *Lychnos* evaluated Ankersmit's other works as well. In Finland, Matti Peltonen²¹⁷ has made White and Ankersmit, as well as more theoretical historiography and postmodernism, known to a broader readership and public. In the same way as in the case of White, Ankersmit was acknowledged for bringing up valuable theoretical questions concerning historiography. Especially the interview between Pihlainen and Ankersmit was promotive, and the narrativist theory within history appeared in a positive manner. At least the themes of truth and representation were considered valuable for every historian and the interview also acted to calm down suspicions against the theorists of history.

3.3 Contributors behind the References

In the end it is not only important to know the amount of referencing and which scholars were referred to, but also who made these citations in the pages of these local journals. The role of a single researcher can be decisive here because scholarly effects are linked to individual people. For example, Torbjörn

²¹¹ *Lychnos* 1977–1978, Rolf Torstendahl: review of *The German Enlightenment and the Rise of Historicism* by Peter Hans Reill, 332–333; *Scandia* 1979, Rolf Torstendahl: *Historiska skolor och paradigm*, 151–170.

²¹² *HT* 2004, Torbjörn Gustafsson Chorell: *Humanism, relativism och tolerans. Hayden Whites samtal med Roger Chartier*, 373–390.

²¹³ *HAik* 2010, Matti Peltonen: review of *The Fiction of Narrative* by Hayden White, 248–250.

²¹⁴ *HAik* 1985, Heikki Lempa: *Historiallisen tiedon kertomuksellisuus – kolme eri merkitystä*, 198–203.

²¹⁵ *HAik* 1997, Kalle Pihlainen: "*Me historiateoretikot olemme aivan vaarattomia*," 362–369.

²¹⁶ *Lychnos* 2003, Torbjörn Gustafsson Chorell: review of *Historical Representation* by F.R. Ankersmit, 317–318.

²¹⁷ E.g. *HAik* 2000, Matti Peltonen: *Kieli, kulttuuri ja arki*, 203–211; *HTF* 2000, Matti Peltonen: *Ledtrådar, marginaler och monader*, 251–264.

Gustafsson Chorell, a researcher of the history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdoms historia*) from the University of Uppsala and an enthusiast regarding historiographical discussions, wrote a considerable number of articles and book reviews, some of them contributing heavily to the linguistic turns. This, in turn, leads to the importance of single researches to use and promote linguistic turns in Finland and Sweden.

Gustafsson Chorell himself wrote for *Lychnos* alone 12 articles between 1995 and 2010 contributing to the visibility of these international senior scholars, mainly citing White and Ankersmit. Based on his writings, he has tended to understand the narrative side of the linguistic turn comprehensively, that is to include narrativist insight into it. For example, his article of the discussion between Roger Chartier and White²¹⁸ in the *Historisk Tidskrift* in 2004 was one of the rare writings in the journal that defended White, as Gustafsson Chorell described him as including philosophical humanism in his theories (p. 388–389). Mats Persson, a historian of *idé- och lärdoms historia* from Uppsala, had in *Lychnos* 10 scripts contributing to linguistic turns by referring mostly to Skinner, Koselleck, and Pocock, but also to White. And as we saw in the previous chapter, Monika Edgren has been widely interested in Scott's theories throughout her career. The same kinds of patterns of referencing to certain senior scholars and themes are found on the Finnish side as well – for example, Markku Hyrkkänen has promoted Koselleck and Skinner, while Jorma Kalela has partly discussed time in history based on Koselleck's viewpoints, and Matti Peltonen has dealt with Ankersmit and White.

The intertwined and close connections between Finland and Sweden are also visible in the published contributions considering linguistic turns. Some writers, as the afore-mentioned Gustafsson Chorell, tended to write mainly for one journal, in his case for *Lychnos*, but some scholars contributed significantly to many journals during their career. *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland* has allowed for the historians from Sweden to contribute more easily on the Finnish historical research, as, for example, Aleksander Kan,²¹⁹ Bo Lindberg,²²⁰ and Ulf Mörkenstam²²¹ have done in the field of the linguistic turns as well.

The borders of history should also be reconsidered. The linguistic turns have had an influence in the field of social and political sciences for a long time, and this is visible also in the pages of the examined journals. Some notable writers from that area have contributed to the historical journals, most notably Kari Palonen,²²² Jacob Westberg,²²³ and Jussi Kurunmäki,²²⁴ for instance. It is evident

²¹⁸ HT 2004, Torbjörn Gustafsson Chorell: Humanism, relativism och tolerans – Hayden Whites samtal med Roger Chartier, 373–390.

²¹⁹ E.g., HTF 2009, Aleksander Kan: Postmodernismen och historieskrivningens praktik, 56–74.

²²⁰ E.g., HTF 2007, Bo Lindberg: Begreppshistoria i Sverige, 121–129.

²²¹ E.g., HTF 2006, Ulf Mörkenstam: "Önskvärda och icke önskvärda folkelement," 285–319.

²²² E.g., HAik 2004, Kari Palonen: Poliittinen ajattelu politiikan ulottuvuutena, 80–89.

²²³ E.g., HT 1998, Jacob Westberg: När ord får mening – författarskap och tolkningssammanhang i Quentin Skinners analyser av språkanvändning hos Bollingbroke, Machiavelli och Hobbes, 159–186.

²²⁴ E.g., HAik 2004, Jussi Kurunmäki: Käsitteiden venyttämisestä, 90–93; HTF 2007, Jussi Kurunmäki: Kan en nation byggas på politisk vilja, 63–89.

that political scientists have had their part in promoting linguistically oriented approaches.

The discussions related to the linguistic turns appeared at different times in different journals, and the intensity varied also in correlation with time. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* already had a vivid discussion²²⁵ about the narrativity in history from the middle of the 1980s, but this kind of discussion²²⁶ appeared in *Historisk Tidskrift* just at the end of the 1990s. On the contrary, long before that a discussion²²⁷ was emerging about narrativity in other Swedish journals, which also may be a sign of the preferable themes in *Historisk Tidskrift* at that time. In contrast, gender history has made a real breakthrough in Sweden, with considerable thanks to Yvonne Hirdman, who at the end of the 1980s made Scott's linguistically based viewpoints well known.²²⁸ The clear promoter of Scott in the same manner was missing in Finland, the emphasis remaining on social history.²²⁹

The main findings thus far can be summarized as follows: in most cases the linguistic turns have been adopted scarcely and with more or less delay. The actions of individual historians also seem very notable, and the focuses of the journals have varied a lot depending on the contributors and their interests. Nevertheless, in both countries the clear breakthroughs in the applications of linguistically oriented methods seem to have happened in the beginning of the 2000s, while before that the transfers from abroad emerged scattered and in single waves. The theme numbers in the first decade of the 2000s demonstrate this interpretation.

By these results from the journals it seems to be clear that the linguistic turns have been well adopted by a few individual researchers, and it would be wise to concentrate on them. Still, the contributions in the journals reveal also the methodological principles held by those historians who themselves do not apply linguistically oriented approaches and thus they might be worthwhile for a deeper study as well; but that would be a question for further research projects.

The data presented in this chapter gives an interesting premise considering our next step. I have thus far searched the citations of senior scholars, and this clearly does not include all the research with linguistically oriented approaches. Next, my intentions are to look at the dissertations and their methodological sections to trace the impact of the linguistics turns in a more comprehensive and complementary way. Nevertheless, the data found in these long-tradition

²²⁵ HAik 1985, Heikki Lempa: Historiallisen tiedon kertomuksellisuus – kolme eri merkitystä, 198–203; HAik 1987, Jorma Kalela: Historiallisen prosessin käsitteellistäminen ja historiallinen aika, 119–127; HAik 1990, Heikki Lempa: Yhteiskuntahistorian umpikuja – Historian unohdettu kerronnallisuus, 208–217; HAik 1991, Jorma Kalela: Narratiivi ei ole kertomus, 146–155; HAik 1991, Heikki Lempa: Kertomuksellisuus ja historiallinen esitys, 353–356; HAik 1992, Hannu Salmi: Historiatieteellisen kerronnan rakenteesta, 253–260.

²²⁶ HT 1997, Birgitta Odén: Metodologisk meny, 3–23; HT 1999, Jonas Harvard: Historikerna och postmodernismen, 806–807; HT 1999, Kim Salomon: Samtidshistoriens nya perspektiv, 60–69; HT 1999, Rolf Torstendahl: Ny och gammal samtidshistoria, 262–266.

²²⁷ Scandia 1990, Christer Winberg: Varför skriver vi inte historiska romaner i stället?, 5–17.

²²⁸ See Hirdman 1988, where she employed the constructions of Scott.

²²⁹ For the selective reception of linguistically constructed gender theory by J. Scott in Finland and Sweden, see the further chapters 7.3 and 7.4 in this study.

journals replies to some extent to the question of whether and to what degree linguistically oriented methods and theoretical discussions are visible in these types of publications and in a broader discussion among historians. An interesting question to answer will be, whether similar kinds of developments are evident also in the doctoral dissertations as was the case with the leading national journals; or were the linguistically oriented methods earlier, later, or roughly at the same time used in the dissertations as they appeared in the journals? Further, dissertations are the first real study of a scholar and the first academic attempt of a young historian, while the contributors to the journals comprise a more heterogenous group of academics—scholars with different backgrounds, careers, positions, and even disciplines (also outside of historical studies) who have contributed to the discussions in the historical journals.

To conclude, the journals indicate that the more vivid discussion rose in the 1990s and the real breakthroughs of linguistically oriented methods happened only in the 2000s. Still, it is interesting to see whether in the dissertations these were visible at the same time, since they are different by their structure and nature from the journals. Furthermore, dissertations must include a methodological section, and analyzing them leads to a more comprehensive understanding about the influence of the linguistic turns into Finnish and Swedish historiography. This, hopefully, will lead to a more explicit methodological discussion in the future, while my research also gives a picture of the kind of reception the theoretical and methodological sections of the dissertations have met.

In the following chapters I treat different linguistically oriented approaches separately. Within these chapters, the chronology is traceable and the comparison between the two countries is kept in mind. Establishing a chronological order makes the changes easier to detect, while the approach is still to compare countries with each other.

4 CONCEPTUAL HISTORY IN FINNISH AND SWEDISH DISSERTATIONS

In the beginning of each chapter about the specific form of a linguistic turn, I present a table that contains the dissertations that have references to that specific linguistic turn. These tables contain the core of my research materials and they are interpreted further in the following chapters. The tables run from 1970 to 2010 in a parallel way so that the comparison between Finland and Sweden is easier to conduct, as well as temporal differences and similarities concerning the reception of linguistically oriented methods.

I use the following abbreviations in the tables. From the Finnish universities are represented universities from Helsinki (Hki), Turku (Tku), Jyväskylä (Jkl), Tampere (Tre), Oulu (Ou), Joensuu (Jo), and Åbo Akademi (ÅA). The disciplines and departments are abbreviated as GH (general history), FH (Finnish history), CH (cultural history, in Turku and Helsinki), PH (political history, in Turku and Helsinki), NH (Nordic history, in Åbo Akademi), and SSH (Swedish-speaking history, in Helsinki).²³⁰

From the Swedish universities are represented here Uppsala (Upp), Lund (Lu), Gothenburg (Go), Stockholm (St), Umeå (Um), and Örebro (Ör). The disciplines are history (H) and history of science and ideas (HSI). History of science and ideas is a separate discipline in the universities of Uppsala, Lund, Gothenburg, Umeå, and Stockholm.²³¹

Overall, there have been 29 Finnish and 22 Swedish dissertations with a reference to conceptual history:

²³⁰ Pihjala & Päivärinne 2009, 108.

²³¹ Nilsson 2014, 127-128.

TABLE 3 Dissertations with Reference to Conceptual History. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations 1970–2010.

Year	Finland (29)	Sweden (22)
1970		
1971	J. Kalela (Hki, GH), J. Tiainen (Jkl, GH)	
1972	U. Paananen (Hki, GH)	
1973		
1974		
1975		
1976		
1977		
1978		
1979		J. Perényi (Upp, H), B. Lundberg (Go, H)
1980		
1981		
1982		
1983		
1984		
1985	S. Haikala (Jkl, GH)	
1986	M. Hyrkkänen (Tre, GH)	
1987		
1988		
1989		
1990		Å. Abrahamsson (St, H)
1991		
1992		P. Aronsson (Lu, H)
1993	H. Salmi (Tku, GH), H. Lempa (Tku, GH)	
1994	V-M. Rautio (Tre, GH)	
1995		H. Berggren (St, H), S. Gieser (Upp, HSI)
1996		
1997		
1998	S. Riukulehto (Jkl, GH)	A. Frenander (Go, HSI)
1999	P. Ihalainen (Jkl, GH), A. Helo (Tre, GH), J. Oikarinen (Tre, GH)	J. Hansson (Lu, HSI)
2000		L.M. Andersson (Lu, H), P. Wisselgren (Um, HSI)
2001		
2002	R. Forsström (Tku, CH)	O. Ljungström (Upp, HSI), M. Alm (Upp, H), P. Lundell (Lu, HIS)

2003	P. Torsti (Hki, PH)	
2004	S. Tuomaala (Hki, FH), Wolff 2004 (Hki, SSH)	
2005	M. Jalava (Hki, FH), P. Einonen (Jkl, FH)	D. Stockelberg (Go, HSI)
2006	A. Sivula (Tku, GH)	A. Sundin (Upp, H), J. Harvard (Um, H), K. Petrov (Go, HSI)
2007	T. Tuikka (Jkl, FH)	B. Tjällén (St, H), J. Östlund (Lu, H)
2008	H. Tandefelt (Hki, SSH), O. Ampuja (Hki, FH), M. Sivonen (Jo, FH), J. Wassholm (ÅA, GH)	P. Landgren (Go, HSI)
2009	J. Nurmiainen (Hki, GH), K-M. Miettunen (Tre, FH), A. Suoranta (Hki, PH), T. Särkkä (Jkl, GH)	A. Ers (St, HSI)
2010	M. Pekkola (Jkl, GH)	J. Eriksson (Lu, HSI)

To summarize these findings so far, conceptual history has been visible in the Finnish dissertations in three different waves before its more established status in the 2000s. First, it was a method that was referred to only infrequently (Kalela 1971, Tiainen 1971, Paananen 1972), then picked up with references to Koselleck and *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* beginning in the middle of the 1980s (Haikala 1985, Hyrkkänen 1986), which were repeated at the beginning of the 1990s (Salmi 1993, Lempa 1993, Rautio 1994). The years 1998 and 1999 produced four dissertations with a conceptual approach (Riukulehto 1998, Ihalainen 1999, Oikarinen 1999, Helo 1999). Between the years 2002 and 2010, there were already a total number of 17 dissertations containing at least some kind of link to conceptual history.

In the Swedish dissertations, conceptual history was applied in single studies (Perényi 1979 and Lundberg 1979) at the end of the 1970s, but the next dissertations referring to concepts were limited to four in the 1990s (Abrahamsson 1990, Aronsson 1992, Berggren 1995, and Gieser 1995). During the first decade of the 2000s there were a total of 14 conceptually oriented studies. One can see the year 2006 as kind of mark of the consolidation of conceptual history with three dissertations (Sundin 2006, Harvard 2006, and Petrov 2006). By these results, the reception and influence of conceptual history has been slower and less effective in Sweden. These works are discussed in more detail in the next sub-sections.

4.1 From 1970 to the mid-1980s: Early Interest in the Concepts

From the beginning of the 1970s there were a few dissertations that, more or less, concentrated on certain concepts. Based on the dissertations of the 1970s, the interest toward language appeared mainly in contesting specific and single concepts from a historical perspective. The themes of the dissertations dealt mostly with Finnish, Swedish, and German history, the national historiographies of which were also sources of methodological and theoretical starting points. In this chapter I introduce the works connected to conceptual history.

In the turn of the 1970s there were already traditions or indications of conceptual history in Finland. My research period starts from 1970, but in 1969 Osmo Jussila (Helsinki, Finnish, and Scandinavian history) defended his doctoral dissertation about Finnish fundamental laws as interpreted by Russia and Finland between 1808 and 1863, and this study was clearly the first concept-based dissertation in Finland. In his introduction Jussila emphasized the role of words and the changes in their meanings, especially from the viewpoint of the language of the past. Jussila concentrated on the concepts – such as “state” (*valtio*), “nation” (*kansakunta*), “law” (*laki*), and “constitution” (*perustuslaki*) – to reveal both the survival and changing means as the origin of new habits of thought and understanding. Additionally, he concluded that conceptual analysis is essential in the history of ideas. Political words changed quickly along with the political events, based on different times, places, users, and contexts; different meanings were not separated, new concepts implied new thoughts or states of affairs, and key concepts must be defined through the sources of that particular time. While writing about the changing sense of central words and conceptions, Jussila interestingly did not derive this methodological approach from historians but linguists, as he referred to English and Swedish linguists and their theories from the 1930s to the 1960s: G. Stern, A. Rudskoger, S. Ullmann, L. P. Smith, R. Wells, C.C. Fries, and R.S. Messner. Finally, Jussila concluded his research by asserting that different semantic and terminological developments in Finland and Russia had led to a variety of interpretations of Finnish fundamental laws.²³²

The opponent and reviewer, Eino Jutikkala, was not fully convinced by Jussila’s concentration on words and expressed his doubts when the study was discussing concepts. According to Jutikkala, there was no need to put too much stress on the words because this kind of approach may lead to misunderstandings and interpreting the past wrongly. Moreover, Jussila had stumbled on some of his own interpretations and the accuracy of his method was questioned.²³³ Jutikkala (1907–2006) himself was one of the best-known Finnish historians, and also academic, in the twentieth century, and his warning about the conceptual approach certainly restricted the further reception of it.

The case of Jussila and Jutikkala gave a demonstration of attitudes toward conceptual history in the beginning of my research period. It seemed that

²³² Jussila 1969b, 16–17, 236, 264, 279.

²³³ Jutikkala 1969, 329–332.

Jutikkala approved more of analytical concepts of social history than the actual conceptual approach. Concentrating on the words of the past was seen to be fruitful and necessary, but that kind of approach was seen by Jutikkala as prone for misunderstandings. On top of that, Jussila's topic was sensitive during the Cold War period and considering the relationships between Finland and Soviet Union.

In the year of 1971 two dissertations were published with connections to linguistic turns, by Jorma Kalela and Jorma Tiainen. Both of them took into account the role of specific concepts, but not as closely as Jussila had done.

Jorma Tiainen's (Jyväskylä, general history) dissertation, titled *Napoleon und das napoleonische Frankreich in der öffentlichen Diskussion des "Dritten Deutschland,"* was a study of the public discussion about Napoleon. Tiainen was supervised by Aira Kemiläinen (University of Jyväskylä), as well as Arvi Korhonen (University of Helsinki) before Korhonen's death in 1967. Tiainen's starting point concentrated around the concept of *Öffentlichkeit* ("public," "publicity") and its derivations (*öffentliche Meinung, öffentliche Diskussion*). In this case Tiainen got inspiration from sociology, as he referred to the new methodological texts of Hans L. Zetterberg and Rudolf Heberle among others to start with.²³⁴ Among German social scientists Ferdinand Lenz, Martin Löffler, and Jürgen Habermas were an example to follow to judge the many possible interpretations of *Öffentlichkeit*, although the concept was treated principally as an analytical concept.²³⁵ In her review Aira Kemiläinen, the opponent, was pleased that Tiainen had considered so many meanings of public opinion and thus had not searched for the "real public opinion" about Napoleon, because that concept was controversial.²³⁶ From a later perspective, it seems odd that a supervisor wrote a review about the dissertation she had been supervising.

Jorma Kalela's (Helsinki, political history) dissertation, *Grannar på skilda vägar – Det finländsk-svenska samarbetet i den finländska och svenska utrikespolitiken 1921–1923*, considered Nordic cooperation and compared the foreign policies of Finland and Sweden in the early 1920s. His intention was to compare the foreign policy of Finland and Sweden as a whole and a conceptual approach was helpful in this task. Concepts like the "foreign policy of a state" (*stats utrikespolitik*) and "security" (*säkerhet*) were defined during this work, as these also implied the circumstances of different nations and separate conceptions of a current situation—security was one concept that was redefined in different circumstances and by different users.²³⁷ It contained also a section about the discussions and debates about the foreign policies of Finland and Sweden, but this was more like a compilation of the local press discussion.²³⁸

All in all, Kalela's work was about foreign policy and decision-making in foreign businesses and the role of the language in his work was maintained in problematizing the main concepts, not on the systematic research of those. His

²³⁴ Tiainen 1971, 9–10.

²³⁵ Tiainen 1971, 13–17.

²³⁶ Kemiläinen 1972, 64.

²³⁷ Kalela 1971, 9, 15–16.

²³⁸ Kalela 1971, 214–227.

opponent Mauno Jääskeläinen agreed that the concepts used for that case, foreign policy and search for security in the early 1920s Finland and Sweden, had been, more or less, indefinite until that time.²³⁹

The dissertations of Tiainen and Kalela were not conceptual history in the comprehensive meaning and substance, but they demonstrated attitudes against such concepts in the turn of the 1970s when they were starting points of the study. The meanings of the words were considered, and they were not understood in their traditional meanings as definable as such but were subject to change and critical analysis.

Also, Unto Paananen (University of Helsinki, general history) applied conceptual analysis when he studied the political and social concepts used by Roman history writer and politician Sallust. He chose 10 main terms (*populus*, *plebs*, *nobilis*, *nobilitas*, *pauci*, *factio*, *factiosus*, *partes*, *boni*, and *homo novus*) to study and characterize the political life in Rome during the first century BC. Interestingly, Paananen also paid attention to counter-concepts, such as *senatus* or *patres* against the concepts of *populus* and *plebs*, both of which may translate as "people." *Homo novus* was highlighted as well, because Sallust was considered to belong to one of them. Paananen's main interest was the attitude of Sallust toward political terms, but the study also handled a broader political life and language of politics of Rome, and especially how Sallust constructed Roman life choosing different words in his various texts (e.g., which words he used about certain people and which he did not). Paananen mainly used dictionaries and other secondary studies to reconstruct the previous use of these terms. The main research background for Paananen was located in Europe, as he considered the studies of political terminology written after the Second World War as his literature, mainly consisting of research literature written in German, English, and French.²⁴⁰ His dissertation was defended in the discipline of history, but it is also greatly a part of Finland's research of ancient cultures and languages, thus being an example of a study between history and linguistics. Still, Paananen's work is an example of a pioneering work, wherein systematic analysis of both historical developments and meanings of certain concepts were made.

In the same period, conceptual history was less notable in Sweden. Linguist Gustaf Stern had published his study of conceptual change already in 1931,²⁴¹ and O. Jussila had referred to it in his own dissertation, but it did not gain popularity among Swedish historians.

Still, a few Swedish dissertations contained public debates and concepts, like in Finland, but these were written with more traditional methods of political and social history rather than expressing interest toward the concepts as such. An example of this is Klas Åmark's (Stockholm, history) dissertation. Åmark divided the public debaters of Swedish foreign and defense policies of 1938–1939 into different groups wherein each of them represented a certain mode of

²³⁹ Jääskeläinen 1972, 152.

²⁴⁰ Paananen 1972, 7–11, 23, 44 – 45, 87–89, 108–109.

²⁴¹ Stern 1931/1964.

thought.²⁴² In some sense Åmark's study is similar to what J. Kalela did in his dissertation, but Åmark did not use a conceptual approach as widely or explicitly as Kalela.

In an interesting way, the first Swedish conceptual research was carried out at the end of the 1970s, when Bengt Lundberg (University of Gothenburg, Department of History) defended his dissertation about uses of the concept of equality within the Swedish Social Democratic Party (*SAP, Sveriges socialdemokratiska arbetareparti*). His method, which he called "systematic content analysis" (*systematisk innehållsanalys*), was, however, inspired more by quantitative semantics as he used the minutes of congress and party programs as his source material and counted every single mention of the word "equality" (*jämlikhet*) and its synonyms in those. And more than that, he also traced arguments about equality in such sections where the word itself was not used in the SAP materials. In conclusion, Lundberg acknowledged the role of language in political decision-making and the many different meanings of just one concept, as well as the distinction, but not yet interconnection, between real politics and ideological uses of language. Finally, Lundberg divided equality into 21 different categories in various contexts, from total equality to equal working conditions. He also graded the uses of the word equality by intensity (explicit or implicit) and attitude (from positive to negative).²⁴³ This method was rather statistical, searching for words and evaluating them, but it was an example of combining numbers and words together, especially when the contexts of word use were included as well.

Lundberg's final work was heavily criticized. According to Lennart K. Persson, Lundberg did not follow his own methodology of quantifying words, and it lacked the precise description of the selection process of the categories and words, which in turn were the base for the whole study. The contents and differences of the 21 categories remained unclear, and some of them were not explained at all, and the lack of awareness of methodological problems left the reader with the question, whether all the statistical information and numbers presented were reliable. Finally, some of the results were not contextualized with earlier discussions and background.²⁴⁴

Further, during the same year János Perényi (University of Uppsala, department of history) analyzed the 1848 revolutions in the Swedish public debate from a more pronounced linguistic starting point. His study about public opinion in newspaper articles of 1848–9 mentioned also J. Habermas, but theoretical examples were added also from M. Foucault, J.G.A. Pocock, and H. White, as well as linguistic and semiotic studies by F. de Saussure and J. Lotman. Perényi started from structural linguistics and the difference between *langue* and *parole*, as he studied ideological phenomena being conceived as a language. Further, he studied the changes of the concept of "revolution" (*revolution*) from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries and in the end analyzed how the idea

²⁴² Åmark 1973, 16–19.

²⁴³ Lundberg 1979, 25, 28, 32, 35–36.

²⁴⁴ Persson 1980, 69–72.

of revolution realized in the revolutions of 1848.²⁴⁵ De Saussure was Perényi's main methodological authority, while Pocock, White, and Foucault were offered as examples of linguistically oriented research.

So, in the case of Perényi, a linguist was seen as the most fruitful and suitable for a study of history, which demonstrates the interdisciplinary nature of historical studies. But problematizing the concept of revolution and its changing meanings was included, although not in the most comprehensive way. The topic was indeed seen as interesting by the reviewer Jan Grahn, but he concluded in the review that the results of the dissertation made a slightly thin impression, and the simple thoughts about opinion research were mixed with unnecessary theoretical patterns.²⁴⁶ Theory and empirical study have been hard to combine, and not all have succeeded.

To conclude, some dissertations during the period of 1970 to the mid-1980s had a clear focus on concepts, starting from O. Jussila's and U. Paananen's dissertations. They both took inspiration from language studies and combined historical studies with each. In Sweden, conceptual studies appeared in the works of B. Lundberg and J. Perényi, but both were criticized for their methodology and theory. Conceptual history was not approved or convincing everywhere, but interest was growing in problematizing the meanings of concepts.

4.2 Conceptual History and Contextualism Rises in Finland: 1985–1999

From the middle of the 1980s, conceptual history in Finland was more visible, and soon it started to add a new methodological insight to the field. The thought of concepts with a long history started slowly to mix with the Skinnerian idea of using concepts each in its unique way in different situations. Along with the German tradition, a British influence started to settle as well into Finnish historiography during this period.

Before that, Sisko Haikala, a PhD candidate from the University of Jyväskylä, discipline of general history and supervised by A. Kemiläinen, studied images about England and British freedom in the German public discussions near the end of the eighteenth century. Haikala stated that studying the meanings of phenomena in their own time is used in conceptual history by a wide selection of source material to reveal broader lines of the concepts' use and development. With this she justified the wide scale of her own source materials from political periodicals to pamphlets and travel books. She also mentioned R. Koselleck's article "Richtlinien für das 'Lexikon politisch-sozialer Begriffe der Neuzeit'" (1967) as a methodological starting point representing the conceptual history of using and developing concepts. In addition, she used eight articles from the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*—"fanatics" (*Fanatismus*), "equality" (*Gleichheit*), "separation of

²⁴⁵ Perényi 1979, 10, 12–16, 19–20, 22–26.

²⁴⁶ Grahn 1980, 44.

powers" (*Gewaltenteilung*), "democracy" (*Demokratie*), "citizen" (*Bürger*), "war" (*Krieg*), "Enlightenment" (*Aufklärung*), and a part from the article of "organ" (*Organ*)—in her work in order to understand the situation of Germany and its people better in their temporal context.²⁴⁷ Though reviewer and opponent J. Tiainen, also from the same discipline of general history and even the same department, described a long list of possible source materials that had been omitted, he considered that Haikala's dissertation was high-class.²⁴⁸

Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe was already published from 1972 on, and this was the first extensive application of it in the Finnish dissertations. On the longer scale, Haikala's dissertation represented the same line of the history of opinions as that of Tiainen from 1971, and this study was also directly influenced by Kemiläinen. Still, the style of these studies was more in the field of social history and public debates, though they also problematized the meanings of supposedly established concepts.

From the viewpoint of the history of ideas, Markku Hyrkkänen (Tampere, general history) made a notable use of both R. Koselleck and Q. Skinner in his dissertation of 1986, which referred to Eduard Bernstein and his position toward colonial policy. First, Hyrkkänen rejected the analysis of influences that was fairly common in the studies of political history at that time. He justified this based on the international discussion, with Skinner's "Meaning and Understanding" being one certain article for reference. After that, he described his own research as "historical awareness" or "consciousness" (*bewusstseinsgeschichtlich Forschung*) wherein the apprehension of things is possible with the cooperation of social history and the history of ideas, with the latter including conceptual analysis as described by Koselleck in the *Vergangene Zukunft*. Instead of making a study of instances of influences, Hyrkkänen read the texts of Bernstein as answers to contemporary questions, like R.J. Collingwood had advised, and not only analyzed Bernstein's colonial ideas but also noticed their conceptual connections to revisionism.²⁴⁹

In a review written by the opponent and professor Seppo Hentilä, the methods and results of Hyrkkänen were described as fresh and independent, compared to other research. The dissertation as a whole was largely positively appraised as it was an indication of extensive and internationally valuable research.²⁵⁰ The reception of German scholarly tradition was strong as Hentilä had been known as a specialist of German history. In this case, the German conceptual history was complemented with the British theory of linguistic contextualism.

In 1993 two dissertations within general history appeared – Hannu Salmi's and Heikki Lempa's – with conceptual approaches defended in the University of Turku. Both were supervised by Kalervo Hovi, who himself had focused mainly on the history of international relations and thus was clearly internationally oriented. Salmi studied German national identity and mentioned Q. Skinner's

²⁴⁷ Haikala 1985, 11, 16–17, 23–24, 29–30.

²⁴⁸ Tiainen 1986, 57.

²⁴⁹ Hyrkkänen 1986, 20, 22.

²⁵⁰ Hentilä 1987, 53, 54.

article “Meaning and Understanding” critically, because he could also agree with using effect analysis in the history of ideas. He also noted R. Koselleck’s works about the meanings of utopia and crisis.²⁵¹ Salmi did not express more precisely his relationship, neither to Skinner nor to Koselleck, and they remained slightly inspirational figures for him and in the role of background literature.

In turn, Heikki Lempa took note of Koselleck’s *Vergangene Zukunft* and *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* in his study about German philanthropism during the eighteenth century. Lempa stated that the latest research about the theme had not been fully acceptable from a chronological viewpoint, and he himself applied conceptual history to reveal the historical meanings of words like “affect” (*Affekt*) and “passion” (*Leidenschaft*). He considered conceptual history to be something that lay between the history of words and the history of ideas.²⁵² Markku Hyrkkänen has made a somewhat similar point in one of his later articles, and this may also be one reason to reject the study of the language of the past.²⁵³ Conceptual history lies between linguistics and history and thus tends to be neglected if one concentrates only on historical studies. This, in turn, raises the question why the historicity and political nature of language has not been acknowledged.

Previous PhD candidates had concentrated on Koselleck and concepts, but Veli-Matti Rautio (Tampere, general history) continued in some sense the tradition started by M. Hyrkkänen, who was also one of his supervisors. When Rautio searched the debates of German Social Democratic party members for the contemporary reception and reaction to the texts of E. Bernstein (1850–1932), he saw the flows or currents within the party as discourses in the Foucauldian sense described in the *Archaeology of Knowledge*. From the history of ideas he applied the Collingwoodian method of asking and answering questions to see how the flows in the party were internally united but also separated from each other. He also used *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* to clear up the meanings of “ideology” and referred also to Skinner’s *Foundations*.²⁵⁴

The opponent and reviewer, again professor Seppo Hentilä, did not comment directly on the theoretical starting points, but rather stated the view that the topic and its handling were rather safe and Rautio only tried to produce more accurate research than other historians had done.²⁵⁵ Rautio did not fully follow the example of his supervisor but still at least acknowledged the usability of language in historical research via versatile referral to different scholars within that particular field. This can be seen as one sign of such a study that operated on safer grounds, but the possible importance of language was still indicated.

Sulevi Riukulehto (Jyväskylä, general history) concentrated on the concepts of “luxury” and “waste” in his doctoral dissertation, which combined sociology and history while he studied the critique of consumption in the United States between 1880 and 1929. The dissertation was a continued research of his previous

²⁵¹ Salmi 1993, 35, 38, 78.

²⁵² Lempa 1993, 16–17, footnote 2 (p. 16).

²⁵³ Hyrkkänen 1994.

²⁵⁴ Rautio 1994, 19, 23–24.

²⁵⁵ Hentilä 1995, 83.

licentiate thesis wherein his supervisors were Jukka Gronow (sociology, University of Helsinki) and Jorma Ahvenainen and Kalevi Ahonen (history, University of Jyväskylä). Riukulehto, who also has a degree in political science, studied the discourse of luxury in the United States and understood the term “discourse” widely: it meant for him all the ways of expression, including non-textual output, but the main focus was on the texts. Discourse was also deeper than individual discussions, because the participants of discourse may not know about each other or the existence of the very discourse, meaning that there could be many discussions around the same subject. In this process the ruptures, changes, and continuance of concepts occupied the main role. Methodologically, R. Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte* was the main starting point for Riukulehto, but he recognized also Q. Skinner and J.G.A. Pocock, who he identified as a member of the “English revisionist school,” though he did not refer directly to their works or any work about discourse analysis. In the end, Riukulehto made his basic research by the means of conceptual history but later attached these conceptual findings to their wider contextual environment.²⁵⁶

In the review of Professor Auvo Kostiainen, these conceptual and discursive approaches aroused some questions. The link between conceptual history and how it affiliates with the history of consumption should have been clearer. Further, according to Kostiainen, Riukulehto did not introduce the main lines of discourse analysis, though he was clearly applying it – it was taken as granted and there were no references to previous methodological discussions. Texts containing criticism toward luxury and waste were considered to be discourse, but the nature of discourse itself as creating change in history also could have been considered. To put this another way, if the concept of discourse had been approached from another direction, as the cause of acts and effects, it could have produced more interesting results also from the temporal viewpoint. Now Riukulehto’s work lacked the temporal dimension, as time was hidden behind the concepts themselves. For the many discourses at the same time on the subject, Kostiainen was a little bit skeptical, as he wondered how separate these kinds of discourses were and how one could sort them out. But in the end, the overall analysis and application of conceptual history was seen as workable and meritorious.²⁵⁷ It was questionable though, how deeply Kostiainen was aware of conceptual history and discursive historical studies, but the results of the dissertation were acknowledged.

Pasi Ihalainen (Jyväskylä, general history) made a considerable contribution with his dissertation on political language in early eighteenth-century England and the concepts used there. Ihalainen combined the history of political thought represented by the Cambridge School with German conceptual history, partly inspired by methodological seminars organized by K. Palonen and H. Stenius and attended by R. Koselleck and Q. Skinner, among others. In the beginning, Ihalainen wrote that he would use “an overlooked methodology, which might lead to new findings” (p. 16) to address applying continental conceptual history to English

²⁵⁶ Riukulehto 1998, 11, 18–21.

²⁵⁷ Kostiainen 1999, 375–377.

sources and that his study “represents a modified version of the history of concepts” (p. 16). In his long chapter concerning methods and theories, a total of 23 pages (pp. 37–60), Ihalainen explained the usability of this combination. In this comprehensive passage he introduced the traditions—with similarities and differences—of conceptual history and the history of political thought and how to combine those two. The empirical part of the dissertation discussed concepts of “uniformity” and “diversity”, terminology of “party” and “faction”, concepts of “fanaticism” and “toleration”, and associations between freethinking and political pluralism.²⁵⁸

In the review of British opponent G.M. Ditchfield (whom, according to the preface of the dissertation, Ihalainen had met already at the University of Kent as an exchange student in 1989–1990), the dissertation was described as a “most thorough and skillful implementing of key concepts’ use” (p. 82), and the results of the study were highlighted in a positive manner.²⁵⁹

Thus, Ihalainen’s work can be seen as one of the examples of the turn of the 2000s to apply conceptual history and expand it further with a more specific contextualist, metaphorical, and discursive combination. The dissertation has been referred to many times as a methodological example in the later researches about political language.²⁶⁰ In the case of Ihalainen, inspirations came again from both Germany and the United Kingdom—German conceptual history was taught in Finland and exchange programs enabled the possibility for direct interaction with British scholars.

Jarmo Oikarinen (Tampere, general history) applied Q. Skinner’s and R. Koselleck’s theories as well in his dissertation about central ideas in the United States foreign policy in the 1950s. In the chapter “World Order as a Conceptual Framework” (pp. 13–15) Oikarinen explained how he concentrated on concepts and their usage to understand the United States policy. For him, the central concepts were “self-determination,” “collective security,” “leadership,” “development,” “interdependence,” and “democracy,” all of which were contested both internationally and domestically. The combination of Skinner and Koselleck was apparent in understanding the meanings of texts and acts as dependent on the context and how conceptual conventions lead to historical foresight, “horizons of expectation” being adopted from Koselleck. The existence of such horizons served as the theoretical basis for practical political decisions for Oikarinen.²⁶¹ Again, the discipline of general history in Finland tended to be the nexus for German and British traditions concerning linguistic turns.

Markku Hyrkkänen was not Oikarinen’s supervisor but otherwise had advised Oikarinen in the course of the research, which was visible also in the final form of the study. Further, Hyrkkänen’s role as one of the most important advocates of conceptual history stood out during the period of 1985–1999. This period produced various linguistic turns, including dissertations defended in the

²⁵⁸ Ihalainen 1999, 8–9, 16, 37–47, 60.

²⁵⁹ Ditchfield 2000, 82.

²⁶⁰ E.g., dissertations Wolff 2004, Tuikka 2007 and Nurmiainen 2009, all of which are discussed in the later chapters.

²⁶¹ Oikarinen 1999, 13–15.

universities of Tampere (Hyrkkänen 1986, Rautio 1994, Oikarinen 1999), Turku (Salmi and Lempa in 1993), and Jyväskylä (Riukulehto 1999, Ihalainen 1999, both influenced by Kari Palonen). Moreover, the conceptual approach was supplemented with Skinnerian linguistic contextualism, already in Hyrkkänen's study, but also in the dissertations of 1999. This indicated a clear and more focused concentration on language.

4.3 Concepts More Acknowledged in Sweden, 1985–1999

To compare with the situation in Sweden, the first dissertations mentioning *Begriffsgeschichte* and R. Koselleck appeared in the 1990s (Abrahamsson 1990, Aronsson 1992, Berggren 1995). However, some interest in concepts and their meanings existed in the studies of Sverker Sörlin, Henrik Björck, and Jakob Christensson as well.

Sverker Sörlin (Umeå, history of science and ideas) defended a dissertation about the debate on Norrland and its natural resources, but it lacked the theories about the nature of public debate, though such was visible in the title (Land of Future—The Debate about Norrland and Natural Resources during the Industrial Revolution). From the conceptual side, Sörlin wondered what was included and excluded by the territorial concept of Norrland.²⁶² Henrik Björck (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) studied the history of technological ideas and divided reality into materialistic and linguistic forms. Technology as artifacts was seen as its representations, in the sense that concepts and symbols were representations of language.²⁶³

These studies were quite separate from actual conceptual history, and the conceptual approach was not involved more deeply in the analysis sections. However, language was acknowledged at some level, although it was not in the focus. Further, Jakob Christensson (Lund, history of science and ideas) studied the era of the Enlightenment in Sweden from the conceptual viewpoint, especially the changes of the concept of citizenship, but his theoretical standing point remained ground in a thick reading by the way of Clifford Geertz. In the case of Christensson, thick reading meant a close and repeated reading of the source material.²⁶⁴

Still, the study about nineteenth-century Stockholm's labor movement and social consciousness by Åke Abrahamsson (Stockholm, history) was the first dissertation with *Begriffsgeschichte* as one of its starting points. Abrahamsson's research had three interrelated topics: the societal role of the press, emancipatory strivings of the laborers, and the conceptualizations of society. The English working class works of E.P. Thompson and Gareth Stedman Jones were models for Abrahamsson. In addition to them, he applied the public-sphere model of

²⁶² Sörlin 1988, 12–13. *Framtidslandet – Debatten om Norrland och naturresurserna under det industriella genombrottet*.

²⁶³ Björck 1995, 308.

²⁶⁴ Christensson 1996, 9–10.

Habermas, but took note also of R. Koselleck and referred also to J.G.A. Pocock's chapter "Verbalizing a Political Act." Briefly, for Abrahamsson there existed socially different language uses and means of expression. As the primary source material Abrahamsson used press material and dozens of journals and concluded that each of them constructed and interpreted different class positions and had their own understanding of how society and state were imagined.²⁶⁵ Abrahamsson's dissertation was the first one in Sweden that referred both to *Begriffsgeschichte* and the Cambridge School. The motivation of the study was inspired as well from outside Sweden, namely by Thompson's and Stedman Jones's studies.

Peter Aronsson (Lund, history) handled peasants as policy-makers in three small Swedish parishes from 1680–1850. Using among others the theory of a public sphere by J. Habermas, he treated local self-government as a place, where one part of the meanings lies in the rhetoric of the speeches. M. Foucault was as well inspirational with his theory of power relations, applied here to local communities. R. Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte* were mentioned by their names in a footnote, but not in the source list. Here Aronsson, as an example of a possible conceptual approach to the theme of local political history, referred to an article by Britt Liljewall, who had applied conceptual history in her previous research.²⁶⁶ This was a hint that Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte* had already gained some growing attention – they were identified but not established, as the references to them were still mainly scarce. Language was not Aronsson's primary target of analysis, but he distributed a study of a changing political culture in which the parish assembly was an important arena for peasants to express themselves, to a certain degree, against the elite.

Begriffsgeschichte and a certain linguistic turn was clearer in Henrik Berggren's (Stockholm, history) dissertation of the rhetoric used by the Swedish youth movements at the beginning of the twentieth century. Through the diverse use of the concept of "youth" (*ungdom*) at that time, Berggren's method was inspired by Koselleckian conceptual analysis; that is, defining the particular meanings of that concept in different times and situations. He also noted the Foucauldian concept of discourse, but recognized it as problematic, and used himself instead terms like "concept" (*begrepp*), "rhetoric" (*retorik*), and "identity" (*identitet*) in his own study to refer to the linguistic landscape created by the youth. Concepts of "nation" and "class" were often used among the youth, either in a positive or negative manner. What differed from the traditional *Begriffsgeschichte* was that the concept of youth was not only a political concept, but something connected with everyday life, existential and metaphorical, justifying also the term rhetoric instead of a plain concept. Besides, Berggren did not use only traditional sources of political history and youth party programs, but extended these to many kinds of written sources produced by the youth themselves, including magazines, romances, and poems as well. The diversity of language was also clearly stated by Berggren: "[T]hat language can be a reflection of reality

²⁶⁵ Abrahamsson 1990, 11–14, 527, 541.

²⁶⁶ Aronsson 1992, 28–30, 34, 351.

but also a creator of reality” (p. 17). J. Scott was also one example of using language as a starting point for some phenomenon, and so Berggren was also interested in the gender aspect of youth as well.²⁶⁷

Berggren’s approach was different from previous ones, created a clear method based on conceptual history, and was applied systematically. Denying the Foucauldian discourse, or at least questioning it, was also revealing at this point. Magnus Rodell called Berggren’s dissertation a pioneering effort in many senses, including its concentration on the meaning of language and acknowledging its governing function.²⁶⁸ Another referee, Roddy Nilsson, marked also Berggren’s approach wherein language can be both a reflection and creator of reality and noted that his developed theoretical base and successful methods were less usual in historical studies in Sweden. Moreover, Berggren’s dissertation had now introduced a new, linguistically oriented research approach to Swedish history, and Nilsson hoped that other historians would follow the example of Berggren and be interested in the language of the past.²⁶⁹

A clearer application of *Begriffsgeschichte* was the starting point for Jonas Hansson (University of Lund, history of science and ideas). Hansson studied the concept of “humanism” (*humanismen*) and the idea of a crisis of humanism in Sweden between 1848 and 1933. While examining the influences connected with the word humanism, he addressed *Begriffsgeschichte* as his methodological starting point but also included the linguistic field (*språkliga fältet*) to contextualize the usage of the concept. In Hansson’s theory the linguistic field consisted of a series of concepts, and a change in the meaning of a concept indicated that the linguistic field had changed. Hansson linked the Swedish debate with the German one and concluded that the concepts of humanism originated from Germany and had changed during the early twentieth century in Sweden—originally the linguistic field around humanism included culture, enlightenment and progress, but these gradually vanished.²⁷⁰

Hansson’s reviewer and opponent Mats Persson admitted that the dissertation was for him pioneering because of its methodological and theoretical solutions, as it was the first dissertation of *idé- och lärdoms historia* with a conceptual analysis. The conceptual analysis also mostly worked, although there could have been a greater focus on what exactly the linguistic field was, as it was not clearly declared in the short section on method and theory.²⁷¹

Anders Frenander (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) touched on the concept of “ideology” (*ideologi*) and ideological change in his study about the Swedish cultural debate during the post-war era. In addition to describing the concept itself, referring to authors like K. Marx, M. Weber, P. Ricœur, S. Hall, J. Habermas, and G. Geertz, Frenander understood ideology as a discursive and

²⁶⁷ Berggren 1995, 15–19, 23, 52–53. “[A]tt språket kan vara en reflektion av verkligheten men också en skapare av verklighet” (p. 17).

²⁶⁸ Rodell 1996, 264.

²⁶⁹ Nilsson 1996/1997, 172–173.

²⁷⁰ Hansson 1999, 22–27, 39–42, 215–217, 220.

²⁷¹ Persson 2001, 234, 238.

floating unit composed of more or less changeable elements.²⁷² Treating one concept above others was notable, but Frenander's study did not concentrate on conceptual research further. Yet this was an example of a study right before the year 2000, in which the meaning of a concept was widely and precisely considered and seen also in a discursive form.

To conclude, conceptual history emerged before the year 2000 in Sweden as concepts were not just analytical but problematized against their historical background and meanings. Still, the main interest lay in the concepts and British linguistic contextualism was not included in the same way as in Finland, which in turn was in the nexus of the German and British methodological debates. This was the basis for the new millennium and growing number of studies concerning the conceptual approach.

4.4 The 2000s: The Strengthening Position of Conceptual History in Finland

During the first decade of 2000, conceptual history gradually gained a more established position in Finland, as it had started in the previous decades. Likewise, conceptual turns were rising in Sweden as well in the same era and were more visible in the dissertations.

As a background and concerning the national applications of conceptual research, the magnum opus of Finnish conceptual history, *Käsitteet liikkeessä* (Concepts in Motion), was published in 2003, while the whole work took eight years in total.²⁷³ It contained 10 articles of basic concepts analyzed in the Finnish context of political history, culture, and thought. The aim of the contributors, who came from the disciplines of history, politology, and sociology, among others, was to closely look at everyday political concepts (such as *valta*, *valtio*, *kansa*, *politiikka*, *puolue* – “power,” “state,” “people,” “politics,” and “party”) that are not so self-evident as they first seem – all these concepts were created in the Finnish language in the nineteenth century because they did not exist in Finnish before that.²⁷⁴ There was no such contribution in Sweden at the same time,²⁷⁵ but the *Den antika skevheten* (The Ancient Skewness) by Bo Lindberg has been described as the most prominent work in the field of conceptual history in Sweden.²⁷⁶ The focus was on systematically analyzing political language and concepts in the early modern period of Sweden.

²⁷² Frenander 1998, 19–27.

²⁷³ Matti Hyvärinen, Jussi Kurunmäki, Kari Palonen, Tuija Pulkkinen & Henrik Stenius (eds.): *Käsitteet liikkeessä. Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Vastapaino, Tampere 2003.

²⁷⁴ See also the review by Pasi Ihalainen: Ihalainen, Pasi (2004), “Uraauurtava käsitehistoriallinen tulkinta Suomen poliittisesta kulttuurista.” *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 102, no. 3, 408–417.

²⁷⁵ But this kind of project is underway; situation in spring 2019.

²⁷⁶ Lindberg 2006; Marjanen 2018, 118.

Besides publishing *Käsitteet liikkeessä* and the more vivid discussion about concepts in the journals,²⁷⁷ conceptual history was on the rise in the dissertations as well. Pilvi Torsti (Helsinki, political history) was again one of those who combined Skinnerian and Koselleckian methods in her dissertation about the conceptions of history among the youth in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. She studied school books of history and interviewed students herself. Koselleck's understanding of historical time was relevant, as well as the awakening of the historical consciousness through experience and expectations since the eighteenth century. From the conceptual side, the concepts of "war," "peace," and "nation" were the most relevant for Torsti, as she used the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* to define them historically but also studied how different ethnic groups of Serbians, Croatians, and Bosnians understood those during the end of the 1990s. One of the reasons to use these three particular concepts was that "they are typical examples of historically constructed societal concepts" (p. 75). Skinner's theory of concepts was added and applied later in the analysis section where Torsti examined her key concepts through their meaning, usage, and values. For example, the concept of "peace" was pragmatic by its meaning, because it was used in the contexts of the UN and negotiations and no values were attached to the concept.²⁷⁸ The opponent Peter Aronsson from the University of Linköping and the supervisor Sirkka Ahonen praised Torsti for her concept-based study, which was appraised as convincing.²⁷⁹

The mixture of Koselleckian and Skinnerian approaches was a clear methodological basis also in the dissertation of Timo J. Tuikka (Jyväskylä, Finnish history), who also was influenced by Kari Palonen. Tuikka studied former president Urho Kekkonen (1900–1986) as a rhetorical actor and described his approach as a "conceptual-historical-rhetorical method" (*käsitehistoriallis-retorinen metodi*). Here the contexts of actions (*tapautumakontekstit*) created and provided the basis for the concepts in speech acts. In the end, Tuikka divided the concepts used by Kekkonen into three categories: political participation (such as "democracy," "parliamentarism," and "state"), value-based concepts ("patriotism," "liberalism," "dictatorship," "freedom," and "fatherland") and those with political actions ("realism," "idealism," and "neutrality").²⁸⁰

The opponent and reviewer Pauli Kettunen, who has also studied concepts during his scholarly career, acknowledged the linguistic turn as a basis that intersects with nationally strong and vivid research about Kekkonen, and this approach with a linguistic emphasis has been clearly different from how it used to be applied before. Although, the dissertation's reading of vast amounts of sources through the lenses of rhetoric and conceptual history without thinking about the genres of the texts, as well as clarifying the contexts, was partially unfinished. According to Kettunen, this showed up as mistakes in some overly straightforward interpretations and too-vast background information. Nevertheless, Kettunen wished that both Kekkonen-historians and linguists

²⁷⁷ See Chapter 3.2.

²⁷⁸ Torsti 2003, 23, 37, 72–75, 196–197.

²⁷⁹ Ahonen 2004, 131–132.

²⁸⁰ Tuikka 2007, 38–42, 48.

would discuss Tuikka's research.²⁸¹ The final statement was conciliatory rhetoric with the purpose to build bridges between historical research and language research. Until that time, the co-operation between the two had not been so beneficial what it might have been.

Johanna Wassholm (Åbo Akademi, general history) studied identity construction in early nineteenth century Finland and used as the method a mixture of conceptual history and microhistory. From the conceptual side, the concept of "identity" (*identitet*) was central. Wassholm introduced R. Koselleck and his great project *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* as a fundamental and systematic study of concepts with their long history. She also mentioned Q. Skinner and the Cambridge School as another type of conceptual study, with the focus on linguistic conventions, speech acts, and rhetoric. Wassholm continued that the study of concepts is linked with the linguistic turn, which had gained more popularity within history during the last few decades. She mentioned also the contributions to conceptual history in Finland and acknowledged the position of conceptual study in Finland:²⁸²

The conceptual history research has for many reasons gained a prominent position in Finnish history studies, as explained by the simple fact that Finland offers an unusually fertile starting point for conceptual-historical studies.²⁸³

As an explanation she referred to H. Stenius who had stated that Finland is a mixture of a cultural and political nation, and that the institutional contexts had differed from the Swedish reign and autonomic status in the Russian empire to an independent republic, and the nation-building in the nineteenth century was partly done in two languages, and Finnish had to fill the conceptual vacuum by transferring concepts from Swedish. Wassholm also described the tradition of conceptual history in Finland, starting from A. Kemiläinen and O. Jussila, who concentrated on concepts before the actual conceptual history was known, and ending with *Käsitteet liikkeessä* and P. Ihalainen.²⁸⁴

Wassholm clearly equated German conceptual history with British linguistic contextualism. She also saw concepts and their study as clearly being a part of the linguistic turns. Besides Åbo Akademi, she had colleagues also in the University of Jyväskylä, whom she greeted in her preface. This could be seen as a direct reference to influence or exchange of ideas so meaningful that the important role and honorary position of those colleagues was explicated. Wassholm's conceptual analysis and its results were described as interesting and approved by the opponent, Petri Karonen, who himself is not known to be a conceptual historian.²⁸⁵

²⁸¹ Kettunen 2007, 518–520.

²⁸² Wassholm 2008, 18–21.

²⁸³ Wassholm 2008, 18. "Den begreppshistoriska forskningen har av många anledningar fått en framträdande position i finländsk historieforskning, vilket förklaras av det enkla faktum att Finland erbjuder en ovanligt fruktbar utgångspunkt för begreppshistoriska undersökningar."

²⁸⁴ Wassholm 2008, 19–21. See also Stenius 2007, 7–8.

²⁸⁵ Karonen 2008, 214–215.

In 2009, Jouko Nurmiainen (Helsinki, Finnish and Scandinavian history) defended his dissertation on political language, with a special focus on the concepts of “progress” (*edistys*) and the “common good” (*yleinen hyvä*), during the Age of Liberty (1719–1772) in Sweden. He started his introduction with a direct reference to conceptual history and addressed his interest in discrepancies of different meanings in political speech. Bearing in mind the intention to study both concepts and context, the change in concepts was an aid or tool (*apuväline*) to understand abstract things and ideas in the past. Concepts were more or less in a linguistic form and at this point, Nurmiainen stated that conceptual history is more than just the history of language; in its etymological sense, it is instead about meanings and conceptions. Further, Nurmiainen not only demonstrated his own concept-based and contextualizing method but also described briefly the history of conceptual history, from Koselleckian *Begriffsgeschichte* and Skinnerian linguistic contextualism to the recent Finnish and Swedish conceptual studies (*Käsitteet liikkeessä, Den antika skevheten* by B. Lindberg). He concluded that conceptual history had separated from its Germany-based ground and developed further here. Finland was for him a country where “broad methodological freedom reigns” (“*vallitsee laaja metodologinen vapaus*”).²⁸⁶ The conceptual and linguistic methodological basis for Nurmiainen builds on the fact that he was employed in the Academy of Finland project “Enlightened Loyalties,”²⁸⁷ led by Pasi Ihalainen.

Nurmiainen’s dissertation contributed to linguistic turns in two ways. First, it was clearly a study based on researching the language of the past combining different linguistically oriented theories. Second, Nurmiainen also introduced conceptual history for a larger academic public when he described both older and newer conceptual studies both abroad and in the Nordic countries. The approach toward conceptual history was positive and promotional in this study. Further, the opponent Jussi Kurunmäki was pleased that the concepts that earlier had been assumptions and on the sides, “progress” and “general good,” were now in the center of focus. According to Kurunmäki, Nurmiainen had difficulty at times to separate words and concepts, but this was common in conceptual studies. Kurunmäki, a conceptual scholar himself, linked Nurmiainen’s dissertation to the tradition of conceptual studies in Finland.²⁸⁸ In conclusion, the opponent saw a clear continuum within Finnish conceptual studies.

Conceptual history was visible also in a smaller role in some dissertations, or at least the conceptual sphere was acknowledged and references were made to conceptual studies, although the studies may not be conceptual themselves. For example, Mika Sivonen (Joensuu, Finnish history) and Anu Suoranta (Helsinki, political history) referred to conceptual history. Sivonen studied religious life in eastern Finland and constructed the identity of orthodox people

²⁸⁶ Nurmiainen 2009, 11–12, 16–22.

²⁸⁷ The full name of the project was “Enlightened Loyalties: The Conceptual Construction of National, Cultural and Political Identities and Loyalties in North-Western Europe, 1750–1800,” January 1, 2005 to December 31, 2007.

²⁸⁸ Kurunmäki 2010a, 260.

during the late seventeenth century. He referred to *Käsitteet liikkeessä* and B. Lindberg, to demonstrate the different meanings of “people” (*kansa*) and its relationship with the concept of “common people” (*rahvas*, *allmoge* in Swedish). Individual people were not seen as an actor or subject, but more like an object to be ruled in its ethnical meaning, and the varying nominations for orthodox people reflected the relationship and attitudes between the rulers and the people.²⁸⁹ Suoranta (supervised by Jorma Kalela and Pauli Kettunen) mentioned as well *Käsitteet liikkeessä* as an inspirational work of conceptual history while she herself was interested in different time layers of concepts for women’s “working” (*työnteko*) in employment contracts.²⁹⁰ Katja-Maria Miettunen (Tampere, Finnish history) referred to Risto Alapuro’s article of revolution in *Käsitteet liikkeessä* in her dissertation about the 1960s.²⁹¹ These were again demonstrations that works with no direct link to conceptual history still use conceptual studies as research literature. In addition to these, Outi Ampuja (Helsinki, Finnish history) in turn concentrated on noise and its reactions and referred to *Vergangene Zukunft*, though not in the conceptual sense but about the notion of modern time that has no comparable point of reference in the past.²⁹²

Further, a reference to the Koselleckian form of conceptual history was touched on in the dissertation of Henrika Tandefelt (Helsinki, Swedish-language history) about the political culture during the reign of King Gustaf III of Sweden. At the beginning of the study Tandefelt briefly described the revolution by Gustaf III in 1772, but also stated in the footnotes that the French Revolution was the first one with modern meanings. At the same time, with the coronation of the new king, the meaning of central political concepts, like “freedom” (*frihet*), “law” (*lag*), and “citizen” (*medborgare*), were changing.²⁹³ Otherwise, Tandefelt’s dissertation did not concentrate on the linguistic aspects of political culture but more on semiotics. Still, this is a sign that conceptual history was applied also on a smaller scale and the background of certain general concepts was valuable to comprehend. Further, one of the most prominent Swedish conceptual historians, Bo Lindberg, acted as the opponent for Tandefelt.

Juha Hannikainen (Tampere, general history) studied Austrian politics and parliamentarism during the early twentieth century and referred to articles of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* when he defined parliamentarism and power. However, he did not analyze the contemporary definitions of these concepts in his research period.²⁹⁴ One weighty reason and explanation for acknowledging and referring to conceptual history can be traced to his supervisor, M. Hyrkkänen, who had already long been a forerunner for conceptual history in Finland. Charlotta Wolff (Helsinki, Swedish-language history) in turn studied the Swedish political elite and its networks with France during the Enlightenment and mentioned several studies of conceptual history when she demonstrated the

²⁸⁹ Sivonen 2007, 20–21.

²⁹⁰ Suoranta 2009, 18.

²⁹¹ Miettunen 2009, 156.

²⁹² Ampuja 2007, 109.

²⁹³ Tandefelt 2007, 24–25.

²⁹⁴ Hannikainen 2003, 23.

changing meanings of the concept of cosmopolitanism and how the conceptions of fatherland were articulated.²⁹⁵

Piia Einonen (Jyväskylä, Finnish history) referred to conceptual history in her dissertation about political culture at the turn of seventeenth century Stockholm. However, the articles about political culture in early modern Sweden and government in the recent *Käsitteet liikkeessä* collection were not convincing for Einonen, as the articles did not dig into deeper society and the comprehension of common people, or conceptual history had treated political culture as too state-centered. Despite this, Einonen did not reconstruct alternative meanings of the concepts that existed in her source material.²⁹⁶ Interestingly, the opponent Kimmo Katajala brought up the issue that Einonen did not use the concepts of “discourse analysis” (*diskurssianalyysi*) or “discourses” (*diskurssit*), though they seemed to be one starting point for her, and the methodological chapter about the principles and background of the methods was too modest.²⁹⁷ Conceptual history has been criticized for the reasons Einonen mentioned, and naturally it has not convinced everyone. Rational suspicion against linguistically oriented methods, especially to acknowledge the limitations of what kind of results it provides, is healthy at times. Still, conceptual sensitivity has not always been high.

The first decade of the 2000s produced, as in the 1990s, several dissertations with a clear focus on concepts. But what is notable, during this period not only PhD candidates of general history but also from Finnish history referred to conceptual studies. Yet they were not explicitly conceptual studies, but at least the linguistic and conceptual dimension was acknowledged on some level. A reason for this lies most probably in the publication of *Käsitteet liikkeessä*. Now there finally existed an extensive study about the importance of concepts in Finnish, and it introduced the international senior scholars of the area to a broader public of historians in Finland.

And, as already noted, the conceptual approach was in several dissertations combined with the linguistic contextualism à la the Cambridge School. This indicates also a change not only from referring to the German tradition of *Begriffsgeschichte* but to extend it with new British contacts. Besides the dissertations introduced in this chapter, also the ones analyzed in Chapter 5 were at least partially interested in concepts.

4.5 The Conceptual Turn and Consolidation in the Swedish Dissertations: The 2000s

In Sweden, there were a total of 14 dissertations with references to R. Koselleck and/or *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* in the 2000s. One turn happened during the

²⁹⁵ Wolff 2004, 15–21, 366–367.

²⁹⁶ Einonen 2005, 12. Einonen referred also to the conceptual studies of Mikael Alm, who is treated later in this chapter as well.

²⁹⁷ Katajala 2005, 509.

first years of the 2000s, as in 2000 and 2002 five dissertations were defended containing Koselleckian conceptual analysis (Andersson 2000, Wisselgren 2000, Alm 2002, Lundell 2002 and Ljungström 2002).

Lars M. Andersson (Lund, history) studied representations of “the Jew” (*juden*) in Swedish comics. These representations were a counter-force to Swedishness and one way to construct Swedish national identity in the first decades of the twentieth century. This national identity was seen to be constructed and comics as examples of an anti-Semitic discourse. Here Andersson leaned briefly on R. Koselleck and conceptual history to study and historicize the concept of anti-Semitism more closely.²⁹⁸ Accordingly, Koselleck was more like an inspirator for Andersson, and the problematizing of the concept of “anti-Semitism” remained more on the background as research literature than a clear method followed in the analysis chapters of the dissertation.

Per Wisselgren (Umeå, history of science and ideas) studied the formation of a Swedish social science discourse in the historical context of discussions about social questions during 1830–1920. Here the term “discourse” was understood in a broader form than just its Foucauldian use, combining it with *Begriffsgeschichte*: the sphere of concepts was added to the discourse of knowledge. In one of the footnotes Wisselgren noted that conceptual history was linked with the linguistic turn: “The nowadays growing interest toward conceptual history should also be understood in the context of the more general, so-called *linguistic turn* which has taken its place in history” (p. 302, original cursive). He stressed the conceptual and contextual aspects of the history of social knowledge, which led to a perspective of actors who used concepts of a specific background. In addition to studying *what* has been said it was important to clarify *how* things were said.²⁹⁹ To summarize Wisselgren’s method, discourse analysis was combined with conceptual study and concentrated on relevant actors, both individual and collective.

Wisselgren’s study was an example where conceptual history is associated clearly with the linguistic turn. It was an empiric work of a topic that had been studied before from the perspective of “what actually happened,” but Wisselgren included historical discursive processes in this study.

Patrik Lundell (Lund, history of science and ideas) referred to *Begriffsgeschichte* and R. Koselleck in his study about the press in two country provinces of Sweden in the 18th and 19th centuries. First, Lundell criticized the previous press historical studies in Sweden, which were mostly influenced by the public sphere by J. Habermas. Instead of Habermas-style theory of open public, Lundell applied, among others, also a conceptual approach. He studied how practices and conceptions were used to spread ideas and develop communication. Thus, concepts like Enlightenment (*upplysning*), “politics” (*politik*), “party” (*parti*), “liberalism” (*liberalism*), editor (*redaktör*), “publicist” (*publicist*), “public opinion”

²⁹⁸ Andersson 2000, 16.

²⁹⁹ Wisselgren 2000, 16–18, 291–293, 302 footnote 28. “Det numera starkt tilltagande intresset för begreppshistoria bör även förstås i samband den mer allmänna s.k. *linguistic turn* som ägt rum inom historieforskningen” (p. 302, footnote 28).

(*allmän opinion*) and “publicity” (*offentlighet*) were in focus.³⁰⁰ Although reviewers found that Lundell’s conceptual-historical approach was not always accurate, or it lacked references to international (that is, outside Sweden) scholars and studies, it was seen promising.³⁰¹ Further, Lundell’s dissertation was a demonstration that traditional source material, like newspapers in this case, was studied through conceptual approach instead.

Olof Ljungström (Uppsala) from the discipline of the history of science studied anthropological research in nineteenth-century Sweden. He referred to R. Koselleck’s *Vergangene Zukunft* as a “modern classic.” Ljungström mentioned his work in the field of *Begriffsgeschichte* but mainly referred to Koselleck as a scholar who had identified the birth of the “new man” (*den nya människan*) in the eighteenth century. In this section, M. Foucault was also involved, to emphasize the role of the eighteenth century as a turning point of scientific thought. Concepts closely linked to Foucault, “genealogy” and “archeology,” were theoretical starting points for Ljungström as well.³⁰² Ljungström’s usage of Koselleck remained quite limited, and this presented the attitudes of a scientific historian toward conceptual history – there are few scholarly works to refer to as secondary sources and mentioning conceptual history is valid, but this did not carry on to the actual conceptual analysis.

On the contrary, Ljungström admitted that he studied anthropologic discourses and referred to Foucault to deny their role in a Foucauldian way – he instead moved closer to Skinnerian agency in linguistic action:

In any case, I do not want to make “discourses” as the main sorting instrument of my historical study. The focus is clearly on people who used concepts, methods, theories and practices in the performance and reproduction of a form of “intellectual genealogies.” I therefore stand for a clear person-centered historical writing. There are people who talked, not discourses, although these people reproduced whole “clusters” of ideas, attitudes, and even unconscious habits.³⁰³

Mikael Alm (Uppsala, history) studied language and image in the struggle for legitimacy of Gustavian absolutism in 1772–1809 and treated this legitimacy crisis at the discursive level. Alm stated directly that his study was inspired by a mixture of the linguistic and cultural turns, and as well as the “new political history,” where political movements appeared as the movement of words and concepts. He used the concept of “discourse” as transitions of words within the political world and power relationships, inspired also by Keith Michael Baker’s theory of discursive authority, which is concerned with who controls the public

³⁰⁰ Lundell 2002, 8–9, 14–16.

³⁰¹ Nordmark 2003; Marjanen 2007.

³⁰² Ljungström 2002, 17–19, 39. See Whatmore 2016, 11 about the eagerness of Swedish historians to refer to Foucault.

³⁰³ Ljungström 2002, 21, footnote 15: “Jag vill i alla händelser inte göra ‘diskurser’ till min historieskrivnings huvudsakliga sorteringsinstrument. Fokus ligger tydligt på personer som använt sig av begrepp, metoder, teorier och praktiker i uppträttandet och reproduktionen av en form av ‘intellektuella genealogier’. Jag står därmed praktiskt sätt för en tydligt personcenterad historieskrivning. Det är människor som talat, inte diskurser, även om dessa personer reproducerat hela ‘kluster’ av idéer, attityder och till och med omedvetna vanor.”

image and speech about that. The relationship of power and language was essential in this study, but Alm also used a longer Koselleckian conceptual history to concentrate on central concepts of the time like “freedom” (*frihet*), “equality” (*jämlikhet*), “justice” (*rättvisa*), and “people” (*folk*).³⁰⁴

The opponent and an applicator of linguistically oriented methods also himself, Jakob Christensson, stated that Alm’s study was one of the first belonging to the new political history in which language, discourse, and meanings were combined. This was done successfully, and Christensson hoped that Alm’s dissertation would become a standard example of using this kind of new approach.³⁰⁵ Here a new generation of eighteenth-century historians supported each other, and the concept of discourse was clearly separated from its Foucauldian conception. Alm demonstrated how he was familiar with concepts and discourse as methodological and theoretical starting points, and objects of study as well. On the contrary, he remained one of the few PhD candidates from the discipline of history to use the conceptual approach at the time. Referring to and applying conceptual history was still stronger within the *idé- och lärdomshistoria*, and this trend continued in the following years as well.

Next, a greater amount of conceptual history was included in nine Swedish dissertations from 2005 onwards: Leppänen 2005, Stockelberg 2005, Sundin 2006, Petrov 2006, Tjällén 2007, Östlund 2007, Landgren 2008, Ers 2009, and Eriksson 2010.

David Stockelberg (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) studied the concept of “form” (*form*) in the thought of German sociologist and philosopher Georg Simmel (1858–1918). Taking clear inspiration from R. Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte*, Stockelberg analyzed different meanings of that concept and, also, how Simmel himself used it and how its meanings changed in different places and times. Briefly, the focus was on words and their contents, bearing in mind the relationship between language and thoughts. Already the title of the dissertation, *Simmels former* (“Forms of Simmel”), revealed that for Simmel, multiple forms existed.³⁰⁶

The conceptual analysis made the study particularly interesting, but the selection of source material was questioned by the opponent Jonas Hansson because Stockelberg used only three of Simmel’s books. Reading his other works might have changed the meaning and content of his conceptions about form further. It was also partially unclear, when Stockelberg analyzed concepts or bare words of the texts, as the same words could describe one concept and one concept could have had many possible contents.³⁰⁷ The precision of the concepts and concrete meanings that were missing was the key point here.

Kristian Petrov (Södertörn, history of science and ideas) studied how *glasnost* (“openness,” *öppenhet*) and *perestroika* (“restructuring,” *omstrukturering*) became dominant concepts during Gorbachev’s era and, after the fall of communism, faded away very quickly. Besides R. Koselleck’s works and

³⁰⁴ Alm 2002, 16–18, 21–24, 33–35, 389–390.

³⁰⁵ Christensson 2004, 80, 88.

³⁰⁶ Stockelberg 2005, 7–11.

³⁰⁷ Hansson 2005, 330–331.

Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe, Petrov also introduced the contemporary research between the history of ideas and conceptual history in Sweden, led by B. Lindberg and M. Persson, and his own research is part of this approach. He explained that he borrows many elements from German *Begriffsgeschichte*, but he is influenced also by his own background in *idé- och lärdomshistoria* and thus puts more stress on social contexts than just concepts. In conclusion, both *glasnost* and *perestroika* were treated as basic concepts of their own temporal context. Petrov also applied Koselleck's theories about temporality, the space of experience, and the horizon of expectation, to make sense of and reconstruct the late Soviet modernity and how concepts emerged there.³⁰⁸ Petrov's dissertation was full of Koselleck. He also tied conceptual history with the Swedish tradition within the *idé- och lärdomshistoria*.

In 2006, Jonas Harvard (Umeå, history) studied how so-called public opinion was conceptualized by members of the Swedish parliament between 1848 and 1919. The focus was on clarifying what the Members of Parliament considered to be the most reliable public opinion and what was its relationship with the conditions for public discourse. As a result, public opinion was a contested concept, extending from religious conservatism to economic and liberal interpretations between different parties and their MPs. Harvard used conceptual history as his method, as political language contains certain concepts that are more important than others at a given time. He stated also that in trivial terms, all research dealing with language-formulated thought and ideas is basically conceptual history by its nature. Harvard defended the linguistic approach, saying that language does not constitute only the outer costume of thoughts, but it is a semi-transparent carrier of significance – conceptual history was as well more than just the history of words. As a basis, he referred to the groundbreaking works of R. Koselleck and introduced the Cambridge School as a newer branch of conceptual history. Practically, Harvard adopted the concentration on political vocabulary from Skinner and the longer history of concepts from Koselleck and stated that his study was closer to *Begriffsgeschichte*, but he left room also for interpretations in individual situations.³⁰⁹

Roddy Nilsson underlined in his review that Harvard's dissertation is nearly a pioneering conceptual study within Swedish historical studies and even though it had its problems concerning the analysis of public opinion, the conceptual approach offered many new viewpoints.³¹⁰ Torbjörn Nilsson stated in his positive review that Harvard's study was an example of the more conceptually oriented form of political history that had become increasingly popular in the last decade. Harvard had ambitiously developed his empiricism on his theoretical starting points.³¹¹

As stated also by the reviewers, Harvard's study strongly defended the linguistically oriented method within historical studies. For him, language certainly was not only a neutral media, but something very significant as a

³⁰⁸ Petrov 2006, 1, 3, 32–38, 43, 353–355.

³⁰⁹ Harvard 2006, 26–31.

³¹⁰ Nilsson 2008, 159–160.

³¹¹ Nilsson 2006, 121–122.

formulator and carrier of political thoughts, which in the end were researchable through the investigation of specific concepts of a given time.

Joachim Östlund (Lund, history) applied R. Koselleck's *Futures Past* in his study of norm building and arguments for community in official royal rhetoric in the Swedish realm of 1660–1919. Östlund used the rhetorical perspective as his method of analysis and interpretation, when the proclamations of the prayer days (*böndag*, *böndagsplakat*) were seen as historical and rhetorical texts. The concept and sense of "community" was crucial in this study, as well as concepts like "security" (*säkerhet*), "people" (*folk*), "fatherland" (*fädernesland*), "subject" (*subjekt*), "brother" (*broder*), "citizen" (*medborgare*), "state" (*stat*), and "Swede" (*svensk*). In the end, Östlund described his research method as a text analysis and reading the source material multiple times: "The method is based on a text analysis with a particular focus on arguments and concepts, and the analysis as well as the thematicization are based on multiple readings of the source material" (p. 45).³¹² This was an illustrative example of how difficult it is sometimes to write and define one's own methodological starting points. Nevertheless, from the conceptual side, Östlund's dissertation was a mark of the established study of concepts within history. It was a study of a longer period, circa 250 years, from the perspective of how Swedish state and nationalism were constructed in the prayer day rhetoric.

Conceptual historian Mikael Alm acted as the opponent for Östlund. Alm was pleased that the source material consisted of prayer day proclamations, because it was the communicating media about communities and their moral principles. He mentioned that Östlund had concentrated on concepts but did not evaluate the method itself. Instead, Alm was very pleased with the dissertation and recommended it for every researcher of nationalism.³¹³ Another reviewer, Alexander Maurits, a scholar from the discipline of theology and religious studies, did not explicitly discuss the methods but otherwise valued the work of Östlund highly as well.³¹⁴

Thus, neither of the reviewers rated nor criticized the methodological solutions of Östlund's dissertation, which was a sign that the conceptual approach was at least silently recognized. Concentrating on language, rhetoric, and concepts was like a natural part of this historical study. Östlund defended his dissertation within the discipline of history, but in the history of science and ideas three dissertations with conceptual method were completed between 2008 and 2010: studies by Per Landgren, Andrus Ers, and Jonnie Eriksson.

Per Landgren (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) studied the Aristotelian concept of history in the context of establishing history as a discipline at the University of Uppsala at the beginning of the seventeenth century. Separated from poetry and the bare concept of history, the Aristotelian concept of history lacked chronology since it was defined as knowledge about particular things. As the whole dissertation was about one concept, it was natural to refer

³¹² Östlund 2007, 33–36, 41–45, 277–278. "Metoden bygger på en textanalys med särskilt fokus på argument och begrepp och där analysen liksom tematiseringen bygger på ett flertal omläsningar av källmaterialet" (p. 45).

³¹³ Alm 2009, 547, 549.

³¹⁴ Maurits 2008.

to *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, R. Koselleck, and Q. Skinner's study about the concept of science according to T. Hobbes, as well as to Landgren's own supervisor B. Lindberg, the most prominent conceptual historian in Sweden. Landgren noted that he uses conceptual history, which was developed in the contemporary research of political and social concepts. Nevertheless, this scholarly concept was also valid for a study as the concept of history had been ignored in previous studies. Thus, Landgren demonstrated the use of the concept of history from Herodotus and Aristotle to the Renaissance and the theory of history among Swedish scholars in the early modern period. It was used in various circumstances and slowly changed its content and meaning to a concept without a specific chronological content. His own method Landgren described quite simply as a traditional method of the history of ideas (*idéhistoria*), wherein texts and their contexts constitute the basis for ideo-historical analysis.³¹⁵ The opponent, Erland Sellberg, reported that Landgren's study was extensive and otherwise successful, but by concentrating only on the Aristotelian concept of history, Landgren had omitted a few influential scholars from the seventeenth century whose conceptions about history deviated from that one.³¹⁶

Andrus Ers (Stockholm, history of science and ideas) widely applied *Begriffsgeschichte* in his research about how history was used for moral, political, and existential aims in the present time and what desirable actions could be considered appropriate for the future, with the focus on the Swedish political scientist and writer Herbert Tingsten (1896–1973). Ers's theoretical and methodological starting point was a combination of contextualizing the reading of the history of ideas with a theoretical perspective of conceptual history. Ers used the time experience theories of R. Koselleck, horizon of expectations, and timelines characterized by progress and also problematized central concepts of the dissertations, such as "democracy" (*demokrati*), "history" (*historia*), "western countries" (*Västerland*), "Enlightenment" (*upplysning*), and "progress" (*framsteg*). The focus for Ers was to demonstrate the struggles about the inclusive and exclusive meanings of these concepts, for example, what was considered to belong or not to the features of western countries. Q. Skinner's speech act theory and M. Foucault's discourse analysis were mentioned as well with a link to conceptual history, but Ers remained still in the field of concepts. Tingsten's choices of words and concepts in his texts were one of the key issues in this research, as well as to study what kind of narrative forms of the past he structured.³¹⁷ As the opponent, Lennart Olausson stated that Ers succeeded in describing the historical views of Tingsten, but the function of certain concepts (*Västerland*, *upplysning*) was not fully explained, although these were central to the topic.³¹⁸

Jonnie Eriksson (Lund, history of science and ideas) also touched upon conceptual history in his study of the French philosophy of humanity, especially teratology (study of abnormalities of physical development), from the

³¹⁵ Landgren 2008, 15–22, 44–46, 88–89, 107, 124, 345–350.

³¹⁶ Sellberg 2009, 357.

³¹⁷ Ers 2009, 14–16, 18–21, 59, 230–231, 240 footnote 16.

³¹⁸ Olausson 2009, 345–346.

Renaissance until the era of post-humanism. A. Paré (1509/1510–1590) represented the Renaissance thought and G. Deleuze (1925–1995) the post-humanist one for Eriksson. Science and philosophy had been entangled in this period and the development of the concept of the “monster” (*monstret*) was central. Interestingly, Eriksson did not limit the concept of the monster to written form, but treated, for example, images and sketches of monsters in books also as concepts. In this case analogies, metaphors, and symbols were worthy of a deeper analysis to grasp the idea of the monster and what was thought to belong to monstrosity. Eriksson developed the visual analysis further from the more textual theories of P. Ricœur and J. Derrida: sketches were pictures about the world and represent it in their own way, and finally, compilations of images form a discourse of their own. Eriksson stated that he applied discourse analysis in his work, inspired by J. Derrida and M. Foucault and even A. Lovejoy’s dynamic complexity of relationships, to study the human and monstrous in a humanistic discourse. The concept of the monster was treated in its historical context, in different times and places and considering its positive and negative implications, as well as the translation issues from one language to another.³¹⁹ Eriksson’s study thus combined textual analysis with visual analysis.

Anders Johansson, the opponent from literature studies, was pleased with the conceptual approach and pointed out the precise work of Eriksson with the concepts (with one exception, defining “postmodernism”). However, one problematic issue was that it did not always concentrate solely on the discourse, as Eriksson described his starting point—from time to time Eriksson had analyzed real images of monsters and not the discourses about them. Because of this, the question was, did Eriksson concentrate solely on the discursive constructions of monsters, or did he slip to studying monsters instead? The same may happen when one tries to study discourses about reality but in the end studies the actual reality.³²⁰

Eriksson’s study was one kind of contribution to a newer conceptual study wherein the concepts also can be something else than just words in a text, in this case pictures and images. To see discourses as the lifters of ideas, formulating concepts and constructing images and stereotypes were central and theoretically new. Despite the suspicions of the opponent, in the end the study was not about the monsters themselves but the visual discourses about them.

As in Finland, some dissertations referred to conceptual history, yet their main focus was elsewhere. Biörn Tjällén (Stockholm, history) used two articles from the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (“Autorität” and “Legitimetät”) as background literature.³²¹ Katarina Leppänen (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) in turn studied Elin Wägner (1882–1949), a notable Swedish journalist, pacifist, and feminist. Motherhood was a key metaphor in Wägner’s magnum opus *Väckarklocka*, and Leppänen’s purpose was to clarify how central concepts like “motherhood” and “sexual difference” were useful in this political feminist

³¹⁹ Eriksson 2010, 36–45, 691–692.

³²⁰ Johansson 2011, 289, 291.

³²¹ Tjällén 2007, 22.

context, expanding the context from Sweden to the mainland of Europe. Other highly contested concepts between different movements of feminism, such as “woman,” were also registered, as not all women may be counted as being part of women in certain situations. Leppänen referred also to J. Scott, not to her article “Gender” but another work about the paradoxical discourse about women since the French Revolution.³²²

To conclude the Swedish results, the conceptual approach confirmed its status during the first decade of the 2000s also in Sweden. Not only single concepts were studied but also larger discursivities of different source corpuses, and J. Eriksson expanded the view by the concept of the monster in images, which demonstrated an already visual or materialistic turn. Overall, references to R. Koselleck and *Begriffsgeschichte* were more common than in the previous decades, and there existed also a combination of conceptual history with the linguistic contextualism of the Cambridge School, which is therefore treated in the next chapter.

³²² Leppänen 2005, 27, 213–216, 227.

5 CAMBRIDGE-STYLE LINGUISTIC CONTEXTUALISM

As there were many combinations of conceptual history with linguistic contextualism, some of which were introduced in the previous chapter, I continue here to analyze the other dissertations that were inspired by the Cambridge School. Referring to this British tradition demonstrates the shift and expansion of the linguistically oriented methods from the German-based conceptual history.

Overall, the Cambridge School was presented in the dissertations as follows³²³:

TABLE 4 References to the Cambridge School. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations 1970–2010.

Year	Finland (18)	Sweden (19)
1970		
1971		
1972		
1973		
1974		
1975		
1976		
1977		
1978		
1979		J. Perényi (Upp, H)
1980		E-L. Dahl (Go, HSI)

³²³ Abbreviations, Finland: Universities of Helsinki (Hki), Turku (Tku), Jyväskylä (Jkl), Tampere (Tre), Oulu (Ou), Joensuu (Jo) and Åbo Akademi (ÅA). The disciplines and departments are abbreviated as GH (general history), FH (Finnish history), CH (cultural history, in Turku and Helsinki), PH (political history, in Turku and Helsinki), NH (Nordic history, in Åbo Akademi) and SSH (Swedish-speaking history, in Helsinki); Sweden: Universities of Uppsala (Upp), Lund (Lu), Gothenburg (Go), Stockholm (St), Umeå (Um) and Örebro (Ör). The disciplines are history (H) and history of science and ideas (HSI).

1981		
1982		
1983		R. Björk (Upp, H)
1984		
1985		
1986	M. Hyrkkänen (Tre, GH)	
1987	H. Stenius (Hki, SSH)	
1988		
1989		
1990		Å. Abrahamsson (St, H)
1991		E. Lundgren-Gothlin (Go, HSI)
1992	M. Peltonen (Hki, GH)	
1993	H. Salmi (Tku, GH)	
1994	V-M. Rautio (Tre, GH)	M. Persson (Upp, HSI)
1995		
1996		M. Hörnqvist (Upp, HSI)
1997		
1998		T. Jonsson (Go, HSI)
1999	P. Ihalainen (Jkl, GH), J. Oikarinen (Tre, GH), A. Helo (Tre, GH), K. Multamäki (Hki, GH)	V. Höög (Lu, HSI)
2000		
2001		N. Olaison (St, HSI)
2002		M. Alm (Upp, H)
2003	P. Torsti (Hki, PH)	K. Tegenborg Falkdalen (Um, HSI)
2004		
2005		
2006		G. Magnusson (Go, HSI), P. Winton (Upp, H), A. Sundin (Upp, H), J. Harvard (Um, H)
2007	T. Tuikka (Jkl, FH)	A. Wasniowski (Um, HSI)
2008	J. Wassholm (ÅA, GH), T. Toukomies (Jo, GH), S. Kotilainen (Jkl, FH)	P. Landgren (Go, HSI)
2009	J. Nurmiainen (Hki, GH), T. Särkkä (Jkl, GH), M. Tolonen (Hki, GH)	A. Ers (St, HSI)
2010	M. Pekkola (Jkl, GH)	

In Finland, the first application of Skinner's method, based on the article "Meaning and Understanding" from 1969, was used in Markku Hyrkkänen's dissertation. The impact of the linguistic contextualism was otherwise modest throughout the 1980s, which were dominated by versions of social history, but

there were a few signs of possible turns in the 1990s and 2000s. Between 1992 and 1999, there were seven dissertations with references to the Cambridge School: Peltonen 1992, Salmi 1993, Rautio 1994, Ihalainen 1999, Oikarinen 1999, Multamäki 1999, and Helo 1999. The year 1999 stands out with its four dissertations of Skinnerian methodology defended, although this might be an only random occasion. In addition, during the first decade of the twenty-first century, seven dissertations included Skinner in their references (Torsti 2003, Tuikka 2007, Kotilainen 2008, Toukomies 2008, Nurmiainen 2009, Särkkä 2009, and Pekkola 2010). However, when we look at the total number of dissertations of this period, these linguistically oriented studies were still in the clear minority.³²⁴ But during this period the international directions have moved from German tradition to British ones, which is one of the explanatory factors behind this trend and, further, these dissertations as well.

Interestingly, the Cambridge School had already been referred to in Sweden in dissertations from the turn of the 1980s (Perényi 1979, which included Pocock, Dahl 1980, and Björk 1983), but in these cases it was more about referring to them only briefly and in the meaning of secondary literature. A more methodological use appeared again in the 1990s with six dissertations, including three studies toward the end of the decade (Hörnqvist 1996, Jonsson 1998, and Höög 1999). In the 2000s, there were ten dissertations with a Skinnerian approach, and the year 2006 bounces up again with four different studies (Magnusson 2006, Winton 2006, Sundin 2006, and Harvard 2006). These are discussed next to see what kind of methodological choices and influence they had.

5.1 Finnish Adaptions of Linguistic Contextualism

Henrik Stenius (Helsinki, Swedish-speaking history) studied history of voluntary associations in Finland until the 20th century. Here Q. Skinner's article "Meaning and Understanding" was applied not as a methodological inspirator but as a reference literature. Skinner's article presented that the people behind association movements had different motives and intentions. Stenius was also interested in concepts as the first chapter of his study discussed about positive definitions of concepts like "association" (*föreningen*) and "mass organization" (*massorganisation*).³²⁵

One obvious turning point of the adoption of Q. Skinner and his work into Finland was the dissertation of Markku Peltonen (Helsinki, general history). Peltonen referred widely to the works of Skinner and J.G.A. Pocock in his research about classical humanism in English political thought and discourse during the early modern period. According to the preface, Skinner himself had originally suggested the topic to Peltonen, read many earlier versions, and he

³²⁴ See the tables of all dissertations of history and the dissertations referring to the linguistic turn in Chapter 1.2.

³²⁵ Stenius 1987, 204, 373.

finally acted as the opponent for the final study. Leaning on Pocock's works, Peltonen acknowledged the role of the political vocabulary and conceptualization of a political universe during the research period, although there had been criticism of Pocock's research results. One focus was on the changing political vocabulary of English humanists, in comparison with other contemporaries in Europe, and especially how they identified civic consciousness and the idea of citizenship.³²⁶

Peltonen concluded, against the assumption widely accepted earlier, that no gaps existed in the classical republicanism in the political discourse of early-modern England. Skinner himself praised these results, as well as the methodological side of his dissertation: Peltonen's study moved beyond the "traditional kind of intellectual history," because he considered the functions of the arguments of the English humanists—what interests they served, what programs they advanced, and what motivated the writers.³²⁷ In a way, Skinner defended and highlighted the contextualist approach, which is his own methodological starting point. The concentration on language and contexts was highlighted as Peltonen treated humanists as a group and did not read only single authors, as, for example, could have been possible in the case of Francis Bacon.

Kustaa Multamäki (Helsinki, general history) studied the discussion of the commercial and military hegemony in England during the late seventeenth century. Multamäki, like Markku Peltonen, was supervised by Erkki Kouri, who had close connections to Great Britain. Also, Jonathan Scott from the University of Cambridge had helped Multamäki since they had met in Cambridge. Skinner had read a part of the manuscript before its final form and doctoral defense. The topic was partially selected with the assistance of Peltonen, who had introduced English thought to Multamäki. His topic was also connected with the transformation of the conceptions of citizenship and civic virtues, as the English mercantilist texts stressed commercial values, like trade and money, above the Machiavellian republican values of *virtù* and *fortuna*. The origins of this development, as well as different (humanist and republican) conceptions of the greatness of England, were discoverable through the political language use.³²⁸

The dissertations of Peltonen and Multamäki showed the already growing reception and new wave of research as well as continuity, as it was a sign of the emerging Helsinki School of the history of political thought. Contacts with English scholarly life tended to be important, and in these cases the influence came directly from Skinner himself. From a scholarly viewpoint, stressing the changes of language in a certain context of political thought had made a kind of breakthrough by direct reception from the original methodological sources.

Ari Helo (Tampere, general history) studied Thomas Jefferson's republicanism and the question of slavery in his dissertation. The contributions of J.G.A. Pocock represented classical studies of the republican hypothesis. Helo

³²⁶ Peltonen 1992, 5, 10–11, 13–15, 17.

³²⁷ Skinner 1992, 3–4.

³²⁸ Multamäki 1999, 7, 13, 19, 21.

highlighted the language of republicanism in the American context, in particular defining the citizenship of that time. Referring also to Q. Skinner's "Meaning and Understanding," Helo distinguished the language and political ideas of a given person deploying such a language to contextualize the acts of speeches from the common language contexts in which such acts of speech occurred. He also mentioned R. Koselleck's *Futures Past* in the context of future-oriented time conception—the concept of progress characterized Jefferson's ideology because some of his utopian contemporaries saw republicanism as unprogressive.³²⁹

Helo's second supervisor, P. S. Onuf, came from the University of Virginia, which was established by T. Jefferson himself. Along with K. Multamäki they concentrated on republicanism, one of the most popular topics for the Cambridge School, though on different continents. In a wider picture, it was about working on Pocock's works of Machiavellian and republican language from the 1970s, which were re-evaluated and considered in a new way, all in reception of an Anglo-American history of political thought that was increasingly considered the "right" way to study early modern history.

Timo Toukomies (Joensuu, general history) applied Skinnerian theory in his study about the English historian Arnold J. Toynbee as an interpreter of international relationships in the twentieth century. The concepts of "nationalism" and "war" were in special focus, and the meanings of these were covered both thematically and chronologically. Toukomies leaned on Skinner's *Visions of Politics*, and after he interpreted the meaning of certain sections of Toynbee's text, he connected it with other texts that had the same subject. This revealed, if different texts spoke about the subject in a similar way, this could also clarify the intended meanings of the writer. At the core of this was the two-sided dialogue between texts and their contexts. One should also be aware that writing texts is a functional act and behind it are thinking, motives, and intentions. This led to the context of thinking and acting—understanding thinking that includes action helped to understand actions, and understanding actions helped to understand thinking. Based on this, Toukomies concentrated on the possible meanings and intentions of Toynbee's texts as well as on his contexts around the international historiographical tradition to understand the past from its own starting point.³³⁰

While recognizing the basic nature of the language both as a resource and as a constraint on expression, I accept as one of my research bases that Toynbee meant what he wrote, using the generally accepted terms of his own time without hidden additional meanings when he expressed his message.³³¹

One reason to apply Skinnerian contextualism may lie in the fact that M. Hyrkkänen was one of the reviewers of Toukomies's dissertation. Interestingly

³²⁹ Helo 1999, 7–8, 23–24, 29, 33–35.

³³⁰ Toukomies 2008, 16–18.

³³¹ Toukomies 2008, 17. "Samalla kun tiedostan kielen pohjimmaisesta luonteen sekä voimavarana että ilmaisun rajoitteena, hyväksyn yhdeksi tutkimukselliseksi peruslähtökohdaksi sen, että Toynbee tarkoitti sitä mitä kirjoitti, käyttäen sanomansa ilmaisemisessa oman aikansa yleisesti hyväksytyjä termejä ilman piilotettuja lisämerkityksiä."

in Toukoniemi's case, he wrote his dissertation in Finnish and in some way contributed to the national debate.

Another doctoral student from the University of Jyväskylä and the discipline of general history, Timo Särkkä, applied the Skinnerian approach of contextualism in his study about J.A. Hobson's paradigm of imperialism. Seen from this point of view, historical contexts only help to interpret the political thought of their time, they do not offer causal explanations as such. Särkkä also used the article about *Imperialismus* in the *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* and applied R. Koselleck's method to deepen his research perspectives and interpretations compared to previous studies about Hobson. According to Särkkä, the real intentions and meanings beyond the texts of Hobson have not been studied clearly enough within the studies of one of the most prominent Hobson-researchers, Peter Cain.³³²

In the end, Särkkä's opponent was British historian P. Cain himself, who required a further review of the Skinnerian method. It was questionable to him how the intentions of certain situations can be applied to texts with wide generalizations of the current time, because Hobson was not taking part only in certain debates but striving for an analysis of imperialism.³³³ Skinner's role among British scholars has been debatable and this demonstrated it – although the Cambridge School has had its established status, at least in some circles, its topics and methods have not convinced everyone. Furthermore, methodological debates have continued within the original linguistic turns ever since their first wave, and the discussion also has been continuing in Great Britain, as the valuations of Cain showed.

One of Markku Peltonen's PhD students, Mikko Tolonen (Helsinki, general history) offered an interpretation of David Hume's (1711–1776) conception of the conjectural development of civil society and artificial moral institutions. The intellectual development of Bernard Mandeville (1670–1733) was included in order to understand Hume's thinking. Tolonen called his method as "a contextual approach to intellectual history", and it was a Pocockian one while Q. Skinner was applied as reference literature. The main focus was on the moral and philosophy of Hume, and the conception of politeness was one of the centre objects. Leaning on Pocock's studies, "politeness" was interpreted as a new and emerging concept in Hume's thinking, and this demonstrated how republican ideas evolved.³³⁴ Classical republican tradition and thinking were again in the centre.

According to the preface of the dissertation, Tolonen spent a full academic year 2005–2006 at the University of Cambridge. The opponent was as well from Great Britain, John Robertson from the University of Oxford, a professor of the history of political thought.³³⁵ Tolonen's dissertation solidates the tightening relationship between British and Finnish cooperation on the field of Cambridge-style intellectual history. As we have already seen, also Hyrkkänen himself, Pasi

³³² Särkkä 2009, 15–16, 18, 22.

³³³ Cain 2010, 132.

³³⁴ Tolonen 2009, 1–3, 7–11, 19–20.

³³⁵ Tolonen 2009, vi.

Ihalainen and Timo Särkkä all had British opponents, though not representatives of the Cambridge School.

Mika Pekkola (Jyväskylä, general history) further demonstrated the combination of conceptual history and linguistic contextualism in his research on German-born psychoanalyst and social critic Erich Fromm (1900–1980). Pekkola had background in philosophy and the topic was to analyze Fromm's works as a metaphorically constituted reaction to the crisis of modernity, which was in the form of a dialectic narrative. Pekkola described his research as an attempt to contextually interpret the metaphoric and narrative aspects of Fromm's thinking. Pekkola recognized the value of Skinner's advice in *Visions of Politics* to think about what a certain actor was doing when he or she was writing, as well as to consider what the content of a certain text is and how and why it is represented as it is. Promoted by Skinner, the motives and intentions were also relevant and may influence interpretations of the past. R. Koselleck's works about crisis in culture were added to the literature, and the understanding of narratives was inspired mainly by H. White and P. Ricœur.³³⁶ M. Hyrkkänen acted as the second reviewer and the intellectual background in the University of Jyväskylä was quite clear in Pekkola's dissertation, as Anssi Halmesvirta was his second supervisor. The opponent came from outside of history as Juhani Ihanus from the institute of behavioral sciences (University of Helsinki) acted as the opponent.

At the end of the first decade of the 2000s, dissertations without much contact with linguistic contextualism or conceptual history also contained references to Q. Skinner. One of these only mentioned Skinner's *Vision of Politics* as a demonstration of "linguistic capital" (*kielellinen pääoma*) and its value within the social context, when Sofia Kotilainen (University of Jyväskylä, Finnish history) studied the norms for name-giving in Central Finland.³³⁷ Mia Lindberg (University of Turku, cultural history) studied the image of Finland in the German press, 1989–1998. She included a rather philosophical notion about the role of language in her research about the impact of communication: "[A]lthough this study is not about the so-called new rhetorical research, language is in no sense understood here merely as verbiage" (p. 18).³³⁸ This was also a kind of turn to question the essence of language, but it was not developed further after this single sentence. Maybe language was not the most crucial research target after all. The influences for Lindberg came again from Germany, but this time more from the communication theories, which do not concentrate on language deeply.

Jani Marjanen pointed out in 2007 that Jyväskylä had become the capital city of conceptual history in Finland. Here conceptual history was understood as both *Begriffsgeschichte* and linguistic contextualism and also as the combination of the two.³³⁹ Marjanen referred to Kari Palonen and his "school," but based on the dissertations studied in the previous chapters, the conceptual and contextualist approaches have been applied also within historical studies and in

³³⁶ Pekkola 2010, 13, 19–24, 27–34, 37, 39, 53, 130, 143.

³³⁷ Kotilainen 2008, 292.

³³⁸ Lindberg 2008, 18. "[V]aikka tässä tutkimuksessa ei ole kyse ns. uuden retoriikan tutkimuksesta, kieltä ei tässä millään muotoa ymmärretä pelkäksi sanahelinäksi (p. 18)."

³³⁹ Marjanen 2007, 138.

their dissertations. To conclude, the status and influence of political studies, including the work of its guiding star Kari Palonen, cannot be denied here. It has produced many studies with a conceptual approach and even those PhD candidates who do not primarily research concepts or language have tended to refer to linguistic turns.

5.2 The Contextualist Method in Sweden

Besides the many dissertations connected to conceptual history, the Cambridge School was present also on its own in Sweden as well. Already, in his dissertation of 1979, J. Perényi mentioned J.G.A. Pocock. Further, Q. Skinner, J. Dunn, and the works of the Cambridge school were used as research literature in Eva-Lena Dahl's (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) dissertation about the thinking of Locke and Hobbes. Dahl was mostly interested in political philosophy and the concept of ideology from the ethical and theoretical sides.³⁴⁰ This was not surprising as the dissertation was about the history of philosophy. Skinner appeared here only in a small role as his article about Hobbes from 1966 was listed as research literature. Nevertheless, this was so far one of the first-ever mentions of Skinner in the Swedish doctoral dissertations of historical studies, more precisely in the discipline of the history of science and ideas. Skinner was mentioned also in the dissertation of Ragnar Björk.³⁴¹

Between 1990 and 2010, there were a total of 12 Swedish dissertations with some kinds of references to Skinner and Pocock. Some of these were using them as research literature (Hörnqvist 1996, Olaison 2001, and Tegenborg Falkdalen 2003), when the topics concerned the Renaissance or the Enlightenment era and political thought of their time. However, a few dissertations, especially within the discipline of history of science and ideas, referred to them for a methodological purpose as well.

Mats Persson (Uppsala, history of science and ideas) studied the Swedish philosopher, conservative, and Christian idealist Vitalis Norström (1858–1916) and his crisis of idealism. Norström struggled for decades against modernity and its tendencies, coming to be in conflict with the world view of natural sciences, political radicalism, technological ideas, and mass culture. To study Norström's crisis of philosophical idealism, Persson followed a method he called the hermeneutics of understanding. Besides a Collingwoodian approach of question and answer and Ricoeur-inspired textual analysis, Q. Skinner's "Meaning and Understanding" offered an example to analyze texts in their contemporary context to understand their intended meanings. Based on this, Persson reconstructed the first general discussions and debates within the nineteenth

³⁴⁰ Dahl 1980, 8–9, 59–60.

³⁴¹ Björk 1983. Björk did not apply Skinner in a methodological role but as research literature. H. White had a more considerable role and the dissertation of Björk is described more precisely in Chapter 6.5.

century intellectual history to use this later as a context for Norström's own contributions.³⁴²

The opponent Kjell Jonsson remarked that the idea-historical understanding of Persson's own method should have been described in a more explicit way – now the foreign authors he referred to (Skinner, R. G. Collingwood, and P. Ricœur) remained in the background and their theories were not problematized and elaborated deeply enough. For example, Persson referred to Skinner, who is a known contextualist, but the study still lacked the needed Swedish contexts concerning Norström's life and relations. Nevertheless, the results were convincing, and the dissertation was impressive and trustworthy.³⁴³ This was a rather classical use of the Skinnerian method but rare in Sweden before this.

In his dissertation, Tomas Jonsson (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) studied the role of the Marxist concept of "exploitation" (*utsugning*) in the ideological changes within the Swedish Social Democratic Workers' Party in 1911–1941. The party is also famous for using the Swedish concept of a "people's home" (*folkhem*), and Jonsson researched the relationship of "exploitation" to it. The concept was compared also with others, often in the same context, using concepts like "citizen" (*medborgare*) and "worker" (*arbetare*), to reveal both the political theories and practices of the party, and its ideological changes as well. Contextualization was necessary in this kind of research, and Jonsson relied, among others, on J. Lacan's, P. Ricœur's, and J. Habermas's theories of identity. Jonsson saw that subjects operate like ideologies and like an agent with motives to control the linguistic game. To continue, he studied the ideological changes of concepts as this was a sign of changes in power relationships, like he pointed and referred to Skinner.³⁴⁴ PhD candidate Hans Dahlqvist criticized that Jonsson had overestimated the concept of exploitation and forgotten to contextualize it, despite the fact that Jonsson had referred to Q. Skinner. Jonsson did not consider the usage of the concept in its context but treated it like a separate word that operated in history on its own and led to anachronistic interpretations of the concept's content during different eras.³⁴⁵ It seems that this criticism was directed toward the history of words, and which indicates that such history had not convinced everyone yet.

Victoria Höög (Lund, history of science and ideas) studied four philosophers (T. Hobbes, J. Locke, D. Hume, and C. de Montesquieu) to analyze what the view was of human nature in the philosophy of the Enlightenment and which concepts were essential at that time. In her view, the Age of Enlightenment was not only constructed through the concepts of "rationality" (*rationalitet*), "empiricism" (*empirism*), and "progress" (*framstegsoptimism*), but also concepts like "passion" (*känsla*) and "desire" (*begär*). The topic belonged to the history of philosophy, but even though it also handled concepts, it was not primarily interested in the political language of the Enlightenment. Höög used many works

³⁴² Persson 1994, 20–23, 397.

³⁴³ Jonsson 1994, 173, 177–178.

³⁴⁴ Jonsson 1998, 1–2, 16–19, 37–38.

³⁴⁵ Dahlqvist 2001, 72–73.

produced by the Cambridge School, studies of Q. Skinner, J.G.A. Pocock, and J. Dunn, as literature, and emphasized their significant role considering the interpretation of historical texts in context. Narrativity, manifested by A. Danto and H. White, was also mentioned, in the manner of interpreting great thinkers, but this was clearly less substantial than the comments of the Cambridge School.³⁴⁶

Höög's dissertation included a strong argument for linguistic contextualism. She presented an interesting comparison between the Cambridge School and the traditions of Swedish *idé- och lärdomshistoria*:

The traditional method of analyzing big thinkers based on contemporary liberal value perspective has been questioned in recent decades by, among others, Cambridge historians John Dunn and Quentin Skinner. The perspective has been extended, on the basis of a careful reading, to place the political thinkers in their intellectual context. The interpretation of the texts is based on the historical context. In a theoretically less conscious way than the Cambridge School, this has been the guiding principle for the Swedish history of ideas and science since the establishment of the discipline in 1932. Common to the Anglo-Saxon research and the Swedish tradition is the emphasis on the interaction of ideas within the historical environment.³⁴⁷

Höög's statement was bold in 1999 when the Swedish discipline was equated with the Cambridge School, and it can be seen as highlighting the national traditions. Nevertheless, there was something behind that juxtaposition as the historians within *idé- och lärdomshistoria* have tended to refer more to linguistic contextualism than other historians in Sweden. Further, if this kind of contextualist approach was invented in Sweden, the whole methodological debate had been in Swedish rather than international.

Eva Lundgren-Gothlin (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) had already studied Simone De Beauvoir's (1908–1986) theory of women's oppression and had equated Skinnerian linguistic contextualism with the method used in Gothenburg. Lundgren-Gothlin applied mainly hermeneutic and ideology-critical theory by P. Ricoeur, but at the same time she was also inspired by Q. Skinner's book *Meaning and Context* (1988). Still, Lundgren-Gothlin's method was adapted from the "analysis of ideology" (*ideologianalys*), which, according to her, was created in the History of Science and Ideas Institution in Gothenburg University during the 1980s.³⁴⁸

It is thus interesting that historians within the *idé- och lärdomshistoria* have emphasized the methodological development of their own discipline. Indeed, Sven-Eric Liedman already promoted Skinner in the 1980s. Besides the positive

³⁴⁶ Höög 1999, 11–16, 265–270, 305–306.

³⁴⁷ Höög 1999, 15. "Den traditionella metoden att analysera de stora tänkarna utifrån nutidens liberala värdeperspektiv har ifrågasatts under de senaste decennierna av bl.a. Cambridgehistorikerna John Dunn och Quentin Skinner. Perspektivet har breddats till att utifrån en noggrann textläsning placera de politiska tänkarna i deras intellektuella kontext. Tolkningen av texten har utgått från det historiska sammanhanget. På ett teoretiskt mindre medvetet sätt än Cambridgeskolan har detta varit ledstjärnan för den svenska idé- och lärdomshistorien alltsedan ämnets tillkomst 1932. Gemensamt för den anglosaxiska forskningen och den svenska traditionen är betoningen på idéernas samspel med den historiska miljön."

³⁴⁸ Lundgren-Gothlin 1991, 15.

review of Skinner's *Foundations* in *Lychnos* 1979–1980, Liedman demonstrated the Skinnerian method of linguistic contextualism in his theoretical book *Form och innehåll* (*Form and Content*) in 1987, which Lundgren-Gothlin also referred to. In these works, Liedman wrote about the methodological battle or contest within the history of political ideas from the 1960s onwards, and Skinner with his textualist approach was the main contender. Reflecting on Skinner, Liedman stressed that action was behind every speech or text. To conclude, he described the Skinnerian method as a matter of form and content (hence the title of Liedman's book) – the text composed a complex form, but this form also hid a specific content in it, the political context of the time when the text was written. In the end the text itself constituted an act that allowed itself to be included in an action pattern. And the patterns of actions were the content. However, Liedman also asked a counter-question, whether the Skinnerian method emphasized the political context and whether that meant that every form had only one content (compare with the criticism of reception theorists toward Skinner, discussed earlier in Chapter 1.3). But in the end, Liedman was pleased with how Skinner had methodologically conducted his research in the *Foundations*.³⁴⁹

There has been, indeed, an internal interest toward the contextual approach in the discipline. The history of science and ideas was founded as an independent discipline in 1932, when literary historian Johan Nordström was appointed to fill the first professorship in the University of Uppsala. Nordström emphasized contextualism and another founding scholar of the discipline, philosopher Gunnar Aspelin, was interested in conceptual changes from historical perspective. Thus, there was already a natural interest towards texts, contexts and concepts before the works of Skinner and Koselleck.³⁵⁰ This is same kind of phenomenon like the tradition of conceptually oriented history in Finland before the publication of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe*—there existed an own tradition which was open to interpret past from the linguistic side. Nevertheless, it seems that the mainstream history has ignored what has been done in the disciplines of *idé- och lärdoms historia* and *yleinen historia*.

Patrik Winton (University of Uppsala, history) researched political practices, focusing on priests, in Sweden 1746–1766 using the theoretical perspectives of social exchange and public opinion. In his dissertation Winton used the works of Q. Skinner and J.G.A. Pocock to recognize the significance of the words and concepts used in this public discussion. Thus, the language of actors in political speech was highlighted, and it was in the centre of political practices.³⁵¹ The opponent, Pasi Ihalainen, noted that the analysis of political speech could have been developed further. The Skinnerian idea of language used as political action was acknowledged, but there also should have been an analysis of the key concepts to contextualize the uses of certain words in certain situations. Historical semantics were lacking here, when only the speech act was considered and not the longer history of using certain words and concepts. Furthermore, this

³⁴⁹ Liedman 1979–1980; Liedman 1987, 144–148.

³⁵⁰ For the history of the discipline *idé- och lärdoms historia*, see e.g. Nilsson 2014 and the compilation by Andersson & Björck (2008).

³⁵¹ Winton 2006, 23–24, 35.

led to the danger that overly simplified conclusions might be made, such as forgetting the ideological reasons when the main focus was on the political practice.³⁵²

In the end, this was an interesting case also from a transnational viewpoint because a Finn was the opponent for a Swedish doctoral student and advised him to think about the linguistic aspects of historical language more precisely – in a way, the Finnish interpretation of the methodological implications of the linguistic turn and Swedish social history had collided. When one concentrates on speech acts, it is not enough, because the longer history and the contexts of concepts should also be there.

Another historian from Uppsala and the department of history, Anders Sundin, completed his dissertation in the same year as Winton. Sundin's research was narrowed to the year of 1809 and examined the interpretations of Sweden's regime transition of 1809, starting with the coup d'état and ending with the adoption of the new instrument of government during that year. The change of the political culture, and particularly the new political rhetoric, was emphasized, as Sundin used concepts originated from discourse analysis and (post-)structuralism (F. de Saussure) and combined their use with the conceptual conflict of Q. Skinner, and ended up analyzing what "discursive conflicts" (*diskursiva konflikter*) told about the political culture of 1809 – this represented a stronger linguistic turn when the focus was primarily on language. According to Sundin, concepts like "citizen" (*medborgare*) and "public opinion" (*allmän opinion*) were redefined many times by different actors during that short period of time. For Sundin, the concept of discourse was an attempt to determine meaning within a particular domain, and the whole political culture was a set of discourses.³⁵³

Jonas Nordin as the opponent emphasized the theoretical standing points of Sundin's work and stated that the work was nearer to the Anglo-Saxon tradition than the Swedish, which was still very empirically oriented.³⁵⁴ However, this raises the question whether linguistically oriented history can also be empiricist, but there have been demonstrations of this (for instance, H. Berggren's conceptually and discursively oriented dissertation discussed in Chapter 4.3).

Sundin's work can be described as similar to M. Alm's dissertation in 2003 where politics were seen as a discursive process, and the conception of discourse was separated from its Foucauldian sense. Alm was one of Sundin's supervisors so there was continuity in the methodological approach. However, based on the dissertations of my research period, it did not lead into any specific popularity, at least in the sense that there had been a group of researches that could be described as a "School." In comparison with the situation in Finland, for example Helsinki or Jyväskylä, the historians applying linguistic contextualism remained more individual and scarcer.

³⁵² Ihalainen 2006, 826.

³⁵³ Sundin 2006, 18, 22, 37–38, 40–41, 258–259.

³⁵⁴ Nordin 2007, 516.

An interesting result is that only Winton and Sundin represented the discipline of history. All the other PhD candidates mentioned in this sub-chapter (Persson, Jonsson, and Höög, as well as Hörnqvist, Olaison, and Tegenborg Falkdalen) came from the discipline of *idé- och lärdomshistoria*. One of the methodological conclusions is that the Cambridge School indeed gained popularity in Sweden, but not so much on the methodological side but rather as research literature. In *idé- och lärdomshistoria* there were already traditions and advocators (S.-E. Liedman and M. Persson) for it, but in the twenty-first century it was applied also within the discipline of history.

To summarize the situations of Finland and Sweden concerning conceptual history and linguistic contextualism, many scholars have combined conceptual history (Koselleckian method) and linguistic contextualism (Skinnerian method), especially in the Finnish dissertations.³⁵⁵ Melvin Richter had already tried to combine these two and it has had success in Finland, which is an outsider of larger linguistic areas and open to the adoption of influences from international discussions.³⁵⁶ Already, these kinds of dissertations have totaled 11 in Finland, starting from Hyrkkänen in 1986 and ending with Pekkola in 2010, the final year of the era analyzed in this study. At the same time, the equivalent number of Swedish dissertations is only six, and five of them are from the 2000s (Abrahamsson 1990, Alm 2002, Sundin 2006, Harvard 2006, Landgren 2008, and Ers 2009).

One considerable explanation for the differences between the countries lies in their structural differences concerning historical disciplines. In both countries there has been a discipline that has had an interest in linguistic turns: general history (*yleinen historia*) in Finland and the history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*) in Sweden. If we look at the dissertations with a link to conceptual history, all 12 dissertations before 2000 belonged to the discipline of *yleinen historia*. The same outline is visible also in the case of the Cambridge School: all eight of the dissertations in Finland before the turn of the millennium were defended within general history; this underlines the fact that the discipline of general history has been interested in foreign historiography.

In the case of Sweden, eight of the 17 dissertations referring to conceptual history represented *idé- och lärdomshistoria*. Furthermore, in the case of referring to the scholars of the Cambridge School, there were a total of 19 dissertations in Sweden and no fewer than 12 of them belonged to *idé- och lärdomshistoria*. One could conclude that the history of ideas and science was overrepresented, because the whole discipline produced “only” 200 dissertations concerning my research period, and the general discipline of history was 878.

Idé- och lärdomshistoria tended to have similar traditions with the Cambridge School, and this appeared in the dissertations as well, as we can see in the next chapter. The reasons for the link between *idé- och lärdomshistoria* and the

³⁵⁵ See also Appendix A: The Studied Dissertations in Chronological Order and their References to the Linguistic Turns.

³⁵⁶ Marjanen 2007, 139; Richter 1995.

Cambridge School trace back partially to the actions of Sven-Eric Liedman (University of Gothenburg).³⁵⁷ *Idé- och lärdoms historia* has taken a place in Sweden since its establishment in 1936. Bo Lindberg stated in 2007 that most of the works of conceptual history have been made within that discipline and have operated with concepts linked to philosophy and politics. Nevertheless, it has not in any case been a dominant element or established method in Sweden.³⁵⁸

³⁵⁷ As mentioned in Chapter 3, Liedman had introduced Skinner in Lychnos 1979–1980, and later in his book *Form och innehåll*: Liedman 1979/1980; Liedman 1987. Also, Sven Bjerstedt displayed Skinner's methods and works before their popularity: Bjerstedt 1993.

³⁵⁸ Lindberg 2007, 125–129.

6 THEORETICAL APPROACHES WITHIN LINGUISTIC TURNS: DISCOURSE, GENDER, NARRATIVITY

6.1 Michel Foucault and Discourse in Finnish Dissertations

In this chapter I analyze the rest of the linguistic turns in this order: discursivity inspired by M. Foucault, linguistic gender advocated by J. Scott, and J. Butler, narrative history writing introduced by H. White and F.R. Ankersmit, and in the end other philosophical theoretical starting points.

The discursive viewpoint, taking its ideas mainly from M. Foucault, appeared in the dissertations in the following way³⁵⁹:

TABLE 5 References to M. Foucault and Discursivity. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations 1970–2010.

Year	Finland (17)	Sweden (23)
1970		
1971		
1972		
1973		
1974		
1975		
1976		

³⁵⁹ Abbreviations, Finland: Universities of Helsinki (Hki), Turku (Tku), Jyväskylä (Jkl), Tampere (Tre), Oulu (Ou), Joensuu (Jo) and Åbo Akademi (ÅA). The disciplines and departments are abbreviated as GH (general history), FH (Finnish history), CH (cultural history, in Turku and Helsinki), PH (political history, in Turku and Helsinki), NH (Nordic history, in Åbo Akademi) and SSH (Swedish-speaking history, in Helsinki); Sweden: Universities of Uppsala (Upp), Lund (Lu), Gothenburg (Go), Stockholm (St), Umeå (Um) and Örebro (Ör). The disciplines are history (H) and history of science and ideas (HSI).

1977		
1978		
1979		J. Perényi (Upp, H)
1980		
1981		
1982		
1983		
1984		
1985		
1986	P. Kettunen (Hki, FH)	
1987	K. Immonen (Tku, GH)	
1988		
1989		
1990		
1991		
1992		
1993	H. Lempa (Tku, GH)	
1994	V-M. Rautio (Tre, GH)	M. Edgren (Lu, H), Å. Bergenheim (Um, HSI)
1995	M. Liljeström (ÅA, GH)	
1996		
1997		
1998		G. Andersson (Upp, H)
1999	M. Uimonen (Hki, E&S)	R. Nilsson (Lu, H)
2000		C. Frängsmyr (Upp, HSI), P. Wisselgren (Um, HSI)
2001	J. Suomela (Hki, FH)	F. Sunnemark (Go, HSI), N. Olaison (St, HSI), H. Håkansson (Lu, HIS), A. Lindberg (Lu, H)
2002	R. Forsström (Tku, CH)	M. Larsson (Upp, HSI), O. Ljungström (Upp, HSI), E. Friman (Um, HSI)
2003		K. Johansson (Go, HSI)
2004	H. Kuusi (Hki, E&S), H. Valtonen (Jkl, FH), S. Tuomaala (Hki, FH), J. Valenius (Tku, PH), M. Sarantola-Weiss (Hki, FH)	E. Bergenlöv (Lu, H), L. Carls (Lu, H)
2005	M. Jalava (Hki, FH)	P. Laskar (St, HSI), U. Holgersson (Lu, H)
2006	A. Sivula (Tku, GH)	
2007	T. Tuikka (Jkl, FH)	A-K. Frih (Ör, H), S. Kling (Um, H)
2008		
2009		A. Ers (St, HSI)
2010	M. Vuorinen (Hki, E&S)	J. Eriksson (Lu, HSI)

In Finland references to Foucault remained scarce until the turn of the year 2000, but between 2000 and 2010 there were 10 dissertations with a discursive starting point, more or less inspired by Foucault. In Sweden Foucault has been widely cited since the mid-1990s, especially in dissertations defended in Lund or Umeå. These discursive studies are discussed next in these two sub-chapters.

Pauli Kettunen's (Helsinki, political history) dissertation concerned about social democrats and trade unionism in Finland 1918–1930. Kettunen was open for linguistic interpretations and he referred also to Foucault's *Power/Knowledge*. Nevertheless, Foucault was not a methodological inspirator for Kettunen, since there was only a single reference to him and in the context of possible reasons for revolutionary situations.³⁶⁰

In 1987 Kari Immonen (Turku, general history) defended his doctoral dissertation *Ryssästä saa puhua . . .* ("One Can Talk About Rusnya") and formulated his theoretical starting points in the chapter "Julkisuus – Valta – Merkitys" (Publicity, Power, Meaning). This included M. Foucault's theory of power as one starting point in addition to the notion of the public by J. Habermas. Immonen stated that the concept of *valta* ("power") has at least two meanings, an active system of public commandments including the struggle for hegemony and the Foucauldian network by which power spreads everywhere. In the latter case, publicity, a positive value for Habermas, was a negative one in Foucault's thought, because the individual wanted to hide from publicity and control. Further, according to Immonen, language held an essential position in both theories of power, since in the first one language is more like an instrument maintaining power relations, while in the latter theory language is the basis of human existence in the world. He proposed that a person cannot settle outside of language because it sets the boundaries to his or her actions. Besides problematizing the concept of power, Immonen also considered different interpretations of *merkitys* ("meaning"). On the one hand, the meanings within language had always one and a right interpretation, thus the real meaning of a text lies always in the text itself and not behind historical or cultural contexts. On the other hand, texts had many meanings and many facts, so the concept of meaning extended outside of the text. The starting point here was to think about the person in the middle of the language: the possibilities of meanings reached out to what was spoken and from what was able to be spoken about in certain linguistic, cultural, and historical settings, making in the end many different meanings of a text depending on the points of view and the questions proposed to them. Immonen referred to the content analysis of B. Berelson and the ontology of understanding of H.G. Gadamer. To continue, meanings and their relation to publicity and power differ based on how publicity and power are understood. In the Foucauldian approach, power and submission lay in the language and through the language was founded also the way of the world by humankind. So, according to Immonen, the interpretations of an individual person were behind

³⁶⁰ Kettunen 1986, 88–89.

this preliminary understanding, or discourse, in other words. Interpretation was creative, but in the end, it was only inside the existing language and discourse.³⁶¹

Immonen's dissertation was reviewed in many forums. Toivo Nygård wrote that Immonen had mastered his materials and methods well and the research literature—including the references to Habermas, Foucault, Berelson, and Gadamer—had been used with distinction. The theoretical part was well justified, and in the end Immonen's work was considered to be outstanding.³⁶² Max Engman noticed that the concept of publicity was in the key position for Immonen, but he did not challenge it theoretically. Engman also noted that maybe the concept of "hegemony" should have been brought up also. Nevertheless, Engman appreciated Immonen's dissertation as a pioneering work of its topic.³⁶³ In the case of Immonen, the empirical results convinced the reviewers and so the questioning of the methodological and theoretical frameworks was mostly brushed aside. It should also be noted that Immonen's dissertation was written in Finnish and thus did not participate in the international methodological discussion.

Minna Uimonen, a PhD candidate from the discipline of economics and social history in the University of Helsinki, defended in 1999 her dissertation about neuroses and their conceptions in Finnish medicine, which already thematically was linked to M. Foucault. Many internationally acknowledged scholars touching the linguistic turns were visible, as Uimonen referred to many works of Foucault, J. Butler, and L. Wittgenstein. J. Scott was also on the source list, but there were no references to her work in the actual study. The methodological starting point of her study was "a perspective whereby the diagnostic knowledge is viewed as embedded in socio-cultural discourses and practices" (p. 194), establishing Foucault as a key figure to understand the discursive dimension of medical discussions. The concept of a "neurotic discourse" (*hermodiskurssi*) meant for her general professional material in textual form for diseases, which also had temporal variability in the meaning and contents of certain concepts; in this "discursive time" some elements had long continuities while in some contexts of usage there were already new themes and problems (pp. 20–21).³⁶⁴

Uimonen's dissertation was also reviewed many times by different Finnish scholars. The opponent, Irma Sulkunen, gave to Uimonen otherwise positive feedback but criticized her for having displayed the theoretical framework of Foucault only in the introduction and nowhere else after that. Also, the heavy use of discourse analysis led the primary results from their starting point, in the sense that discourse dictated the meanings and possible results.³⁶⁵ Heini Hakosalo noticed that the discursive starting point blurred some of the otherwise excellent study because it seemed that every discourse interacted with every other and

³⁶¹ Immonen 1987, 25–28.

³⁶² Nygård 1988, 235, 236–237.

³⁶³ Engman 1989, 342, 344.

³⁶⁴ Uimonen 1999, 16, 19–20, 194.

³⁶⁵ Sulkunen 2000, 172.

everything tended to belong together.³⁶⁶ Mikko Jauho continued and pointed out that the medical discourse in Uimonen's work seemed to be rather monolithic and only one big entirety of medical discussion, rather than a number of separate discourses. Nevertheless, Jauho acknowledged Uimonen's work as being interesting by its methods and results.³⁶⁷ Concluding from this, Uimonen's theoretical work leaned heavily on Foucault's theory of discourses and this was seen as a restriction. Martin Kusch,³⁶⁸ a philosophically oriented historian from the University of Oulu, was one of the supervisors of Uimonen and the transferor of philosophic influences.

In the 2000s, linguistic turns appeared in a broader sense. Julitta Suomela (Helsinki, Finnish and/or Scandinavian history) studied the ideological and political views of Russian émigrés in European Russian newspapers between 1918 and 1940. Suomela mainly used A. Appadurai's theory about cultural flows but referred also briefly to M. Foucault's *Archeology of Knowledge*. She treated newspapers as a discourse or as a forum where different discourses met. Thus, discourses in newspapers used power in the society, and Suomela questioned what the role of the newspapers was in this kind of power usage.³⁶⁹

These theoretical and methodological short passages were mostly loose, and Suomela mainly applied "qualitative content analysis" and "common sense" (*terve järki*), also according to the official opponent Seppo Zetterberg.³⁷⁰ The approach of Suomela was seen as "quite traditional" also in the review of Timo Vihavainen, as Suomela had followed the opinions presented by Russian émigré newspapers and their reactions to the events in Russian and international politics, and the results justified this approach.³⁷¹ It is not always successful to write a chapter about one's methodological and theoretical framework in the dissertation and carry that along to the analysis. Quite often the theoretical parts of the dissertations tend to remain unattached.

Marja Jalava (Helsinki, Finnish or Finnish and Scandinavian history) combined the methodological approaches of the history of ideas and psychohistory in her dissertation about the formation of modern subjects among Finnish nineteenth-century men of letters. She referred briefly to discourses as experiences, where all of them were equally right and justified. Jalava referred also to R. Koselleck's *Vergangene Zukunft* in the sense of its theories about the horizon of expectations and the space of experience in the modern sense of history and its time, but not in the conceptual parts of the work. Overall, her notions of discourses were derived in the end from M. Foucault, but Jalava also included psychohistorical points of view to make a separation from Foucault.³⁷² The opponent Marja Tuominen was not fully pleased how Jalava had justified her psychohistorical and phenomenological body reading in her dissertation, but

³⁶⁶ Hakosalo 2001, 68.

³⁶⁷ Jauho 2001, 66–67.

³⁶⁸ The dissertation of Kusch is analyzed in Chapter 6.3.

³⁶⁹ Suomela 2001, 16.

³⁷⁰ Zetterberg 2002, 99.

³⁷¹ Vihavainen 2002, 358.

³⁷² Jalava 2005, 47, 49, 84.

in the end proclaimed this way of reading the sources “insightful” (*oivaltava*).³⁷³ Jalava’s supervisor was Juha Siltala, the most prominent psychohistorian in Finland, but the trend of psychohistory has not been as considerable as linguistic turns.

The wide use of the concept of discourse appeared also in the dissertation of Ilona Kemppainen (Helsinki, economic and social history, later known by the surname Pajari) about military deaths in Finland during the Second World War. She approached the deaths of soldiers from the perspectives of mentalities and discourse. For her discourse meant not only speech about reality or locution (*puhetapa*) but independent social construction. Still, Kemppainen pointed out that discourse analysis could research only phenomena in the language itself as she thought that constructivist interpretations did not assume the reality outside of the texts. In conclusion, discourse was for Kemppainen a part of reality, but it was restricted only to language. Her theoretical approach was a Foucauldian one as she comprehended his concept of the dispositive, a multi-sited entity of action including also discourses; discourses modified practices, but practices created in turn new discourses.³⁷⁴

Overall, Kemppainen’s dissertation was still rather traditional in a Foucauldian sense and restricted by its treatment of discourse. The whole research itself was quite broad without clear definitions. The opponent Pirjo Markkola stated that the research methods were not written in a totally open manner.³⁷⁵ Still, Kemppainen’s different viewpoint of Foucault’s hard constructivism, wherein language determines what it is possible to think, was included and the understanding of discourse was similar to apprehensions of discourse within language studies.

Riikka Forsström (Turku, cultural history) referred to M. Foucault, R. Koselleck, and H. White in her doctoral dissertation about the idea of happiness in the utopian thoughts of the French dramatist and writer L.-S. Mercier (1740–1814). Her starting methodological points emerged from cultural history as she considered the nature of contextualization and problematized the concepts of “mentality,” “idea-forces,” “representations,” and “collective imagination,” and referred to R. Darnton, J. Le Goff, and R. Chartier concerning these. H. White’s *Metahistory* worked as a research of the thought of the eighteenth-century philosophers. Foucault was used mainly concerning his work about the punishment, observation, and evolutionary thinking of the eighteenth century.³⁷⁶ Koselleck’s works *Critique and Crisis* and *Futures Past* were used as well as secondary literature information in the passages of the new temporal horizon – which also included progress and not only static symmetry between the past and present – rising in the eighteenth century and the categories of experience and expectation, and the words of Mercier could be interpreted also as a situation of crisis. A conceptual piece was also thought to be detectable in the paragraph about the concepts of “progress” and “revolution,” and the changes of their

³⁷³ Tuominen 2006, 89, 91.

³⁷⁴ Kemppainen 2006, 29–31.

³⁷⁵ Markkola 2006, 225.

³⁷⁶ Forsström 2002, 21–23, 197, 199, 216, 249, 255, 270–271, 281.

meanings.³⁷⁷ In Forsström's case, the works of White, Foucault, and Koselleck were used as research literature to contextualize the main findings rather than apply their methodological innovations.

Hanna Kuusi (Helsinki, economic and social history) defended a Foucauldian dissertation about alcohol, governmentality, and identity in 1960s Finland under the supervision of Matti Peltonen. Kuusi described her research approach as "discursive" (p. 15), wherein discourses are understood as "spaces of speech" (*puheavaruudet*), entities to which belong certain typical ways of argumentations and their possible realization as social practices, thus combining the real actions and conceptions of them. Otherwise, Kuusi relied on Foucault's notions of power and its structures, especially through the thought of governmentality and how power creates everything that we accept as truth and normal.³⁷⁸ Minna Sarantola-Weiss (Helsinki, Finnish history) studied discussions about the consumer culture in Finland during the 1960s and 1970s. One part of the dissertation was that Sarantola-Weiss concentrated on the decor of the homes, and representations about it in magazines and advertising leaflets. Like Kuusi, she also used the term "space of speech" (*puheavaruus*) in the meaning of discourse. According to her, the term was easier to apply with decoration, pieces of furniture, and advertisements of those, as it included not only text but also images and speeches. Thus, for Sarantola-Weiss, speech space and discourse included, besides discussions, also action, space, and things.³⁷⁹

In the end though both Kuusi and Sarantola-Weiss described their studies as discursive, there were no actual practices of that in the analysis part, which demonstrates again the difficulty of writing a coherent theoretical framework and applying it. But interesting in their case is the use of the concept "space of speech" (*puheavaruus*). It is originally a Finnish term and coined in the 1990s by sociologist Pertti Alasuutari, as a substitute for the Foucauldian concept of discourse.³⁸⁰ This indicated that there existed a certain Finnish appliance of discursive studies, which used a term of its own. This was also again an example how historians borrow methods and theories from other disciplines, in this case from sociology.

Discourse was a basis also in the dissertation of Heli Valtonen (Jyväskylä, Finnish history). Her study was to construct through autobiographies discursive realities of the twentieth century's so-called white-collar women in Finland. Valtonen understood values discursively and studied the interaction between the individual and her environment. The values came across discursively through linguistic acts and social actions. The starting point for the discourse analysis was M. Foucault, but Valtonen referred also to many national and international scholars to create a theoretical background for her own work. J. Butler was referred to in connection with the constructive nature of gender and J. Scott as a general expert within gender history.³⁸¹

³⁷⁷ Forsström 2002, 210, 237, 266.

³⁷⁸ Kuusi 2004, 15, 42–47.

³⁷⁹ Sarantola-Weiss 2003, 39–40.

³⁸⁰ Alasuutari 1996, 18.

³⁸¹ Valtonen 2004, 17–18, 32–33.

Opponent Anne Ollila noted that the study used and developed many new research trends that had before been more familiar within the fields of cultural studies and social sciences. The methodological and theoretical starting points were expressed clearly, but according to Ollila, the multidisciplinary basis lacked the notification of some of the discussions within historical research itself, for example, German *Alltagsgeschichte* and British oral history. Otherwise, the chapter in which Valtonen especially had applied discourse analysis was regarded as the most interesting part of the dissertation.³⁸² Valtonen gave an example of how to start with Foucauldian discourse and develop it further. Seldom has the opponent so highly praised the successful practice of discourse analysis.

Ilkka Nordberg (Helsinki, general history) studied the Basque Nationalist Party and its economic policy through G.R. Elton's theory on political history and empirical power analysis by M. Foucault, although these two international senior scholars differed from each other considerably. Separating this study from many others was the fact that the discursivity of Foucault's political discussion was mentioned only once, and the concept of discourse was ignored. For Nordberg, Foucault was an empiricist whose theories were just instruments. On the contrary, the narrativity and narrativeness raised by the postmodernists was treated as a challenge to this empiricism, although he admitted that historical analysis would not exist without narration. The problem was more about postmodernists. Nordberg trusted in Elton and stated that although political history is about explaining sequences of events, it is not restricted only to that but is interested also in the processes behind events. To conclude, Foucault's theories are based on both narrative and action, and thus Foucault was for Nordberg an exception among the postmodernists.³⁸³

Nordberg's study was quite basic and a traditional historical account that concentrated on economics and politics, but there was also a notably newer and more narrative nature of historical studies. The dissertation also contained a clear confrontation between Elton and postmodernists, and applying an Eltonian approach was most likely an influence from his supervisor, Erkki Kouri. Most interesting here was the fact that Nordberg considered Foucault not to be a postmodernist but an empiricist.

Marja Vuorinen (Helsinki, economic and social history) redefined the meaning of discourse in her study about nobility as enemy image and in-group identity in nineteenth-century Finland. Based on M. Foucault's *Archaeology*, Vuorinen concentrated on linguistic forms of manifestation concerning ideology. Discourse could be any established speech mode that produced consequences. Thus, Vuorinen traced such features of speech that could hold political and social consequences when nobility was defined in printed sources, either by noble people themselves or from outside. The significance of nobility was changing in the nineteenth century, and this new and more critical discourse from outside

³⁸² Ollila 2005a, 232–233, 235.

³⁸³ Nordberg 2005, 15, 27–35, (p. 32, footnote 97).

constructed the image of noble people in a new manner.³⁸⁴ The opponent was Hannu Salmi from the discipline of cultural history.

All in all, discourse attached to Foucault was seen and described in several ways in the Finnish dissertations. Although the danger existed that the theoretical part of the dissertation would remain loose and not be applied in the analysis sections. If one chooses to apply discursive method in the study, it must also be included in the study. This is a kind of sign that discourse can be understood in many ways—and when a PhD student has to develop his/her theoretical framework for the study, it is quite easy to state that the subject of the study contains information about discourses, and refer to Foucault. The concept of discourse has in several dissertations meant simply speech about something, and the final study indeed has concentrated on the language of the past, but the nature of discourse has not been analyzed further. Saying that one applies the discursive method in the study sometimes only makes simple things difficult.

One solution for this would be that there is not always a need to do exactly discursive research. For example, if one studies the language of the past, does conceptual history or linguistic contextualism also offer tools for that? Is it a discursive study, if one only reads source material? And as we have seen, dissertations that developed discursivity out from its Foucauldian sense were well received (Valtonen 2004, Vuorinen 2010) in the reviews. In these works, the theoretical part was combined successfully with the empirical study and the theoretical insight did not remain loose.

6.2 Discursive Approaches Inspired by Michel Foucault in Sweden

In Sweden, the discursive viewpoint was essential in Åsa Bergenheim's (Umeå, history of science and ideas) dissertation about Swedish discourse on childhood sexuality 1930–1960. The central concept of discourse was adopted from M. Foucault, as well as his other theories about sexuality, discipline, and power. Bergenheim searched for long-time discursive transformations between the years 1500 and 1900, as the concepts of "childhood" and "sexuality" were in transition during that time. She also noted J. Scott's idea that gender is a fundamental category in all social relations, which is visible, for example, in speech. So, the words "man" and "woman" have always had different meanings and subject matters throughout time. Methodologically, Bergenheim searched for discursive changes, but discursivity was still more like an inspirational starting point—she stated that she reads her sources, handbooks, and informative literature among them, "in a traditional way of history of ideas" (*"på ett traditionellt idéhistorisk sätt"*): analyzing debate, interpreting texts, searching for ideological starting points, and grouping different thinking.³⁸⁵ This was somewhat the same kind of

³⁸⁴ Vuorinen 2010, 56–58.

³⁸⁵ Bergenheim 1994, 16–18, 21–25.

phenomenon as in Finland, as discourse offered a starting point for theory but after that could be easily forgotten.

Roddy Nilsson (University of Lund, history) studied the nineteenth-century prison organization in Sweden and was inspired by the works of M. Foucault concerning discourse and power. Nilsson's general aim was to study prisons from the point of view of the surrounding discourse and prisons as a social system. He concentrated on prison discourse, texts, and talk of prisons and prisoners, where ideas and images of reality were created, and this in turn had consequences for the development of the prison system itself. For Nilsson, discourse was practice that had consequences—discourse was produced and reproduced through the speech of something. Overall, according to Nilsson, prisons were formed by practices of discursive elements, material and architectural changes, and social actions. Thus, Nilsson read texts of prisons and prisoners (books, articles, pamphlets, and yearbooks of prisons produced by people connected to prisons) to see the discursive side of the prison system. In the end, he combined this theoretical and rhetorical approach with the practical.³⁸⁶

The opponent, Birgitta Svensson from the discipline of ethnology and an applier of Foucauldian theories, stated that the best part of the dissertation was the section where texts of prison practices were combined with the theoretical framework. From the conceptual side, Svensson was pleased that the concept of "prison" (*fängelse*) was not only descriptive but also analytic.³⁸⁷ For Nilsson, discourse was practice and active, and it also had consequences—what has been said always has consequences.

Carl Frängsmyr (Uppsala, history of science and ideas) researched the theory of climate in eighteenth-century Sweden, and Foucauldian discourse was one of his inspirators. He divided the theory of climates into three different discourses: Gothic, economic, and anthropological. The term "climate" (*klimat*) also included other things in the eighteenth century and climate theories were involved. For instance, climate was politically applied and part of the discussions about the origin of Swedish people, national characteristics, and climate theory was also considered as an explanation behind the wealth of Sweden's national resources. As the method, Frängsmyr analyzed ideas in their historical and social context, concentrating particularly on the relation to their function. Discourse was in a Foucauldian way seen as a framework where specific ideas could be formed and brought forward. For him, "[d]iscourse forms a sorting system that excludes some kind of knowledge and sanctions another type of knowledge, in this case about the climate" (p. 12).³⁸⁸

Frängsmyr's opponent Pär Eliasson stated that studying different discourses was valid, but Frängsmyr should have underlined his own role as the selector and maker of discourses, because discourses did not exist on their

³⁸⁶ Nilsson 1999, 35–38, 451–452.

³⁸⁷ Svensson 2000, 240–241.

³⁸⁸ Frängsmyr 2000, 9, 11–13, 197–200. "Diskursen bildar ett sorteringsystem som utestänger en viss sorts kunskap och sanktionerar en annan ty på vetande, i detta fall om klimatet" (p. 12).

own.³⁸⁹ Again, reflecting on the dissertation of Bergenheim, the discourse was seen as a useful starting point, but the actual analysis was carried out in a traditional way by reading primary sources. Bergenheim and Frängsmyr were interested in the meanings of concepts in different times as well.

Håkan Håkansson (Lund, history of science and ideas) applied the theories of M. Foucault and G. Geertz in his thesis about the Renaissance occult philosopher John Dee (1527–1608). Dee himself searched for language and words that could produce information of both nature and God, a perfect language with metaphoric association between the word of God, language, the human soul, and nature. Already, Foucault had noted that the knowledge in the Renaissance transformed from one form of language to another form of language. Through the archaeological analysis inspired by Foucault, Håkansson studied how the language of science changed and what kind of discursive changes these were in the scientific texts of John Dee. He added the semiotic definition of culture by Geertz, where culture was practice, in this case scholars writing scientific texts because knowledge could be understood as a cultural construction and discursively practiced. Discourses could be seen as cultural practices, constantly changing and contestatory. Here Håkansson also clearly denied the use of the concept of “discourse” in an early Foucauldian way: they only motivate, not predict interpretive strategies. Håkansson also noticed the rise of narrativity and the linguistic turn, started by H. White and *Metahistory*, and described this as an “interpretative turn.”³⁹⁰

Håkansson’s dissertation continued the application of a discursive starting point within *idé- och lärdomshistoria*, but here the discourse was separated from its Foucauldian conception. The results of the study were also highlighted when the British opponent Stephen Clucas called it an outstanding contribution to occult philosophy with its convincing arguments and approaches.³⁹¹ This linked the dissertation of Håkansson to the international discussion, which otherwise has been rare in Sweden—most likely the opponents have been Swedish, or in some cases, from neighboring countries (Norway, Denmark, and Finland), but seldom from the United Kingdom or Germany.

Fredrik Sunnemark (Gothenburg, department of history of science and ideas) studied discursivity and ideology in the rhetoric of Martin Luther King Jr., with the main focus on the construction and effects of King’s civil rights movement discourse. He used a variety of King’s contributions (books, speeches, articles, and sermons) to trace their created meanings and significations, focusing especially on what happened after King’s public messages were expressed. The main theoretical starting points consisted of rhetoric, ideology, and discourse. Leaning on M. Foucault’s works, Sunnemark concluded that power is inscribed in the discourses themselves, and struggle arises over this discursive power. Furthermore, in a narrow Foucauldian sense, discourse ends in the direct relation between its own structures and the subject; to get beyond this, Sunnemark

³⁸⁹ Eliasson 2001, 197.

³⁹⁰ Håkansson 2001, 46–48, 51–52, 54–56, 63.

³⁹¹ Clucas 2001, 189.

referred to N. Fairclough's critical discourse analysis (CDA), where the way a discourse constitutes and changes the significations of world is seen as an ideological practice. In the end, discourse was for Sunnemark "a process in which the world is named and ordered through the social practice of language" (p. 29).³⁹²

Although Sunnemark did not straightforwardly state it, this kind of study contributed also to speech act theory and what could be done with words. The dissertation was again an example of how the Foucauldian sense of discourse was contested and developed further. The opponent Mattias Gardell valued that Sunnemark's method was reasonable and well executed but pointed out that the meanings of King's writings were not fully explained, whether the meanings and intentions were in the texts or only interpreted by Sunnemark to include those intentions, which King really did not have.³⁹³

Eva Friman (Umeå, history of science and ideas) applied discourse analysis, based on M. Foucault's *Archeology*, in her work about the discourse of economic growth in the twentieth century. She described language as an instrument of power that was not necessarily used consciously and in an outspoken way. Linguistic acts and social practices were also distinguished in discourse theory, according to Friman.³⁹⁴ Language was clearly in the focus in Friman's study and here it was taken seriously, adding more theoretical aspects to the theories of M. Foucault. Friman can be classified as belonging to the certain School of Umeå within the discipline of the history of science and ideas, like Åsa Bergenheim in 1994.³⁹⁵

Kaj Johansson (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) studied the history of popular science and popularization through the philosophy of science by Ludwig Fleck (1896–1961). Science and knowing was seen, as M. Foucault had suggested, in the form of discursive formation. Wittgenstein's philosophy of language also played a role for Johansson, as language offered a possibility to draw reasonings and explanations in scientific discussions. The main point of Johansson's dissertation was to conclude that scientific language and concepts can be converted into intelligible everyday language and for the so-called popular science.³⁹⁶ These were his brief points from the perspective of linguistic turns, and the dissertation otherwise remained as a regular study within the discipline of *idé- och lärdomshistoria*, mainly describing and analyzing the scientific actions of a certain actor.

At the beginning of the 2000s, the University of Lund and its discipline of history emerged as a site for a few dissertations of discursively oriented approaches – Lindberg 2001, Bergenlöv 2004, Carls 2004, and Holgersson 2005, all of which are discussed next. Common to them was that Eva Österberg, a cultural historian and professor in Lund between 1987 and 2007, was the supervisor or second supervisor for them.

³⁹² Sunnemark 2001, 5, 22–25, 29.

³⁹³ Gardell 2002, 238.

³⁹⁴ Friman 2002, 24–26.

³⁹⁵ See again Whatmore 2016, 11 about the popularity of referring to Foucault in Umeå.

³⁹⁶ Johansson 2003, 61–62, 95–96, 329–331, 334–335.

Anna Lindberg (Lund, history) studied the experiences of women workers in factories in Kerala 1930–2000. She concentrated on class, caste, and gender, and the results of the study were divided into the categories of social practice, gender discourse, gender ideology, and identity. At the beginning of the study she clearly distanced herself from postmodern traditions:

Although not rooted in the postmodern tradition, the research here presented, both with regard to theory and methodology, is not unaffected by “the cultural and linguistic turn.” This study situates itself in the crossroads of labor history, a sub-field of social history, sociology, and anthropology, and is affected by feminist theories and, to some extent, postmodern criticism (original quotation marks).³⁹⁷

The conception of discourse was separated from its Foucauldian and deterministic form, and instead inspired by Stuart Hall – discourses were ways of talking, thinking, or representing a particular subject or topic, and linked with linguistics. J. Scott’s gender theory was also inspirational, in this case regarding how the gender relations between Indian workers were constructed. Briefly, the theoretical starting point was the view that identities are shaped and constructed in the middle ground in which social practice, ideologies, and discourses intersect – this in turn led to an understanding of the actions of women and the rationality of their strategies in working life.³⁹⁸

Eva Bergenlöv (Lund, history) studied how judicial cases of mothers responsible for their infant’s death constructed two contradictory qualities – guilt and innocence – in Swedish courts c. 1680–1800. Bergenlöv treated the court as a discourse-maker, where narratives on the guilty or innocent mothers were constructed in these judicial texts, and she defined discourse straightforwardly: “Discourse is for me the linguistic side of culture and social context. Discourse is an underlying order, a set of rules that determine what can be expressed in language” (p. 23). For theoretical inspiration, Bergenlöv leaned on the theories of M. Foucault and N. Fairclough, in addition to theories of intertextuality and interdiscursivity, where texts and discourses include elements from other texts and discourses. According to this, the judicial discourse was related not only to the law but more widely to the society of that time. Furthermore, Bergenlöv also emphasized the analysis of judicial rhetoric, in the way of K. Sobota, because this rhetoric was not always logical and attached directly to the law. After this theoretical background she still described her method modestly as “getting close to the source material, read closely and interpreting texts” (p. 37). Bergenlöv concluded two different and contrasting images of convicted women, the ideal and its antithesis. Finally, judicial discourse was not based only on the law, but it was connected also with religious, political, scientific, and economic discourses as well.³⁹⁹

³⁹⁷ Lindberg 2001, 5.

³⁹⁸ Lindberg 2001, 38–39, 43–44, 324, 342.

³⁹⁹ Bergenlöv 2004, 2 –23, 29–34, 443–444, 448–449. “Diskurs är för mig den språkliga sidan av kulturen och samhällskontexten. Diskursen är en bakomliggande ordning, ett regelverk som bestämmer vad som kan uttryckas med språk” (p. 23); “[G]å tätt inpå källmaterialet, närläsa och tolka texterna” (p. 37).

Bergenvlöv's study was an example of how the conception of discourse was again widely developed and applied in one's own work, but the deterministic role of the discourse was still visible. Still, she worked it further and included other theorists among the Foucauldian conception of discourse. Reviewer Karin Hassan Jansson underlined seeing the language as social practice in a social context, but there could have been also an analysis of the debates about infant deaths, which would have shed light on the relationship between juridical and political discourses.⁴⁰⁰ This was a kind of discursive turn within social history in Sweden.

Lina Carls (Lund, history) studied why women's integration into the universities had progressed so slowly in twentieth-century Sweden. She concentrated on gender discourse and debates on women in higher education, leading to a study of whether the prevalent discourses were reproduced or contradicted. Interestingly, Carls did not refer to J. Scott at all, but to Y. Hirdman, the main Swedish advocator of gender history. The conception of discourse was pragmatic for Carls, as she called it. She started with the Foucauldian notion of discourse as the determining figure and criticized this clearly: "It is a dark and gloomy picture that Foucault gives of people's ability to change a discourse. Instead, can discourses be seen that though they are slow-moving, it is still possible for the actors to change them?" (p. 19). Instead, Carls used the theories of Hirdman, P. Bourdieu, and N. Fraser to conclude that gender is discursively constructed in different historical contexts, where language is a social practice and discourse is the arena of speech acts by different actors – not actors who are presented as powerless in front of the discourse. On this she built up her method, reading different types of texts and tracing how the ideas of different functions concerning women and men are strengthened, extended, and contradicted.⁴⁰¹

Carls's study is an example where there is no need to mention J. Scott when the national advocator of gender theory is available. Also, her challenging of the meaning of Foucauldian discourse and re-formulating it through the literature review was again notable. Finally, this intertwined in a combination of discursive research, concentrating mainly on gender discourse. Hanna Markusson Winkvist commented that although the discursive approach was fruitful, the essence and role of discourse should have been considered more deeply. Now it seemed that Carls had treated one master discourse or narrative, which in a mainstream way included everything, rather than considering that there were multiple discourses by women in higher education.⁴⁰²

Ulrika Holgersson (Lund, history) studied how class was constructed linguistically in *Svensk Damtidning* (Swedish Woman's Magazine) at the beginning of the twentieth century. Theoretically, she borrowed aspects from post-Marxist and feminist traditions to study how the concepts of class and women were used when the magazine wrote about women's work, education,

⁴⁰⁰ Jansson 2005, 238, 240.

⁴⁰¹ Carls 2004, 18–19, 27–28, 31, 379–380. "Det är en mörk och dyster bild som Foucault ger av människors möjligheter att förändra en diskurs. Kan man inte istället se diskurser som visserligen trögrörliga men ändå möjliga för aktörerna att förändra?" (p. 19).

⁴⁰² Markusson Winkvist 2004, 333.

and motherhood. Methodologically, she described her approach as of the deconstructive and genealogic methods, originally inspired by M. Foucault but extended to E. Laclau and C. Mouffe. They had a theory of discursive fields and material existence as discursively constructed, which in turn marked new French input from the methodological point of view. For Holgersson, *Svensk Damtidning* and Swedish society offered the discursive field where the experiences of the women were constructed. Holgersson also noted that this kind of study, researching class and language, was no more notable in Sweden than in Great Britain (portrayed by E.P. Thompson and P. Joyce).⁴⁰³

The opponent Tom Olsson expressed his delight with the study's theoretical and methodological implications and how those were applied to the primary sources. He was also sure that Holgersson would receive followers for this kind of approach.⁴⁰⁴ The discursive approach gave fruitful new insights, but reviewer Eva Blomberg wanted to see more about the experiences of women and whether women really expressed their real experiences in the magazine. Despite this, she valued the dissertation of Holgersson highly.⁴⁰⁵

As in Finland, the conception of discourse was changing but it was not applied in its original Foucauldian sense anymore, at least not in all the cases. Methodologically, the notion of discourse was changing, especially in the five dissertations defended in Lund: Nilsson 1999, Lindberg 2001, Bergenlöv 2004, Carls 2004, and Holgersson 2005. These can be interpreted as a discursive turn within social history – a feature that did not occur in the Finnish dissertations of my research period.

The gender history and theories of J. Scott include also, among others, a sense of discursivity, and it is natural to continue with Scott from here.⁴⁰⁶

6.3 Joan Scott and Gender Constructed with Language

Joan Scott's works, along with Judith Butler's, have been an inspiration for many when speaking about gender construction through language. In Finland, there were 17 dissertations with reference to these kinds of gender theories, starting in the mid-1990s (Markkola 1994, Liljeström 1995, and Lähteenmäki 1995), continuing with the turn of the millennium (Oikarinen 1998, Pihlainen 1999, Uimonen 1999, Östman 2000a, and Teräs 2001), and to stable reference density after that.

In total, the references to gender history inspired by Scott were as follows⁴⁰⁷:

⁴⁰³ Holgersson 2005, 26, 29–30, 58–59, 301–303.

⁴⁰⁴ Olsson 2010, 104, 106.

⁴⁰⁵ Blomberg 2007, 124.

⁴⁰⁶ See also Appendix A: The Studied Dissertations in Chronological Order and their References to the Linguistic Turns.

⁴⁰⁷ Abbreviations, Finland: Universities of Helsinki (Hki), Turku (Tku), Jyväskylä (Jkl), Tampere (Tre), Oulu (Ou), Joensuu (Jo) and Åbo Akademi (ÅA). The disciplines and departments are abbreviated as GH (general history), FH (Finnish history), CH (cultural his-

TABLE 6 References to Gender History. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations 1970–2010.

Year	Finland (17)	Sweden (26)
1970		
1971		
1972		
1973		
1974		
1975		
1976		
1977		
1978		
1979		
1980		
1981		
1982		
1983		
1984		
1985		
1986		
1987		
1988		
1989		
1990		
1991		L. Eskilsson (Um, HSI)
1992		I. Artæus (Upp, H)
1993		
1994	P. Markkola (Tre, FH)	M. Edgren (Lu, H), Å. Bergenheim (Um, HSI), E. Elgán (Upp, H)
1995	M. Liljeström (ÅA, GH), M. Lähteenmäki (Hki, FH)	H. Berggren (St, H)
1996		E-H. Ulvros (Lu, H)
1997		
1998	S. Oikarinen (Tre, GH)	G. Andersson (Upp, H), B. Jordansson (Go, H)
1999	K. Pihlainen (Tku, CH), M. Uimonen (Hki, E&S)	
2000	A-C. Östman (ÅA, NH)	P. Wisselgren (Um, HSI)
2001	K. Teräs (Tku, FH)	A. Lindberg (Lu, H)

tory, in Turku and Helsinki), PH (political history, in Turku and Helsinki), NH (Nordic history, in Åbo Akademi) and SSH (Swedish-speaking history, in Helsinki); Sweden: Universities of Uppsala (Upp), Lund (Lu), Gothenburg (Go), Stockholm (St), Umeå (Um) and Örebro (Ör). The disciplines are history (H) and history of science and ideas (HSI).

2002		B. Plymoth (St, H), M. Larsson (Upp, HSI)
2003		H. Markusson Winkvist (Um, H), U. Nilsson (Upp, HSI), K. Tegenborg Falkdalen (Um, HSI)
2004	H. Valtonen (Jkl, FH), S. Tuomaala (Hki, FH), J. Valenius (Tku, PH)	E. Bergenlöv (Lu, H)
2005	M. Jalava (Hki, FH)	M. Lidestad (St, H), K. Leppänen (Go, HSI), P. Laskar (St, HSI), C. Lundström (Um, H), U. Holgersson (Lu, H)
2006		E. Alm (Go, HSI)
2007	S. Jalagin (Ou, GH), M. Heinonen (Tku, GH), A. Lahtinen (Tku, CH)	H. Hill (Um, HSI), A. Wasniowski (Um, HSI), A-K. Frih (Ör, H), S. Kling (Um, H)
2008	S. Kotilainen (Jkl, FH)	
2009	M. Rautelin (Hki, SSH)	
2010		

In Finland, the rise of gender history started to show in the middle of the 1990s in the dissertations of Pirjo Markkola and Maria Lähteenmäki. They both referred to articles of J. Scott, G. Bock, and Y. Hirdman as they problematized the concept of “gender” (*sukupuoli*) at the beginning of their dissertations. For Markkola (Tampere, Finnish history), gender and gender systems were helpful as they illuminated the social and historical nature of the relationships between the sexes, wherein gender was both determining and determined. Lähteenmäki (Helsinki, Finnish history) had the same starting points, but she included class theory by E.P. Thompson in her study, since the theoretical starting point for her dissertation was not gender but the tension between class and gender.⁴⁰⁸ Though both Markkola and Lähteenmäki applied the notion of gender systems and referred to the international discussion of Scott and Bock, their methods were not linguistically oriented, but more within the field of social history where the linguistic aspects were excluded as they did not fit within the existing paradigm.

Sari Oikarinen (Tampere, general history) referred briefly to Scott’s notable works in her dissertation about Constance Markievicz (1868–1927) and her vision of Ireland. She only mentioned that gender was used as an analytical tool in her work to find out how Markievicz understood the role of the sexes and to point out that Scott had defined gender as an analytical category in the work of a historian. Otherwise, Oikarinen relied on the method of question and answer, taken from R.J. Collingwood via M. Hyrkkänen’s work.⁴⁰⁹

Tiina Kinnunen, who has concentrated on gender history but from other perspectives, stated in her review that Oikarinen’s dissertation was stylish and

⁴⁰⁸ Markkola 1994, 14–15; Lähteenmäki 1995, 11–12.

⁴⁰⁹ Oikarinen 1998, 18.

answered directly to its research questions, but in some places it was rather limited. The lack of a methodological discussion was especially questionable for Kinnunen and thus Oikarinen's work did not challenge at all the traditional research of the history of ideas. Still, the lack of methodological discussion was described as a norm in Finnish historical research.⁴¹⁰

These examples show that the name of Scott and her works were known in Finland, but the linguistic part of her theories was not used. Furthermore, Kinnunen's comment that Finnish historical research did not practice methodological debate was accurate, at least if we compare Finland, for example, with the Anglo-Saxon, German, or French traditions.

Marianne Liljeström (Åbo Akademi, general history), in her thesis about the origin and discursive reproduction of the Soviet gender system, already had a clear focus on gender and discourse. The gendered hierarchy of Soviet society was understood in terms of discourse when gender differences were discursively constructed. Here discourses arise as rhetoric where language acts between the producers of texts and the audiences. She also followed M. Foucault and considered discourses as meaningful practices that were formulated, expressed, and upheld by different actors. In the end, Liljeström described her own research as a historical study of discursive formation.⁴¹¹ Liljeström's dissertation was the first Finnish one in which the linguistic side of gender was considered more deeply. Besides that, the understanding of what is or could be discourse, was emphasized here as well.

Ann-Catrin Östman (Åbo Akademi, Nordic history) studied the agrarian life of Ostrobothnia (*Pohjanmaa, Österbotten*) and how femininity and masculinity were attached to the working life. In line with J. Scott, Östman acknowledged that gender is knowledge or discourse about the differences that gives meaning to female and male, and these discourses cannot be defined independently: they are connected, hierarchically arranged, and get their meanings through each other, establishing gender as a structured category. She included in this also the notion that social relations are discursive constructions, which in the first place was also a critique toward M. Foucault. Methodologically, Östman treated language and concepts as historical remnants, and referring again to Scott, new concepts should have been interpreted as events. Overall, manliness and womanliness in agrarian life were constructed and delimited according to work, everyday practices of work, and speech about work.⁴¹²

Östman was supervised by M. Liljeström, and the tradition of a discursively oriented gender history was carried on. In this study gender was also constructed clearly by practices and language. In a way, a discursive turn has taken place within social history in Finland, but first on the Swedish-language side.

Johanna Valenius (Turku, political history), supervised by J. Kalela, studied gender, sexuality, and the body during the construction of the Finnish nation. Though Valenius did not apply an actual conceptual history, she qualified the

⁴¹⁰ Kinnunen 2000, 100.

⁴¹¹ Liljeström 1995, 5-9, 55, 59-63, 475-477.

⁴¹² Östman 2000a, 21-23, 42-43.

concepts of “masculinity” and “femininity,” “heterosexual matrix,” “homosocial desire,” “body,” “motherhood,” and “eugenics” as key concepts of her study. Valenius referred to the authors M. Foucault, J. Scott, and J. Butler, but not in the discursive senses. Still, she used the notion that gender goes beyond bodies, pointing out that gender exists also in speech, along with gesture, emotions, and thinking. Dealing with the concept of “maternalism,” Valenius cited Ritva Nätkin’s definition that it is “a speech and action, that is a discourse” (p. 58).⁴¹³

Meri Heinonen (Turku, general history) acknowledged the works of J. Scott and J. Butler considering how gender is made culturally and produced through acts, including performances with words. But interestingly, this was separated from post-structuralism. Her study was about gender and the body in later medieval German mystical texts. Instead of Butler-influenced post-structuralism, wherein the repetition of certain gestures produces genders, Heinonen followed the example of the Finnish philosopher S. Heinämaa who thought that gender is composed from the ways of being, but this did not put language in the primary role. Thus, one and the same act or gesture could be interpreted as either masculine or feminine, depending on the situation.⁴¹⁴

Scott was quite frequently referred to among studies that were concerned, at least partially, with gender. However, there were many dissertations in which the role of language in gender construction was not mentioned.

Seija Jalagin (Oulu, general history) referred to the gender theories of J. Scott and Y. Hirdman quite broadly, but the focus was not on the linguistic part of constructing gender.⁴¹⁵ Scott’s article “Gender” was also used by Anu Lahtinen (University of Turku, cultural history) in the sense of introducing the difference between (biological) *sex* and (constructed) *gender*, but without going into discursive notions. She did, however, concentrate on the rhetorical aspects and arguments used in the texts produced by women, to trace the socio-historical power relationships and hidden intentions when women strengthened their positions with rhetorical tools.⁴¹⁶ This was acknowledged also in the review of opponent Maiju Lehmijoki-Gardner.⁴¹⁷ Thus, Scott was still popular, but though almost no reference to her was about the discursive nature of gender, at least there was a kind of discursive turn within social history.

Also, Kari Teräs (Turku, Finnish history) mentioned J. Scott in his dissertation, but only as a criticizer of E.P. Thompson, not in the sense of using her theories of language and gender.⁴¹⁸ Sofia Kotilainen’s (Jyväskylä, Finnish history) dissertation about historical name-giving in Central Finland included the theory that the performativity of gender was based on repeated, also linguistic, practices that produce phenomena discursively, and giving a name to a child was part of this performance.⁴¹⁹ Mona Rautelin (Helsinki, Swedish-

⁴¹³ Valenius 2004, 38, 50–52, 58. “Se on puhetta ja toimintaa, siis diskurssia”.

⁴¹⁴ Heinonen 2007, 7–8.

⁴¹⁵ Jalagin 2007, 19–21.

⁴¹⁶ Lahtinen 2007, 24, 30–31, 34–35.

⁴¹⁷ Lehmijoki-Gardner 2007, 356.

⁴¹⁸ Teräs 2001, 22.

⁴¹⁹ Kotilainen 2008, 82–83.

speaking history) referred to J. Scott and J. Butler as well in her study about infanticide as a cultural phenomenon in Finland 1702–1807, but not from a linguistic viewpoint.⁴²⁰

Based on the dissertations studied in this chapter, for some reason social history in Finland has tended to exclude the linguistic aspects from its studies, but there were also exceptions to this trend: Liljeström 1995, Östman 2000, and Lahtinen 2007. The works and theories of Scott and Butler are well-known worldwide, but they have not been fully applied, at least not from the perspective of their attitude on language and its meaning.

6.4 Gender History in Sweden – A Selective Linguistic Turn?

Gender history, or in Swedish *genushistoria*, in turn has been very popular in Sweden. This is clearly visible also in the case of dissertations—the first applications of J. Scott’s articles appeared already at the beginning of the 1990s (Eskilsson 1991 and Artæus 1992), while a clear turn appeared at the mid-decade (Edgren 1994, Bergenheim 1994, Elgán 1994, Berggren 1995, and Ulvros 1996), and between 2001 and 2010 there were 17 dissertations with references to Scott. However, as was the case in Finland, not all of those who referred to Scott’s theories included its linguistic side in their studies.

In the early 1990s of Sweden, Lena Eskilsson (Umeå, history of science and ideas) considered the role and citizenship of women in schools and used the division of sex and gender as it was used in Anglo-Saxon gender studies. Eskilsson translated the term “gender” as social sex (*socialt kön*), a term that has spread widely.⁴²¹ Eskilsson’s dissertation was the first one with a reference to J. Scott, and the delay from the article “Gender” was not too long.

The popularity of referring to J. Scott continued in the dissertations of Iréne Artæus and Elisabeth Elgán (both from the University of Uppsala and department of history). Artæus wrote her dissertation about the status of single women in the first half of the nineteenth century, but she emphasized the power relationships between men and women rather than the linguistic contents of Scott.⁴²² On the contrary, Elgán compared Swedish and French abortion and contraceptive policies from the turn of the century to the Second World War. Her work combined political and comparative history with gender history, and she also highlighted the linguistic side of Scott’s theories—concepts, expressions, images, and discourses constructing society in different ways during different times.⁴²³

This seems to be the first time that the linguistic side of Scott’s gender theories was acknowledged in the Swedish dissertations. The PhD student Gunnel Karlsson stated that the results of the dissertation were convincing, and

⁴²⁰ Rautelin 2009, 38, 504.

⁴²¹ Eskilsson 1991, 18–19.

⁴²² Artæus 1992, 17–19.

⁴²³ Elgán 1994, 16–20.

she was eager to see continuing studies in which the discourses of females and males would be set against each other.⁴²⁴ So at least one member of the younger generation saw the possibilities of gender history studies in a discursive way.

Still, some doctoral students, like Eva Helen Ulvros (Lund, history), noted the linguistic side of J. Scott's gender theories, but kept it in the background and focused more on a concrete study of the past in her study about the everyday lives of women in the nineteenth century.⁴²⁵ The opponent, Dane Bente Rosenbeck, indeed would have liked to see a deeper application of Scott's theories about discourse and its relationship with reality.⁴²⁶

Monika Edgren (Lund, history) applied J. Scott's gender and class perspectives in her dissertation about lower class family structures in Norrköping during the nineteenth century. She referred briefly to the theory that concentrating on the use of language gives different meanings about gender. Further, she referred also to the theories of Nancy Fraser about social identities as discursively constructed objects in historically specific social contexts. Thus, identities are not given but constructed.⁴²⁷ Edgren's dissertation was criticized because its gender viewpoint was insufficiently specified. Further, Edgren's strict concentration on women only was valuable, but ignoring men caused the final results to be excessively one-sided.⁴²⁸

The linguistic and discursive natures of gender were established in Gudrun Andersson's (Uppsala, history) dissertation about the construction of gender and norms in early modern court and legal practices. For her, gender is constructed with texts and discourse, as suggested by J. Scott and M. Foucault. And when Andersson treated court books as text, she expanded this view to treat the whole court as a discourse-maker and controller of norms. Otherwise, the purpose of the study was to demonstrate the constructions of gender in different spheres (political, social, and economic) and to show the different ideals for women and men within these.⁴²⁹

Reviewer Ingrid Lövkrona described the study as creative and comprehensive, but Andersson had reduced the meaning of gender only to women and men and had not included femaleness and maleness.⁴³⁰ This critique was justified, because femaleness and maleness are primarily the categories and cases that can be constructed by language and practices, not the biological sexes (man, woman) as such. The same kind of danger may lie in a discursive research, if one studies the discourses of something in the reality, but instead, maybe unconsciously, studies the reality itself.⁴³¹

The popularity of J. Scott continued in the first decade of the 2000s, but the discursive aspects were still not always the most crucial ones for the PhD

⁴²⁴ Karlsson 1995, 37.

⁴²⁵ Ulvros 1996, 15–16, 337–338.

⁴²⁶ Rosenbeck 1996, 661.

⁴²⁷ Edgren 1994, 42, 237.

⁴²⁸ Schånberg 1996, 345–346.

⁴²⁹ Andersson 1998, 15, 22–25, 307–315.

⁴³⁰ Lövkrona 1998, 229.

⁴³¹ Compare this with the case of J. Eriksson's dissertation, the images of monsters vs. discourses of the images of monsters, at the end of Chapter 5.5.

candidates who referred to her. Birgitta Plymoth (Stockholm, history) was one of the referrers, but her study lacked the discursive elements of the gender system.⁴³² This occurred also in the work of Madelene Lidestad (Stockholm, history), where again there was a reference to Scott, but not in the linguistic meaning of genders.⁴³³ Karin Tegenborg Falkdalen (Umeå, history of science and ideas) applied Scott's gender theory in her study of political debates about Swedish and British female monarchs during the early modern period, but did not include the linguistic part of it.⁴³⁴ Pia Laskar (Stockholm, history of science and ideas), supervised by the significant conceptual historian B. Lindberg, built her theoretical starting point on the works of J. Scott, J. Butler, and M. Foucault, but did not handle discursive gender theory or consider the concept of discourse.⁴³⁵ Malin Grundberg (Stockholm, history) applied J. Scott and Y. Hirdman when she expressed the role of gender in power relations, but did not include the linguistic aspect.⁴³⁶ Ulrika Nilsson (Uppsala, history of science and ideas) investigated how gynecology was established in Sweden in the 1860s and onwards. She was aware of Scott's theory about constructed gender and Butler's performativity of gender but did not explicitly mention the linguistic side of doing or constructing gender.⁴³⁷ Anna-Karin Frih (Örebro, history) applied linguistically constructed gender as one of his theoretical points when she studied how concepts of childhood and adolescence were constructed in medical discussions between 1870 and 1930.⁴³⁸ Sofia Kling (Umeå, history) wrote her thesis about birth control, gender, and sexuality during the Swedish fertility transition, 1880–1940, and how birth control was constructed through different notions of gender, where gender was constantly reconstructed through the repetition of certain gendered acts, but linguistic practices were not mentioned for this purpose.⁴³⁹

These examples show that the reception of the linguistic turns has been selective in the case of gender history, as the linguistic aspect has not always been transferred along with the other theories. There has been plenty of references to this internationally remarkable senior scholar, but Scott has remained more as a general and inspirational figure for gender studies in these cases. Moreover, as dissertations require that theory has to be included in the study in some way, referring to famous senior scholars has been a rather easy and maybe a safe solution. This is most likely also the case with R. Koselleck, Q. Skinner, or M. Foucault, because they are known names to refer to in their fields of research. This in turn leads to a problem if there is a reference to a senior scholar, but the added value or application of his/her methods is lacking. In the end, this kind of reference without any deeper purpose tends to give the reader a superimposed feeling.

⁴³² Plymoth 2002, 23–24.

⁴³³ Lidestad 2005, 11.

⁴³⁴ Tegenborg Falkdalen 2003, 17.

⁴³⁵ Laskar 2005, 11–15.

⁴³⁶ Grundberg 2005, 25–27.

⁴³⁷ Nilsson 2003, 17–18, 25.

⁴³⁸ Frih 2007, 34–35.

⁴³⁹ Kling 2007, 26–28, 102.

Catarina Lundström (Umeå, history) described and analyzed the role of the county governor's wife during the period 1900–1940. Based her starting point on J. Scott, she presented gender as a historical and analytical category that should be studied discursively and cannot be understood independently of its linguistic context. Interestingly, Lundström described Scott as the most important source of inspiration for Swedish history studies within this postmodern and post-structuralist attitude.⁴⁴⁰ Scott can be described as definitely post-structuralist but connecting her to postmodernism was rare and distinct. Although, postmodernism has never been a clear entity, and it is connected and contested in many ways, depending on individuals. Lundström saw also a challenge for the historical materiality:

The criticism of the poststructuralist ideas, in turn, points out that the deconstruction of the categories, including the concepts of woman and man, is likely to lead to the dissolution of historical analyzes in total relativism. The connection between discourse and real actors may become unclear, or as Anita Göransson expresses it, "one does not try to make sense of materiality." In addition, the question of who creates discourse, can this creative subject only be a product of the discourse itself. Is there no "doer behind the deed?"⁴⁴¹

The citation above summarizes the critique of historians toward the Foucauldian sense of discourse. As an answer to this challenge, Lundström tried to combine the theories of constructed gender but acknowledged also the actions of individuals. This led to a starting point based on the constructivist gender concept but included also physical bodies with ideas and knowledge. This she described as "society's overall gender system" (*samhällets övergripande könsordning*).⁴⁴² Lundström's dissertation demonstrated a study in which a kind of materialistic or physical turn toward the body was pursued.⁴⁴³

Helena Hill (Umeå, history of science and ideas) studied the Swedish men's movement of the 1970s and applied the poststructuralist feminist theories of J. Scott and J. Butler. Hill was supervised by the first referrer to J. Scott in Swedish dissertations, L. Eskilsson. For Hill, the starting point was thus that gender was constantly being produced and reproduced through language, speech, and actions. Hill also made her contribution to see discourse in her own way: "I see discourses like the flow of speech and actions that produce and reproduce norms, ideals, and meanings. Even institutions, laws, and regulations are part of discourses. Therefore, I do not make any distinction between language and practice" (p. 17). Discourse contains also what is not said and therefore silence also creates discourses, according to Hill. Besides gender issues, Hill analyzed

⁴⁴⁰ Lundström 2005, 22.

⁴⁴¹ Lundström 2005, 22. "Kritiken av de poststrukturalistiska idéerna poängterar i sin tur att dekonstruktionen av kategorierna, inklusive begreppen kvinna och man, riskerar att leda till att historiska analyser upplöses i en total relativism. Kopplingen mellan diskursen och reella aktörer kan bli oklar, eller som Anita Göransson uttrycker det, 'man försöker inte knyta mening till materialitet.' Dessutom ställs frågan om vem som skapar diskursen, kan detta skapande subjekt endast vara en produkt av själva diskursen. Finns det ingen 'doer behind the deed'?"

⁴⁴² Lundström 2005, 22–23.

⁴⁴³ For the materialistic turn, see, e.g., Halonen et al. 2015.

the changing discussions and rhetoric about men, and what they should be, and the concept of “unmanliness” (*omanlighet*) was essential at this point.⁴⁴⁴

Hill’s work was another example of redefining the meaning of discourse, and again it parted from the Foucauldian deterministic form. The extensive amount of different types of primary sources, official and unofficial (material produced by the movement *Befria mannen*, the institution of sexual information RFSU and newspapers), were treated discursively and contribute to the discourses in their own way. To emphasize how researchers were outgrowing Foucault’s discourse, Hill did not refer to him at all. The empirical analysis was valued as being really good by the opponent, Jens Rydström, so the theory and empirical study were balanced as the actors and power struggles were studied through discursive analysis.⁴⁴⁵ Rydström himself was a representative of discursive gender history.

From the above we can see that J. Scott and her gender theory were widely applied in the Swedish dissertations. Furthermore, even if in some cases there was a reference to Scott but no further application of her theoretical starting points, the linguistic side of her theory was sometimes mentioned. For example, Maja Larsson (Uppsala, history of science and ideas) studied the interpretations of concepts of “sex” (*kön*) and “individuality” (*individualitet*) in nineteenth-century popular medicine. She referred to J. Scott’s article “Gender” and acknowledged the metaphoric possibilities of language to determine and categorize gender, masculinity, and femininity.⁴⁴⁶ Hanna Markusson Winkvist (University of Umeå) wrote her dissertation about post-graduate women in the Swedish academic world during the first half of the twentieth century. She referred to J. Scott that both sex and gender are practices that are created by language and their subject matter changes in time and space, but Markusson Winkvist did not develop this theoretical aspect further in the analytical part of her dissertation.⁴⁴⁷

These were examples of gender history, which again has been very popular in Sweden, and in which the linguistic side is often at least mentioned. This might be due to Scott and gender history relating strongly to the idea of gender as a social construction. The reception of Scott’s theories has been clearly selective, as some PhD students have referenced and applied the linguistic part as well, but many have also left it out.

Further, an interesting application of combined gender and discourse theory occurred when Erika Alm (Gothenburg, history of science and ideas) reformulated Aristotle’s concepts of “form” and “matter” as “materialization.” Alm based her starting point on J. Butler’s ideas about gender as performative construction and argued that the concept of “form” was useful in studying

⁴⁴⁴ Hill 2007, 16–18, 24, 33–37, 238–240. “Jag ser diskurser som flöden av tal och handlingar som producerar och reproducerar normer, ideal och betydelser. Även institutioner, lagar och regler utgör delar av diskurser. Jag gör därför ingen uppdelning mellan språk och praktik” (p. 17).

⁴⁴⁵ Rydström 2007, 304, 308.

⁴⁴⁶ Larsson 2002, 15.

⁴⁴⁷ Markusson Winkvist 2003, 28.

discourses of the body (*kropp*). Accordingly, Alm studied the conceptions of bodies in Swedish Government Official Reports from the 1960s and 1970s and concentrated on the discussions about juridical sex, abortion, and sterilization.⁴⁴⁸ This was an example of a study with a continuing material, more specifically bodily, turn and how bodies and body images were seen as discourses. This is somewhat similar to the manner in which J. Eriksson treated images of monsters as concepts and discourse, which in a way was also a representation of a material turn (Chapter 5.5).

In conclusion, J. Scott was referred to many times in the dissertations and almost every time when the topic was about gender. However, the most important core of Scott's theories has not been considered to be the construction of gender through linguistic practices, but the construction itself in a more social or cultural sense. Gender can be constructed in many various ways and linguistic practices are just one of those, among others. That also explains why not everyone who has read Scott, has been interested in her linguistic side of gender construction theory. Constructivism has appeared in different forms, as it can be either social, cultural, or linguistic.

6.5 Hayden White, Frank Ankersmit, Ludwig Wittgenstein, and Other Theoretical Orientations

H. White and F.R. Ankersmit could be considered to be the main international advocates of narratively and literature-oriented historical theories, and indeed, they were the inspiration for some dissertations during the decades in the focus of this work at hand. In Finland, from 1999 and onwards, there were 10 dissertations with a reference to them.

Historical narrativity advocated by H. White and F.R. Ankersmit:⁴⁴⁹

TABLE 7 References to H. White and F.R. Ankersmit. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations 1970–2010.

Year	Finland (10)	Sweden (6)
1970		
1971		
1972		
1973		
1974		

⁴⁴⁸ Alm 2006, 37, 81, 84.

⁴⁴⁹ Abbreviations, Finland: Universities of Helsinki (Hki), Turku (Tku), Jyväskylä (Jkl), Tampere (Tre), Oulu (Ou), Joensuu (Jo) and Åbo Akademi (ÅA). The disciplines and departments are abbreviated as GH (general history), FH (Finnish history), CH (cultural history, in Turku and Helsinki), PH (political history, in Turku and Helsinki), NH (Nordic history, in Åbo Akademi) and SSH (Swedish-speaking history, in Helsinki); Sweden: Universities of Uppsala (Upp), Lund (Lu), Gothenburg (Go), Stockholm (St), Umeå (Um) and Örebro (Ör). The disciplines are history (H) and history of science and ideas (HSI).

1975		
1976		
1977		
1978		
1979		J. Perényi (Upp, H)
1980		
1981		
1982		
1983		R. Björk (Upp, H)
1984		
1985		
1986		
1987		
1988		
1989		
1990		
1991		
1992		
1993		
1994		
1995		
1996		
1997		
1998		
1999	K. Pihlainen (Tku, CH), J. Hiltunen (Tku, CH)	V. Höög (Lu, HSI)
2000		
2001		H. Håkansson (Lu, HSI), U. Zander (Lu, H)
2002	R. Forsström (Tku, CH)	
2003	J. Kortti (Hki, E&S)	
2004	S. Tuomaala (Hki, FH)	
2005		
2006	A. Sivula (Tku, GH)	
2007	T. Tuikka (Jkl, GH)	A. Wasniowski (Um, HSI)
2008		
2009	J. Nurmiainen (Hki, GH), K-M. Miettunen (Tre, FH)	
2010	M. Pekkola (Jkl, GH)	

In Finland, the narrativist impacts of the linguistic turns appeared first in the dissertations of the late 1990s. Juha Hiltunen from the cultural history of the University of Turku referred to H. White and *Metahistory* when he wrote about the nature of the chronicles and their usability. Hiltunen himself worked with the

history of ancient Peru and studied the reliability of their chronicles.⁴⁵⁰ In her dissertation of 2009, Katja-Maria Miettunen (Tampere, Finnish history) mentioned the relationship between reality and narrative and introduced P. Ricoeur and H. White as the main advocates of emplotment in history.⁴⁵¹ Both of these dissertations mainly resorted to repeating the narrativist theory of White and did not add anything new or contribute further to the theoretical discussion. History was described as narrativist by its nature and that was all that was said about it. To conclude, mentioning narrative did not have much effect on the studies of Hiltunen or Miettunen but remained more like a loose and generally theoretical background of historical studies as such.

Kalle Pihlainen, from the University of Turku and cultural history as well, not only used linguistically oriented approaches (linguistic model of historical representation and linguistic figuration), but he also studied them in his dissertation about narrative representation in history. The dissertation was not a traditional research because it had no separate list of primary sources, only one list of bibliography. Pihlainen concentrated on the thinking of the narrative theorists and historians H. White, M. Riffaterre, and J.-P. Sartre. In addition to them there were other scholars in minor roles, such as F.R. Ankersmit, P. Ricoeur, K. Jenkins, and T. May. The main point for Pihlainen was to “investigate the ways in which concrete practices of representation demand an ethical response” (p. 12). Besides reading the works of the previously mentioned theorists, Pihlainen also applied the intertextual approach of French semiotician M. Riffaterre wherein different works of art, like texts in this case, were seen in a different construction against the backdrop of their ever-changing contexts – the reader always identifies the structures of the text and its current connections to other texts.⁴⁵² Pihlainen’s study was a rare example of narrativistic discussion among the doctoral dissertations in history. Its nature was specific as it concentrated on methodology and thus explicitly defined theories of history as well.

Saara Tuomaala (Helsinki, Finnish, and Scandinavian history) used narrativistic methods in her dissertation about the encounters between Finnish compulsory education and rural children. She described her research as “experiential narratives” (*narratiivoinen kertomusnäkökulma*) in the sense that narrativity meant the way of understanding and constructing the historical knowledge of the past with intertextual methods. The narrative perspective was largely adopted from H. White and M. Bakhtin as the texts used as sources and literature were seen as narrativistic wholes (*kerronnallinen kokonaisuus*), fragments, or of significant content (*merkityssisältö*). Tuomaala understood discursivity as a two-level narrative and social process. Discourse and gender were highlighted through J. Scott’s notion that discursive continuities and breaks in an individual’s experience are the key to researching feminine and masculine divisions within a cultural community. Tuomaala also criticized H. White’s concentration merely

⁴⁵⁰ Hiltunen 1999, 52.

⁴⁵¹ Miettunen 2009, 36.

⁴⁵² Pihlainen 1999, 10–12, 24–26.

on the textual world, while history was for Tuomaala also continuously bodily and physical, including using voice, being silent, marks on skin, and using different gestures and expressions.⁴⁵³

Thus, Tuomaala's dissertation combined notions of narrativity, the body, and power. In the presentation, opponent A. Ollila described how Tuomaala used interviews in their entirety (including gestures and laughter as essential components of speech), which opened a new and fresh perspective for researching childhood as a historical phenomenon.⁴⁵⁴ Tuomaala's dissertation can be described as successful as she tied her theoretical part closely to the empirical study and succeeded well in this task.

Anna Sivula (Turku, general history) wrote a long, over 600-page dissertation about the historian Marc Bloch (1886–1944) and the methodological heritage of his historical research. In her work, Sivula adopted the method of historiographical operation from P. Ricœur and explained how both understanding and explaining are discursive processes in a historical account, which is finally actualized during the reading process. Otherwise, her methods did not lean so much toward the language itself, but throughout the dissertation there were references to H. White and R. Koselleck in the contexts of a general depiction of the linguistic turn in the United States and on the nature of historical time.⁴⁵⁵ The opponent Matti Peltonen recognized the merits of Sivula's work, from the starting point of Ricœur to the original interpretation of the reading.⁴⁵⁶

In addition to the dissertations discussed above, F.R. Ankersmit and M. Foucault were mentioned in the dissertation of Jukka Kortti (Helsinki, economic and social history) about Finnish television advertisements, but only from the viewpoint of postmodern history and excluding the meaning of "discourse" from "ideology." Otherwise, his study started with a semiotic approach,⁴⁵⁷ and in this case, semiotic did not mean linguistic.

White, Ankersmit, and, partially, Ricœur, were inspirations to some historians in Finland, but the cases were unique. Mainly, the references to narrativistic works remained in a small role, or the works were clearly historiographical (K. Pihlainen and A. Sivula) by their topics. As an exception, Saara Tuomaala's study was a successful demonstration of empirical research based on narrativist theory.

In Sweden, the narrativistic starting point was less popular than in Finland. On the other hand, only six of the Swedish dissertations referred to White or Ankersmit, but from those, Perényi (1979)⁴⁵⁸ and Björk (1983) stand out as early works that were connected to their respective works.

⁴⁵³ Tuomaala 2004, 13, 29, 32, 50–51, 57–58, 401–402. See also Ihalainen & Saarinen 2019 for a recent demonstration of this kind of application.

⁴⁵⁴ Ollila 2005b, 236.

⁴⁵⁵ Sivula 2006, 46–48, 140, 272.

⁴⁵⁶ Peltonen, Matti 2006, 346.

⁴⁵⁷ Kortti 2003, 81, 169.

⁴⁵⁸ Perényi's dissertation was discussed in Chapter 4.1.

A really broad work within the borders of analytical historiography was Ragnar Björk's (Uppsala, department of history) dissertation about explanatory reasoning in history through two Swedish historians, Nils Ahnlund (1889–1957) and Erik Lönnroth (1910–2002), representatives of the second generation of the Uppsala and Lund "schools." Björk's work was about the concept of explanation in historical studies, and narrativity played one of the roles here in this throughout the methodological research. The concept of "narration" had its own chapter. Narrativity was more an object than a method for Björk, but throughout his dissertation he cited H. White, W.H. Walsh, L. Stone, W. Dray, L. Mink, A.R. Louch, M. White, H. von Wright, and A. Danto, among other philosophers of history, and once cited Q. Skinner as a terminological example.⁴⁵⁹ This dissertation marked a clear starting point for the narrativistic turn among Swedish history dissertations, but it also remained as such for a long time. Mats Persson described Björk's use of new theories and concepts as a possibility to make a difference from the old and more traditional studies, thus seeing narrativity and historical constructions as positive matters and fruitful viewpoints. According to Persson, Björk's study was also a good example of combining the theoretical and practical sides.⁴⁶⁰

Andréaz Wasniowski (Umeå, history of science and ideas) applied the philosophy of history as his starting point, more precisely the theories of F.R. Ankersmit and H. White. The focus was on the Swedish Federation for Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Queer Rights (RFSL, today *Riksförbundet för homosexuellas, bisexuellas, transpersoners och queeras rättigheter*, formerly *Riksförbundet för sexuellt likaberättigande*) and how it spread scientific and objective information about homosexuality 1950–1970. Reading through archive materials and publications and bearing in mind source criticism, Wasniowski used the concept of representation, advocated by both White and Ankersmit, along with philosopher W. Quine, as his inspiration. Here all historical texts were representations of something that has never existed as such—but not all representations were equal; for example, by the level of their truthfulness or validity. At the same time, different descriptions and theories could be valid, leading to the question of truth in historical studies. Wasniowski also introduced the essential concepts of his study, such as "normal" – "abnormal" (*normal – avvikande*) and mentioned J.L. Austin's performative side of his speech act theory as a demonstration of the possibilities of language. However, Wasniowski did not carry out conceptual research in particular.⁴⁶¹

Wasniowski's representationalism was, indeed, a bit unconnected from the topic of the dissertation itself. It felt like somewhat of a theoretical framework to justify that he had written a coherent narrative about RFSL. The opponent, Torbjörn Gustafsson Chorell, also pointed out that the theoretical framework was not fluently connected to the actual empirical research, and the dissertation tended to be like a traditional historical study, which consisted of reading source

⁴⁵⁹ Björk 1983, 28–36, 51–53, 108, 98–99, 102, 151–190.

⁴⁶⁰ Persson 1984, 231–232.

⁴⁶¹ Wasniowski 2007, 10–14, 18–20, 22–23, 236 footnote 14, 239 footnote 40.

material with common sense.⁴⁶² The narrative and history-philosophical theories may be used as starting points, but appear to have seldom added anything considerable to the study itself. Nevertheless, narrativity may also produce some fruitful results.⁴⁶³

In addition to the works discussed above, Ulf Zander (Lund, history) mentioned H. White in the text but did not refer to him in the source list when he wrote a paragraph about tropes and narrativity and their role in historical presentations.⁴⁶⁴ This highlights the point that theoretical insights about narrativity have been only an inspiration or a starting point to understand the nature of historiography, yet they have not offered much for the PhD candidates in the empirical sense. Nevertheless, they may give an unusual form to the dissertations and thus be more interesting for the readers.

In some sense, Ludwig Wittgenstein started the interest in language, and he had some visibility in the dissertations, but they remained scarce. Martin Kusch was one of the first PhD candidates who defended his dissertation *Language as Calculus vs. Language as Universal Medium* within the chair of intellectual history (*aatehistoria*) in the University of Oulu and was supervised by philosopher Jaakko Hintikka. Kusch combined two major traditions of philosophy – continental and analytical – when he interpreted the works of E. Husserl, M. Heidegger, and H-G. Gadamer within a conceptual framework of the analytical philosophy at that time. Although the dissertation was defended within the department of history, or precisely *aatehistoria*, it was throughout philosophical by its nature. The linguistic theme was visible mainly by L. Wittgenstein's views of language and comparing those to that of Heidegger. Kusch applied an interpretational framework to study two types of theories of language within logic, language as the universal medium (logic as universal language) and language as calculus (re-interpretable logic).⁴⁶⁵

Kusch himself is of German origin and his point of view to combine analytical and continental philosophy was largely influenced by the nature of the Finnish tradition to combine continental and Anglo-Saxon philosophical thought. Otherwise, it was a work outside of traditional history and with little reference to historical research.

Tuomas Lehtonen (Helsinki, general history) took another kind of approach in his doctoral dissertation in 1995. Although his theme was the poem *Carmina Burana* within cultural history, he interpreted it as a discursive piece of history in the textual network of its own time, "a discourse which is constructed on the basis of a textual network." What was new in his work was that not only did Lehtonen use philological starting points, but he also combined intellectual and cultural history. The poetry was for him participating in the discursive formation of its environments. Despite referring to the less-frequently applied thought of

⁴⁶² Gustafsson Chorell 2007, 289.

⁴⁶³ Compare, e.g., with Pikkanen 2012, a dissertation with a narrativist starting point and application.

⁴⁶⁴ Zander 2001, 45.

⁴⁶⁵ Kusch 1989, 1, 2-3.

medieval texts as textual or discursive by their nature and where the changes in socio-cultural context were finally conceptualized in poetry, there was no other clear, linguistically oriented method in this work. Scholars from the fields of semantics and literature studies were represented in the research literature, not historians.⁴⁶⁶ Therefore, Lehtonen's work was on the border between history and literature studies.

Suzanne Gieser (Uppsala, history of science and ideas) applied a partially conceptual approach in her dissertation about the correspondence of physicist Wolfgang Pauli (1900–1958) and psychologist C.G. Jung (1875–1961). The main sources of this correspondence were letters between them and, among other topics such as scientific influences, Gieser observed how they used and tended to understand certain scientific concepts of their fields in different contexts. She was interested especially in the concept of "the detached observer," but also terms of positivism, phenomenology, and realism. Gieser herself referred to this as a "concept-critical method" (*begreppskritisk metod*). For this she used L. Wittgenstein's *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus* and its language theories as a background to the conversation of these two scientists.⁴⁶⁷ This was an example of a study, which operated in the field of the history of science, but was at some level interested in the meanings of the words more closely.

Gert Magnusson's (Gothenburg) dissertation within the discipline of the history of science and ideas was about language and method. The relationship between language and the world was an essential starting point for the whole study, and Magnusson pursued a new type of conceptual investigations, and demonstrated them as well. This was done mainly by reflecting on L. Wittgenstein's works and philosophy in the first part of the dissertation. Magnusson ended up with three crucial elements: the meaning of the concepts (dictionaries), the use of the concepts (speaking and writing in different situations), and the limits of meaning and usage (Wittgenstein's theories of the borders of language). General and unique situations of comparing the meanings and usage of concepts were also included, because the exact meanings of words were not in the dictionaries. Magnusson noted also the performative aspect of language, and here referred to J.L. Austin's speech act theory. The contextualization of scientific concepts, such as "analysis" (*analys*), "theory" (*teori*), "method" (*metod*), "word" (*ord*), "category" (*kategori*), and "concept" (*begrepp*), was also treated but, instead of referring to the Cambridge School, it focused on Wittgenstein's and G.H. von Wright's philosophies about quantitative and qualitative research. The example of a concept to demonstrate this in the second part of the dissertation was "ethics," in the context of I. Kant.⁴⁶⁸

The dissertation of Magnusson contributed more to analytic philosophical studies, especially linguistic philosophy, than to historical studies. It was quite a traditional work to present concepts as bridges between language and the world, starting with word meanings in dictionaries, and did not lean on specific primary

⁴⁶⁶ Lehtonen 1995, 30–34.

⁴⁶⁷ Gieser 1995, 8–9, 78–79, 82–83, 85–87.

⁴⁶⁸ Magnusson 2006, 23, 26–28, 30–39, 49, 61–64, 67–69, 101–105, 455–457.

sources. As a conclusion, Magnusson's research was more about the language in science and philosophy, rather than a historic survey about some concrete case study. The form of the dissertation was as well philosophical. The form and the results of the study were also questioned as the opponent, Ola Fransson, stated that the dissertation dealt with themes and contents that we already knew and thus it did not really bring any new information about its main topics, language, and the world.⁴⁶⁹

Among other alternative foreign authors to lean on were the philosopher, semiotician, and literary critic Mikhail Bakhtin (1895–1975) from Russia, and the French philosopher Gilles Deleuze (1925–1995). Kjell Jonsson (Umeå, history of science and ideas) studied the Swedish debate between science and belief during 1870–1920 and referred briefly to Russian philosopher Mikhail Bakhtin about his idea that language is not neutral, and to John Searle's speech acts as well.⁴⁷⁰ This indicates that there were alternative foreign authors to rely on concerning the problematization of language and concepts.

Niklas Olaison (Stockholm, history of science and ideas) studied the paradoxes in T. Hobbes's theories. Q. Skinner was again referred to here as a prominent researcher of the topic, but Olaison himself used conceptual analysis obtained from G. Deleuze. Here he tried to reconstruct Hobbes's thought by trying to see him as a "conceptual persona" (*begreppsliga karaktär*): every philosopher uses the concepts of his/her own time, and these can be seen as motivators and agendas behind someone's thought. Olaison concluded that the conceptual persona in Hobbes was Robinson Crusoe or Adam from the Bible, because he strived to organize the world and re-create civilization.⁴⁷¹

Marie Cronqvist (Lund, history) studied everyday cultural narratives in Sweden during the Cold War, especially how neutrality was seen as a narrative of the era. Cronqvist used various source materials from newspapers to fictional stories, and in the end her own dissertation contained a disposition of a spy drama to present her study in the form of a narrative itself. Narratives were not only reflections of reality, but they mediated between the self and the world and created the order and meaning of life.⁴⁷² In no way was this a traditional dissertation. However, narrativity can also produce added value if it is more exciting for the reader and easier to popularize.

To conclude, direct theoretical inspirations from H. White, F.R. Ankersmit, L. Wittgenstein, and other philosophers of history or philosophers were not so widely used in the dissertations. One reason for this could be that their own works have been highly theoretical, and they have not offered so much to the historical studies, which operate mainly through empirical research. Conceptual history, for example, has given clearer tools for historians to concentrate on concepts. Narrativity and linguistic theories are fascinating and valid in theoretical debates of history, but for PhD candidates they may not

⁴⁶⁹ Fransson 2007, 309, 312.

⁴⁷⁰ Jonsson 1987, 17–18.

⁴⁷¹ Olaison 2001, 18–20, 37–38, 216–217.

⁴⁷² Cronqvist 2004, 41–43, 371.

have brought any clear advantage, at least not during my research period of 1970–2010.⁴⁷³ This is also one of the reasons why I have concentrated more on conceptual history and linguistic contextualism, and to a partial degree, discursivity: they have been easier to write about openly, to formulate, and apply to one's own thesis.

⁴⁷³ See and compare again with Pikkanen 2012.

7 DISCUSSION

After analyzing the methodological sections of the doctoral dissertations from Finland and Sweden within the time frame of 40 years (1970–2010), some conclusive remarks can be made. The processes of transformation, reception, and applications of the various linguistic turns were different in Finland and Sweden, but similarities were also present. Briefly, historians in Finland have been more aware about these particular methodological debates – and combining insights coming from different scholarly cultures – concerning linguistic turns, largely thanks to the status of general history (*yleinen historia*), while in Sweden the most visible applications have occurred within the discipline of the history of ideas and science (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*). However, there were marks of a discursive turn within social history in Sweden, especially concerning dissertations with discourse or gender as a theoretical starting point, a feature that in turn did not have a similar counterpart in Finland.

At the beginning of this study, I divided linguistic turns into five different categories – conceptual history, linguistic contextualism, discursivity, linguistically constructed gender, and narrativity. This was based on the senior theorists (mainly R. Koselleck, Q. Skinner, M. Foucault, J. Scott, and H. White) and the first wave of linguistic turns their works represent. By no means is it a simple task to fit all the works into these generalizing and overlapping categories.⁴⁷⁴ Nevertheless, this was necessary as the first step to get a grasp of the vast and amorphous source material. These international senior scholars and their works have in any case been key sources of the linguistic turns from the methodological side, both internationally and in Scandinavia. Some of the citations in the analyzed historical studies were single references to a certain scholar and his/her methodological and theoretical framework, but there were a few dissertations that included more explicit starting points of linguistically oriented research. I also hope that the bibliography at the end of this study, the compiled list of the dissertations with a reference to linguistic turns and

⁴⁷⁴ See Appendix A: The Studied Dissertations in Chronological Order and their References to the Linguistic Turns.

discussions around them, would further give assistance to other scholars in future.

To summarize, the number of dissertations that referred to the linguistic turns, 63 in Finland and 70 in Sweden, compared with the total number of all dissertations of history, were as follows:

TABLE 8 Linguistic Turns in Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations, 1970–2010

	Finland (63/658=9,6%)	Sweden (70/1072=6,5%)
Conceptual history (R. Koselleck)	29	22
Linguistic contextualism (Q. Skinner)	18	19
Discursivity (M. Foucault)	17	23
Gender history (J. Scott)	17	26
Narrativity (H. White, F. Ankersmit)	10	6

The linguistic turns and the connected influence of social, cultural, and linguistic constructivism have been transnational and multi-sited, and one can conclude that linguistic turns have had dozens of applications in the Finnish and Swedish history dissertations in the studied period. There has been no one major methodological turn but multiple smaller and different turns. This corresponds with the international development, since the inner developments within the five categories of linguistic turns have also renewed since the turn of the 1970. Thus, both internationally and from the Finnish and Swedish perspectives, the linguistic turns in their widest sense have not been simply received and canonized but rather contingently received, applied, and diversified. This also may have been a factor in their slower adaptations.

As one can also see from the table above, some of the PhD candidates clearly used only one methodological approach, for example, concentrated on specific concept(s), while others may have combined different methods and theories with each other. Easiest would be to conclude that each dissertation has had its own and unique way of studying that specific topic and material in one's research. Drawing a bigger picture, political and social topics of history have been complemented, at least partially and under no circumstances in all of them, with the linguistic aspects, that is, to acknowledge the nature, limitations, and possibilities concerning the language of the past.

The linguistic turns have been transferred gradually to the Nordic countries over the decades, and they have been interpreted in many different and partly contradictory ways. First, it was mainly following foreign debates and later using each country's own innovations and applications. The sources for methodological inspirations have gradually changed and widened from Germany to British, American, and French traditions of linguistically oriented approaches.

In many cases these overlapped as well, and combinations of different methodological applications occurred in the dissertations, for instance

combining German conceptual history with British-style linguistic contextualism or to apply both M. Foucault's and J. Scott's theories about discourse. As Leonhard has proposed, reception has different stages from imitation to applying.⁴⁷⁵ In the Swedish and Finnish cases single and unattached references to scholars or the articles of *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe* and applying their methodological starting points typified imitation and adaptation. Systematic linguistically oriented empiric analysis, especially the ones that connected more than one category (e.g. *Begriffsgeschichte* and linguistic contextualism or Foucauldian discursivity combined with gender history), represented full applying of these methodological frameworks.

In the 1970s and early 1980s, there were dissertations in both countries that concentrated on public debates and contained mainly problematizations of concepts. Later, in addition to citing only the key theorists or concentrating only on the meanings of single concepts, conceptual history has had its own national applications in Finland and Sweden. Interest in spatiality, materiality, and mobility was rising slightly as well, although I did not concentrate on those because I was more interested in the first wave of linguistic turns and their applications. Instead, these more recent methodological trends are possible topics for future research.

We can conclude that conceptual history had an impact in Finland and in Sweden, in both temporally and substantially different ways. Conceptual history already had single breakthroughs in Finland before the 2000s, even in the mid-1980s, while in Sweden conceptual studies were more frequent toward the end of the studied period. Different linguistically oriented approaches were also combined, as the case of the linking of long-term conceptual history with contextualism to a certain unique speech moment has shown.

Though maybe any historian should consider studying, or at least acknowledging, the possibilities and problems of the language of the past, conceptual history has been a central theme for a number of dissertations across the decades. To sum up the general trends, R. Koselleck was first scarcely noted among historians contributing to the leading historical journals in Finland and Sweden, but by the end of the 1980s and at the beginning of the 1990s there was a noticeable turn toward being interested in Koselleck's works.

A wider interest toward conceptual history – among the other linguistically oriented approaches – grew further in the turn of the 2000s, making it known also to the broader audience of historians and not only the specialists, especially in Finland after the publication of *Käsitteet liikkeessä*. In some sense the reception of Koselleck in Finland is connected with certain senior scholars acting like trajectories, most notably Markku Hyrkkänen, Henrik Stenius, Pauli Kettunen, and Pasi Ihalainen in the field of history and Kari Palonen, Tuija Pulkkinen, and Jussi Kurunmäki in political science. After them the new generations have adopted conceptual approaches as the state of the art.

⁴⁷⁵ See Leonhard 2011 about imitating, adopting, and applying.

Koselleck had a long career and attempted breakthroughs time to time outside of Bielefeld, but his reception has been different in various academic cultures. The processes of reading and appreciating his works have come along in waves, and in the 2000s he has become an established senior theorist representing one wave of the linguistic turns. In some sense Finland has risen to one of the leading countries in the field of conceptual history and where Koselleck has enjoyed—at least in some circles—an established status. Considering Finland, Koselleck can be seen as a valuable, linguistically oriented authority alongside Skinner, and where various methodological attempts have been made by combining the viewpoints of both.

Based on this, Finland, a country with long-standing academic links to Germany but influenced by the Cold War language policies identifying English with the West, has as a cultural crossroads become in some sense a nexus for German and British methodological trends and discussions. One reason for this is the view of conceptual history as a larger phenomenon than just its German version—that is, including Skinner, separated from the other members of the Cambridge school, as he considers also linguistic conventions, speech acts, and rhetorical transfers highly and has an interest in a broader history of certain concepts.

Henrik Stenius has offered reasons why concentrating on words and conceptual history has gained popularity and created traditions in Finland. According to him, Finland is a young nation that has had two national languages, and during the nation-building in the nineteenth century, the Finnish language had to create its own political terms because they did not exist before.⁴⁷⁶ Truly, Finland may be considered to be a country of academics with unusually high linguistic skills because, besides compulsory Finnish and Swedish, every historian has had knowledge of at least one foreign language. Finland has been a small nation interested in understanding the approaches followed by several great powers.

Furthermore, as Willibald Steinmetz and Michael Freedden have pointed out, conceptual history is not an orthodoxy, and it reinvents itself continuously when it constantly crosses national and disciplinary boundaries.⁴⁷⁷ Conceptual history and linguistic contextualism have had supporters also in Sweden, most notably Bo Lindberg, and the applications by him and the dissertations of Jonas Hansson, Mikael Alm, Anders Sundin, Jonas Harvard, and Kristian Petrov demonstrated Swedish examples of how to study concepts in different unique speech acts, or Kristiina Savin in the 2010s.

Compared to Finland, the pace of reception has been slower, and in the overall picture, comparing and relating the situation of Finland and Sweden with the trends in the Anglophone world, the delay seems to be at least 20 years—that is, as far as there has been any reception of *Begriffsgeschichte* in the Anglophone world at all.⁴⁷⁸ The developments of linguistically oriented methods have clearly

⁴⁷⁶ Stenius 2007, 7–8.

⁴⁷⁷ Steinmetz & Freedden 2017, 31.

⁴⁷⁸ Whatmore 2016, 33.

had different paces. The scholarly effect has been bound to individual people, with their extended networks, and network analysis of the reception of scholarly trends (supervisors, research groups, and projects) is also a possible project in future.

When we move to discursive historical research, the discourse attached to Foucault has been seen and described in several ways, as he has been an inspirator (or at least an object of reference) for many. Sometimes there has existed the danger that the theoretical part of the dissertation remained loose, a mere reflection of scholarly “fashions,” and the discursive theory was not carried on to the analysis sections.

The concept of *discourse* has in several dissertations simply meant speech about something, and the final study indeed may have concentrated on the language of the past, but the nature of discourse was not analyzed further. This is a sign that discourse could certainly be understood in many ways – and when a PhD student had to develop his/her theoretical framework for the study, it was quite easy to state that the subject of the study contained sections about discourses. Saying that one applies the discursive method in the study sometimes only makes simple things more difficult, when in the end it is only about reading discussions (or debates, speeches) in the selected source materials.

On the contrary, Finnish dissertations that developed discursivity out from its Foucauldian sense were highlighted (Valtonen 2004, Vuorinen 2010) in the reviews. In Sweden, methodologically the notion of discourse was changing, especially in the five dissertations defended in Lund: Nilsson 1999, Lindberg 2001, Bergenlöv 2004, Carls 2004, and Holgersson 2005. These can be interpreted as a discursive turn within social history – a feature that did not occur on the same scale in the Finnish dissertations of my research period, except in Swedish-language Åbo Akademi (Liljeström 1995, Östman 2000), which reflects a transnational connection created by a shared natural language that was weaker in the case of Finnish speakers. In these works, the theoretical parts were combined successfully with the empirical study, and the theoretical insight did not remain loose from it.

Briefly, the conception of discourse was changing, and it was not applied in its original Foucauldian⁴⁷⁹ and deterministic sense anymore, at least not in all the cases. However, this process was rather slow and happened only gradually by the beginning of the 2000s. For example, the dissertations by Henrik Berggren, Mikael Alm, or Marja Vuorinen contributed to the debate by defining discourse in their own way – they did not see discourse as defining and restricting in its strictest form, but rather it was a tool to summarize different and crossing discussions around one certain subject. Thus, at least some historians dared to use the concept of discourse in their works freely, and applications of discursively oriented methods have become more usual in a softer sense, that is, not restricted to the form of discourse as determining context and agency.

Further, debates between the dissertations and their reviews clarified also attitudes toward the usefulness of linguistically oriented methods. Some of the

⁴⁷⁹ See Ihalainen & Saarinen 2019 for hard and soft discourse.

reviews in both countries were positive and recommending, while some expressed more doubtful thoughts about concentrating on language, or especially on *discourse*, which has been through the decades a highly contested concept within historical studies—whether the discourse was seen as the frame for thought and language and as a creator of language or discourse as linguistic action with a nature of its own. Naturally, neutral views were also voiced, but in a wider sense, the concept of discourse was gradually distanced from its original, Foucauldian meaning.

Besides Foucault, J. Scott was also mentioned many times when the theoretical base of the study was built on a discursive base. Further, Scott and her theory about linguistically constructed gender was referred to many times in the dissertations and almost any time when the topic was about gender. However, the most important core of Scott's theories has not been considered to be the construction of gender through linguistic practices, but the construction itself in a more social or cultural sense. Indeed, gender can be constructed in many various ways and linguistic practices are just one of those, among others. That also explains why not everyone who has read Scott has been interested in her linguistic side of gender construction theory.

To complete the analysis of referring to various linguistic turns, direct theoretical inspirations from H. White, F.R. Ankersmit, L. Wittgenstein, and other philosophers of history or philosophers were not so widely used in the dissertations as they have provided little guidelines for or examples of empirical research. These cases were unique and the references to narrativistic works remained mainly in a small role, or the works were clearly historiographical (Björk 1983, Pihlainen 1999, and Sivula 2006) by their topics.

One reason for this could be that their own works have been highly theoretical, and they have not offered so much to the historical studies, which operate mainly through empirical research. Conceptual history, for example, has given clearer tools for historians to concentrate on concepts. Narrativity and linguistic theories are fascinating and valid in theoretical debates of history, but for PhD candidates they may have not brought any clear advantage, at least not during my research period of 1970–2010.⁴⁸⁰

It seems that the rhetoric around the term linguistic turn reflects a change in history, but at the same time it is also some kind of motor for the change. This process can be seen also as a series of speech acts.

The similarities and differences between the countries is thus reflected also in the case of linguistic turns. National specialties include the division of different disciplines, in this case the role of Finnish general history (*yleinen historia*) and the Swedish history of science and ideas (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*). They, thanks to the character of the discipline, have contributed more to the internationalization of the scholarly field as well as to linguistically oriented methods than other disciplines of history in these countries. *Idé- och lärdomshistoria* has taken a place in Sweden since its establishment in 1936. While *yleinen historia* has been

⁴⁸⁰ Compare with Pikkanen 2012.

internationally oriented and taken inspirations both from Germany and Britain, *idé-och lärdomshistoria* has found the Cambridge School to rely on dozens of its dissertations. Here the adoption and application of linguistic turns revert again, at least on some level, to the actions of individual scholars, and in this case most notably to Sven-Eric Liedman, Torbjörn Gustafsson-Chorell, and Mats Persson.

In the end we can summarize that linguistic turns have had a clearly growing visibility during the research period, and the language of the past is taken more seriously in the 2000s. Studies have not concentrated solely on concepts but have expanded our understanding about language – language has not been treated as a neutral medium, but its relations to actions and thinking have become more widely acknowledged. Also, such scholars who do not apply linguistically oriented approaches by themselves are more and more aware of the many-sided nature of language, and this was demonstrated by how studies of conceptual history were referred to also in the kind of dissertations that did not concentrate on language. Further, the structure of the dissertations in both countries requires methodological and theoretical sections and referring to widely known international scholars is one solution for that. This has not always meant that the theories would have been actively or successfully applied in the empirical chapters.

On the contrary, not all historians are interested in language as historical processes have always had non-linguistic aspects as well. Further, proving who is interested or not, or what exactly is the interest toward language, is already a much more complicated issue. If less than 10 percent of the dissertations in Finland and Sweden contained a reference to the senior scholars I have selected, does it mean that all the other dissertations, over 90 percent, were not interested in language at all? I doubt that, but I have made my choices to restrict my study, and its results should be interpreted with this reservation. Still, the majority of historians were not involved in discussions about linguistic turns, but dissertations and journals had their role to play as a visible but silent marker.

I consider that the biggest difference between Finland and Sweden, in the case of linguistic turns, is that in Finland a generation of historians with an interest in language already existed in the 1970s and 1980s (e.g., Aira Kemiläinen, Sisko Haikala, and Markku Hyrkkänen). During the 1990s there arose the second generation (e.g., Markku Peltonen and Pasi Ihalainen) and in the 2000s already the third one (e.g., Jouko Nurmiainen). In Sweden, on the contrary, early conceptual studies (János Perényi and Bengt Lundberg in 1979) remained solitary attempts and did not receive followers in as linear a fashion as the conceptual studies in Finland. Linguistic turns emerged in Sweden within the discipline of history in the 1990s (e.g., H. Berggren), and the second generation appeared in the 2000s (e.g., Mikael Alm and Anders Sundin).

Based on these findings, my conclusion is that the interest toward language has had longer traditions in Finland and it has been carried on in a more linear way, or at least without significant breaks – thus, there has been one generation of linguistically oriented historians more in Finland than in Sweden. An explanation for this is the earlier internationalization of historical research, the

maintenance of links to Germany, and the addition of links to Britain to their side. Methodological flows have in these cases moved first from Germany to Finland and later the British influx has been partially combined with this. In Sweden, the methodological flows have been, in proportion to Finland, minor and it has not been the same kind of forum or nexus for German and British combinations. Discussions have remained more likely leaning either toward German or British links, but not so likely to combine these two.

The concentration on language has grown during the research period, and I assume this trend will continue despite continuing counter-trends. In the 2010s, the interaction and connections between language, thinking, and actions have become more acknowledged. Further, the cooperation between different disciplines and consequent methodological cross-fertilization in the humanities has become more common. At this point it is necessary to stress that historical studies have borrowed many of their methods from outside, as this research has also shown. For example, Osmo Jussila stressed in his concept-historical dissertation of 1969 that his study is somewhere between historical and language studies. Besides linguistics, methodological and theoretical inspirations have been taken from political studies, philosophy, gender studies, and so on.

I claim that different divisions between historical disciplines have had their effect on this process. Based on the source material I have studied, there exist both positive and negative sides because of the division of the historical disciplines. In Finland, general history has been internationally oriented, which is validated when we look the amount of citations and references to foreign methodological works. In turn, the national history in Sweden is more national than in Finland, although that the discipline of *idé- och lärdomshistoria* has been more open to foreign methodological and theoretical inputs than the actual discipline of history. Thus I conclude, that the internalization of historical studies could have been more comprehensive, if the mainstream history would not have ignored the studies within general history and history of science and ideas.

In conclusion, the influence of the first wave of linguistic turns has been diverse and varied, but in the end, it has had clear effects on the historical disciplines at the national level. At first, linguistically oriented approaches were used by individual scholars, but over the decades they have been acknowledged more widely. From single scholars there have slowly arisen groups of scholars with a shared interest in the language of the past. In some sense, even some schools, at least unofficially, have emerged – for example, by the cooperation of political science and history (Jyväskylä and Helsinki Center for Intellectual History) or the tradition of seeing texts in their contexts, like Q. Skinner has emphasized (history of science and ideas in Gothenburg). From the viewpoint of the universities, some clear centers concentrating on various forms of linguistic turns are visible and the role of individuals is as well considerable. Over the decades, a few names appear more frequently as a PhD candidate, supervisor, opponent, or reviewer.

It is presumable that interest in the language of the past will not disappear as the rise of digital history rather supports it as it is mainly about texts and words that are being analyzed. The cooperation between the different disciplines of humanities will continue and the Finnish and Swedish applications of linguistically oriented approaches will presumably evolve further, to accommodate more solidly the local surroundings and research. Hopefully, there also will be more extensive cooperation between the Finnish and Swedish historians on methodological matters as well.

SUMMARY IN FINNISH

Menneisyyden kieli vakavasti otettuna: Kielelliset käänteet suomalaisissa ja ruotsalaisissa historian väitöskirjoissa, 1970–2010

Ihmistieteissä viimeisen kuudenkymmenen vuoden ajan vaikuttanut ns. kielellinen käänne on rantautunut asteittain myös historian tutkimuksen puolelle. Tässä tutkimussuuntauksessa menneisyyden kieli otetaan vakavasti ja sille annetaan analyysissa keskeinen rooli. Kieltä ei ymmärretä enää pelkkänä sanoman välittäjänä vaan aktiivisena tekijänä ajatusten ja toiminnan yhteydessä. Ulkomaisessa, lähinnä brittiläisessä, saksalaisessa, ranskalaisessa ja yhdysvaltalaisessa historiantutkimuksessa, tämä muutos alkoi 1970-luvun taitteessa ja sen ensimmäisen aallon auktoreihin kuuluvat mm. Quentin Skinner, Reinhart Koselleck, Joan Scott, Hayden White ja Michel Foucault. Näiden menetelmiä ja teorioita käsitelleet julkaisut edustavat empiirisesti ja teoreettisesti hyvin erilaisia näkökulmia, sillä heillä kaikilla on ollut erilainen lähestymistapa kielen kautta tapahtuvaan menneisyyden tutkimukseen.

Historiantutkijat ovat yleensäkin ymmärtäneet kielellisen käänteen monella eri tavalla. Välillä on myös vaikea täsmentää, mitä kielellinen käänne eksplisiittisesti on ja mitä se mahdollisesti sisältää. Vaikka kyseinen termi tuli käyttöön 1960-luvun lopulla, ei varsinainen keskittyminen kielen monimuotoisuuden ja ominaisuuksiin ole pelkästään 1970-luvun taitteen ilmiö, sillä sen juuria voidaan jäljittää ainakin Ludwig Wittgensteinin analyyttiseen kielifilosofiaan asti. Kielellinen käänne on vaikuttanut melko lailla kaikilla ihmistieteiden aloilla, mutta historian alalla selvimmin lähinnä aatehistoriassa, uudessa poliittisessä historiassa sekä *gender*-tutkimuksessa.

Tässä tutkimuksessa käytetään monikkomuotoista ”kielellisten käänteiden” käsitettä, koska historiantutkimuksessa ei voida väittää tapahtuneen mitään yksittäistä ja yhtenäistä käännettä. Yhden laajan käänteen sijaan menneisyyden kielen keskittyvät suuntaukset ovat ulottuneet tutkimuslähtöisestä, empiriaan ja alkuperäislähteisiin pohjautuvasta käsite- ja aatehistoriasta kiistanalaisempiin postmoderneihin teorioihin. Kyseessä on siis pikemmin sarjasta useita pienempiä käänteitä kuin yhdestä monoliittisestä käänteestä. Kielelliset käänteet eivät siis ole olleet mikään yhtenäinen ja homogeeninen tapahtumasarja vaan hyvinkin monitahoinen ilmiö tai prosessi.

Kielellisten käänteiden vastaanoton selvittäminen on relevanttia, koska menetelmien rantautumista suomalaiseen ja ruotsalaiseen historiantutkimukseen ei tarkemmin tunneta, vaikka ne nykyään vaikuttavat entistä selvemmin ja ovat aiempaa suuremman tutkijakunnan käytössä. Nykyinen tutkimus olisi hyvin erilaista ilman monimuotoisen menneisyyden kielen huomioonottamista. Samalla tämä tarjoaa näkökulman suomalaisen ja ruotsalaisen tutkimuskulttuurin yleisempään tarkasteluun, koska se mittaa tutkimuksen avoimuutta uusia menetelmiä kohtaan ja sitä kautta ilmentää tutkimustraditioiden ja vaihtoehtoisten lähestymistapojen vahvuutta. Historiantutkimukseen kielelliset käänteet ovat saapuneet lähialoilta, kuten valtio-opista, joissa ne myös ovat vaikuttaneet selkeämmin.

Kielelliset käännteet ovat siis mullistaneet tutkimusta, mutta tutkimatta on jäänyt, mikä niiden omaksumisen merkitys on ollut historian alalla Suomessa ja Ruotsissa.

Tutkimuksen metodologinen ja teoreettinen pohja on yllirajaisen vastaanoton ja vertailevan tutkimuksen alueella. Vertaileva tutkimusote auttaa näkemään Suomen ja Ruotsin historiantutkimuksen tilanteet ulkopuolisen silmin ja nostaa esille vaihtoehtoisia kehityskulkuja. Vastaanottoteoriaan tukeutuen käsitelien suomalaisia ja ruotsalaisia historiantutkijoita yleisönä, joka seuraa (tai ei seuraa) muiden maiden menetelmäkeskusteluja ja soveltaa kielellisiä käännteitä omissa tutkimuksissaan. Menetelmä- ja teoriasovellukset ovat siis jo täällä olemassa olleiden perinteiden ja pääasiassa ulkopuolelta tulleiden metodivirtausten sekoitusta.

Alkuperäisaineistona ovat historian alan väitöskirjat kummastakin maasta aikaväliltä 1970–2010. Väitöskirjat ovat toimiva ja vertailtavissa oleva aineisto, kun otetaan huomioon maiden yhteinen historia sekä tiedeinstituutioiden yhteiset juuret. Lisäksi tutkintosäännösten mukaan väitöskirjoissa vaaditaan teoria- ja menetelmäosio, myös tutkittavan ajanjakson alkuvaiheessa, mikä edelleen perustelee niiden käyttökelpoisuutta menetelmiin keskittyvässä tutkimuksessa. Väitöskirjojen lisäksi on käytetty myös niistä kirjoitettuja arvioita, jotta kielellisten käännteiden soveltamiseen saadaan arvioiva ääni seniorisukupolvelta. Edellisten lisäksi on käytetty tukevana lähdeaineistona Suomessa ja Ruotsissa ilmestyneitä tieteellisiä aikakauskirjoja (Suomen osalta *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* ja *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*; Ruotsin osalta *Historisk Tidskrift, Scandia* ja *Lychnos*) väitöskirjoissa käydyn menetelmällisen keskustelun taustaksi ja kontekstiksi. Väitöskirjat korpuksena ovat vain yksi mahdollinen lähdeaineisto, ja tutkittavia teemoja sekä tutkijoita rajautuu niiden pohjalta väistämättä pois. Siteerausten ja viitteiden laskemiseen perustuvalla lähestymistavalla päästään kuitenkin vertailukelpoisiin tuloksiin, erityisesti kun kyse on kahden maan vertailusta neljän vuosikymmenen ajalta.

Edellä mainitut kielellisten käännteiden ensimmäisen aallon suuntaukset eroavat siis selkeästi toisistaan sekä empiirisesti että teoreettisesti. Kuitenkin täytyy muistaa, että kielelliset käännteet eivät ole koskaan olleet historiantutkimuksen valtavirtaa edes omissa maissaan ja kielialueillaan, vaan ne ovat niissäkin olleet vähemmistöliikkeitä. Lisäksi kielellisen käännteiden alun tai käännekohtien mielletään liittyvän eri aloilla vahvasti johonkin yksittäiseen teokseen tai artikkeliin kuten vaikkapa Skinnerin ”Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas” -artikkeliin, Whiten *Metahistory*-teokseen tai Scottin ”Gender”-artikkeliin. Myös näiden ns. alkupisteiden jälkeen kielellisesti suuntautuneet menetelmät ovat kehittyneet paljon ajan mittaan, joten mistään yhtenäisestä ilmiöstä ei voi todellakaan puhua. 2000-luvulla tapahtuneet kielellisten metodien innovaatiot, kuten tilallinen käänne tai liikkuvuuden korostaminen, alkavat olla jo eriytyneitä itsenäisiksi näkökulmiksi.

Historiantutkijoiden kiinnostus menneisyyden kieltä kohtaan on mielekästä ymmärtää yhtä suurta ja yhtenäistä käännettä laajempaan sarjana useita erilaisia ja pienempiä käännteitä. Tämä ilmiö on ollut nähtävillä myös Suomen ja

Ruotsin historiografiassa: erilaisia lähtökohtia painottavat kielellisesti suuntautuneet menetelmät ovat ilmenneet erilaisina sovelluksina väitöskirjoissa, käsitehistoriasta aina narrativistisiin lähtökohtiin asti. Toisaalta suhteutettuna koko historian väitöskirjojen kokonaismäärään tutkittavalta ajanjaksolta ei kielellisiä käännteitä voida ainakaan ennen 2010-lukua pitää hallitsevana suuntauksena. Ainoastaan noin yhdeksässä prosentissa Suomessa ja kuudessa prosentissa Ruotsissa puolustetuista väitöskirjoista on viitattu kielellisiin käännteisiin, ja näistäkin vain osassa on sovellettu niitä varsinaisessa tutkimuksessa.

Kiteyttäen voidaan sanoa, että sekä Suomessa että Ruotsissa kielellisesti suuntautuneiden menetelmien vaikutteita omaksuttiin aluksi hitaasti, usein yksittäisten tutkijoiden tuomina ja käyttäminä, mutta hiljattain laajemman tutkijayhteisön tiedostamina. Käytetty tutkimusaineisto osoittaa selvän ajallisen muutoksen. Kielellinen käänne alkoi näkyä selkeästi vasta 1990- ja 2000-luvuilla, vaikka sen teoreettiset kansainväliset sovellutukset oli julkaistu 1970-luvun taitteessa. Väitöskirjojen ja kielellisten käännteiden sekä absoluuttinen että suhteellinen osuus on selvästi kasvanut kummassakin maassa koko ajanjakson aikana:

TAULUKKO 9 Viittaukset kielellisiin käännteisiin väitöskirjoissa. Selite: Kaikki väitökset – historian väitöskirjojen kokonaismäärä; KK – historian väitöskirjat, joissa on viitattu kielellisiin käännteisiin; KK osuus – kielellisiin käännteisiin viitaneiden väitöskirjojen osuus kaikista väitöskirjoista. Lähde: Suomessa ja Ruotsissa 1970–2010 puolustetut historian väitöskirjat.

Ajanjakso	Suomi			Ruotsi		
	<i>Kaikki</i>	<i>KK</i>	<i>KK osuus</i>	<i>Kaikki</i>	<i>KK</i>	<i>KK osuus</i>
1970-1979	64	3	4,7 %	180	2	1,1 %
1980-1989	83	6	7,2 %	159	5	3,1 %
1990-1999	205	17	8,3 %	271	21	7,7 %
2000-2010	306	37	12,1 %	462	42	9,1 %
Yhteensä	658	63	9,6 %	1072	70	6,5 %

Vaikka kielellisten käännteiden substanssit esiteltiin ulkomaisissa julkaisuissa jo 1970-luvun taitteessa, niiden läpimurtoa ei suomalaisissa ja ruotsalaisissa väitöskirjoissa näe oikeastaan ennen 1990-lukua. Tämä pätee kumpaankin maahan, mutta kun suhteutetaan kaikkiin historian väitöksiin, ovat kielelliset käännteet vaikuttaneet Suomessa vahvemmin kauttaaltaan jokaisena vuosikymmenenä. Kielellisten käännteiden osuus on hiljalleen ollut nousussa, etenkin 1990-luvun alusta lähtien. Yleisesti ottaen Ruotsissa on ilmestynyt enemmän väitöskirjoja kuin Suomessa, mikä on luonnollista suuremman väestöpohjan perusteella, mutta Suomessa niissä on suhteellisesti useammin viitattu kielellisiin käännteisiin. 2000-luvulla jo noin joka kymmenes väitöskirja on jollain tasolla ottanut kielelliset käännteet huomioon. Edelleen täytyy ottaa huomioon se, että edellinen taulukko sisältää ne väitöskirjat, joissa on viitattu kielellisiin käännteisiin. Jos väitöskirjassa on viitattu esimerkiksi käsitehistoriaan, ei se vielä tarkoita sitä, että kyseistä menetelmää olisi käytetty itse tutkimuksessa.

Kielellinen käänne ei varsinkaan ensimmäisinä vuosikymmeninä ole näkynyt kovin vahvana kummankaan maan väitöskirjoissa, mutta kielellisten käännteiden piiriin luettavien väitöskirjojen suhteellinen osuus on selkeästi kasvanut koko ajanjaksolla. Tämä kartoitus on keskeinen tutkimustulos ja lähtökohta, joka osoittaa kielellisesti suuntautuneiden menetelmien olleen vähemmistössä ja osittain marginaalissa. Tämä kuitenkin kertoo siitä, miten kielen merkitys on ainakin tiedostettu jo yleisemmällä historian tutkimuksen tasolla.

Olenaisempaa on kuitenkin ajallinen ja laadullinen muutos: kielellisesti suuntautunut historian tutkimus on lisääntynyt ajan saatossa kummassakin maassa, ja myös yleisesti väitöskirjojen lukumäärä on samalla selkeästi kasvanut. 1970-luvulla varsinaiset kielellisesti suuntautuneet menetelmät olivat väitöskirjoissa harvinaisia, mutta joitakin yksittäisten käsitteiden systemaattisia tutkimuksia (Suomessa U. Paananen 1972, Ruotsissa B. Lundberg 1979 ja J. Perényi 1979) ilmestyi. 1980-luvulta alkaen Suomessa otettiin jo kattavammin huomioon käsitehistorian merkittäviä tutkimuksia ja sovellettiin menetelmiä kansainvälisestikin merkittävällä tavalla (S. Haikala 1985, M. Hyrkkänen 1986, H. Salmi 1993, H. Lempa 1993, M. Peltonen 1994). Kiinnostavasti verraten Ruotsissa ei ollut 1980-luvulla käsitehistoriallisia väitöstutkimuksia ja varsinaiset kielellisesti suuntautuneet tutkimukset nousivat esille vasta 1990-luvulla (Å. Abrahamsson 1990, H. Berggren 1995, S. Gieser 1995). Tällä saralla Suomi on siis yhden tutkijasukupolven verran ruotsalaisia edellä.

Kielelliset ulottuvuudet ovat näkyneet yksittäisten käsitteiden tutkimisen ohella tulkittaessa lähdeaineistoja laajempien diskursiivisten prosessien näkökulmasta, kun kielellinen ulottuvuus on otettu huomioon tulkittaessa perinteisiä sosiaali- ja poliittisen historian lähdeaineistoja, kuten lehdistöä ja muita julkista keskustelua sisältäviä lähteitä (P. Ihalainen 1999, K. Multamäki 1999, A. Helo 1999). 2000-luvulla kielelliset käännteet ovat vaikuttaneet selkeästi kummassakin maassa: Ruotsissa ne ovat tehneet läpimurron (M. Alm 2002, A. Sundin 2006, J. Harvard 2006, P. Landgren 2008, A. Ers 2008), kun taas Suomessa ne ovat johtaneet pitkäkestoisten käsitteiden tutkimuksen yhdistämiseen ainutkertaisten puhetekojen kanssa (P. Torsti 2003, T. Tuikka 2007, J. Wassholm 2008, J. Nurmiainen 2009, M. Pekkola 2010). Tällainen eri maista saatujen vaikutteiden luova yhdistäminen on osaltaan nostanut Suomen yhdeksi käsitehistorian keskuksiksi Euroopassa.

Sekä Scottiin että Foucault'hon viittaavat väitöstutkimukset ovat olleet merkkejä eräänlaisesta diskursiivisesta käännteestä sosiaalishistorian sisällä. Useimmille historian tutkijoille Foucault edustaa diskursiivisuutta, mutta myös Scottin *gender*-teoria pohjautui diskursiivisuuteen, sillä sen mukaan sukupuolta on konstruoitu mm. kielenkäytön kautta. Tällä alalla Ruotsi on ollut Suomea edellä, sillä siellä lähtökohdiltaan laajan diskursiivisia väitöskirjoja on ilmestynyt tasaisesti 1990-luvun alusta alkaen (mm. Å. Bergenheim 1994, E. Elgán 1994, G. Andersson 1998). Suomessa tällaiset tutkimukset jäivät ennen vuosituhannen vaihtumista yksittäisiksi (K. Immonen 1987, M. Liljeström 1995) ja varsinainen käänne toteutui vasta 2000-luvulla (mm. A-C. Östman 2000, H. Valtonen 2004, M. Vuorinen 2010).

Whiten ja Ankersmitin edustamaa narratologista otetta ei sen sijaan ole esiintynyt historian väitöskirjojen menetelmäosuuksissa kovinkaan paljon, ja viittaukset ovat jääneet lähinnä yksittäisiksi maininnoiksi historian teoreetikoista. Syynä tähän on se, että varsin teoreettiset näkemykset historiasta teksteinä eivät näytä tarjonneen riittävästi lähtökohtia empiiriselle tutkimukselle. Narratiivisuuteen laajasti viittanneet väitöskirjat ovat olleet puhtaasti historiateoreettisia (esim. R. Björk 1983, K. Pihlainen 1999, A. Sivula 2006).

Kun tarkastellaan edellä mainittuun tapaan saksalaisen käsitehistorian ja brittiläisen lingvistisen kontekstualismin soveltamista sekä yhdistämistä, on Suomi ollut Ruotsia kauemmin eräänlainen solmukohta näiden traditioiden omaksumisessa. Ruotsissa puolestaan vastaanotto on jäänyt lähinnä brittiläiseen metodikeskusteluun viittaamiseksi: esimerkiksi Skinneriä on toisinaan käytetty enemmän tutkimuskirjallisuutena kuin menetelmällisenä innoittajana. Vaikka ruotsalaisissa väitöskirjoissa on toki viitattu ajoittain myös käsitehistoriaan, ei Ruotsia voi käyttämäni lähdeaineiston pohjalta sanoa samanlaiseksi eri metodisuuntausten ja -keskustelujen kohtauspaikaksi kuin Suomea. Tästä voi tehdä johtopäätöksen, että Suomessa käsitehistoria on nähty laajempaan kokonaisuuteen kuin pelkästään sen puhdas saksalainen versio. Historiantutkimus on Suomessa ollut myös suhteellisen avoin eri suunnista omaksutuille vaikutteille, kielellisten käänteiden tapauksessa erityisesti valtio-opista tulleille syötteille. Samanlainen ilmiö, joskin hieman pienemmässä mittakaavassa, on havaittavissa myös Ruotsin tapauksessa.

Esimerkiksi käsitehistoriaan viittaavia väitöskirjoja on vuosina 1970–2010 ollut Suomessa yhteensä 26 ja Ruotsissa 21. Vastaavasti Quentin Skinnerin kielellistä kontekstualisointia korostaviin töihin on viitattu 16 suomalaisessa ja 20 ruotsalaisessa väitöskirjassa. Mielenkiintoista näiden kahden eri suuntauksen (käsitehistorian ja lingvistisen kontekstualismin) viittauksissa on se, että yhteensä 11 suomalaisessa väitöskirjassa on yhdistelty nämä lähestymistavat ja viitattu kumpaankin metodologiaan. Näin on tehty tasaisesti jo 1980-luvun puolivälistä alkaen. Ruotsissa näitä menetelmiä yhdisteleviä väitöskirjoja on ollut koko tutkittavalla ajanjaksolla kuusi, joista viisi on valmistunut 2000-luvulla.

Kielellisten käänteiden vastaanotossa Suomen ja Ruotsin välillä on siis yhtäläisyyksiä, kuten väitöskirjamäärien tasainen kasvaminen. Erot puolestaan johtuvat osittain maiden tutkimuskulttuurien rakenteellisesta erilaisuudesta. Esimerkiksi Suomen käsitehistoriallisista väitöksistä suurin osa (16 väitöskirjaa, yhteensä 26) on valmistunut yleisen historian oppiaineesta, ja yleisen historian piiriin ovat kuuluneet esimerkiksi kaikki käsitehistorialliset väitöskirjat ennen vuotta 2000. Ruotsissa taas puolet (11/22) kaikista käsitehistoriaan viittaavista väitöstutkimuksista tehtiin aate- ja oppihistorian oppiaineessa (*idé- och lärdomshistoria*), vaikka tutkittavan ajanjakson aikana oppiaineesta väitöksiä oli yhteensä vain 210 (vrt. historian oppiaineen 862). Erot ovat lähinnä oppiainekohtaisia kuin eri yliopistojen välisiä. Suomessa yleisen historian oppiaineen väitöskirjoissa on Ruotsia kauemmin viitattu ulkomaiseen keskusteluun, ja 2000-luvulla tämä on ulottunut enenevässä määrin myös muihin oppiaineisiin kuten

Suomen historiaan. Tähän on vaikuttanut yleisen historian luonne, jossa substanssikysymyksissä on pitänyt viitata ulkomaiseen tutkimukseen. Tällaisten oppiaineiden korostumiset kuitenkin herättävät kysymyksiä siitä, miten eri historian oppiaineet ovat käyneet keskenään dialogia omissa maissaan. Vaikuttaa siltä, että yhteiskuntahistoriallisesti suuntautunut valtavirtahistoria on sivuuttanut yleisen historian ja *idé- och lärdomshistorian* oppiaineissa tehdyn tutkimuksen, eikä eri oppiaineiden välinen yhteistyö ole ollut välttämättä kovinkaan läheistä.

Edellä olevan perusteella suomalainen historian tutkimus on tietyiltä osin ollut suhteellisen avoin kansainvälisille trendeille. Kielelliset käänteet ovat näkyneet erityisesti yleisessä historiassa, koska siellä on tällä alueella selvä tutkimustraditio. Suomessa onkin ollut nousevaa käsitehistorian perinnettä jo 1960-luvulla, eli siis jo ennen varsinaisen saksalaisen käsitehistorian alkua, vaikkakin myös tämän taustalla oli saksalaisia vaikutteita. Tämä oli havaittavissa erityisesti Aira Kemiläisen ja Osmo Jussilan tutkimuksissa. Esimerkiksi Kemiläisen *Nationalism*-tutkimus vuodelta 1964 käsitteli nationalismia ja siihen liittyvien käsitteiden ongelmia sekä monimerkityksellisiä sisältöjä. Sekä Kemiläinen että Jussila olivat myös julkaisseet *Historiallisessa Aikakauskirjassa* käsitehistoriaan kiinteästi liittyviä artikkeleita 1960-luvulla. Tämä on osaltaan antanut Suomelle otollisemman lähtökohdan kielellisesti suuntautuneiden menetelmien omaksumiseen: käsitehistorian traditio on luonut Suomessa kielellisen käänteiden lähtökohdat. Toisaalta Ruotsissa on varsinaisesta historiasta erillään olevan *idé- och lärdomshistorian* parissa oltu kiinnostuneita kielellisestä kontekstualismista. Lisäksi *gender*-teorioihin viittaaminen on Ruotsissa ollut Suomea yleisempää.

Taustalla ovat vaikuttaneet myös yleisemmät kehityskulut mm. tieteellisten kansainvälisten suhteiden ja kielten opetuksen muodossa. Suomessa on säilynyt pidempään saksalainen tutkimustraditio ja paikalliset tutkijat, esimerkiksi Kemiläinen, Markku Hyrkkänen sekä paljon historian tutkimukseen vaikuttanut valtio-opin Kari Palonen, ovat opettaneet sitä edelleen. Sekä Saksan että saksan kielen asema merkittävänä ulkomaisena vaikuttajana säilyi Suomessa 1970-luvulle saakka, minkä jälkeen Ison-Britannian sekä englannin vaikutus on kasvanut voimakkaasti. Ruotsissa puolestaan tieteelliset suhteet Saksaan olivat höllentyneet jo ennen toista maailmansotaa.

Tällaiset tulokset mahdollistavat yleisten päätelmien tekemisen maiden historiografiasta ja kansainvälisistä suuntautuneisuuksista. Koska kielellisillä käänteillä on selkeä kansainvälinen tausta, niiden vaikutus suomalaiseen ja ruotsalaiseen historian tutkimukseen heijastaa myös maiden kansainvälistä (uudelleen-)suuntautumista. Siinä missä Ruotsissa tieteelliset suhteet Saksaan heikkenivät jo ensimmäisen maailmansodan jälkeen, hallitsi saksalainen tutkimustraditio Suomessa pidempään. Tämä näkyy mm. siinä, miten saksa oli erityisesti yleisen historian väitöskirjojen kielenä 1980-luvulle asti, kunnes Suomi on integroitunut englanninkieliseen maailmaan mukaan. 2010-luvulle tultaessa angloamerikkalainen maailma on jo pitkälti syrjäyttänyt Saksan ja saksan kielen aseman. Useassa suomalaisessa väitöskirjassa on esimerkiksi yhdistelty saksalaista alkuperää oleva käsitehistoria brittiläiseen kielelliseen kontekstualismiin, mikä osoit-

taa, että Suomi on ainakin jollakin tasolla ollut näiden suuntausten menetelmällisten keskustelujen risteyspaikka. Ruotsissa puolestaan on viitattu yleensä vain pelkästään jompaankumpaan, joko saksalaiseen tai brittiläiseen menetelmäkirjallisuuteen, mikä osoittaa, etteivät metodivirtaukset ole siellä sekoittuneet Suomen tavoin.

Yhteenvedon voidaan todeta, että kielellisten käännteiden soveltamisella on kansainvälinen, ylirajainen ja eri tieteenalat ylittävä tausta, joka on yhdistynyt paikalliseen kansalliseen tutkimustraditioon erilaisten sovellutusten kautta. Juuri liikkuvuus eri muodoissaan ja tasoilla – tutkijoiden, tutkimusryhmien ja ideoiden – on huomionarvoista, koska kielellisillä käännteillä on vahvat kansainväliset taustat ja niiden läpimurrot ovat vaatineet ainakin jonkintasoista kansainvälisen keskustelun seuraamista. Tämä ei kuitenkaan tarkoita sitä, etteivätkö menetelmät olisi voineet kehittyä muulla tavoin – kansainvälisen/kansallisen tasot eivät sulje pois toinen toistaan eivätkä liioin hedelmällistä menetelmäkeskustelua: viitatus tutkimuksen kansallisten taustojen moninaisuus ei määritä tutkimuksen tai menetelmiä koskevan keskustelun laatua. Lisäksi edelleen on syytä muistaa, että kielellisesti suuntautunut historiantutkimus on vain yksi osa historiantutkimusta. Menetelmäkeskustelut eivät muutenkaan ole aina kohdanneet, koska historia tutkimusalana on viimeisinä vuosikymmeninä pirstoutunut ja yksittäiset suuntaukset ovat eriytyessään kehittäneet juuri omiin tarpeisiinsa sopivia menetelmiä ja teorioita.

Tässä tutkimuksessa käytettyjen lähteiden pohjalta voi väittää, että oppiainerajoilla on ollut kummassakin maassa sekä hyviä että huonoja puolia. Yleinen historia sekä *idé- och lärdomshistoria* ovat omissa maissaan olleet muita oppiaineita avoimempia kansainvälisille menetelmäsyötteille, mutta Ruotsissa kansallinen historia on ollut vielä kansallisempaa kuin Suomessa. Valtavirtahistoria sen sijaan ei ole ollut niin vastaanottavainen ja se on pikemmin vaikuttanut sivuuttaneen näissä oppiaineissa tehdyn tutkimuksen, joten kansainvälistymisen kattavuus ei ole välttämättä niin laaja ja vaikuttava kuin se parhaimmillaan voisi olla. Toisaalta oppiaineet ja niiden piirissä työskentelevät ylläpitävät myös omia koulukuntiaan, ja kenties ovat tarkoituksella myös hieman sivussa.

Väitöskirjojen arvioita lukiessa esille nousee menetelmä- ja teoriasovellusten onnistuneisuus. Toisinaan teoria ja empiria tukivat toisinaan, mutta useammassa tapauksessa väitöskirjan teoreettinen osa jäi liian irralliseksi sen empiirisestä analyysiosuudesta. Teorioita ja menetelmiä voidaan siis esitellä, mutta tällöin niitä tulisi myös soveltaa varsinaisessa tutkimuksessa. Oma suositukseni muille väitöskirjan tekijöille on se, että metodiosuudesta ei tarvitse tehdä liian monimutkaista: yleensä riittää se, että empiirisessä tutkimus- ja analyysiosuudessa tekee sitä, mitä on menetelmä- ja/tai teoriaosuudessa luvannut tekevänsä. Tämä helpottaisi mahdollisesti eri menetelmien ja myös oppiaineiden lähentymistä ja yhdistymistä myös tulevaisuudessa, jotta menetelmät eivät jäisi vain tiettyjen piirien käyttöön.

Lisäksi väitöskirjantekijöiden kannattaa miettiä muulla kielellä kuin suomeksi tai ruotsiksi kirjoittamista. Lähtökohta tuntuu usein olevan se, että jos tutkimus on kirjoitettu jommallakummalla kielellä, se jää melkein automaattisesti

myös kansainvälisen keskustelun ulkopuolelle: lyhyesti sanottuna se on epäkansainvälistä. Vaikka historia oppiaineena on eräällä tavalla jo lähtökohdiltaan kansallinen tiede, ei se kuitenkaan tarkoita sitä, etteikö oman maan historiasta voisi käydä keskustelua myös ulkomaisilla foorumeilla. Menetelmäsuuntauksista esimerkiksi vertailua, ylikansallisuutta ja ylijäräista liikkuvuutta painottavat näkökulmat ovat haastaneet kansallisvaltiot, toisinaan melkein pä ainoina mahdollisina, tutkimusyksikköinä.

SOURCES

I Primary Sources

Dissertations

- Abrahamsson, Åke (1990), *Ljus och frihet till näringsfång: Om tidningsväsendet, arbetarrörelsen och det sociala medvetandets ekologi – exemplet Stockholm 1838–1869*. Stockholm: Kommitten för Stockholmsforskning.
- Alm, Erika (2006), *“ett emballage för inälvor och emotioner”*: Föreställningar om kroppen i statliga utredningar från 1960- och 1970-talen. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Alm, Mikael (2002), *Kungsord i elfte timmen: Språk och självbild i det gustavianska enväldets legitimitetskamp 1772–1809*. Stockholm: Atlantis.
- Ampuja, Outi (2007), *Melun sieto kaupunkielämän välttämättömyytenä: Melu ympäristöongelmana ja sen synnyttämien reaktioiden kulttuurinen käsittely Helsingissä*. Bibliotheca Historica 110. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).
- Andersson, Gudrun (1998), *Tingets kvinnor och män: Genus som norm och strategi under 1600- och 1700-tal*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 187. Uppsala: University of Uppsala.
- Andersson, Lars M. (2000), *En jude är en jude är en jude... Representationer av “juden” i svensk skämtpress omkring 1900–1930*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Aronsson, Peter (1992), *Bönder gör politik: Det lokala självstyret som social arena i tre smålandssocknar, 1680–1850*. Bibliotheca Historica Lundensis 72. Malmö: Team Offset.
- Artæus, Iréne (1992), *Kvinnorna som blev över: Ensamstående stadskvinnor under 1800-talets första hälft – fallet Västerås*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 170. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Bergenheim, Åsa (1994), *Barnet, libido och samhället: Om den svenska diskursen kring barns sexualitet 1930–1960*. Grängesberg: Höglunds.
- Bergnlöv, Eva (2004), *Skuld och oskuld: Barnamord och barnkvävning i rättslig diskurs och praxis omkring 1680–1800*. Malmö: Princo/Team offset & Media.
- Berggren, Henrik (1995), *Seklets ungdom: Retorik, politik och modernitet 1900–1939*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Björck, Henrik (1995), *Teknisk idéhistoria*. Arachne 9. Uddevalla: Risbergs tryckeri.
- Björk, Ragnar (1983), *Den historiska argumenteringen: Konstruktion, narration och kolligation – förklaringsresonemang hos Nils Ahnlund och Erik Lönnroth*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 132. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Carls, Lina (2004), *Våp eller nucka? Kvinnors högre studier och genusedkursen 1930–1970*. Riga: Preses Nams.
- Christensson, Jakob (1996), *Lyckoriket: Studier i svensk upplysning*. Stockholm: Atlantis.
- Cronqvist, Marie (2004), *Mannen i mitten: Ett spiondrama i svensk kallakrigslitteratur*. Stockholm: Carlsson.

- Dahl, Eva-Lena (1980), *Överideologi och politiskt handlingsprogram: En studie i Lockes och Rousseaus tänkande*. Gothenburg Studies in the History of Science and Ideas 3. Gothenburg: Gothenburg University.
- Edgren, Monika (1994), *Tradition och förändring: Könrelationer, omsorgsarbete och försörjning inom Norrköpings underklass under 1800-talet*. Bibliotheca Historica Lundensis 78. Lund: Lund University Press.
- Einonen, Piia (2005), *Poliittiset areenat ja toimintataavat: Tukholman porvaristo vallan käyttäjänä ja vallankäytön kohteena n. 1592–1644*. Bibliotheca Historica 94. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Elgán, Elisabeth (1994), *Genus och politik: En jämförelse mellan svensk och fransk abort- och preventivmedelspolitik från sekelsiftet till andra världskriget*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 176. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Eriksson, Jonnie (2010), *Monstret & människan: Paré, Deleuze och teratologiska traditioner i fransk filosofi, från renässanshumanism till posthumanism*. Lund: Sekel.
- Ers, Andrus (2009), *Segrarnas historia: Makten, historien och friheten studerade genom exemplet Herbert Tingsten 1939–53*. Stockholm: H:ström – Text & Kultur.
- Eskilsson, Lena (1991), *Drömmen om kamratsamhället: Kvinnliga medborgarskolan på Fogelstad 1925–35*. Stockholm: Carlsson.
- Forsström, Riikka (2002), *Possible Worlds: The Idea of Happiness in the Utopian Vision of Louis-Sébastien Mercier*. Bibliotheca Historica 75. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Frenander, Anders (1998), *Debattens vågor: Om politisk-ideologiska frågor i efterkrigstidens svenska kulturddebatt*. Gothenburg: Department of History of Science and Ideas.
- Frih, Anna-Karin (2007), *Flickan i medicine: Ungdom, kön och sjuklighet 1870–1930*. Örebro Studies in History 8. Örebro: Örebro University Library.
- Friman, Eva (2002), *No Limits: The 20th Century Discourse of Economic Growth*. Skrifter från institutionen för historiska studier 2. Umeå: Umeå University Press.
- Frängsmyr, Carl (2000), *Klimat och karaktär: Naturen och människan i sent svenskt 1700-tal*. Uddevalla: MediaPrint.
- Gieser, Suzanne (1995), *Den innersta kärnan: Djuppsykologi och kvantfysik: Wolfgang Paulis dialog med C.G. Jung*. Skrifter 15. Uppsala: Department of History of Science and Ideas.
- Grundberg, Malin (2005), *Ceremoniernas makt: Maktöverföring och genus i Vasatidens kungliga ceremonier*. Stockholm: Nordic Academic Press.
- Haikala, Sisko (1985), *"Britische Freiheit" und das Englandbild in der öffentlichen deutschen Diskussion im ausgehenden 18. Jahrhundert*. Studia Historica Jyväskyläensia 32. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Hannikainen, Juha (2003), *Kohti modernia politiikkaa Itävallassa: Otto Bauerin parlamenttistrategia 1907–1923*. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis 912. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Hansson, Jonas (1999), *Humanismens Kris: Bildningsideal och kulturkritik i Sverige 1848–1933*. Eslöv: Symposion.

- Harvard, Jonas (2006), *En helig allmänlig opinion: Föreställningar om offentlighet och legitimitet i svensk riksdagsdebatt 1848–1919*. Skrifter från Institutionen för historiska studier 13. Umeå: Department of historical studies.
- Heinonen, Meri (2007), *Brides and Knights of Christ: Gender and Body in Later Medieval German Mysticism*. Turku: University of Turku.
- Helo, Ari (1999), *Thomas Jefferson's Republicanism and the Problem of Slavery*. Tampere: University of Tampere.
- Hill, Helena (2007), *Befria mannen! Idéer om förtryck, frigörelse och förändring hos en svensk mansrörelse under 1970- och tidigt 1980-tal*. Umeå: h:ström – Text & Kultur.
- Hiltunen, Juha (1999), *Ancient Kings of Peru: The Reliability of the Chronicle of Fernando de Montesinos*. Bibliotheca Historica 45. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Holgersson, Ulrika (2005), *Populärkulturen och klassamhället: Arbete, klass och genus i svensk dampress i början av 1900-talet*. Falun: Carlsson.
- Hyrkkänen, Markku (1986), *Sozialistische Kolonialpolitik: Eduard Bernsteins Stellung zur Kolonialpolitik und zum Imperialismus 1882–1914*. Studia Historica 21. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Håkansson, Håkan (2001), *Seeing the Word: John Dee and Renaissance Occultism*. Ugglan, Minervaserien 2. Lund: Reprocentralen.
- Hörnqvist, Mikael (1996), *Machiavelli and the Romans*. Skrifter 16. Uppsala: Department of History of Science and Ideas.
- Höög, Victoria (1999), *Upplysning utan förnuft: Begär och frihet hos Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, David Hume and Montesquieu*. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.
- Ihalainen, Pasi (1999), *The Discourse on Political Pluralism in Early Eighteenth-Century England: A Conceptual Study with Special Reference to Terminology of Religious Origin*. Bibliotheca Historica 36. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Immonen, Kari (1987), *Ryssästä saa puhua... Neuvostoliitto suomalaisessa julkisuudessa ja kirjat julkisuuden muotona 1918–1939*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Jalagin, Seija (2007), *Japanin kutsu: Suomalaiset naislähetit Japanissa 1900–1941*. Bibliotheca Historica 107. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Jalava, Marja (2005), *Minä ja maailmanhenki: Moderni subjekti kristillis-idealisisessa kansallisajattelussa ja Rolf Lagerborgin kulttuuriradikalismissa n. 1800–1914*. Bibliotheca Historica 98. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Jonsson, Kjell (1987), *Vid vetandets gräns: Om skiljelinjen mellan naturvetenskap och metafysik i svensk kulturdebatt 1870–1920*. Arkiv avhandlingsserie 26. Lund: Arkiv.
- Jonsson, Tomas (1998), *"Att anpassa sig efter det möjliga": Utsagningsbegreppet och SAP:s ideologiska förändringar 1911–1944*. Gothenburg: Department of History of Science and Ideas.
- Kalela, Jorma (1971), *Grannar på skilda vägar: Det finländsk-svenska samarbetet i den finländska och svenska utrikespolitiken 1921–1923*. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 84. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Kempainen, Ilona (2006), *Isänmaan uhrin: Sankarikuolema Suomessa toisen maailmansodan aikana*. Bibliotheca Historica 102. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.

- Kettunen, Pauli (1986), *Poliittinen liike ja sosiaalinen kollektiivisuus: Tutkimus sosialidemokratiasta ja ammattiyhdistysliikkeestä Suomessa 1918-1930*. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 138. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Kling, Sofia (2007), *Vi våga ej helt leva: Barnbegränsning, sexualitet och genus under den svenska fertilitetstransitionen*. Reports from the Demographic Data Base 28. Umeå: Department of Historical Studies.
- Kortti, Jukka (2003), *Modernisaatiomurroksen kaupalliset merkit: 60-luvun suomalainen televisiomainonta*. Bibliotheca Historica 80. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Kotilainen, Sofia (2008), *Suvun nimissä: Nimenannon käytännöt Sisä-Suomessa 1700-luvun alusta 1950-luvulle*. Bibliotheca Historica 120. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).
- Kusch, Martin (1989), *Language as Calculus vs. Language as Universal Medium: A Study in Husserl, Heidegger and Gadamer*. Synthese Library, vol. 207. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Kuusi, Hanna (2004), *Viinistä vapautta: Alkoholi, hallinta ja identiteetti 1960-luvun Suomessa*. Bibliotheca Historica 82. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Lahtinen, Anu (2007), *Sopeutuvat, neuvottelevat, kapinalliset: Naiset toimijoina Flemingin sukupiirissä 1470–1620*. Bibliotheca Historica 108. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Landgren, Per (2008), *Det aristoteliska historiebegreppet: Historieteori i renässansens Europa och Sverige*. Gothenburg Studies in the History of Science and Ideas 20. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Larsson, Maja (2002), *Den moraliska kroppen: Tolkningar av kön och individualitet i 1800-talets populärmedicin*. Södertälje: Fingraf tryckeri.
- Laskar, Pia (2005), *Ett bidrag till heterosexuallitetens historia: Kön, sexualitet och njutningsnormer i sexhandböcker 1800–1920*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.
- Lehtonen, Tuomas M. S. (1995), *Fortuna, Money, and the Sublunar World: Twelfth-century Ethical Poetics and the Satirical Poetry of the Carmina Burana*. Bibliotheca Historica 9. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Lempa, Heikki (1993), *Bildung der Triebe: Der deutsche Philanthropismus (1768–1788)*. Turku: University of Turku.
- Leppänen, Katarina (2005), *Rethinking Civilisation in a European Feminist Context: History, Nature, Women in Elin Wägner's Väckarklocka*. Gothenburg Studies in the History of Science and Ideas 18. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Lidestad, Madelene (2005), *Uppbåd, uppgifter, undantag: Om genusarbetsdelning i Sverige under första världskriget*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis 79. Valdemarsvik: Akademitryck AB.
- Liljeström, Marianne (1995), *Emanciperade till underordning: Det sovjetiska könssystemets uppkomst och diskursiva reproduktion*. Turku: Åbo Akademi University Press.

- Lindberg, Anna (2001), *Experience and Identity: A Historical Account of Class, Caste, and Gender among the Cashew Workers of Kerala, 1930–2000*. Studia Historica Lundensia. Malmö: Princo/Team Offset & Media.
- Lindberg, Mia (2008), *Ulkoministeriön mediakatsaukset ja Suomi-kuva Saksan lehdistössä 1989–1998*. Serie C, Scripta Lingua Fennica Edita 275. Turku: University of Turku.
- Ljungström, Olof (2002), *Oscariansk antropologi: Exotism, förhistoria och rasforskning som vetenskaplig människosyn*. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press.
- Lundberg, Bengt (1979), *Jämlikhet? Socialdemokrati och jämlikhetsbegreppet*. Lund: Dialog.
- Lundell, Patrik (2002), *Pressen i provinsen: Från medborgerliga samtal till modern opinionsbildning 1750–1850*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.
- Lundgren-Gohtlin, Eva (1991), *Kön och existens: Studier i Simone de Beauvoirs Le Deuxième Sex*. Gothenburg: Daidalos.
- Lundström, Catarina (2005), *Fruars makt och omakt: Kön, klass och kulturarv 1900–1940*. Skrifter från institutionen för historiska studier 11. Umeå: University of Umeå.
- Lähteenmäki, Maria (1995), *Mahdollisuuksien aika: Työläisnaiset ja yhteiskunnan muutos 1910–30-luvun Suomessa*. Bibliotheca Historica 2. Saarijärvi: Gummerus.
- Magnusson, Gert (2006), *Språk och värld: Metod, exempel, kritik*. Gothenburg: Department of History of Ideas and Science.
- Markkola, Pirjo (1994), *Työläiskodin synty: Tamperelaiset työläisperheet ja yhteiskunnallinen kysymys 1870-luvulta 1910-luvulle*. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 187. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Markusson Winkvist, Hanna (2003), *Som isolerade är: De lagerkransade kvinnorna och akademien under 1900-talets första hälft*. Stockholm/Stehag: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposium.
- Miettunen, Katja-Maria (2009), *Menneisyys ja historiakuva: Suomalainen kuusikymmentäluku muistelijoiden rakentamana ajanjaksona*. Bibliotheca Historica 126. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).
- Multamäki, Kustaa (1999), *Towards Great Britain: Commerce & Conquest in the Thought of Algernon Sidney and Charles Davenant*. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science and Letters.
- Nilsson, Roddy (1999), *En välbyggd maskin, en mardröm för själen: Det svenska fängelsesystemet under 1800-talet*. Bibliotheca Historica Lundensis 93. Bjärnum: TA-tryck.
- Nilsson, Ulrika (2003), *Kampen om Kvinnan: Professionaliseringsprocesser och konstruktioner av kön i svensk gynekologi 1860–1925*. Institutionen för idé- och lärdoms historia, Skrifter 31. Uppsala: Uppsala University Press.
- Nordberg, Ilkka (2005), *Regionalism and Revenue: The Moderate Basque Nationalist Party, the PNV, and Politico-Economic Power in the Basque Country of Spain 1980–1998*. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Nurmiainen, Jouko (2009), *Edistys ja yhteinen hyvä vapaudeanajan ruotsalaisessa poliittisessä kielessä*. Bibliotheca Historica 122. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).

- Oikarinen, Jarmo (1999), *The Middle East in the American Quest for World Order: Ideas of Power, Economics, and Social Development in United States Foreign Policy, 1953–1961*. Bibliotheca Historica 47. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Oikarinen, Sari (1998), *“A Dream of Liberty”: Constance Markievicz’s Vision of Ireland, 1908–1927*. Bibliotheca Historica 34. Tampere: Tammer-Paino Oy.
- Olaisson, Niklas (2001), *Låt oss skapa människan! Stratifieringsprocesser i Thomas Hobbes’ filosofi*. Stockholm: Elanders Gotab.
- Paananen, Unto (1972), *Sallust’s Politico-social Terminology: Its Use and Biographical Significance*. Annales Academiae scientiarum Fennicae, Series B 175. Helsinki: Finnish Academy of Science and Letters.
- Pekkola, Mika (2010), *Prophet of Radicalism: Erich Fromm and the Figurative Constitution of the Crisis of Modernity*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 142. Jyväskylä: University Library of Jyväskylä.
- Peltonen, Markku (1992), *Classical Humanism in English Political Thought from 1570 to 1640 with Special Reference to Classical Republicanism*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Perényi, János (1979), *Revolutionsuppfattningens anatomi: 1848 års revolutioner i svensk debatt*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 108. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Persson, Mats (1994), *Förnuftskampen: Vitalis Norström och idealismens kris*. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.
- Petrov, Kristian (2006), *Tillbaka till framtiden: Modernitet, postmodernitet och generationsidentitet i Gorbacëvs glasnost' och perestrojka*. Södertörn Doctoral Dissertations 11. Huddinge: University of Södertörn.
- Pihlainen, Kalle (1999), *Resisting History: On the Ethics of Narrative Representation*. Turku: Unipaps.
- Plymoth, Birgitta (2002), *Fostrande försörjning: Fattigvård, filantropi och genus i fabriksstaden Norrköping, 1872–1914*. Acta Universitatis Stockholmiensis. Edsbruk: Akademitryck.
- Rautelin, Mona (2009), *En förutbestämd sanning: Barnamord och delaktighet i 1700-talets Finland belysta genom kön, kropp och social kontroll*. Helsinki: NordPrint.
- Rautio, Veli-Matti (1994), *Die Bernstein-Debatte: Die politisch-ideologischen Strömungen und die Parteiideologie in der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands 1898–1903*. Studia Historica 47. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Riukulehto, Sulevi (1998), *The Concepts of Luxury and Waste in American Radicalism, 1880–1929*. Academica Scientiarum Fennica: Humaniora 296. Saarijärvi: Gummerus.
- Salmi, Hannu (1993), *“Die Herrlichkeit des deutschen Namens...”: Die schriftstellerische und politische Tätigkeit Richard Wagners als Gestalter nationaler Identität während der staatlichen Vereinigung Deutschlands*. Turku: University of Turku.
- Sarantola-Weiss, Minna (2003), *Sohvoryhmän läpimurto: Kulutuskulttuurin tulo suomalaisiin olohuoneisiin 1960- ja 1970-lukujen vaihteessa*. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).

- Sivonen, Mika (2007), *Me inkerikot, vatjalaiset ja karjalaiset: Uskonnollinen integrointi ja ortodoksisen vähemmistön identiteetin rakentuminen Ruotsin Inkerissä 1680–1702*. Bibliotheca Historica 111. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).
- Sivula, Anna (2006), *Kysymyksiä ja voimaviivoja: Marc Blochin historiantutkimuksellisen tuotannon metodologinen perintö*. Annales Universitatis Turkuensis C: 241. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Stenius, Henrik (1987), *Frivilligt jämligt samfällt: Föreningsväsendets utveckling i Finland fram till 1900-talets början med speciell hänsyn till massorganisationsprincipens genombrott*. Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet.
- Stockelberg, David (2005), *Simmels former*. Gothenburg: University of Gothenburg.
- Strahl, Christer (1983), *Nationalism & Socialism: Fosterlandet i den politiska idédebatten i Sverige 1890–1914*. Bibliotheca Historica Lundensis 53. Lund: LiberFörlag.
- Sundin, Anders (2006), *1809: Statskuppen och regeringsformens tillkomst som tolkningsprocess*. Studia Historica Uppsaliensia 227. Stockholm: Elanders Gotab.
- Sunnemark, Fredrik (2001), *An Inescapable Network of Mutuality: Discursivity and Ideology in the Rhetoric of Martin Luther King, Jr*. Gothenburg Studies in the History of Science and Ideas 16. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Suomela, Julitta (2001), *Rajantakainen Venäjä: Venäläisten emigranttien aatteelliset ja poliittiset mielipiteet Euroopan venäläisissä sanomalehdissä 1918–1940*. Bibliotheca Historica 67. Pieksämäki: RT-Print Oy.
- Suoranta, Anu (2009), *Halvennettu työ: Pätkätyö ja sukupuoli sopimusyhteiskuntaa edeltävissä työmarkkinakäytännöissä*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Särkkä, Timo (2009), *Hobson's Imperialism: A Study in Late Victorian Political Thought*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 118. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Sörlin, Sverker (1988), *Framtidslandet: Debatten om Norrland och naturresurserna under det industriella genombrottet*. Stockholm: Carlsson.
- Tandefelt, Henrika (2007), *Gustaf III inför sina undersåtar: Konsten att härska och politikens kulturhistoria*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Tegenborg Falkdalen, Karin (2003), *Kungen är en kvinna: Retorik och praktik kring kvinnliga monarker under tidigmodern tid*. Umeå: Print & Media.
- Teräs, Kari (2001), *Arjessa ja liikkeessä: Verkostonäkökulma modernisoituihin työelämän suhteisiin 1880–1920*. Bibliotheca Historica 66. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Tiainen, Jorma (1971), *Napoleon und das napoleonische Frankreich in der öffentlichen Diskussion des 'Dritten Deutschland' 1797–1806*. Studia Historica Jyväskyläensia 8. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Tjällén, Biörn (2007), *Church and Nation: The discourse on authority in Ericus Olai's Chronica regni Gothorum (c. 1471)*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.

- Tolonen, Mikko (2009), *Self-love and self-liking: In the moral and political philosophy of Bernard Mandeville and David Hume*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Torsti, Pilvi (2003), *Divergent Stories, Convergent Attitudes: Study on the Presence of History, History Textbooks and the Thinking of Youth in post-War Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Helsinki: Taifuuni, Helsinki University Press.
- Toukomies, Timo (2008), *Nationalismin ja sodan uhkakuvat: Arnold J. Toynbee 1900-luvun Kansainvälisten suhteiden tulkitsijana*. Yhteiskuntatieteellisiä julkaisuja nro 90. Joensuu: Joensuu University Press.
- Tuikka, Timo J. (2007), *Kekkosen konstit: Urho Kekkosen historia- ja politiikkakäsitykset teoriasta käytäntöön 1933–1981*. Jyväskylä Studies in Humanities 70. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.
- Tuomaala, Saara (2004), *Työtätekevästä käsistä puhtaiksi ja kirjoitettaviksi: Suomalaisen oppivelvollisuuskoulun ja maalaislasten kohtaaminen 1921–1939*. Bibliotheca Historica 89. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Ulvros, Eva Helen (1996), *Fruar och mamseller: Kvinnor inom sydsvensk borgerlighet 1790–1870*. Lund: Historiska media.
- Uimonen, Minna (1999), *Hermostumisen aikakausi: Neuroosit 1800- ja 1900-lukujen vaihteen suomalaisessa lääketieteessä*. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Valenius, Johanna (2004), *Undressing the Maid: Gender, Sexuality and the Body in the Construction of the Finnish Nation*. Bibliotheca Historica 85. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Valtonen, Heli (2004), *Minäkuvat, arvot ja mentaliteetit: Tutkimus 1900-luvun alussa syntyneiden toimihenkilönaisten omaelämäkerroista*. Jyväskylä Studies on Humanities 26. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Press.
- Vuorinen, Marja (2010), *Kuviteltu aatelismies: Aateluus viholliskuvana ja itseymmärryksenä 1800-luvun Suomessa*. Bibliotheca Historica 128. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).
- Wasniowski, Andréaz (2007), *Den korrekta avvikelsen: Vetenskapsanvändning, normalitetsströvan och exkluderande praktiker hos RFSL, 1950–1970*. Umeå: Holzweg.
- Wassholm, Johanna (2008), *Svenskt, finskt och ryskt: Nationens, språkets och historiens dimensioner hos E.G. Ehrström 1808–1835*. Turku: Uniprint.
- Winton, Patrik (2006), *Frihetstidens politiska praktik: Nätverk och offentlighet 1746–1766*. Studia Historica Upsaliensia 223. Stockholm: Elanders Gotab.
- Wisselgren, Per (2000), *Samhällets kartläggare: Lorénska stiftelsen, den sociala frågan och samhällvetenskapens formering 1830–1920*. Eslöv: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.
- Wolff, Charlotta (2004), *Vänskap och makt: Den svenska politiska eliten och upplysningstidens Frankrike*. Helsinki: University of Helsinki.
- Östlund, Joachim (2007), *Lyckolandet: Maktens legitimering i officiell retorik från stormaktstid till demokratins genombrott*. Lund: Sekel.
- Östman, Ann-Catrin (2000a), *Mjök och jord: Om kvinnlighet, manlighet och arbete i ett österbottniskt jordbrukssamhälle ca 1870–1940*. Turku: Åbo Akademi University Press.
- Zander, Ulf (2001), *Fornstora dagar, moderna tider: Bruk av och debatter om svensk historia från sekelskifte till sekelskifte*. Lund: Nordic Academic Press.

Reviews of Dissertations

- Ahonen, Sirkka (2004), "Historiasotaa Balkanin kouluissa". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 102, no. 1, 130–133. Review of P. Torsti.
- Alm, Mikael (2009), "Predikstolens gemenskaper under 250 år". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 129, no. 3, 544–550. Review of J. Östlund.
- Blomberg, Eva (2007), Review of U. Holgersson. *Scandia*, vol. 73, no. 1, 123–125.
- Cain, Peter (2010), "Uutta tietoa John A. Hobsonista". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 108, no. 1, 131–132. Review of T. Särkkä.
- Christensson, Jakob (2004), Review of M. Alm. *Historisk tidskrift*, vol. 124, no. 1, 80–88.
- Clucas, Stephen (2001), Review of H. Håkansson. *Lychnos*, vol. 42, 183–189.
- Dahlqvist, Hans (2001), Review of T. Jonsson. *Arbetshistoria*, vol. 25, no. 2–3, 72–73.
- Ditchfield, G. M. (2000), "Moniarvoisuuden käsitteet 1700-luvun alun Englannissa". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 98, no. 1, 82–86. Review of P. Ihalainen.
- Eliasson, Pär (2001), Review of C. Frängsmyr. *Lychnos*, vol. 42, 192–199.
- Engman, Max (1989), "I grannens ögon". *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, vol. 74, no. 2, 339–351. Review of K. Immonen.
- Fransson, Ola (2007), "Språk och värld". *Lychnos*, vol. 48, 308–312. Review of G. Magnusson.
- Gardell, Mattias (2002), Review of F. Sunnemark. *Lychnos*, vol. 43, 233–241.
- Grahn, Jan (1980), Review of J. Perényi. *Folkets historia*, vol. 8, no. 3, 43–44.
- Gustafsson Chorell, Torbjörn (2007), "Den korrekta avvikelser". *Lychnos*, vol. 48, 285–290. Review of A. Wasniowski.
- Hakosalo, Heini (2001), "Hermostumisen historiaa". *Naistutkimus*, vol. 14, no. 1, 66–68. Review of M. Uimonen.
- Hansson, Jonas (2005), "Simmels former". *Lychnos*, vol. 46, 328–332. Review of D. Stockelberg.
- Hentilä, Seppo (1987), "Eduard Bernstein ja sosialistinen siirtomaapolitiikka". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 85, no. 1, 53–54. Review of M. Hyrkkänen.
- Hentilä, Seppo (1995), "Ukko-Bernstein historian roolipelaajana". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 93, no. 1, 82–85. Review of V-M. Rautio.
- Ihalainen, Pasi (2006), "Det svenska prästerskapet som en härold för en ny politisk kultur". Review of P. Winton. *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 126, no. 4, 823–829.
- Jansson, Karin Hassan (2005), Review of E. Bergenlöv. *Karolinska förbundets årsbok 2005*, 238–241.
- Jauho, Mikko (2001), "Hermostumisen ja 1800- ja 1900-lukujen vaihteen suomalainen yhteiskunta". *Tiede ja edistys*, vol. 26, no. 1, 64–67. Review of M. Uimonen.
- Johansson, Anders (2011), "Monstret & människan". *Lychnos*, vol. 52, 288–292. Review of J. Eriksson.
- Jonsson, Kjell (1994), Review of M. Persson. *Lychnos 1994*, vol. 35, 172–178.

- Jääskeläinen, Mauno (1972), "Naapurien erilainen poliittinen analyysi". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 70, no. 2, 151–153. Review of J. Kalela.
- Karlsson, Gunnel (1995), Review of E. Elgán. *Tvärtanten*, vol. 17, no. 4, 34–37.
- Karonen, Petri (2008), "Identifikaation jäljillä". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 106, no. 2, 214–215. Review of J. Wassholm.
- Katajala, Kimmo (2005), "Porvarit politiikan tekijöinä". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 103, no. 4, 507–509. Review of P. Einonen.
- Kemiläinen, Aira (1972), "Saksalaiset ja Napoleon". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 70, no. 1, 63–66. Review of J. Tiainen.
- Kettunen, Pauli (2007), "Kekkonen retorisena toimijana". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 106, no. 4, 518–520. Review of T. Tuikka.
- Kinnunen, Tiina (2000), "Nainen ja unelma kansakunnasta". *Naistutkimus*, vol. 13, no. 2, 100–102. Review of S. Oikarinen.
- Kostiainen, Auvo (1999), "Kuluttamisen kurjuus?" *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 97, no. 4, 374–377. Review of S. Riukulehto.
- Kurunmäki, Jussi (2010), "Vapaudenajan poliittinen kieli". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 108, no. 2, 260–262. Review of J. Nurmiainen.
- Lehmijoki-Gardner, Maiju (2007), "Naiset Flemingin sukupiirissä". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 105, no. 3, 355–357. Review of A. Lahtinen.
- Lövkrona, Inger (1998), Review of G. Andersson. *RIG – kulturhistorisk tidskrift*, vol. 81, nr. 4, 227–229.
- Marjanen, Jani (2007), "Nyanserat om pressidealens utveckling". *Historisk tidskrift för Finland*, vol. 92, no. 1, 187–191. Review of P. Lundell.
- Markkola, Pirjo (2006), "Sodan mentaliteettihistoria ja kuolemankulttuurit". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 104, no. 2, 224–226. Review of I. Kempainen.
- Markusson Winkvist, Hanna (2004), Review of L. Carls. *Scandia*, vol. 70, no. 2, 331–333.
- Maurits, Alexander (2008), Review of J. Östlund. *Historielärarnas förenings årsskrift 2008*, 151–154.
- Nilsson, Roddy (1996/1997), Review of H. Berggren. *Historielärarnas förenings årsskrift 1996–1997*, 171–173.
- Nilsson, Roddy (2008), Review of J. Harvard. *Historielärarnas förenings årsskrift 2008*, 159–160.
- Nilsson, Torbjörn (2006), Review of J. Harvard. *Scandia*, vol. 72, 121–122.
- Nordin, Jonas (2007), "Radikalism och reformism vid 1809 års statsvälvning". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 127, no. 3, 511–516. Review of A. Sundin.
- Nordmark, Dag (2003), "Pressen i provinsen". *Lychnos*, vol. 44, 282–285. Review of P. Lundell.
- Nygård, Toivo (1988), "Ryssästä yhäkin puhutaan". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 86, no. 3, 234–237. Review of K. Immonen.
- Olausson, Lennart (2009), "Segrarnas historia". *Lychnos*, vol. 50, 341–346. Review of A. Ers.
- Ollila, Anne (2005a), "Historiallinen tutkimus omaelämäkerroista". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 103, no. 2, 232–235. Review of H. Valtonen.

- Ollila, Anne (2005b), "Kasvatuksen ruumiillisuus". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 103, no. 2, 235–238. Review of S. Tuomaala.
- Olsson, Tom (2010), "Svensk dam och svensk klass." *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 130, no. 1, 102–106. Review of U. Holgersson.
- Peltonen, Matti (2006), "Marc Blochin historiateoreettinen perintö". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 104, no. 3, 344–346. Review of A. Sivula.
- Persson, Lennart K. (1980), Review of B. Lundberg. *Meddelande från Arbetarrörelsens arkiv och bibliotek*, vol. 4, no. 11–12, 68–73.
- Persson, Mats (1984), Review of R. Björk. *Lychnos*, vol. 25, 231–232.
- Persson, Mats (2001), "Humanismens kris". *Lychnos*, vol. 42, 234–240. Review of J. Hansson.
- Rodell, Magnus (1996), Review of H. Berggren. *Lychnos*, vol. 37, 263–264.
- Rosenberck, Bente (1998), "Borgerlige kvinder i Sydsverige 1790–1870. *Historisk tidskrift*, vol. 118, no. 3, 655–662. Review of E. H. Ulvros.
- Rydström, Jens (2007), "Befria mannen!". *Lychnos*, vol. 48, 303–308. Review of H. Hill.
- Schånberg, Ingela (1996), Review of M. Edgren. *Scandia*, vol. 62, no. 2, 344–347.
- Sellberg, Erland (2009), "Det aristoteliska historiebegreppet". *Lychnos*, vol. 50, 353–358. Review of P. Landgren.
- Skinner, Quentin (1992), "Report on the Dissertation Submitted by Markku Peltonen". University of Helsinki: The University's Archive and Registry. Unpublished review of M. Peltonen, 1–6.
- Sulkunen, Irma (2000), "Historiantutkijan hienosyinen analyysi hermostumisesta". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 98, no. 2, 171–172. Review of M. Uimonen.
- Svensson, Birgitta (2000), Review of R. Nilsson. *RIG – Kulturhistorisk tidskrift*, vol. 83, no. 4, 240–241.
- Tiainen, Jorma (1986), "Englanti saksalaisten silmin". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 84, no. 1, 55–57. Review of S. Haikala.
- Tuominen, Marja (2006), "Laajasti ja perusteellisesti kansallisajattelusta kulttuuriradikalismiin". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 104, no. 1, 88–91. Review of M. Jalava.
- Vihavainen, Timo (2002), Review of J. Suomela. *The Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 80, no. 2, 358–359.
- Zetterberg, Seppo (2002), "Rajantakainen Venäjä". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 100, no. 1, 99–101. Review of J. Suomela.

Foreign Literature as Primary Sources

- Ankersmit, Frank (1983), *Narrative Logic: A Semantic Analysis of the Historian's Language*. Haag, Boston & London: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Ankersmit, Frank (1989), "Historiography and Postmodernism". *History & Theory*, vol. 28, no. 2, 137–153.
- Ankersmit, Frank (1994), *History and Tropology: The Rise and Fall of Metaphor*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Ankersmit, Frank (2001), *Historical Representation*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Brunner, Otto, Conze, Werner & Koselleck, Reinhart (eds.), *Geschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Historisches Lexikon zur politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*. 8 vols. Stuttgart, 1972–1993.
- Foucault, Michel (2005), *Tiedon arkeologia. L'archéologie du savoir* (1969). Translated to Finnish by Tapani Kilpeläinen. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (1979), *Vergangene Zukunft: Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (1989), "Linguistic Change and the History of Events". *The Journal of Modern History*, vol. 61, no. 4, 649–666.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (2000), *Zeitschichten: Studien zur Historik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (1962), "The History of Political Thought: A Methodological Enquiry". In: Laslett, Peter & Runciman, W. G. (eds.), *Philosophy, Politics and Society*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 183–202.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (1989), *Politics, Language & Time: Essays on Political Thought and History*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Pocock, J.G.A. (2009), *Political Thought and History: Essays on Theory and Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Scott, Joan W. (1986), "Gender: A Useful Category of Historical Analysis". *American Historical Review*, vol. 91, no. 5, 1053–1075.
- Skinner, Quentin (1969), "Meaning and Understanding in the History of Ideas". *History & Theory*, vol. 28, no. 1, 3–53.
- Skinner, Quentin (1978), *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought, Volume 1: The Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin (1996), *Reason and Rhetoric in the Philosophy of Hobbes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin (2002), *Visions of Politics, Volume 1: Regarding Method*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- White, Hayden (1973a), *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, Hayden (1978), *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, Hayden (1987a), *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- White, Hayden (1999), *Figural Realism: Studies in the Mimesis Effect*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Journals

Historiallinen Aikakauskirja (HAik), 1970–2010.

Historisk Tidskrift (HT), 1970–2010.

Historisk Tidskrift för Finland (HTF), 1970–2010.

Lychnos – Årsbok för idé- och lärdoms historia (Lychnos), 1969–2010.

Scandia – Tidskrift för historisk forskning (Scandia), 1970–2010.

II Secondary Sources

Ahtiainen, Pekka & Tervonen, Jukka (1990), "Historiatiede oman aikansa tulkkina: Katsaus suomalaisen historiankirjoituksen vaiheisiin viimeisen sadan vuoden ajalta". In: Ahtiainen, Pekka et al. (eds.) (1990), *Historia nyt: Näkemyksiä suomalaisesta historian tutkimuksesta*. Porvoo: WSOY, 11–38.

Ahtiainen, Pekka & Tervonen, Jukka (1996), *Menneisyyden tutkijat ja metodien vartijat: Matka suomalaiseen historiankirjoitukseen*. Vammala: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).

Alasuutari, Pertti (1996), *Toinen tasavalta: Suomi 1946–1994*. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Alhanen, Kai (2007), *Käytännöt ja ajattelu Michel Foucault'n filosofiassa*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.

Andersson, Nils & Björck, Henrik (eds.) (1994), *Vad är idéhistoria? Perspektiv på ämnets identitet under sextio år*. Stockholm: Brutus Östlings Bokförlag Symposion.

Aronsson, Peter (1998), "En lomhörd dialog? Den historievetenskapliga debatten på 1990-talet". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol 118., no. 1, 53–76.

Austin, J.L. (1962), *How to do things with Words: The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Baldwin, Peter (2004), "Comparing and Generalizing: Why All History Is Comparative, Yet No History Is Sociology". In: Cohen, Deborah & O'Connor, Maura (eds.), *Comparison and History: Europe in Cross-National Perspective*. New York and London: Routledge, 1–22.

Bevir, Mark (1992), "The Errors of Linguistic Contextualism". *History & Theory*, vol. 31, no. 3, 276–298.

Bevir, Mark (1997), "Mind and Method in the History of Ideas". *History & Theory*, vol. 36, no. 2, 167–189.

Bjerstedt, Sven (1993), "Skinner och Atlantican". *Lychnos*, vol. 34, 167–176.

Björck, Ragnar (2009), "Historiker om historiker: En introducerande betraktelse". In: Björck, Ragnar & Johansson, Alf W. (eds.), *Svenska historiker: Från medeltid till våra dagar*. Stockholm: Norstedt, 13–30.

Bonnell, Victoria & Hunt, Lynn (eds.) (1999), *Beyond the Cultural Turn: New Directions in the Study of Society and Culture*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Boréus, Kristina (1994), *Högervåg: Nyliberalismen och kampen om språket i svensk debatt 1969–1989*. Stockholm: Tiden.

Broberg, Gunnar (1985), "Foucault i Uppsala". *Tvårsnitt*, vol. 7, no. 4.

Canning, Kathleen (1994), "Feminist History after the Linguistic Turn: Historicizing Discourse and Experience". *Signs*, vol. 19, no. 2, 368–404.

Carr, David (1986), *Time, Narrative and History*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

- Clark, Elizabeth A. (2004), *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press.
- Dahlgren, Stellan & Floren, Anders (1996), *Fråga det förflutna: En introduktion till modern historieforskning*. Lund: Studentlitteratur.
- Danto, Arthur C. (1965), *Analytical Philosophy of History*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Danto, Arthur C. (1985), *Narration and Knowledge: Including the Integral Text of Analytical Philosophy of History*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Dray, William (1971), "On the Nature and Role of Narrative in Historiography". *History & Theory*, vol. 10, no. 2, 153–171.
- Dray, William, Ely, Richard & Gruner, Rolf (1969), "Mandelbaum on Historical Narrative: A Discussion". *History & Theory*, vol. 8, no. 2, 275–294.
- Dunn, John (1996), "The History of Political Theory". In: Dunn, John (ed.), *The History of Political Theory and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 11–39.
- Dutt, Carsten & Laube, Reinhard (eds.) (2013), *Zwischen Sprache und Geschichte. Zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks*. Göttingen: Wallstein.
- Edenheim, Sara (2009), "Den kulturella förevändningen: Om historieämnet, poststrukturalismen och konflikten som inte får finnas". *Scandia*, vol. 75, no. 1, 91–109.
- Edenheim, Sara (2012), "Att komma till Scott: Teorins roll inom svensk genushistoria". *Scandia*, vol. 78, no. 2, 22–32.
- Ehrnrooth, Jari (1992), *Sanan vallassa, vihan voimalla: Sosialistiset vallankumousopit ja niiden vaikutus Suomen työväenliikkeessä 1905–1914*. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Eklöf Amirell, Stefan (2006), "Den internationella historiens uppgång och fall: Trender inom svensk internationell historieforskning 1950–2005". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 126, no. 2, 257–278.
- Eklöf Amirell, Stefan (2007), *Svenska doktorsavhandlingar i historia 1976–2005*. Uddevalla: Kungliga biblioteket.
- Ekström, Anders (2008), "Den nya kulturhistorien: Från representation till materialitet". In: Andersson, Nils & Björck, Henrik (eds.), *Idéhistoria i tiden: Perspektiv på ämnets identitet under sjuttiofem år*. Stockholm: Symposium, 292–300.
- Forser, Thomas (ed.) (1978), *Humaniora på undantag? Humanistiska forskningstraditioner i Sverige*. Stockholm: PAN/Norstedts.
- Frängsmyr, Tore (2004), *Svensk idéhistoria: Bildning och vetenskap under tusen år, del 2, 1809–2000*. Stockholm: Natur och kultur.
- Frängsmyr, Tore (2008), "Johan Nordström och lärdomshistoriens födelse". *Lychnos*, vol. 45, no. 1, 269–279.
- Grew, Raymond (1980), "The Case for Comparing Histories". *The American Historical Review*, vol. 85, no. 4, 763–778.
- Grew, Raymond (2006), "The Case for Comparing Histories". In: Yengoyan, Aram A. (ed.), *Modes of Comparison: Theory and Practice*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 98–117.

- Gunnariusson, Håkan (2002), *Det historiska fältet: Svensk historievetenskap från 1920-tal till 1957*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Gunnell, John (1979), *Political Theory: Tradition and Interpretation*. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop Publishers.
- Halmesvirta, Anssi (1990), *The British Conception of the Finnish 'Race', Nation and Culture*. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Halmesvirta, Anssi (2006), *Ideology & Argument: Studies in British, Finnish and Hungarian Thought*. Studia Historica 73. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).
- Halmesvirta, Anssi (2012), *Aatehistorian harjoitus*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Press.
- Halonen, Mia, Ihalainen, Pasi & Saarinen, Taina (2015), "Diverse Discourses in Time and Space: Historical, Discourse Analytical and Ethnographic Approaches to Multi-Sited Language Policy Discourse. In: Halonen, Mia et al. (eds.), *Language Policies in Finland and Sweden: Interdisciplinary and Multi-Sited Comparisons*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 3–26.
- Hampsher-Monk, Iain (2001), "The History of Political Thought and the Political History of Thought". In: Hampsher-Monk, Iain (ed.), *The History of Political Thought in National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 159–174.
- Hansson, Jonas (2008), "Begreppshistoria: Program och praktik". In: Andersson, Nils & Björck, Henrik (eds.), *Idéhistoria i tiden: Perspektiv på ämnets identitet under sjuttiofem år*. Stockholm: Symposium, 282–291.
- Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard (2007), "Comparative history: a contested method". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 127, no. 4, 697–716.
- Hietala, Marjatta & Setälä, Päivi (1982), "Yleinen historia: rajaton ja välttämätön". *Historiallinen Aikauskirja*, vol. 80, no. 1, 46–49.
- Hietala, Marjatta (2002), "Kansainväliset yhteydet". In: Tommila, Päiviö (ed.), *Suomen tieteen historia 4: Tieteen ja tutkimuksen yleinen historia 1880-luvulta lähtien*. Porvoo: WS Bookwell, 525–561.
- Hietala, Marjatta (2006a), "Aira Kemiläinen ja hänen jälkivaikutuksensa". *Historiallinen Aikauskirja*, vol. 104, no. 4, 520–524.
- Hietala, Marjatta (2006b), "Tutkijat ja Saksan suunta". In: Hietala, Marjatta (ed.), *Tutkijat ja sota: Suomalaisten tutkijoiden kontakteja ja kohtaloita toisen maailmansodan aikana*. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS), 30–141.
- Hirdman, Yvonne (1988), "Genussystemet: reflektioner kring kvinnors sociala underordning". *Kvinnovetenskaplig tidskrift*, vol. 9, no. 3, 49–63.
- Hoffmann, Stefan-Ludwig (2010), "Koselleck, Arendt and the Anthropology of Historical Experience". *History & Theory*, vol. 49, no. 2, 212–236.
- Hornberger, Nancy & Johnson, David Cassels (2007), "Slicing the Onion Ethnographically: Layers and Spaces in Multilingual Language Education Policy and Practice". *TESOL Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 3, 509–532.
- Hovi, Kalervo (1982), "Yleisen historian tehtävistä ja rajoista Suomessa". *Historiallinen Aikauskirja*, vol. 80, no. 3, 253–257.
- Hyrkkänen, Markku (1984), *Aatehistoriallisesta metodista*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto.

- Hyrkkänen, Markku (1993), "Historiatieteen ja historianfilosofian suhde". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 91, no. 1, 39–53.
- Hyrkkänen, Markku (1994), "Reinhart Koselleck: Sosiaali- ja käsitehistorioitsija". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 92, no. 4, 328–333.
- Hyrkkänen, Markku (2002), *Aatehistorian mieli*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Hyvärinen, Matti et al. (eds.) (2003), *Käsitteet liikkeessä: Suomen poliittisen kulttuurin käsitehistoria*. Tampere: Vastapaino.
- Hyvärinen, Matti (2006), "Towards a Conceptual History of Narrative". In: Hyvärinen, Matti et al. (eds.), *The Travelling Concept of Narrative*. Helsinki: Collegium, 20–41.
- Ifversen, Jan (2011), "About Key Concepts and How to Study Them". *Contributions to the History of Concepts*, vol. 6, no. 1, 65–88.
- Iggers, Georg G. (1997), *Historiography in the Twentieth Century: From Scientific Objectivity to the Postmodern Challenge*. Hanover: Wesleyan University Press.
- Ihalainen, Pasi (2004), "Uraauurtava käsitehistoriallinen tulkinta Suomen poliittisesta kulttuurista." *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 102, no. 3, 408–417
- Ihalainen, Pasi & Saarinen, Taina (2015), "Constructing 'Language' in Language Policy Discourse: Finnish and Swedish Legislative Processes in the 2000s". In: Halonen, Mia et al. (eds.), *Language Policies in Finland and Sweden: Interdisciplinary and Multi-Sited Comparisons*. Bristol: Multilingual Matters, 29–56.
- Ihalainen, Pasi (2017), *The Springs of Democracy: National and Transnational Debates on Constitutional Reform in the British, German, Swedish and Finnish Parliaments, 1917–1919*. Studia Fennica Historica 24. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS).
- Ihalainen, Pasi, Nuolijärvi, Pirkko & Saarinen, Taina (2019), "Kamppailua tilasta ja vallasta: Kieli- ja kielikoulutuspolitiikan historiallisesti kierrätetyt diskurssit". In: Kangasvieri, Teija et al. (eds.), *Kieli, koulutus, politiikka: Monipaikkaisia käytänteitä ja tulkintoja*. Tampere: Vastapaino, 27–59.
- Ihalainen, Pasi & Saarinen, Taina (2019), "Integrating a Nexus: The History of Political Discourse and Language Policy Research". *Rethinking History*, vol. 23, 1–20. (Online)
- Jacobsson, Kerstin (1997), *Så gott som demokrati: Om demokratifrågan i EU-debatten*. Umeå: Boréa.
- Jay, Martin (1982), "Should Intellectual History Take a Linguistic Turn? Reflections on the Habermas/Gadamer Debate". In: LaCapra, Dominick and Kaplan, Steven L. (eds.), *Modern European Intellectual History: Reappraisals and New Perspectives*. New York: Ithaca, 86–110.
- Jenkins, Keith (1991), *Re-thinking History*. New York: Routledge.
- Jenkins, Keith (1995), *On "What Is History?" From Carr and Elton to Rorty and White*. New York: Routledge.
- Joas, Hans & Vogt, Peter (2011), *Begriffene Geschichte: Beiträge zum Werk Reinhart Kosellecks*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Jordanova, Ludmilla (2006), *History in Practice*. London: Hodder Arnold.

- Jussila, Osmo (1969a), "Käsitteetutkimuksesta historiassa". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 67, no. 3, 275–281.
- Jussila, Osmo (1969b), *Suomen perustuslait venäläisten ja suomalaisten tulkintojen mukaan 1808–1863*. Historiallisia tutkimuksia 77. Helsinki: The Finnish Historical Society (SHS).
- Jutikkala, Eino (1978), "Historiallinen Aikakauskirja syntyessään ja nyt". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 76, no. 2, 99–101.
- Jutikkala, Eino (1969), Review of O. Jussila. *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 67, no. 4, 329–332.
- Kaartinen, Marjo & Korhonen, Anu (2001), "Miesten tiede!". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 99, no. 1, 80–85.
- Kainulainen, Jaska (2009), *Paolo Sarpi between Jean Bodin and Thomas Hobbes: A Case Study on the "Political Animal" in Early Modern Europe*. Florence: European University Institute.
- Kalela, Jorma (1976), *Historian tutkimusprosessi: Metodinen opas oman ajan historiaa tutkiville*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Kalela, Jorma (1991), "Narratiivi ei ole kertomus". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 89, no. 2, 146–155.
- Kalela, Jorma (2000), *Historiantutkimus ja historia*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus.
- Kallinen, Maija (2003), "Menneiden mietteiden metsästäjät: Aate- ja oppihistoriaa Suomessa". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 101, no. 1, 133–137.
- Karonen, Petri (2019), "Historiantutkimuksen ja yhteiskunnan yli puolitoistavuosisatainen vuoropuhelu: Resurssit, rakenteet ja tulokset". In: Karonen, Petri (ed.), *Tiede ja yhteiskunta: Suomen Historiallinen Seura ja historiantutkimus 1800-luvulta 2010-luvulle*. Helsinki: The Finnish Literature Society (SKS), 13–41.
- Kelley, Donald (1987), "Horizons of Intellectual History: Retrospect, Circumspect, Prospect". *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 48, no. 1, 143–169.
- Kemiläinen, Aira (1956), *Auffassungen über die Sendung des deutschen Volkes um die Wende des 18. und 19. Jahrhunderts*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Kirjapaino Oy.
- Kemiläinen, Aira (1964a), *Nationalism: Problems Concerning the Word, the Concept and Classification*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän kasvatustieteiden korkeakoulu & Jyväskylän yliopistoyhdistys.
- Kemiläinen, Aira (1964b), "'Nation'-sana ja Porvoon valtiopäivien merkitys". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 63, no. 4, 289–304.
- Kemiläinen, Aira (1982), "Yleisen historian tutkimuksen merkityksestä ja mahdollisuuksista Suomessa". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 80, no. 3, 258–263.
- Kero, Reino & Kostainen, Auvo (1982), "Yleisen historian kirkkaat ja hämärit rajat". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 80, no. 4, 363–366.
- Kero, Reino, Kostainen, Auvo & Virtanen, Keijo (1982), "Yleisen historian rajat". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 80, no. 2, 165–167.
- Kocka, Jürgen (2003), "Comparisons and Beyond". *History and Theory*, vol. 42, no. 1, 39–44.

- Kocka, Jürgen & Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard (2009), *Comparison and Beyond: Traditions, Scope and Perspectives of Comparative History*. In: Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard & Kocka, Jürgen (eds.), *Comparative and Transnational History: Central European Approaches and New Perspectives*. New York: Berghahn Books, 1–30.
- Kurunmäki, Jussi (2000), *Representation, Nation and Time: The Political Rhetoric of the 1866 Parliamentary Reform in Sweden*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Press.
- Kurunmäki, Jussi (2004), "Käsitteiden venyttämisestä". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 102, no. 1, 90–93.
- Kuukkanen, Jouni-Matti (2006), "Minkä historiaa käsitehistoria on?" *Ennen ja nyt. Historian tietosanomat*, no. 1, www.ennenjanyt.fi, read 26.2.2012.
- Kuukkanen, Jouni-Matti (2015), *Postnarrativist Philosophy of Historiography*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Landgrén, Lars-Folke (2006), "HTF övergår till referee-system". *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, vol. 91, no. 1, 1.
- Larsson, Simon (2010), *Intelligensaristokrater och arkivmartyrer: Normerna för vetenskaplig skicklighet i svensk historieforskning 1900–1945*. Hedemora: Gidlund.
- Larsson, Simon, Jalava, Marja & Haapala, Pertti (2017), "Introduction: Nordic Historiography – From Methodological Nationalism to Empirical Transnationalism". In: Haapala, Pertti et al. (eds.), *Making Nordic Historiography: Connections, Tensions and Methodology, 1850–1970*. New York: Berghahn, 1–24.
- Lauerma, Matti (1967), *General History Research in Finland*. Turku: University of Turku.
- Lehti-Eklund, Hanna et al. (eds.) (2009), *Språket i historien: Historien i språket*. Helsinki: Föreningen för nordisk filologi.
- Leonhard, Jörn (2011), "Language, Experience and Translation: Towards a Comparative Dimension". In: Fernández Sebastián, Javier (ed.), *Political Concepts and Time: New Approaches to Conceptual History*. Santander: Cantabria University Press, 245–272.
- Leino-Kaukiainen, Pirkko (2003), "Historiallinen Aikakauskirja 100 vuotta". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 101, no.1, 84–99.
- Liedman, Sven-Eric (1979–1980), "Quentin Skinner och den politiska idéhistorien". *Lychnos 1979–1980*, vol. 23, no. 1, 280–287.
- Liedman, Sven-Eric (1987), *Form och innehåll i den dialektiska traditionen och som en outnyttjad möjlighet i dagens humanvetenskaper*. Texter från institutionen för idé- och lärdoms historia vid Göteborgs universitet 2. Gothenburg: Arachne.
- Lindberg, Bo (ed.) (1980), *17 uppsatser i svensk idé-och lärdoms historia*. Stockholm: Carmina.
- Lindberg, Bo (2006), *Den antika skevheten: Politiska ord och begrepp i det tidig-moderna Sverige*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Lindberg, Bo (2007), "Begreppshistoria i Sverige". *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, vol. 92, no. 1, 121–129.

- Lorenz, Chris (2011), "History and Theory". In: Schneider, Axel & Woolf, Daniel (eds.), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing Volume 5: Historical Writing Since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 13–35.
- Losonsky, Michael (2006), *Linguistic Turns in Modern Philosophy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Louch, A. R. (1969), "History as Narrative". *History & Theory*, vol. 8, no. 1, 54–70.
- Lönnroth, Erik (1998), "Svensk historieskrivning under 1900-talet". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 118, no. 3, 304–313.
- Manninen, Juha (2000), "Aate- ja oppihistorian väitöskirjat". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 98, no. 3, 219–223.
- Marjanen, Jani (2007), "Begreppshistoria i Finland". *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, vol. 92, no. 1, 130–142.
- Marjanen, Jani (2018), "Begreppshistoria". In: Gustavsson, Martin & Svanström, Yvonne (eds.), *Metod: Guide för historiska studier*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 95–130.
- Markkola, Pirjo (2003), "Suomalaisen naishistorian vuosikymmenet". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 101, no. 1, 53–63.
- Marklund, Carl (2008), *Bridging Politics and Science: The Concept of Social Engineering in Sweden and the USA, circa 1890–1950*. Florence: European University Institute.
- Marwick, Arthur (2001), *The New Nature of History: Knowledge, Evidence, Language*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Megill, Allan (1987), "The Reception of Foucault by Historians". *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 48, no. 1, 117–141.
- Melve, Leidulf (2006), "Intentions, Concepts, and Reception: An Attempt to Come to Terms with the Materialistic and Diachronic Aspects of the History of Ideas." In: *History of Political Thought*, Vol. 27, no. 3, 377–406.
- Mikkeli, Heikki (1990), "Aatevirtauksista käsitehistoriaan. Aatehistorian teoriaa ja tavoitteita sodanjälkeisessä Suomessa". In: Ahtiainen, Pekka et al. (eds.) (1990), *Historia nyt: Näkemyksiä suomalaisesta historian tutkimuksesta*. Porvoo: WSOY, 252–280.
- Munslow, Alun (2000), *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*. London: Routledge.
- Munslow, Alun (2003), *The New History*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.
- Mörner, Magnus (1985), "De svenska historikerna och internationaliseringen". *Historisk tidskrift*, vol. 105, no. 4, 430–452.
- Nelson, John (1975), "Review Essays: Metahistory". *History & Theory*, vol. 14, no. 1, 74–91.
- Nevala, Arto (2003), "Tutkijoiden verkostoista yliopistojen vaihtosuhteisiin: Kansainvälisten yhteyksien kehittyminen". In: Tommila, Päiviö & Korppi-Tommola Aura (ed.), *Suomen tieteen vaiheet*. Helsinki: Yliopistopaino, 127–142.
- Nevers, Jeppe (2007), "Om begreppshistorien i Danmark". *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, vol. 92, no. 1, 111–120.

- Nilsson, Göran B. (2002), "Den källkritiska processen". *Scandia*, vol. 68, no. 2, 179–194.
- Nilsson, Ingemar (2014), "Idé- och lärdomshistoria i Sverige och dess doktorsavhandlingar (med en bibliografi över avhandlingar i idé- och lärdomshistoria 1942–2013)". *Lychnos*, vol. 79, no. 1, 127–158.
- Nilsson, Roddy (2000), "Den närvarande frånvaron eller i väntan på Foucault: En diskussion om Foucault och den svenska historiedisciplinen". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 120, no. 2, 183–206.
- Nilsson, Roddy (2005), "Postmodernism, källkritik och historieskrivning". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 125, no. 2, 233–248.
- Nordin, Jonas (2008), "Historisk Tidskrift i nutid och framtid". *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 128, no. 4, 601–620.
- Olafson, Frederick (1970), "Narrative History and the Concept of Action". *History & Theory*, vol. 9, no. 3, 265–289.
- Olausson, Lennart (ed.) (1994), *Idéhistoriens egenheter: Teori- och metodproblem inom idéhistorien*. Stockholm: Symposion.
- Olsen, Niklas (2012), *History in the Plural: An Introduction to the Work of Reinhart Koselleck*. New York: Berghahn.
- Palonen, Kari (1997a), "An Application of Conceptual History to Itself: From Method to Theory in Reinhart Koselleck's Begriffsgeschichte". *The Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought* 1, 39–69.
- Palonen, Kari (1997b), *Kootut retoriikat*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Press.
- Palonen, Kari (2003), *Quentin Skinner: History, Politics, Rhetoric*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Paluch, Stanley (1968), "The Specificity of Historical Language". *History & Theory*, vol. 7, no. 1, 76–82.
- Partti, Kenneth (2013), *Kielellisten käänteiden vastaanotto Historiallisessa Aikakauskirjassa ja Historisk Tidskriftissä 1970–2005*. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylä University Digital Archive.
- Peltonen, Markku (2009), "Aate- oppi- ja kulttuurihistoriallinen tutkimus Suomessa 1908–2008". In: Kangas, Sini, Hietala, Marjatta & Ylikangas, Heikki (eds.), *Historia eilen ja tänään: Historiantutkimuksen ja arkeologian suunnat Suomessa 1908–2008*. Helsinki: Suomen tiedeseura, 83–93.
- Peltonen, Matti (2007), "'New cultural history' ja kielellisen käänteiden ehtyminen". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 105, no. 3, 346–347.
- Peltonen, Matti (2008), "Michel Foucault'n historiallisesta ajattelusta". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 106, no. 2, 167–177.
- Peltonen, Matti (2009), "Kielellisen käänteiden raunioilla". *Tieteessä tapahtuu*, vol. 27, no. 8, 64–65.
- Pihlaja, Päivi Maria & Päivärinne, Tiina (2009), "Historian ja arkeologian väitöskirjat Suomessa 1908–2007". In: Kangas, Sini, Hietala, Marjatta & Ylikangas, Heikki (eds.), *Historia eilen ja tänään: Historiantutkimuksen ja arkeologian suunnat Suomessa 1908–2008*. Helsinki: Suomen tiedeseura, 108–148.

- Pikkanen, Ilona (2012), *Casting the Ideal Past: A Narratological Close Reading of Eliel Aspelin-Haapkylä's History of the Finnish Theatre Company (1906-1910)*. Acta Electronica Universitatis Tampereensis 1262. Tampere: Tampere University Press.
- Piirimäe, Eva (2011), "Keeleline pööre". In: Tamm, Marek (ed.), *Humanitaarteaduste metodoloogia: Uusi väljavaateid*. Tallinn: TLÜ Kirjastus.
- Pikwer, Birgitta (1980), *Bibliografi över licentiat- och doktors-avhandlingar i historia 1890-1975*. Delrapport 7 inom UHÄ-projektet Forskarutbildningens resultat 1890-1975. Lund: Historiska institutionen.
- Quine, W.M. (1960), *Word and Object*. Cambridge, MA: Technology Press of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- Renkama, Jukka (2006), *Ideology and Challenges of Political Liberalisation in the USSR, 1957-1961: Otto Kuusinen's "Reform Platform", the State Concept, and the Path to the 3rd CPSU Programme*. Bibliotheca Historica 99. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Richter, Melvin (2001), "A German Version of the 'Linguistic Turn': Reinhart Koselleck and the History of Political and Social Concepts". In: Hampsher-Monk, Iain (ed.), *The History of Political Thought in National Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 58-79.
- Rommi, Pirkko (1978), "Pro historia rerum gestarum: Historiallisen Aikakauskirjan ensimmäinen neljännesvuosisata". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 76, no. 2, 103-150.
- Rorty, Richard (1967/1992), "Introduction". In: Rorty, Richard (ed.), *The Linguistic Turn: Essays in Philosophical Method*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1-40.
- Roth, Paul (1992), "Hayden White and the Aesthetics of History". *History of the Human Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 1, 17-35.
- Salomon, Kim (2009), "Den kulturella vändningens provokationer". *Scandia*, vol. 75, no. 1, 61-84.
- Schneider, Axel & Woolf, Daniel (eds.) (2011), *The Oxford History of Historical Writing Volume 5: Historical Writing since 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Schochet, Gordon J. (1974), "Quentin Skinner's Method". *Political Theory*, vol. 2, no. 3, 261-276.
- Searle, John (1969), *Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Sihvola, Juha (2001), "Eroon miesten historiatieteestä". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 99, no. 1, 86-87.
- Sihvola, Juha & Kallio, Veikko (2003), "Yleisen historian asema vahvistumassa". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, vol. 101, no. 1, 79-82.
- Southgate, Beverley (2003), *Postmodernism in History: Fear or Freedom*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Spiegel, Gabrielle (2005), "Introduction". In: Spiegel, Gabrielle (ed.), *Practicing History: New Directions in Historical Writing after the Linguistic Turn*. New York & London: Routledge.
- Steedman, Carolyn (2001), *Dust*. Glasgow: Bell & Bain Ltd.

- Steinmetz, Willibald & Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard (2013), "The Political as Communicative Space in History: The Bielefeld Approach". In: Steinmetz, Willibald, Gilcher-Holtey, Ingrid & Haupt, Heinz-Gerhard (eds.), *Writing Political History Today*. New York/Frankfurt: Campus Verlag, 11–33.
- Steinmetz, Willibald & Freedon, Michael (2017), "Introduction: Conceptual History : Challenges, Conundrums, Complexities". In: Steinmetz et al. (eds.), *Conceptual history in the European space*. New York: Berghahn, 1–46.
- Stenius, Henrik (2007), "Begreppshistoriska temperament". *Historisk Tidskrift för Finland*, vol. 92, no. 1, 1–9.
- Stern, Gustaf (1931/1964), *Meaning and Change of Meaning*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Surkis, Judith (2012), "When Was the Linguistic Turn? A Genealogy". *American Historical Review*, vol. 117, no. 3, 700–722.
- Svenstrup, Thyge (2009), "Lauritz Weibull: Epokgörande källkritiker". In: Björk, Ragnar & Johansson, Alf W. (eds.), *Svenska historiker: Från medeltid till våra dagar*. Stockholm: Norstedt, 358–372.
- Thompson, Martyn P. (1993), "Reception Theory and the Interpretation of Historical Meaning". *History & Theory*, vol. 32, no. 3, 248–272.
- Tommila, Päiviö (1989), *Suomen historiankirjoitus: Tutkimuksen historia*. Porvoo: WSOY.
- Torstendahl, Rolf (1981), "Minimum Demands and Optimum Norms in Swedish Historical Research 1920–1960: The 'Weibull School' in Swedish Historiography". *Scandinavian Journal of History*, vol. 6, 117–141.
- Torstendahl, Rolf (2003), "Fact, Truth and Text: The Quest for a Firm Basis for Historical Knowledge around 1900". *History & Theory*, vol. 42, no. 3, 305–331.
- Treanter, Cecilia (1990), *Granskningens retorik och historisk vetenskap: Kognitiv identitet i recensioner i dansk historisk tidskrift, norsk historisk tidskrift och svensk historisk tidskrift 1965–1990*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Vahtola, Jouko (2009), "Suomen historian tutkimus viime vuosikymmenillä". In: Kangas, Sini, Hietala, Marjatta & Ylikangas, Heikki (eds.), *Historia eilen ja tänään: Historiantutkimuksen ja arkeologian suunnat Suomessa 1908–2008*. Helsinki: Suomen tiedeseura, 30–39.
- Vernon, James (1994), "Who's Afraid of the 'Linguistic Turn'? The Politics of Social History and Its Discontents". *Social History*, vol. 19, no. 1, 81–97.
- Väyrynen, Kari & Pulkkinen, Jarmo (2016), "Johdanto". In: Väyrynen, Kari & Pulkkinen, Jarmo (eds.), *Historian teoria: Lingvistikisestä käänteestä mahdolliseen historiaan*. Tampere: Juvenes Print Oy, 7–14.
- Walsh, W.H. (1951/1964), *An Introduction to Philosophy of History*. London: Hutchinson University Library.
- Westberg, Jacob (1998), "När ord får mening": Författarskap och tolkningssammanhang i Quentin Skinners analyser av språkanvändning hos Bollingbroke, Machiavelli och Hobbes. *Historisk Tidskrift*, vol. 118, no. 2, 159–186.

- Westberg, Jacob (2003), *Den nationella drömträdgården: Den stora berättelsen om den egna nationen i svensk och brittisk Europadebatt*. Stockholm: University of Stockholm.
- Whatmore, Richard (2016), *What is Intellectual History?* Cambridge: Polity.
- White, Hayden (1973b) "Foucault Decoded: Notes from Underground". *History & Theory*, vol. 12, no. 1, 23–54.
- White, Hayden (1987b), Review of *Futures Past* by Reinhart Koselleck. *The American Historical Review*, vol. 92, no. 5, 1175–1176.
- Winberg, Christer (1990), "Varför skriver vi inte historiska romaner istället?" *Scandia*, vol. 56, no. 1, 5–17.
- Windschuttle, Keith (2000), *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists are Murdering Our Past*. San Francisco: Encounter Books.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1921/1961), *Tractatus logico-philosophicus: The German text of Ludwig Wittgenstein's Logisch-philosophische Abhandlung with a new translation*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Wittgenstein, Ludwig (1953/1980), *Philosophische Untersuchungen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Åmark, Klas (1973), *Makt eller moral: Svensk offentlig debatt om internationell politik och svensk utrikes- och försvarspolitik 1938–1939*. Stockholm: University press.
- Österberg, Eva (2012), "Kultur, genus och samtiden: Svensk historieforskning från senare delen av 1980-talet till 2010". In: Artaeus, Gunnar & Åmark, Klas (eds.), *Historieskrivningen i Sverige*. Lund: Studentlitteratur, 173–211.
- Östling, Johan (2004), "Att sprida ljus över en mörk historia". *Scandia*, vol. 70, nr. 2, 285–295.
- Östman, Ann-Catrin (2000b), "Joan Scott ja feministinen historiankirjoitus". In: Anttonen, Anneli et al. (eds.), *Feministejä: Aikamme ajattelijoita*. Tampere: Gaudeamus, 275–294.
- Zammito, John (2005), "Ankersmit and Historical Representation". *History & Theory*, vol. 44, no. 2, 155–181.

APPENDIX A: The Studied Dissertations in Chronological Order and their References to the Linguistic Turns.

Abbreviations: Conc.-Conceptual History; L. C.-Linguistic Contextualism; Disc.-Discursivity by M. Foucault; Gender-Discursified Gender History; Narr.-Narrativity. Source: Finnish and Swedish History Dissertations, 1970-2010.

Dissertation	Conc.	L. C.	Disc.	Gender	Narr.
Kalela 1971	x				
Tiainen 1971	x				
Paananen 1972	x				
Perényi 1979	x		x		x
Lundberg 1979	x				
Dahl 1980		x			
Björk 1983		x			x
Haikala 1985	x				
Hyrkkänen 1986	x	x			
Kettunen 1986			x		
Immonen 1987			x		
Stenius 1987		x			
Abrahamsson 1990	x	x			
Lundgren-Gothlin 1991		x			
Eskilsson 1991				x	
Aronsson 1992	x				
Artæus 1992				x	
Peltonen 1992		x			
Lempa 1993	x		x		
Salmi 1993	x	x			
Rautio 1994	x	x			
Persson 1994		x			
Edgren 1994			x		
Bergenheim 1994			x		
Elgán 1994				x	
Markkola 1994				x	
Berggren 1995	x			x	
Gieser 1995	x				
Liljeström 1995			x		
Lähteenmäki 1995				x	
Ulvros 1996				x	
Hörnqvist 1996		x			
Jonsson 1998		x			
Andersson 1998			x	x	

Jordansson 1998				x	
Riukulehto 1998	x				
Frenander 1998	x				
Oikarinen 1998				x	
Pihlainen 1999				x	x
Uimonen 1999				x	
Ihalainen 1999	x	x			
Hiltunen 1999					x
Höög 1999		x			x
Helo 1999	x				
Oikarinen 1999	x	x			
Hansson 1999	x				
Multamäki 1999		x			
Nilsson 1999			x		
Andersson 2000	x				
Wisselgren 2000	x				
Frängsmyr 2000			x		
Östman 2000				x	
Olaison 2001		x	x		
Suomela 2001			x		
Sunnemark 2001			x		
Håkansson 2001			x		x
Lindberg 2001			x	x	
Teräs 2001				x	
Zander 2001					x
Forsström 2002	x		x		x
Ljungström 2002	x		x		
Alm 2002	x	x			
Lundell 2002	x				
Larsson 2002			x	x	
Friman 2002			x		
Plymoth 2002				x	
Torsti 2003	x	x			
Tegenborg Falkdalen 2003		x		x	
Johansson 2003			x		
Markusson Winkvist 2003				x	
Nilsson 2003				x	
Kortti 2003					x
Tuomaala 2004	x		x	x	x
Kuusi 2004			x		
Valtonen 2004			x	x	
Valenius 2004			x	x	
Sarantola-Weiss 2004			x		
Wolff 2004	x				

Bergenlöv 2004				x	
Jalava 2005	x		x	x	
Einonen 2005	x				
Stockelberg 2005	x				
Laskar 2005			x	x	
Holgersson 2005			x	x	
Lidestad 2005				x	
Leppänen 2005				x	
Lundström 2005				x	
Sivula 2006	x		x		x
Sundin 2006	x	x			
Harvard 2006	x	x			
Petrov 2006	x				
Winton 2006		x			
Magnusson 2006		x			
Alm 2006				x	
Tjällén 2007	x				
Östlund 2007	x				
Tuikka 2007	x	x	x		x
Wasniowski 2007		x		x	x
Frih 2007			x	x	
Kling 2007			x	x	
Jalagin 2007				x	
Heinonen 2007				x	
Lahtinen 2007				x	
Hill 2007				x	
Tandefelt 2008	x				
Ampuja 2008	x				
Sivonen 2008	x				
Landgren 2008	x	x			
Kotilainen 2008		x		x	
Wassholm 2008	x	x			
Toukomies 2008		x			
Nurmiainen 2009	x	x			x
Miettunen 2009	x				x
Suoranta 2009	x				
Ers 2009	x	x	x		
Särkkä 2009	x	x			
Tolonen 2009		x			
Rautelin 2009				x	
Pekkola 2010	x	x			x
Eriksson 2010	x		x		
Vuorinen 2010			x		