FF NETWORK

FOR THE FOLKLORE FELLOWS

No. 25 **December 2003**

In this issue:

Publisher:
The Folklore Fellows
by courtesy of
the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters
and
the Kalevala Institute

www.folklorefellows.fi
ISSN 0789-0249

Singing of *runo* poetry. Detail of an engraving by M.R. Heland from a sepia tint published in A.F. Skjöldebrand's *Voyage pittoresque au Cap Nord (1801–1802)*. SKS

Reaping the harvest of the Kalevala jubilee years

by Anna-Leena Siikala, Academy Professor,
Director of the Kalevala Institute

The year 2002 marked the bicentenary of the birth of Elias Lönnrot, which was celebrated in style. The Kalevala and research into Kalevalaic poetry were the topics of many events both in Finland and among experts on epic elsewhere in the world. The festivities have run on into 2003, drawing attention to the numerous publications issued in honour of the jubilee year. The work of Elias Lönnrot had such a major impact on the awakening of folkloristic interest in Finland that it is still worth close examination. It is thus the theme of this issue of the *FF Network*. We may, however, well ask how day-to-day folkloristic research benefits from such celebration.

The enthusiasm for field research in the 1960s and 1970s and the tendency to regard the Kalevala merely as a piece of literature drove many young Finnish folklorists away from the study of epic. The 150th anniversary of the Old Kalevala in 1985 aroused interest on an unprecedented scale in the Kalevala and Kalevalaic poetry. The scholarly and artistic works inspired by the jubilee year also bore fruit in the sense that by the 150th anniversary of the New Kalevala in 1999 the number of experts, speakers and writers had grown considerably. The Kalevala Institute was born on the wave of this interest in epic research, as were numerous publications on epics and oral poetry.

The symposium on comparative epic research held by the Kalevala Institute in November 2002 and reported here by Jouni Hyvönen demonstrated that the study of Kalevalaic poetry, the Kalevala and epic in the broader sense has gained an established foothold in Finland. Among the speakers, numbering close on thirty, were both distinguished scholars and doctoral students. The participants from abroad proved once again that the Kalevala is, as an epic, part of not only the Finnish but also of the world's heritage.

Elias Lönnrot was a product of his times. The nationalist trends of Romanticism and Neo-humanism fashioned his objectives and created a climate favourable to their attainment. At home in Finland, his work has customarily been regarded from a national perspective. Yet Lönnrot was not working in a national vacuum. The idea of constructing an epic occurred to him on becoming acquainted with the great epic poetry of Europe. The Lönnrot bicentenary has in fact underlined the view of diverse sources as a resource for local cultures and above all the necessity of international dialogue.

The Folklore Fellows network aims specifically to promote such dialogue. It at present has more than 600 members spread around the world. Since many of these members have attended the Folklore Fellows' Summer Schools held since 1991, a great number of folklorists all over the world are now in personal contacts. The Summer Schools have likewise fostered relations between Finnish researchers and folklorists in other countries. Many who have already attended a Summer School have expressed the hope that they will continue. Although obtaining funding for a course operating on a global basis has – somewhat surprisingly – become more difficult as the result of globalisation, the Organising Committee of the FFSS intends to continue the Summer School tradition. Next time, maybe researchers who have already attended a course will have a chance to meet colleagues from far away. Until then, the *FF Network* will, we hope, serve as a means of keeping in touch. Please be sure to inform us by email of any change of address.

The new address for the Folklore Fellows' internet pages is

www.folklorefellows.fi

Please update all links referring to www.folklorefellows.org

A singing scribe or a nationalist author?

The making of the Kalevala as described by Elias Lönnrot

by Professor Satu Apo
Dept. of Folklore, University of Helsinki

Few things in Finnish literary research have been investigated as thoroughly as the question of how Elias Lönnrot constructed the Kalevala using folk poetry collected by himself and other scholars. The majority of the runes which formed the basis of the Finnish national epic were collected from a neighbouring country, from the northwest corner of Russia (Archangel Karelia, Olonets Karelia, Ingria).[1] During his lifetime Lönnrot published three versions of his epic, the *Old* (1835) and *New Kalevala* (1849) as well as an abridged edition, the so-called *School Kalevala* (1862). The creation of the *Old* and *New Kalevala* has been analyzed through scientifically-convincing means over several generations of researchers, beginning with Julius Krohn (1883–85) and A. A. Borenius (1891). This analysis was continued by A. R. Niemi (1898), Kaarle Krohn (1903–10), Aarne Anttila (1931–35) and Väinö Kaukonen (1939–45, 1956) with his two major studies on the subject.[2]

It is largely thanks to its learned author, Elias Lönnrot, doctor of philosophy and medicine, that we know with such precision how the national epic was produced. With an eye to future research, he ensured that the source materials for his epic and most of his manuscript versions would be housed in the Finnish Literature Society. Additional sources include his lecture drafts as well as the impressive collection of his letters. The manuscript materials are supplemented by essays and articles written by Lönnrot explaining the Kalevala in Swedish and Finnish. The most famous sources are the extensive prefaces to the *Old* and the *New Kalevalas*. Lönnrot also gave his interpretation of his epic in the edition intended for use in schools (1862), to the end of which he appended an explanatory section.

In the present paper, which deals with the *New Kalevala*, Lönnrot's most outstanding work, I base my arguments chiefly on Lönnrot's letters. The most important letters regarding the *Kalevala* have been published in the first volume of *Elias Lönnrotin valitut teokset* (Elias Lönnrot's Selected Works) edited by Raija Majamaa (1990a). This is my primary source. Additional letter-related materials have been taken from the article by A. R. Niemi entitled "Uuden Kalevalan toimitusajoilta" (The Editing Phase of the New Kalevala, 1921), Aarne Anttila's biography of Lönnrot (1985), and Väinö Kaukonen's study *Elias Lönnrotin Kalevalan toinen painos* (The Second Edition of Elias Lönnrot's Kalevala , 1956).

The long shadow of Macpherson

Why did Lönnrot leave behind such a profusion of evidence regarding the creation of the *Kalevala*? The main reason was the higher standards of authenticity regarding the publication of anything that claimed to be based on folk poetry or on ancient literature. Such standards had been demanded by European scholars since the beginning of the 19th century. The literary documents left behind by the late James Macpherson (1736–96), the man behind the publication of the *Works of Ossian* (1760–65), failed to convince more critical experts that this poetic trilogy which had inspired the whole of Europe was in fact based on written Gaelic sources from the 3rd century A.D.[3]

The debate over its authenticity did not, however, invalidate *Ossian's* enormous cultural significance. Macpherson had written for the Scots a fascinating ancient history and had strengthened their sense of national identity. European writers were inspired by the discovery of a new set of images, the "Celtic twilight" (W. B. Yeats), and by Macpherson's freely flowing rhythmic prose which had thrown off the shackles of the Classicism so dominant in poetic epic.[4]

The controversy over *Ossian* raged in Europe for over 50 years. Finnish historian and folklore researcher Henrik Gabriel Porthan (1739–1804) took part in it; he did not want to believe the charges of spuriousness, nor did professor of Roman literature Johan Gabriel Linsén (1785–1848), who was one of Finland's earliest romanticists and an influential member of the Finnish Literature Society.[5]

Lönnrot was naturally familiar with *Ossian*, if not otherwise then certainly through J. G. Herder's anthology *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern* (1778–1807). All three volumes of *Ossian* had already been published in German by the end of the 18th century, and *Ossian* appeared in Swedish during the years 1794–1800.[6] Lönnrot was also aware of Ossian's disputed authenticity. He wrote to Louis Léouzon Le Duc, the French translator of the *Old Kalevala* on March 30, 1851 as follows:

> Any misgivings concerning the authenticity of the Kalevala poems, such as at one time occupied the critics with regard to, for example, the songs of Ossian, can hardly arise in anyone who has the slightest knowledge of the matter. Doubts would in that case be directed toward those who had collected the poems, that they had either changed the original poems found among the folk or had added new verses composed by themselves; or might it be suspected, that I have done something similar when arranging them into the epic that is the Kalevala. That such is not the case can be

> observed from the fact that anyone visiting the folk in those districts where the poems were recorded can ascertain for themselves that everything which is in the Kalevala is known already in one district or another; – – (Kaukonen 1956: 453–54.)

Lönnrot was in fact careful not to take such great liberties with his folk poetry materials that they would have occasioned doubt over the authenticity of the epic text. Authenticity, it must be said, was understood in a much looser sense in Lönnrot's time than it is today. For Lönnrot it sufficed that it was possible to find parallels (whether direct or indirect) "among the folk" for all elements of the epic. He cautioned against inventing wholly new lines; in the entire *Old Kalevala* (12,078 lines) their number amounted to only 600 (Kuusi, Bosley and Branch 1977: 30). On the other hand, Lönnrot modified all the lines he used as his material into literary language. In addition to softening the singers' dialectic expressions, he revised the form and content of the lines. Lönnrot left behind the aforementioned source materials from which researchers can see for themselves the creation process of the epic from the planning of the collection journeys to the final proofreading of the soon-to-be-published manuscript.

In the final analysis, the strongest guarantee of the *Kalevala's* authenticity were the oral poems collected by persons other than Lönnrot himself. Lönnrot wrote the following in the draft version of the introduction to his *New Kalevala*:

> In order that there would be no doubts concerning whether the songs of the Kalevala were originally collected from the mouth of the folk, the collections made by different writers on the collection journeys must be preserved along with the books in the F[innish] L[iterature] S[ociety]. Through them, the sceptic may be assured that they are not based on imagination. There have been many such collectors: Ganander, Lennqvist, Topelius, von Becker, Gottlund, *ipse*, Cajan, Castren, Europaeus, Ahlqvist, Polen, Sirelius, and Reinholm, not to mention others. (Lönnrotiana 37.)

The ranking of folk poetry genres

Folklore collectors received a vast array of poems from the "mouth of the folk". Only a fraction of these were deemed suitable for the national epic, however. Already in his first attempts to compile long epics using oral poetry, Lönnrot had defined the central themes of folk poetry in traditional Finnish meter. The most important thematic categories were "hero" and "mythology". Lönnrot combined the poems depicting Lemminkäinen's and Väinämöinen's heroic deeds into cycles.[7] Since both heroes had distinguished themselves as incantation-users, having mastered supernatural powers, the heroic poems contained yet another essential thematic category, which was folk belief or mythology. Because mythology was a culturally vital phenomenon, incantations (*magiska runor*) used by *tietäjä*s (seers and healers) were also defined as a valued genre of poetry. Those works by Lönnrot which preceded the *Kalevala* also include a collection of wedding poems. We can assume that wedding poetry ranked high in the thematic hierarchy because it was thought to provide historical and ethnographic information regarding ancient folkways, particularly traditional family life.

Ballad poetry was situated much lower on the hierarchy, as was lyric poetry, even though this genre was perhaps closest to Lönnrot's heart. The lowest rung was occupied by the folk songs in newer meter. The main contours of this ranking order can be seen in the report written by Lönnrot in Swedish regarding his seventh poetry collection trip which he sent to the Finnish Literature Society in November of 1838:

> With regard to the results of my journey, I, for one, am satisfied on that point. I have collected the following:
>
> 1:o *Mythological-historical poems* (*Mytho-historiska runor).* The majority of these are additions to and variants of the Kalevala [1835].
> 2:o *Incantation poems (Magiska runor) – –.*
> 3:o *Idyllic poems* (*Idylliska runor* containing lyric songs, romantic songs, ballads, etc.). – –
> 4:o *Poems from later periods (Sednare tidens poëmer).* As is known, these employ both ordinary heptameter as well as countless other verse structures (*versslag).* – –
> 5:o *Finnish folk sayings* (proverbs, figures of speech, etc.) – –
> 6:o *Finnish folk riddles.* – –
> 7:o *Finnish folk tales* (humorous anecdotes, fairy tales)
> 8:o *New observations regarding Finnish language terms, phrases, dialects, etc.* – – (Majamaa 1993: 131–32.)

Lönnrot considered the Kalevala-meter poems written by contemporary peasants to be an especially important genre of folk poetry. The farmers who "plowed with their pens" (for example Paavo Korhonen and Pentti Lyytinen) demonstrated the potential of despised Finnish peasants and labourers to educate and civilize themselves and thus strenghtened nationalistic beliefs in the future of Finnish language literature.

The question to what extent the oral singers' own categories and internal hierarchy of genres corresponded to Lönnrot's classification and ranking awaits further clarification.

Lönnrot's folk poetry preferences reveal to us that, among other things, he was not in the field as an anthropological folklorist or a researcher of ethnopoetics, collecting information on the uses and meanings of folk poetry or on the creative and performative competence of masters of oral epic. Lönnrot went to the field to obtain the source materials which could best be used to promote the interests of the Finnish-language culture in a Finland ruled by Tzar Nikolai I in the 1820s–40s. I base this interpretation on the travel descriptions and letters written by Lönnrot as well as the ideological texts he wrote for his periodical *Mehiläinen* and the introductions to the *Kalevala* editions and the

Kanteletar (1840).[8] As literary scholar Pertti Karkama has emphasized on many occasions, foremost on the agenda for the promoters of a Finnish national consciousness was the desire to create a Finnish-language *literary arts* which would be presentable in the salons of the elite as well as in the clubs of university scholars and students, and which would support the Finnish nationalistic program and its ideological premises (cf. Karkama 2001: 26–27).

The necessity for a heroic history

The way in which Lönnrot defined folk poetry genres, thematic categories, and their ranking originated in studies of European literature and history. A second source was the contemporary debate in which European intellectuals sorted out which ideological values and political goals should be considered important. Because freedom of speech was limited in an autocratically governed state, ideological discussion in the Grand Duchy of Finland had to be carried out through literature. Karkama (2001: 249–52, 258) has shown how such concepts as heroic age and heroic epic, as well as monotheistic religion, were attributed strong ideological meanings in nationalistic discussions. A heroic age and the existence of epic poetry depicting it were signs that a population (an ethnic community) was qualified to be a nation; similar indications included an ancient religion centered around a supreme deity. Thus in his introduction to the *Old Kalevala* (1835) Lönnrot, completely in keeping with the spirit of his times, let the "folk" (*rahvas*) define Väinämöinen, the main character of the epic, as a hero (*uros*) rather than as a a god. The status of god was reserved for the most important god of the ethnic religion, Ukko:

> If in these [*Kalevala*] runes the former status of god belonging to Väinämöinen is reduced in places, then to my knowledge I can do nothing about it – – If, further, we now ask the folk in those localities in which the memory of Väinämöinen lives on most vividly, who Väinämöinen was, they soon answer: "He was a hero worthy of memory, the first of our forefathers and a famous rune-singer", but if one asks them whom they consider to be their god, then most often they answer that they used to worship Ukko, who created heaven and earth. (Majamaa 1993: 179–80.)

The way in which Lönnrot constructed the overall plot of the *Kalevala* served the political goals of nationalist-minded Finnish intellectuals. The Achilles' heel of Finnishness was considered to be its lack of history. In nationalistic discussions in many parts of Europe it was made clear that the existence of an ancient heroic age and heroic epic poetry which made reference to such an age was one highly important criteria of whether a people were, in their collective soul, qualified to unite into a nation state using the folk language as its official language (cf. Smith 1991: 20–21). The mere existence of ancient folk belief (and its development in the direction of monotheism) did not suffice. Thus in both of his *Kalevala*s Lönnrot told the *history* of the people of Väinölä/Kalevala (i.e. Finland) from the creation of the world to the arrival of Christianity. The subtitle of the *Old Kalevala* is: "Old Karelian Poems about Ancient Times of the Finnish People".

The first and most important readership of the *Kalevala* was the Finnish intelligentsia, who were at this point Swedish-speaking. Readers had difficulty understanding Lönnrot's poetic text and even more difficulty following the historical and heroic plot. The text's structure of events did not form a compact, logically progressing plotline, and the narrative world of the epic diverged too far from the imagery of the literature of the Ancient Greeks and Romans, as well as the Germanic, Scandinavian and Celtic peoples. The heroism depicted in the *Kalevala* was also highly peculiar. Rather than killing dragons, making conquests of both cities and fascinating ladies, and above all emerging victorious over competing chieftans, preferably princes, Väinämöinen cured illnesses, went fishing, killed a bear and grew old as a bachelor in his cottage. The fact that no one had a clear idea of what Kalevala meter poetry was any more than they understood the relationship between Lönnrot's epic and ancient Finnish history only added to the confusion. In 1844 the most important ideologist of the nationalist-minded elite, J. W. Snellman, gave a very unenthusiastic appraisal of the *Old Kalevala* and concluded brusquely: "Such a people as the Finns can never have a true epic" (Sarajas 1984: 39; Karkama 2001: 292). But in the following year the *Old Kalevala* was being read with new eyes. The young scholar Robert Tengström found evidence from the epic of a "vigorous, bold, enterprising Viking spirit" and affirmed: "The Finnish people in no way lacked for a heroic age, as has been claimed" (Sarajas 1984: 41). Snellman changed his mind in 1846; in editing the newspaper *Saima* he was in constant contact with Lönnrot and received from him information regarding the progress of Finnish-language literature and the collection of Finnish and Karelian folk poetry. Although Snellman apparently found it personally difficult to muster enthusiasm for the *Kalevala*, he soon awoke to its political usefulness:

> The fact alone that the Finns have a national epic, the "third" true epic in the world alongside the Iliad and the Nibelungenlied gives cause to surmise the existence of a consciousness such as is not possessed by other peoples. The Greeks and Germans have undisputedly shown themselves to be among the world's most gifted peoples. And since in addition to them, only the Finns have a national epic, this appears to demonstrate a national spirit comparable to theirs. (Sarajas 1984: 41.)

In 1847 Snellman reviewed in his newspaper *Saima* the new edition of the first general work on Finnish history published in the Finnish language. The opening chapters of Johan Fredrik Cajan's *Suomen historia* (History of Finland, 1839–40), which deal with "ancient history", had been written by Elias

Lönnrot on the basis of folk poetry. Snellman now ceremoniously retracted his earlier statement expressing doubts over Lönnrot's epic and a Finnish heroic age:

> We use this opportunity to withdraw a certain reservation stated earlier regarding a heroic age of the Finnish tribe which would have given rise to the events depicted in the Kalevala. On closer consideration of the matter, we are convinced that such a foundation must exist for every true epic, since during the childhood of every folk, which was the era of epic poetry, only warlike heroic deeds can elevate the spirit of the people as required for the birth of the poem. (Karkama 2001: 295.)

The most valuable heroic texts from an ideological and political standpoint were the depictions of power struggles between ethnic groups, that is, "warlike heroic deeds". And Lönnrot made sure to write these into the next version of his Kalevala, the *New Kalevala* (1849). In this epic the enemy group, the people of Pohjola ("the Northland"), were defeated at least four times under Väinämöinen's leadership: through the stealing of the Sampo, through the curing of illnesses sent from Pohjola, by killing the bear summoned by Pohjola, and by freeing the sun and the moon imprisoned by the mistress of Pohjola. In addition to heroism, the basic plot of the Kalevala is intertwined with an abundance of mythology and folk belief. Lönnrot was personally more interested in ancient religion with its gods and myths, but it was heroic history which was the hard currency in 1830s' and 1840s' Finland.

Lönnrot tailored the timespan of the national epic to fit his purposes. He did not continue it as far as the Christian Middle Ages, because then he would have had to depict the patriotically less inspiring era of rule by Sweden or the Pope, or a Finnishness influenced by the Russian Orthodox Church (cf. Anttonen 2002: 46–47).

All things considered, both of Lönnrot's *Kalevala*s were written in the spirit of national Romanticist epic theory. If we wish to "free" Lönnrot from the aesthetic and ideological models of his own time as Lauri Honko (2000: 35–36) has proposed, the man behind the national epic would no longer be recognizable, nor would his *Kalevala* be the epic we know today.

The first phase of work on the New Kalevala

In April 1847, Lönnrot set out to write the *New Kalevala* uninterruptedly. At that time he lived in Kajaani, a small northern Finnish town, where he had held the position of district medical practitioner since 1833. The writing of the *New Kalevala* lasted two years, ending with Lönnrot's dating of the introduction to the *Kalevala* on April 17, 1849 in Laukko manor house, which belonged to his friends.[9]

In beginning his work, Lönnrot had a clear picture of which sorts of elements belonged in a national epic and which did not. Already in 1836 he had made a bound copy of the *Old Kalevala* equipped with blank pages inserted between the printed ones – the blank interleaves were roughly twice as large as the book's printed pages. To these blank pages Lönnrot copied segments first of folk poems collected by himself, and in the 1840s also of folk poems collected by others. Kaukonen estimates these segments to have contained over 20,000 lines of poetry. Following the *Old Kalevala*, Lönnrot had published the *Kanteletar* (1840–41), an anthology of lyric poems and ballads in Kalevala meter. Lönnrot also used the *Kanteletar* as his source material for the new *Kalevala* edition and filled his blank pages with references to the texts in the anthology as well as small fragments from them (Kaukonen 1989: 114, 116).[10]

Identifying additional elements and situating them within the framework of the pre-existing epic demanded an enormous amount of work. Lönnrot wrote to Frans J. Rabbe (6.6.1847): "You cannot imagine what heaps of rune manuscripts (*runoluntor*) I have had to look through and how much time it has taken to put all of the [handwritten material] which belongs in the Kalevala in its place" (Majamaa 1990a: 273).[11] Lönnrot emphasized the arduousness of the search for new rune material in another letter sent to Rabbe on July 27, 1847:

> Because the poems of Russian Karelia seem to be nowadays collected, so that most likely there is not much remaining, I consider it my undisputed obligation to now go through all of them once and for all using the greatest possible care. But ten or so books [nearly 2000 pages] of paper filled with dense handwriting are not so easily read through. Thinking about, searching for, and finding the place where each line is to be situated in the Kalevala takes such an unbelievable amount of time, I can't often do more than 2–3 sheets a day, nor perhaps would I have time to finish even that amount, if I did not each day go to visit my parents in the country and there write for as long as I can possibly remain seated. Nevertheless, I have decided that no greater speed can be forced, because it is only by using such an extremely precise method that I can hope to arrange the work most closely approximating its appropriate condition. If they so wish it, the Germans may republish the previous edition [= *Old Kalevala*] as it now stands, and let the dictionary be delayed by a year. (Anttila 1985: 351.)

On April 18, 1849, Lönnrot told Mathias Alexander Castrén by letter that the selection work had taken more than a year (Kaukonen 1956: 448–49). Lönnrot justified his use of this "extremely precise method" by pointing out that the work in progress was the final version of the *Kalevala*; all of the folk poems needed for the epic seemed to have been collected by the autumn of 1847. In the draft of a letter written to Matthias Akiander on October 2, 1847, Lönnrot wrote the following:

> I do not believe that there will be any need to compile a new edition of the Kalevala after this, since all the runes of this quality seem to now have been collected, and this has been one of the reasons why I have, in

> my opinion, gone through the recorded poems more carefully than I might have done in other circumstances (Majamaa 1990a: 277).

This stage of the work is associated with a valuable eyewitness statement. A young collector of folk poetry and researcher of Finnish language, August Ahlqvist, spent a long period in Kajaani in 1847. Ahlqvist had given his own collected folk poems to Lönnrot to use, and for this reason, among others, he observed with great interest how the master constructed his epic. Ahlqvist told how Lönnrot had attached poems from the *Old Kalevala* to a board and along with them, information regarding their contents. When Lönnrot read an epic poem written down by a collector and found in it something useful, he sought a place for this new addition by looking at the board upon which the contents were arrayed. Following this he wrote the new addition in the appropriate blank interleaf of the *Old Kalevala*:

> Work on the Kalevala proceeds in the following manner: he has a board before him, on which the Kalevala runes and their contents are ordered sequentially. He reads as long a passage from a collector's book as seems to belong together, and if he doesn't remember where in the epic it belongs, he looks at his board. There he searches through a rune topic list and finds that topic to which the words before him belong. Even the page number is up on the board and according to this number he now opens the interleaved Kalevala, finds the sought-after place and writes the lines in question on the paper opposite it.
>
> The longer and clearer the poem, the more smoothly goes this work, but the shorter it is, the more often he comes to search from the board and book. He himself said that he managed to do roughly six pages per day. But for another person this work would be much more difficult, for L. remembers nearly every word of the [Old] Kalevala by heart, and for this reason does not need to look at the board so often, but rather goes straight to the Kalevala. (Niemi 1921: 22.)

On the basis of Lönnrot's letters and Ahlqvist's description it would appear that as a textual-analytical process, the mapping out and writing down of the additions to the *Kalevala* come very close to the working method of the modern researcher. In reading the handwritten sheafs (*runoluntor*), Lönnrot first carried out a comparative analysis of texts. He separated the elements which belonged to the thematics of the Kalevala – or those which would potentially supplement them – from elements which were unsuitable to the epic. At the same time, he made an analysis of the motifs. He wanted to insert into the subplots of the epic the most common, aesthetically most representative or otherwise most interesting motifs and lines which the rune singers had performed for collectors. Thus the *New Kalevala* can still today be used as rough index of epic motifs. By reading the subplots of the epic (its "poems" or episodes), it is in fact possible to predict what motifs will be found from the recordings of different collectors, when a researcher unearths texts regarding, for example, the Theft of the Sampo from the Folklore Archives or the 33-volume series *Suomen Kansan Vanhat Runot* (Ancient Poems of the Finnish People, 1908–48).

In making his selections, Lönnrot at the same time monitored the saturation of his material. When he had gone through part of the new collected materials, he noticed that the same motifs, verse groups and figures of speech began to repeat themselves. The next sheaf of handwritten recordings offered almost nothing worthy of note when compared to the previous sheaf. Assessments of saturation can be found from Lönnrot's letters. On December 12, 1847 he wrote to Fabian Collan: "I will probably still receive new collections, additions and variants from Sjögren and Europeaus, but they cannot mean much additional work, since I suppose that they do not contain much that has not already been put in my interleaves" (Niemi 1921: 23).

When elements suitable for the *New Kalevala* were identified and copied to the interleaves in connection with the appropriate poems, what followed was a comparison among various rune fragments. Here Lönnrot judged on the basis of aesthetic considerations what should be incorporated into the new version, and which lines could be united into a plausible, natural-seeming whole. He anticipated this phase of the process in a letter written to F. J. Rabbe on October 3, 1847:

> Soon I will have all the relevant parts from individual rune collections written into the Kalevala (*inskrifvet i Kalevala*), but there still remains the time-consuming and difficult selection of the best variants, and their completion with other variants (Majamaa 1990a: 278).

Lönnrot thus undertook a complex and highly systematic textual analysis during the first phase of compiling the *New Kalevala*. It hardly needs to be emphasized that it is difficult to find corresponding methods in the production of oral poetry.

Sung, drawn from memory, or rewritten many times?

Lönnrot finished searching for and copying the *New Kalevala's* textual elements in April of 1848 (Kaukonen 1956: 447). The material that had to be sorted, modified and revised during the writing process consisted of four textual corpuses: the poems of the *Old Kalevala*, the poem segments contained in the interleaves, lines from the *Kanteletar*, and the handwritten recordings of folk poetry collectors. In his study *Elias Lönnrotin Kalevalan toinen painos* (The Second Edition of Elias Lönnrot's Kalevala, 1956), Kaukonen identified these elements down to the last line.

Regarding the choices made by Lönnrot when constructing his text using these materials, only rough conclusions can be drawn. It can be seen from Kaukonen's study that the uses to which the four corpuses were put varied from rune to rune. For example, the 36th rune depicting the sad fate of

Kullervo's sister contains numerous elements from the *Kanteletar*, and the same is true of the fourth rune describing the drowning of the maiden Aino. By contrast, the 49th rune recounting the theft and recovery of the sun and moon is based primarily on texts from the *Old Kalevala*, which Lönnrot supplemented with rune segments written in the blank interleaves. A more precise picture of the textualization process, that is, one which illuminated the choices made from among several alternatives as well as the addition and removal of textual elements would nonetheless require access to both Lönnrot's spoken conversation and his wastepaper basket. Appeals to Lönnrot's "mental text" (cf. Honko 2002: 14–15) provide little concrete assistance here, unless we are able to clarify with what methods we can access the processes which occurred in the mind of an eloquent master of words who died over a century ago.

On the basis of Lönnrot's letters we nonetheless know that the actual writing of the *New Kalevala* was not much easier than the previous phase of search and selection had been. Lönnrot told Castrén on April 18, 1849 that "in editing the new text often I am not able to complete more than 100 lines per day" (Kaukonen 1956: 449). It is likely that Lönnrot was forced to browse through the handwritten recorded notes by collectors at this stage as well. Such a hypothesis is supported by the fact that Lönnrot could not leave Kajaani to complete his work in the Laukko manor house until the writing of the Kalevala had progressed to the point where huge masses of collectors' recorded notes were no longer needed. On July 30, 1848, Lönnrot wrote the following to Rabbe:

> Now I am working on the 18th rune, which corresponds to the 10th in the earlier edition. But I rarely manage in half a day's time to do more than a hundred lines, so that for this reason the work proceeds slowly. Due to both of my tasks I have not been able to travel to peaceful Laukko, because I cannot haul with me all of the piles of books and manuscripts which are needed at all moments in this work. (Niemi 1921: 27.)

The second task mentioned by Lönnrot which required large amounts of textual materials was the editing of the Finnish language part of a Russian–Finnish–Swedish dictionary (Niemi 1921: 23).

Difficulties in writing the rune texts did not arise simply from the arduous search for lines from the source materials. Lönnrot was forced to agonize over aesthetic and structural dilemmas as well. How to construct a rune text in which everything would find its proper place: its relationship to other runes in the epic, its event structure and characters, the monologues and dialogues, the decorative details and the depiction of emotion, as well as the "Kalevalaic" expression of all of these elements in poetic verse which flowed naturally? Lönnrot was not the equal of the greatest contemporary masters of literary epic, such as Esaias Tegnér (1782–1846) or Johan Ludvig Runeberg (1804–77). The knowledge and skills that Lönnrot had learned from the rune singers he met in Karelia were certainly useful, even necessary, but they were not sufficient for the creation of a literary epic of national significance. Lönnrot mentioned his writing difficulties in a letter to Rabbe dated January 18, 1849 as follows: "Several runes have given me so much to think about that occasionally I have tarried several weeks over a single rune, and yet all the fragments which belong to it have been gathered in the interleaves; – –" (Niemi 1921: 29).

Lönnrot sought help in solving the structural and thematic problems of the *New Kalevala* by discussing the difficulties with his learned friends J. W. Snellman and Fabian Collan.[12] These associates and fellow nationalists lived at that time in Kuopio, a small town in Eastern Finland. When in the final stages of putting the supplementary materials to the *Old Kalevala* "in their place",[13] Lönnrot announced his intention to travel to Kuopio. He wrote the following to Collan on December 12, 1847:

> I have put into the Kalevala's interleaves everything that I have at the moment and would much like to confer with You and Snellman before I begin writing the text. In the new edition the sequence of several runes must be altered from where they were in the Old. (Niemi 1921: 23.)

The trip to Kuopio did not take place until three months later, at the end of March 1848 (Anttila 1985: 351). By this time news of the February Revolution in Paris had already reached even the northernmost corners of Europe.[14] The discussion with Collan continued a couple of months later when Collan arrived in Kajaani to spend his summer holidays there. Lönnrot visited Kuopio a second time in 1848 before settling down in Laukko Manor for nine months to write the *Kalevala* (Niemi 1921: 24–30.)

There is good reason to believe that during the spring and summer of 1848 Snellman, Collan and Lönnrot discussed other questions regarding the *New Kalevala*'s contents besides simply the ordering of the epic runes. One can find, in fact, an ideological discourse on liberty and progress in the 1849 *Kalevala* and its preface which hints at contemporary events.[15] According to Lönnrot, the epic is a story of how the Kalevala people, that is, the Finns, freed themselves from domination by the richer and militarily more powerful Pohjola, a neighboring people. According to Lönnrot, Pohjola subjected the Kalevala people to taxation, until the ancient heroes "Wäinämöinen, Ilmarinen and Lemminkäinen put a stop to this subjection to taxation". He continues: "The central thread or unity of the Kalevala-type songs lies in just this point, namely, that they tell how Kaleva's District gradually achieved a prosperity equal to that of Pohjola and finally attained victory over it." (Lönnrot 1963: 378–79.) This theme in the spirit of liberation and progress was constructed by Lönnrot and his fellow nationalists, and is not reflected in the oral poetry.

One receives the strong impression from Lönnrot's correspondence that the compilation of the

New Kalevala was the joint effort of a core group of nationalist-minded intellectuals, as was suggested by Heikki Laitinen in the *The Singer of Epics Symposium* on November 2, 2002 in Turku. It must be further kept in mind that Lönnrot's effort at writing the *New Kalevala* benefitted from critique of the *Old Kalevala* offered by his friends and colleagues, for example M. A. Cástren (Kaukonen 1979: 99–100).

The fact that Lönnrot in his letters describes the production of the *Kalevala* as onerous paperwork does not exclude the possibility that he occasionally utilized the methods and conventions of oral epic ("singing", "performing"; cf. Honko 2002: 14–15, 19). It is certain that at times he also made use of his memory. But it is equally certain that Lönnrot was forced to carry out his work dependent on papers and writing just like other authors who have crafted books based on traditional narratives. The closest parallel to Lönnrot and his three *Kalevalas* may be the brothers Grimm and their several editions of the *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (1812–57). When we look closely at the creation process as depicted by Lönnrot himself, we arrive at a familiar conclusion. The Finnish national epic is a hybrid, a product of both oral song and written narrative.

It is for this reason not advisable to reduce the crafting of the *Old* and the *New Kalevala*s to either the writing of literature or the performance of a long epic. Arguments solely for the latter alternative are contradicted by too many sources. What then of Lönnrot's famous poetic statement in which he refers to his role in the making of the *New Kalevala*: "I made myself a sorcerer, / I transformed myself into a singer ("Itse loime loitsijaksi, laikahtime laulajaksi")? These lines are included in his essay "Anmärkningar till den nya Kalevala upplagan" (1849; Majamaa 1993: 403). It becomes clear from the textual context that Lönnrot felt himself entitled to construct the sort of epic he wanted, without considering individual rune singers as authorities on the sequential structure of his book:

> The order in which the rune singers sing their runes should not be completely overlooked, even if I do not wish to assign to it too great a significance, because the singers diverge from each other greatly on this matter ––. I was unable to regard the order used by one singer to be more authentic than another's but rather considered both to be explained by the natural human need to arrange knowledge into some kind of order, and due to the singers' individual modes of conception, this has given rise to differences. In the end, when none of the singers could rival me with regard to the vast number of songs which I collected, I believed myself to have the same right which, I am convinced, most singers bestow upon themselves, namely to order the poems as they best fit together, or to use the words of the singer: *I made myself into a sorcerer, I transformed myself into a singer*. That is: I considered myself as good as singer as they. (Majamaa 1993: 403.)

Lönnrot defended his divergence from the solutions chosen by the rune singers by appealing, in a manner characteristic of Enlightenment thinking, to the natural rights and qualities of man. According to Lönnrot, people have a "natural cognitive" tendency to arrange knowledge into some kind of order; this method of organization was, in addition, individual in nature. The second justification offered by Lönnrot was that the "mass of runes" (*massan af runor*) he had mastered was greater than that possessed by any single singer of oral epic.

The only qualified epic authority that Lönnrot was willing to acknowledge was the poet Johan Ludvig Runeberg, whom he greatly admired, the creator of the Swedish language epics *Elgskyttarne* (Elk Hunters, 1832) and *Kung Fjalar* (King Fjalar, 1844).[16] In a letter sent to Rabbe on February 28, 1849, just before the *New Kalevala* went to press, Lönnrot expressed the hope that Runeberg would read through the manuscript and use his "epic eye" to remove superfluous lines and sequences:

> If Runeberg, in his demanding duties as headmaster, would have time even to quickly look over the manuscript before it goes into print, I am convinced that his epic eye would easily spot what portions of the text should be trimmed away in order to beautify the epic form. (Majamaa 1990a: 310).[17]

Lönnrot's roles as a writer and the Kalevala's international context

At many points in the construction process of the *New Kalevala* Lönnrot worked in the same way as a meticulous researcher. He was a folklorist and scholar of folk belief in two senses: he carried out fieldwork and analyzed texts at his desk at home. Lönnrot's goals and methods, however, were naturally different from those of modern researchers.

As a researcher, the author of the *Kalevala* can also be compared to an ethnologist or anthropologist. Lönnrot constructed a wide-ranging portrayal of a foreign culture, which was based largely on his own fieldwork. This depiction of an exotic culture was aimed at readers belonging to Western European educated circles. But the Kalevalaic song culture was not only unfamiliar to the elite of Lönnrot's day and age – it was also unknown among the majority of inhabitants living in the Grand Duchy of Finland, that is, the peasants and rural labourers of Southwestern and Western Finland.

The fact that Lönnrot told a story of a foreign culture distinguishes the *Kalevala* from the traditional epics of Antiquity and the Middle Ages. If we think of the persons who produced the source materials that went into the *Odyssey*, the *Edda* and the *Nibelungenlied*, as well as their authors and initial readership, all of these were situated within the same culture and tradition of the verbal arts. It was not necessary to explain these traditional epics to their contemporary audiences. Lönnrot, on the contrary, had to use a number of means to make his work accessible to the readers sitting on Biedermeier sofas. One of these

means was to standardize and clarify the language of his epic. In addition, Lönnrot wrote out the basic contents of the *Kalevala* also in prose form by placing at the beginning of each rune a clarifying paraphrase or summary. He also "Europeanized" and "civilized" the contents of his folk poetry-based work: the world was created under the influence of a divine being (Ilmatar), not by a bird, and the "supreme God" depicted in the runes is the God of 19th-century Christianity. The frenzy of the verbal incantation formulas was muted, and overly bizarre images were pruned away.

There is good reason to examine Lönnrot's roles as a writer in the *Kalevala* more closely, for they change from section to section. The writer-narrator of the Kalevala appears at times to be a creative tragic poet, at times as a promoter of the nationalistic agenda, at times as a teacher of the people, and at times as an ethnographer and scholar of folk belief. At the same time, such an examination could give us a more precise picture of Lönnrot's aesthetic ideals and his poetics, of what he considered to be a good text, a beautiful poem or an epic that would appeal to a 19th-century reader.

The question of what sort of literary school Lönnrot had studied in prior to encountering Eastern Finnish and Russian Karelian rune-singing is of vital importance. Lönnrot, who was born and raised in the Western Finnish countryside, can be assumed to have had his first contact with poetic epic through broadside ballads or other narrative songs in the newer meters. In school he became familiar with the classics of Greek and Roman Antiquity. Lönnrot was considered to be a good scholar of Latin and he had studied Classical Greek already from boyhood. At the beginning of the 1830s, Lönnrot translated parts of Homer directly from the Greek. In his letters, Lönnrot made mention of his attempts to translate into Finnish Runeberg's epic *Elgskyttarne*. In his own artistic poetry he experimented with a number of poetic meters, including those used in Classical literature.[18]

The *Kalevala* ja *Kanteletar* have been studied too narrowly also with regard to the literary arts of the 18th and early 19th centuries. Lönnrot would have become familiar with the fine literature of his own time period at the very latest when he worked as a tutor in the wealthy and cultured family of J. A. Törngren in the 1820s. In analyzing the literary context of Lönnrot's works, special attention should naturally be paid to literature which was based on folk poetry or ancient folk belief. James Macpherson's *Ossian* series, particularly *Fingal* (1761) and *Temora* (1763) were regarded as not merely cautionary examples of misleading source information but as, in fact, inspirational models to follow. In addition to Johann Gottfried Herder's international anthology *Stimmen der Völker in Liedern* (1778–1807) which also contained literary poetry, Scandinavian intellectuals were inspired by the collection of German folk songs *Des Knaben Wunderhorn. Alte deutsche Lieder* (1806–08) compiled by Achim von Arnim and Clemens Brentano. In the years 1814–17, the anthology *Svenska visor från forntiden*, edited by E. G. Geijer and Arvid A. Afzelius was published in Sweden. And while Lönnrot was writing and publishing ever newer versions of his epic, Jacob and Wilhelm Grimm were publishing new editions of their fairy tale collection *Kinder- und Hausmärchen* (1812–57).

Lönnrot and his contemporaries followed closely the developments in Scandinavian literature. The most renowned writers in Denmark and Sweden composed poetic epics which drew inspiration from Nordic mythology and ancient history. Adam Oehlenschläger (1779–1850), Erik Gustav Geijer (1783–1847) and Esaias Tegnér (1782–1846) were well known in Finland. The Swedes' enthusiasm for their own Viking past could be seen, for example, in the activities of the Gothic alliance (*Götiska förbundet* 1811).[19] This aroused envy in the generation of Finnish university students which preceded Lönnrot, but at the same time directed the attention of cultural activists to the non-material heritage of their own country. Abraham Poppius (1793–1866) wrote: "It is no longer fitting that Finns should extol Gothic masculinity. We are a different people, and the chests of our forefathers were just as hairy as ever those of the Goths, though they were not as famous for piracy." (Hautala 1954: 93.)

In the final analysis, the creation of the *Kalevalas* and the *Kanteletar* took place in a literary-historical context which can be characterized as Anglo-Germanic-Scandinavian primitivism.[20] It is worth continuing along the path indicated by Pertti Karkama's study of Lönnrot (2001) and to see Elias Lönnrot also as a European writer rather than simply a collector and compiler of Karelian and Finnish oral folk poetry.

Translated by Laura Stark

Notes

1 For the geographical distribution of the *Kalevala* materials see Kaukonen 1979: 58–59, 154–57 and Siikala 2002.

2 For more on the various phases of research on the *Kalevala*, see Kaukonen 1956: X–XII and Kaukonen 1939–45. – Kaukonen's lengthy studies on the Kalevala include *Vanhan Kalevalan kokoonpano I–II* (1939–45) and *Elias Lönnrotin Kalevalan toinen painos* (1956). In addition, Kaukonen's massive work *Elias Lönnrotin Kanteletar* (1984) contains valuable information on the birth of the *New Kalevala*. Kaukonen has summarized the results of his studies in his general overview *Lönnrot ja Kalevala* (1979) and *Lönnrot ja Kanteletar* (1989).

3 Macpherson published three volumes which he claimed to be of ancient poetry; the first to appear was *Fragments of Ancient Poetry Collected in the Highlands of Scotland and Translated from the Gaelic of Erse Language* (1760), then *Fingal. An Ancient Epic Poem in Six Books, Together with Several Other Poems, Composed by Ossian the Son of Fingal* (1761) and finally *Temora. An Ancient Epic Poem in Eight Books* (1763; Moore 2000: 380).

4 Dafydd Moore (2000), among others, has presented new perspectives on Macpherson's works, see also Groom 2000, Pittock 2000 and Fulford 2001.

5 Porthan 1983: 19–20, 104; Kaukonen 1956: 453.

6 Information regarding the translations of *Ossian* are from the database of HELKA (University of Helsinki libraries).

7 For more on the preliminary drafts of the *Old Kalevala* (1835), see Kaukonen 1979: 38–55.

8 The texts mentioned here can be found in the volumes *Elias Lönnrotin valitut teokset*, part 1 (*Kirjeet* 1990a), 2 (*Mehiläinen* 1990b) and 5 (*Muinaisrunoutta* 1993) edited by Raija Majamaa.

On the basis of the written correspondence between Lönnrot and other folk poetry collectors, it can be deduced that they perceived their task as having two aims: they were to find new materials which compared favourably with the poetic plots, themes or lines procured on earlier collection trips, and they were to record "good variants", in other words write down versions of previously-recorded poems which were of higher quality than their predecessors.

9 Numerous researchers have described the main stages in the completion process of the *New Kalevala*. The most important of these are Niemi (1921), Anttila (1931–35 = 1985) and Kaukonen (1956, 1979).

10 Väinö Kaukonen (1989: 114–22) has shown that the *Kanteletar* was an important precursor to the work on the *New Kalevala*.

11 The original text written by Lönnrot in Swedish is as follows: "Du kan icke föreställa dig hvilka runoluntor jag måste genomgå och hvad för tid åtgår att få inpassadt på sitt ställe, hvad i dem förekommer hörande till Kalevala."

12 Johan Wilhelm Snellman (1806–81) was a philosopher and journalist, later a professor at the University of Helsinki and a senator. Fabian Collan was a researcher and journalist, and also served as lecturer and headmaster at the Kuopio New Gymnasium.

13 In order to express how he fitted the supplementary new material "in its place" Lönnrot used the Swedish phrases "inpassa på sitt ställe" and "införa på behöriga ställen". See his letters to Rabbe on June 6, 1847 and to Akiander on October 3, 1847 (Majamaa 1990a: 273, 277).

14 Lönnrot commented on the February Revolution in his letter addressed to Fabian Collan on March 19, 1848 (Majamaa 1990a: 284), and Collan continued this conversation in his letter dated March 22, 1848 (Apo 2003: 271–72). They both took a stance on the side of progress and against reactionarism and hoped that the liberals and nationalists would emerge victorious. In speaking of the Paris revolutionaries, Lönnrot brought up the poet Alphonse de Lamartine, a moderate Republican.

15 The ideological features of the *New Kalevala* which are indicative of the period of its writing have been addressed by, for example, Kai Laitinen (1996), Pertti Anttonen (2002) and Satu Apo (2002 and 2003).

16 Lönnrot particularly admired Runeberg's epic *Elgskyttarne* in which the poet depicted Finnish folk life using hexameter verse. Lönnrot tried to translate the work into Finnish. *Kung Fjalar* shows influences from Ossian. For more on Lönnrot's translation of Runeberg, see Majamaa (1992: 456–61, 579). Majamaa has also published the letters which refer to these translations (1990a: 69–71).

17 The original text is as follows: "Skulle Runeberg för sina Rektorsbestyr hafva tid att helst flygtigt påögna mscr före tryckningen så tror jag ej annat än att hans episka öga lätt skulle upptäcka, hvad som för den episka formens större skönhet borde utlemnas."

18 Majamaa (1992: 580) and Anttila (1985: 46–47, 98–99) have provided information regarding Lönnrot's mastery of Latin and Greek, as well as his translations of Classical authors. Lönnrot's translations of poetry and the poems that he himself composed have been published in part 4 of his Selected Works (*Valitut teokset*; edited by Majamaa 1992: 433–85).

19 For more on the National Romanticism of Denmark and Sweden, see for example Brøndsted 1972: 259–92 and Svanfeldt 1972: 302–12. Regarding Denmark, see Fibiger and Lütken 1999: 119–26, 129–33 and for Sweden, see Olsson and Algulin 1995: 173–204.

20 Nordic literary scholars use the term national romantik for this literary trend/current (Brøndstedt 1972: 263; Fibiger and Lütken 1999: 129). English researchers, on the other hand, use the term primitivism (for example Celtic primitivism, Fulford 2001: 126; poetic primitivism, Groom and Rounce 2000: 471).

Bibliography

Anttila, Aarne 1985 (1931–35): *Elias Lönnrot. Elämä ja toiminta*. Second edition. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Anttonen, Pertti 2002: Kalevala-eepos ja kansanrunouden kansallistaminen. Pekka Laaksonen and Ulla Piela (eds), *Lönnrotin hengessä 2002*, 39–57. (Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 81.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Apo, Satu 2002: Kertojan ääni Kalevalassa. Pekka Laaksonen and Ulla Piela (eds), *Lönnrotin hengessä 2002*, 108–22. (Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 81.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— 2003: Lönnrot's Voice in the Kalevala. Lotte Tarkka (ed.), *Dynamics of Tradition: Perspectives on Oral Poetry and Folk Belief*, 266–79. (Studia Fennica Folkloristica 13.) Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Brøndsted, Mogens 1972: 1800–1830. Inledning; Danmark. Mogens Brøndsted (ed.), *Nordens litteratur. För 1860*, 259–92. København: Gyldendalske Boghandel.

Fibiger, Johannes and Gerd Lütken 1999: *Litteraturens veje*. København: Gads Forlag.

Fulford, Tim 2001: "Nature" poetry. John Sitter (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Eighteenth-Century Poetry*, 109–32. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Groom, Nick 2000: Forgery and Plagiarism. David Womersley (ed.), *A Companion to Literature from Milton to Blake*, 94–113. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Groom, Nick and Adam Rounce 2000: Literature 1757–1776. David Womersley (ed.), *A Companion to Literature from Milton to Blake*, 464–82. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Hautala, Jouko 1954: *Suomalainen kansanrunoudentutkimus*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

HELKA 2003: Database of the libraries of the University of Helsinki.

Honko, Lauri 2000: Kalevalan viisi esitystä. Niina Roininen (ed.), *Viimeinen Väinämöinen. Näkökulmia kansalliseepokseen*, 10–37. Turku: Kirja-Aurora.

— 2002: The Kalevala as performance. Lauri Honko (ed.), *The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics*, 13–25. (Studia Fennica Folkloristica 12.) Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Karkama, Pertti 2001: *Kansakunnan asialla. Elias Lönnrot ja ajan aatteet*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Kaukonen, Väinö 1939–45: *Vanhan Kalevalan kokoonpano*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— 1956: *Elias Lönnrotin Kalevalan toinen painos*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— 1979: *Lönnrot ja Kalevala*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— 1984: *Elias Lönnrotin Kanteletar*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— 1989: *Lönnrot ja Kanteletar*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Kuusi, Matti, Keith Bosley and Michael Branch (eds.) 1977: *Finnish Folk Poetry: Epic*. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Laitinen, Kai 1996: Lönnrotin ääni Kalevalassa. Juhani Salokannel (ed.), *Kirjojen Suomi*, 65–78. Helsinki: Otava.

Lönnrot, Elias 1963: *The Kalevala or Poems of the Kaleva District*. Translated by Francis Peabody Magoun, Jr. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press.

Lönnrotiana 37: Digital version of the Old Kalevala and its interleaves. The Literature Archives of the Finnish Literature Society, Helsinki.

Majamaa, Raija (ed.) 1990a: *Elias Lönnrotin valitut teokset 1. Kirjeet*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— (ed.) 1990b: *Elias Lönnrotin valitut teokset 2. Mehiläinen*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— (ed.) 1992: *Elias Lönnrotin valitut teokset 4. Ohjeita ja runoelmia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

— (ed.) 1993: *Elias Lönnrotin valitut teokset 5. Muinaisrunoutta*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Moore, Dafydd 2000: James Macpherson, Fingal and Other Poems. David Womersley (ed.), *A Companion to Literature from Milton to Blake*, 380–86. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers.

Niemi, A. R. 1921: Uuden Kalevalan toimitusajoilta. *Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 1*, 12–30. Porvoo: WSOY.

Olsson, Bernt and Ingemar Algulin 1995: *Litteraturens historia I:*

Sverige. Stockholm: Nordstedts Förlag.
Pittock, Murray 2000: Literature and Nationhood. David Womersley (ed.), *A Companion to Literature from Milton to Blake*, 114–30. Oxford and Malden: Blackwell Publishers.
Porthan, Henrik Gabriel 1983: *Suomalaisesta runoudesta (De poësi Fennica 1766–78.)* Edited and translated by Iiro Kajanto. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
Sarajas, Annamari 1984: Snellman ja Kalevala. 37–45. (Kalevala-seuran vuosikirja 64.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
Siikala, Anna-Leena 2002: The singer ideal and the enrichment of poetic culture: Why did the ingredients for the Kalevala come from Viena Karelia? Lauri Honko (ed.), *The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics*, 26–43. (Studia Fennica Folkloristica 12.) Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.
Smith, Anthony D. 1991: *National Identity*. London: Penguin Books.
Suomen Kansan Vanhat Runot 1908–48. 33 volumes. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
Svanfeldt, Gunnar 1972: 1800–1830. Sverige. Mogens Brøndsted (ed.), *Nordens litteratur. För 1860*, 293–317. København: Gyldendalske Boghandel.
Thomson, Deric Smith 1967: James Macpherson. *Encyclopaedia Britannica. Vol. 14*, 545. Chicago and London: William Benton.

Elias Lönnrot the ethnographer

Academy Professor Anna-Leena Siikala,
University of Helsinki, Kalevala Institute

April 26, 2002 marked the 200th anniversary of the birth of Elias Lönnrot, creator of the Kalevala. During the jubilee year, his work as a collector of folklore and the author of an epic was assessed from many angles. The process leading up to the birth of the Kalevala has to be examined in the light of Lönnrot's work and his objectives, which reflected the ideals prevailing in Europe and Finland in the 19th century. What is significant is that his perspective was not moulded by the milieu inhabited by the ordinary people. Rather, his work was founded on a familiarity with epic theories, and he formulated his task according to the models of international research. These included scientific expeditions seeking to amass all kinds of information on language, culture and physical conditions. The 19th century collection of folk poetry should thus be regarded as part of a broader international research tradition.

Unus homo nobis cursando restituit rem

In April 1828 Elias Lönnrot set forth from his home in the Western Finland village of Sammatti on his first scientific expedition. As he approached the town of Hämeenlinna, he requested a horse at one of the inns in order to enter the town as a traveller. The innkeeper, who regarded Lönnrot as a travelling apprentice, refused to grant him a horse, even when the young graduate listed all his academic qualifications. This incident serves as an excellent illustration of the position in which the young Elias found himself between two worlds. The son of a village tailor, he represented agrarian artisan culture, from which he had risen to academic circles after studying at the University of Turku.

The contrast between these two worlds constituted a dichotomy which he addressed as an educator and a portrayer of the people, and as a scientist and poet pointing the way to European civilisation. Elias Lönnrot was a man who crossed cultural borders, the various sides of his identity being reflected in his concept of the people just as much as the philosophical tenets assimilated at university. The reports of his travels should in fact be interpreted as ethnography across cultural borders that provides a key to understanding the rare diversity of his lifetime achievements.

Finland having been severed from its former mother country, Sweden, to become an autonomous grand duchy of the Russian Empire in 1809, the young intellectuals turned their attention on the construction of a culture that was inherently Finnish. The national awakening was, to begin with, hesitant and did not aim at the establishment of an independent state. Rather, it sought to foster a nation with a language and culture of its own, and a history that would place it on a par with other nations. Johan Jakob Tengström was one of the scholars who, like Henrik Gabriel Porthan, pointed out the importance of language as a nation's identifying factor and stressed the ability of folklore and folk customs to provide knowledge of ancient times: "The 'few remaining relics' of Finnish folk poetry and the 'inherent features' of the national character could, according to him, still be found and collected 'in their original purity' in the heartlands of Kainuu, Karelia and Savo." (Sihvo 1973: 53.)

Porthan had already described the performance of Kalevalaic epic and its characteristic features in 1778, in *De Poesii Fennica*. Folk poetry did not, however, yet hold any very wide appeal among the educated circles. The impetus to begin collecting and studying it after an interval of 40 years came at an auspicious moment, with the change of political regime. There is, however, more to the explanation than the political events of the time. The interest in mythology aroused in the Anglo-Saxon and German Romantics and the admiration for folk poetry shown by the Neohumanism of Johan Gottfried Herder had long been firing the minds of learned northerners. A meeting in Copenhagen in 1799 debated whether Norse mythology should be adopted as a literary

subject instead of Greek. The fact that the Uppsala Romantics turned their attention on Finnish folk poetry in 1814 also says much about the times. (Sihvo 1973: 36–37.)

Caught up most strongly by this German-Geatish trend in Finland were Anders Johan Sjögren and those who had studied at Uppsala, above all Karl Aksel Gottlund, who had already put forward the idea of collecting folk poems to make an epic in 1817. This idea gradually germinated in the minds of many a Finnish-minded scholar. The first to visit Karelia was A. J. Sjögren, in 1823–25, but his collection of 433 poems lay dormant for many years. In other words, Elias Lönnrot was not the first to make the journey. He was, however, the first to really discover Viena Karelia, an inveterate explorer and, following the publication of the Kalevala, an expert second to none on archaic poetry.

A cartoon by A. W. Linsén depicting Elias Lönnrot and bearing the text "Unus homo nobis cursando restituit rem" (A single man, by running about, has created a heritage for us) reflects, even in its irony, Lönnrot's superiority as a collector of poetry in the Kalevalaic metre. Regarding his expeditions in the narrow sense simply as the noting down of folk poetry in the way suggested by those who speak of his poetry-collecting trips is, however, misleading. So what, then, did he actually do on his journeys?

Ethnography project

The report titled *Vaeltaja* (Wanderer) of Lönnrot's first field trip and published posthumously well demonstrates the scientific tradition represented by his journeys. Written in the form of a diary, it consists of thumbnail sketches describing the course of his journey, his own impressions and people he met, but it also contains elements of standard 19th century ethnography: observations on the landscape, vegetation, occupations, people, folk customs, buildings, dress, religion, language and poetry. A good work for comparison in this respect is the travel reports of Pehr Kalm, a botanist. Kalm spent three-and-a-half years in the mid-18th century travelling in North America on behalf of the Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences. The first volume of his travel diary appeared in 1753 and observes the model prescribed by Carl von Linné: "a diary in which observations and reflections follow one another as Kalm encountered them or as they occurred to him" (Leikola 1991: 7). The purpose of his expedition was to assemble first-hand observations, facts and samples; these not only provided substance for his travel reports but later, at his desk, were arranged and interpreted in the light of comparative material to form scientific data. This basic model for ethnographical fieldwork in the 18th and 19th centuries had its origins in the natural sciences but also lent itself well to the needs of the human sciences. The objects of these observations, nowadays so sharply differentiated, did in fact constitute a natural entity in the exploration of alien cultures. Thus a natural scientist who, like Darwin, was interested in the geographical distribution of species might equally well collect ethnographic data. (Stocking 1992: 21.) Geographers tended to take for granted the observation of nature, culture and customs, as the many expeditions to Siberia by German and Russian scientists prove. All-round observation was one of the primary objectives of these travellers; it was, for example, the very reason why Captain Cook was accompanied on his first Pacific voyage of 1768–71 by experts in a number of fields, among them the Finnish botanist-zoologist Herman Dietrich Spöring. In addition to natural samples, members of the expedition sought information on human customs and language and used it to form conclusions on the characteristics of peoples and cultures.

Captain Cook was sponsored by the British Royal Society. Another major source of ideas and funds for field research was the Russian Academy of Sciences. Although the journeys seeking information on the language and cultural history of Finland were motivated by nationalist interests, they were determined by international practice. This is clear on examining the contacts between scholars in Europe. But let us return to Henrik Gabriel Porthan. In 1799 Porthan paid a five-week visit to Göttingen, where one of the professors was the German scholar August Ludwig Schlözer, who had spent some time in Sweden and had been professor of Russian history in St. Petersburg. Schlözer's book on the history of Eastern Europe, the material for which had been collected by many scholars under the auspices of the Russian Academy of Sciences, gave a more thorough account of the Finno-Ugrian peoples than any other to date. His stay in Göttingen strengthened Porthan's desire to seek the history of the Finns in the neighbouring peoples to the east. Based on St. Petersburg, he was offered an opportunity in 1795 to conduct an expedition among the Finno-Ugrian peoples, but the 66-year-old Porthan declined on grounds of age and health. (Branch 1973: 26.) The expeditions were ultimately led by Anders Johan Sjögren, who, on rising to an exalted state in the academic world of St. Petersburg, directed and assisted Finnish scholars in their travels among the Finns' linguistic relatives.

The warp and weft of national and international, nationalism and imperialism were intertwined in the 19th century in a more complex weave than the debate on the building of the Finnish identity has sometimes wished to acknowledge. The secret of Elias Lönnrot's travels lies not in his agrarian background and the taste acquired as a young schoolboy for long journeys on foot and a simple way of life. These may well have helped him to cope in strenuous circumstances, but the international research tradition provided the models for achieving his objectives.

Lönnrot in the field

The journalistic travel reports published either alone or as by-products of expeditions, such as Giuseppe Acerbi's *Travel through Sweden, Finland and Lapland to the North Cape in the Years 1798 and 1799*, were fashionable reading in the 19th century among persons wishing to broaden their outlook on the world, and they brought their writers welcome publicity. After *Vaeltaja*, Lönnrot no longer sought to keep a regular travel diary. Instead, he maintained contact with readers by means of shorter accounts of his travels published either in the *Helsingfors Morgonbladet* newspaper edited by his friend, Johan Ludvig Runeberg, or elsewhere. Along with the field diaries, letters and more disconnected notes, they provide an insight into the nature of his approach to his subjects. (Lönnrot 1902, I–II.)

On his first journey, Lönnrot did not get as far as Viena. He later embarked on the systematic collection of poetry across the border in Karelia, being well positioned for this on his appointment as district physician in Kajaani. The journeys he made between 1832 and 1838 were relatively short forays across the border. Having completed the Kalevala, he wished to concentrate on the collection of linguistic material and his travels in 1836–37 and 1841–42 took him further and further afield: to Lapland, the Kola Peninsula, Archangel, Olonets, and the region inhabited by the Veps. His last, eleventh journey took him to Estonia in 1844; on the way home, he found time to collect some Votic folklore. While planning his extensive tour of the north in 1834, he listed his objectives in a letter to his friend C. N. Keckman.

> He wished, he said, to travel through all the places both in Finland and on the Russian side where the Finnish language was spoken. Not much could be achieved in one year alone; it would take at least two or three. First, he would visit all the places in the Viena and Olonets governments to collect whatever came to hand: poems, songs, folk tales, legends, words, sayings, all sorts of other information about the country, customs, life, and so on.

In other words, Lönnrot wished to continue his comprehensive presentation of culture, taking in not only genres of folklore but all sorts of other information, too, about the country, customs, life, and so on.

How, then, did he achieve his objectives? Entries here and there in his field diaries and the thematisation of his travel reports and letters demonstrate that Lönnrot made his notes along the lines of ethnographic description already familiar from *Vaeltaja*. In addition to lively accounts of his personal moods and adventures, the texts are repeatedly dotted with descriptions of nature, the precise distances covered in versts, analyses of the people's character, detailed reports of economic conditions, settlement and housing, folk customs, dress, rites and folk belief, notes on language and lexicon, and samples of folk poetry. At times he recorded them in quick portraits of people he happened to meet and humorous stories about memorable events, at others in the form of rough, dry lists. His main observations were presented accorded to the interests of the assumed reader. Only those closest to him would have suspected his despondency and misery, above all the student Johan Fredrik Cajan, who shared the trials of the visit to Uhtua and to whom Lönnrot confided his most dejected moods.

The criticism aimed at ethnography, the description of culture, in the 1980s focused on a fieldworker who, in accordance with the anthropological tradition, sought information on alien cultures. (Clifford and Marcus 1986; Heikkinen 1998; Kupiainen 1998). Literary accounts of culture – and these include the reports of Lönnrot – inevitably reflect their author's values, conscious and subconscious objectives and feelings. Definition of the "inherent features" of the national character was one of the standard tools both of the nation builders (as the demand put forward by J. J. Tengström quoted above reveals) and of the early ethnographers examining alien cultures. Thus Lönnrot likewise took it upon himself to examine and compare the inherent features of both the Finnish tribes and the peoples living the other side of the border. He was already ranking the Finnish tribes in order of superiority in the early days of *Vaeltaja*, praising the people of Savo above those of Häme, and placing the Karelians on a par with the Finns. These early descriptions of racial traits were to a great extent founded on the stereotypical views of the Finnish character that had their roots in contemporary Swedish literature.

It is interesting to follow the change in Lönnrot's attitude to the Viena Karelians across in Russia as he acquired more experience. The early Viena descriptions are idealising. The approach is repeatedly one of "them versus us", and hence the Vienans, whom Lönnrot repeatedly calls Finns, are likened either to the Kainuu population the other side of the border or, more vaguely, to the Finns in Finland. The Viena Karelians are cleaner, more hospitable, drink less, are more tolerant over matters of religion (though not the Old Believers), wealthier, more colourfully dressed, more polite, more lively and mobile than their neighbours in Finland. (Lönnrot 1902, I: 151–57, 173, 195). They have neglected agriculture, but they have a greater aptitude for trade than the Finns (Lönnrot 1902, I: 159). The reports of Lönnrot's travels published in the *Helsingfors Morgonbladet* and later elsewhere were, until the 1880s, the most important source of information on Karelia (Sihvo 1973: 132) and thus created and established images of the Karelians. The same accounts are repeated almost verbatim in later Karelianist literature.

The tendency to idealise nevertheless grew weaker as the years went by. Experience gave Lönnrot a greater sense of proportion and his views became more realistic and distanced. In describing the Lonkka reindeer thefts on his fifth journey he calls the Karelians Russians, as was the custom in Kainuu

(Lönnrot 1902, I: 205). The further he travelled from the border, and the further north, the bleaker are his descriptions of the people he met. On his seventh trip, in 1836–37, he suffered from cold, hunger, exhaustion and low spirits. Even the Vuokkiniemi "goldmine" acquired a negative hue: the inhabitants had a Russian tendency to cheat, and he described their itinerant merchants as swindlers. He wrote:

> The only real benefit derived by the men of Vuokkiniemi and other regions from their travels in Finland is some kind of civilisation such as is missing from the other nearby regions. May this increase, but the trading cease, and may agriculture, cattle-farming and handicrafts prosper more. (Lönnrot 1902, I: 321.)

This utterance is typical of Lönnrot, a man who viewed conditions and livelihoods through the eyes of a popular educator.

The aim of the ethnographic field trip taking an all-round look at culture was to obtain facts and samples for subsequent systemisation. This is the spirit in which Lönnrot worked in collecting his vast volume of folk poetry. There is, by contrast, little information about the singers of the poetry. This is surprising, for the reports are rich in descriptions of people and their fates. Folklorists have indeed tried to figure out why so little light is shed on the encounter of collector and singer. The explanation lies not only in the nature of Lönnrot's expeditions but also in his concepts of the essence of folk poetry.

In the preface to the *Kanteletar* Lönnrot expounds in more detail his view on the origin of folk poetry. To him, folk poetry is an organic phenomenon comparable to nature that cannot be approached via individual items:

> Folk poems cannot, for this reason, really be said to have been made. They are not made, they are made of their own accord, they are born, they grow and are shaped as such without any special effort by a maker. The soil that grows them is the mind itself and thought, the seeds from which they germinate, all kinds of workings of the mind. But since the minds, thoughts and workings of the mind of all people at all times are for the most part similar, so the poems of which they are born are not the exclusive property of one or two but belong to the whole nation. In being ascribed to one particular maker, they would at the same time cease to have value as folk poetry. (Kanteletar III.)

The view was the result of careful consideration. Aarne Anttila, author of a biography of Lönnrot, observed that he borrowed Johan Gottfried Herder's *Stimmen der Völker in Lieder* from the university library just before he wrote the preface (Anttila 1985: 260). The roots of his Herderian concept of folk poetry did, however, run deeper than this. They ultimately go back to Porthan, who was highly familiar with both the Neohumanist theories and the Romantic Anglo-Saxon collections of folk poetry. He did, for example, set his student J. H. Kellgren the task of translating Ossian, and this was later published in the magazine *Aurora* (Sihvo 1973: 35).

H. G. Porthan, Professor of Eloquence at the University of Turku, created an ideal image of rune (i.e. poetry) singing that was assimilated and passed on by his students. Not only did he characterise rune singing; he also delivered the first treatise on the Kalevalaic metre. He applied the text-critical method widely familiar in the humanistic and theological disciplines in Europe to the study of Finnish poetry. His aim was, by comparing poem variants, to restore the poem to its most aesthetically intact form. Thus the aesthetic values of a literary scholar became guiding principles for subsequent collectors. Poems were to be clear in their content and pure of form. A good example to illustrate this is the meeting between Lönnrot and Martiska Karjalainen of Lonkka. Martiska had been recommended to Lönnrot as a good singer, but the latter was disappointed: "He had been mentioned to me as an excellent singer long before this. And nor was he short of words, but it is a pity they were not in better order. For the most part he switched from one poem to another, so that that which I did note down from him did indeed serve to supplement that which I had previously collected, but he did not offer me any complete poems." (Lönnrot 1902, I: 203–04.) During the brief visits to Viena on his earlier journeys, the collector had been pressed for time. On meeting rune singers, he concentrated on taking notes. Only the best singers impressed him and were immortalised on the pages of his travel diary. The most inspiring was Miihkaili Arhippainen, whom Lönnrot met on his fifth collection trip and whose songs provided some of the main substance for the Kalevala.

Instead of giving a systematic presentation of his singers, Lönnrot founded his concept of their culture on close-up portraits of everyday practices and persons representing different ethnic groups and social classes. It would appear that the custom familiar from his educational writings of couching advice and instructions in the form of narratives attached to a particular person also served as a tool for his travel reports. In addition to farmers and farm hands, the reader is introduced to beggars, shamans, Russian officials, drivers, and members of the various ethnic minorities of the northern regions. Being a doctor, Lönnrot was interested in the diet of the people he met, their state of health and living conditions in general, hygiene and houses included, though he avoided – having no official blessing – the practice of medicine wherever possible. His increasingly profound meditation on religious phenomena was fuelled by his acquaintance with monastic life and the Old Believers. His most trenchant comments are directed at precisely such phenomena alien to him. Some of the most choice descriptions are, as travel literature, possibly those of the imperial officialdom in Russia, and of Kola, Kannanlahti and Kouta society. In the bleak little towns of the north Lönnrot was obliged to adapt to local life by speaking five languages.

The trips to Lapland and the Kola Peninsula were particularly taxing, and Lönnrot reports his

experiences openly and with humour. It would be easy to interpret them as expressions of corporeality, emotion and attitude. The journey to Lapland in the company of Matias Aleksanteri Castrén was especially tiring: having been forced to spend a couple of weeks in a cold, uncomfortable Sami cottage, the two companions fell into an argument sparked off by some minor dispute and did not speak to each other for ages. Castrén, with whom Lönnrot travelled to Archangel to learn Samoyed, later became a good friend. Lönnrot gave up the idea of studying Samoyed on observing that Castrén would be a better man for the job.

Elias Lönnrot was a multi-linguist. In addition to Finnish and Swedish, he had a mastery of German, Latin and Russian, and could read texts written in several other languages, such as English. His travel reports also reveal him as a multicultural man with the art of making himself equally at home in the company of the most diverse social classes and peoples. Or of avoiding them if necessary if they interfered with his work. Lönnrot – a man of moderation – had nothing against a convivial drink with an academic friend, a Sami reindeer herder or a Russian official. Behind the serious exterior it is possible to catch the occasional glimpse of a rascal with a sense of humour that allowed him to weather both officiousness in those around him and the hardships of his strenuous journeys.

And after his journeys?

What, then, was Lönnrot's philosophy in assembling the results of his field trips? Pertti Karkama, in *Kansakunnan asialla. Elias Lönnrot ja ajan aatteet* (2001), examines Lönnrot's position vis-à-vis contemporary ideals and philosophical trends. In particular he makes a penetrating study of the relationship between Lönnrot's concepts about poetry and the thoughts propounded by Johan Gottfried Herder. Karkama describes Lönnrot as an eclectic "who always chose his theories according to what he felt he needed to carry out the highly practical task he had assigned himself" (2001: 35). Lauri Honko in turn claimed that "Elias Lönnrot was a practical epic man, not a theorist" (1987: 47). Lönnrot does indeed avoid direct theoretical references, though he is known to have been familiar with the leading thinkers of his day. In addition to Herder, he had studied Hegel and the epic theory of the German J. W. Wolf.

It is significant to note that Jacob Grimm's *Die Deutsche Mythologie* appeared in 1835, the same year as the Kalevala. Grimm's aim had been to compile an ancient Germanic mythology out of elements of folk narratives, akin to Lönnrot's Kalevala. In the second edition of his work in 1844 Grimm likened the Kalevala mythology to the ancient Germanic and Greek fables. He influenced reception of the Kalevala by giving a talk that aroused considerable attention at a session of the Berlin Academy of Sciences in 1845. (Hautala 1954: 143–44.) German mythological research did in fact have close links with Nordic research and interest in Kalevalaic epic right up to the 1880s, as manifest in, for example, the more or less simultaneous shifts of interpretation.

The skipper who keeps his eye only on the rocks does not see how the river flows. In addition to seeking out individual theoretical models, the researcher must examine the work of Lönnrot as a whole – and also as part of a whole. Lönnrot's train of thought seems, in the light of his field trip objectives, to have been clear. His aim was to investigate the ancient history of the Finnish people as planned by Porthan and J. J. Tengström. Even in *Vaeltaja* he was already urging people to go out and collect sufficient information for comparative research on wedding customs, "in order to determine what elements of them are from ancient times" (Lönnrot 1902, I: 70–71). He felt that the study of language he made on his journey of 1833 would help him to discover the history of the occupations of the various Finnish tribes (Lönnrot 1902, I: 190). Like folk customs and language, folk poetry created a picture of the nation's past. This, then, was his objective in compiling the Kalevala. It also explains why he historicised the extreme mythological interpretation of the epic. He described epic poetry – in a manner relevant from the present-day perspective – as mythico-historical (Lönnrot 1902, I: 190).

The picture of his life-long project revealed to us in his field trips illustrates that Lönnrot's fundamental objective was the same as Porthan's. Like the Göttingen scholars of the latter half of the 18th century, and above all August Schlözer, Porthan wanted to examine the history of nations using linguistic, ethnographic and folkloristic material (Sihvo 1973: 39). This was in fact one of the most thriving disciplines in humanistic research and one of the strongest inter-disciplinary traditions, as was repeatedly manifest in German scholarship in the 19th century. One major figure of influence in the study of cultures was Wilhelm von Humboldt, and his views on education; like Herder, he emphasised the special role of culture rather than the universalism of Immanuel Kant and the Enlightenment and defined the principles of comparative anthropology (in the sense of the study of language and culture) in 1795–97 (Dumont 1994). The Humboldtian view according to which language, folklore and myths evolve in the nation's historical processes and thus reflect the history of the nation and its inherent way of thinking was introduced into American cultural anthropology by Franz Boas at the end of the 19th century (Bunzl 1996). The ethnographic-folkloristic expeditions arranged by Boas to Siberia, his considerable collections of Indian folklore, and the large-scale collection of folk poetry carried out by the German Adolf Bastian in the Pacific in the 1870s are manifestations of this trend (Jacknis 1996; Koepping 1983).

It should also be remembered that this humanistic research trend applying a comparative method is not just a thing of the past, even though the theoretical

assumptions and research methods have been revised many times. Conspicuous examples in the present day are the cross-disciplinary study of Finland's prehistory or the joint international project being conducted by archaeologists, linguists, ethnographers and folklorists into the history of the Austronesian peoples. The trend is not confined to the nationalist disciplines, and nor does it necessarily have nationalist roots; it has been applied particularly in the study of peoples with no written history in the empires of both West and East. In the background is Herder's concept of the basic unity of mankind, as it is known in Anglo-Saxon circles: a principle that justified comparative research in the study of folklore, language and culture alike. Or as Elias Lönnrot put it, "the minds, thoughts and workings of the mind of all people at all times are for the most part similar."

The Kalevala is part of world literature and is Elias Lönnrot's greatest achievement. His lifelong ambition, to describe the history and environment of the Finnish people, and the achievement of this ambition by means of expeditions resulted in a literary output of rare complexity. His journeys provided substance not only for the Kalevala, the Kanteletar and other collections of folk poetry, but also for linguistic research, a large-scale dictionary, and a publication on Finnish plants. They matured his view of life and man; they provided material for his thoughts on religion and public enlightenment. Above all they are proof of an all-round concept of culture such as may be difficult to grasp, let alone achieve, for modern man with his fragmented view of the world.

Conclusion

The work of Elias Lönnrot and its objectives cannot be evaluated without a familiarity with the concepts of nation of Neohumanism and Romanticism and the influence on Nordic ideology of the Anglo-Saxon and German Romantic view of the role of folk poetry and mythology at the very hub of culture. The building of the Finnish language, culture and history should not, however, be regarded merely as a peripheral movement operating in a vacuum and influenced only from afar, but as the outcome of close interaction with the surrounding world. Of this the Kalevala is a splendid example. We cannot understand the inherent features of Finland's history until we know what role the international trends mentioned here had to play in developing scholarship in other countries and on other continents: how they were put into practice in cultural and political climates that differed in their aspirations, their procedures and their opportunities.

References

Anttila, Aarne 1985: *Elias Lönnrot, Elämä ja toiminta*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Branch, Michael 1973: *A. J. Sjögren Studies of the North*. Helsinki: Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura.

Bunzl, Matti 1996: Franz Boas and the Humboldtian Tradition: From Volksgeist and Nationalcharakter to an Anthropological Concept of Culture. George W. Stocking, Jr. (ed.), *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic. Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, 17–78. (History of Anthropology, vol. 8.) Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Clifford, James, and George E. Marcus (eds) 1986: *Writing Culture: The Poetics and Politics of Ethnography*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Dumont, Louis 1994: *German Ideology from France to Germany and Back*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Elias Lönnrotin matkat I, vuosina 1828–39. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1902.

Elias Lönnrotin matkat II, vuosina 1841–44. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1902.

Hautala, Jouko 1954: *Suomalainen kansanrunoudentutkimus*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Heikkinen, Kaija 1998: Venäläinen matkalla Karjalassa – kenen katse? Marja-Leena Hakkarainen and Tero Koistinen (eds), *Artikkeleita kirjallisista matkoista mieleen ja maailmaan*, 198–217. Joensuu: Universitas Ostiensis.

Honko, Lauri 1987: Kalevala: aitouden, tulkinnan ja identiteetin ongelmia. Lauri Honko (toim.), *Kalevala ja maailman eepokset*, 125–70. (Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 64.) Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Jacknis, Ira 1996: The Ethnographic Object and the Object of Ethnology in the Early Career of Franz Boas. Volksgeist as Method and Ethic. George W. Stocking, Jr. (ed.), *Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*, 185–214. (History of Anthropology, vol. 8.) Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Kaukonen, Väinö 1979: *Lönnrot ja Kalevala*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Karkama, Pertti 2001: *Kansakunnan asialla. Elias Lönnrot ja ajan aatteet*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Koepping, Klaus-Peter 1983: *Adolf Bastian and the Psychic Unity of Mankind. The Foundations of Anthropology in Nineteenth Century Germany*. St. Lucia, London and New York: University of Queensland Press.

Kupiainen, Tarja 1998: Runoja keräämässä ja kansaa tarkkailemassa. Suomalainen katse 1800-luvun lopun Karjalassa ja Inkerissä. Marja-Leena Hakkarainen and Tero Koistinen (eds), *Artikkeleita kirjallisista matkoista mieleen ja maailmaan*, 172–97. Joensuu: Universitas Ostiensis.

Kuukka, Väinö, Raija Majamaa and Hannu Vepsä 2002: *Elias Lönnrot. Taitaja, tarkkailija, tiedemies*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Leikola, Anto 1991: Saatesanat. Pehr Kalm, *Matka Pohjois-Amerikkaan*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Lönnrot, Elias 1979: *Vaeltaja. Muistelmia jalkamatkalta Hämeestä, Savosta ja Karjalasta 1828*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Sihvo, Hannes 1973: *Karjalan Kuva. Karelianismin taustaa ja vaiheita autonomian aikana*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Stocking, George W., Jr. 1992: *The Ethnographer's Magic and Other Essays in the History of Anthropology*. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press.

— (ed.) 1996: *Volksgeist as Method and Ethic. Essays on Boasian Ethnography and the German Anthropological Tradition*. (History of Anthropology, vol. 8.) Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Symposium on comparative epic research, 1–3 November 2002

Jouni Hyvönen, University of Helsinki

The main academic event of 2002 in honour of the bicentenary of the birth of Elias Lönnrot was a symposium on comparative epic research held in Turku, Finland on 1–3 November. The work of Elias Lönnrot, compiler of the Kalevala, versatile scholar and major builder of the Finnish national identity, was to be of fundamental significance to the study of Finnish folklore and the subsequent course of the discipline. Since the symposium was dedicated to his memory in this his jubilee year, the discussions focused to a great extent on research into the Kalevala and Kalevalaic poetry.

One of the main ideas of the initiator of the symposium, the late Professor Lauri Honko, was, in the spirit of comparative epic research, to place the Kalevala of Elias Lönnrot on a par with other epic traditions, to establish a place for it in the debate on the birth of the epic, its relationship with tradition and the voice of the epic maker. It was clear from the papers on the position of Lönnrot in Finnish cultural life and on the textualisation of the Kalevala that the wealth of perspectives adopted by contemporary research has created completely new potential for answering the challenging questions raised at the symposium: the definition of the Kalevala in the light of comparative epic research, the way in which Lönnrot worked, and the place of the Kalevala in Finland's cultural history. The working methods employed by Lönnrot, the Kalevala process itself, clearly require further profound research, and the cultural-historical contextualisation of the birth of the epic will have to be founded on the revised views thereby formed.

The genesis, definition and regional forms of epic poetry

Anna-Leena Siikala (University of Helsinki) talked about the nature of myth and the problem of interpreting myth motifs in the study of Kalevalaic poetry. Scholars have, she said, approached myths according to the classical myth theories in different ways at different times. The variety of myth theories employed by way of explanation is clearly evident in interpretations of the era in question, yet Siikala also stressed the tendency of myth theories to influence for a long time. Analysis of complete myth corpuses provides a sounder basis for interpretation in the study of Kalevalaic poetry than examination of isolated myth motifs in individual poems.

Mythical narratives and songs should, in Siikala's opinion, be approached as cultural discourse. In adopting this perspective, it is important to observe that 1) mythical motifs engage in the negotiation of cultural meanings, and the cultural context prevailing at the time thus guides their interpretation; 2) the variation in myths displays not only historical continuity but also shifts in meaning; 3) mythical discourse as cultural discourse has its own coherence that is best revealed on examining the myth motifs of the culture in question as a corpus. Myths and mythical narratives are by nature never systematic. Myths are, like poetry, open to different interpretations due to their metaphorical mode of expression. Kalevalaic myth poetry should be regarded not as encapsulated relics but as a mode of expression generating different meanings in their culture. The corpus-oriented perspective permits not only the interpretation and study of myths but also a more synchronised network of images reflecting their singer's cultural meanings. Not all the criteria of a myth narrative are satisfied in each individual performance. Rather, different motifs engage in dialogue, not only within the same genre but also across narrow generic borders. The corpus-oriented perspective is an equally sound basis for examining the links between motifs in the way they are distributed in ritual texts (such as incantations) as in folk tales marked by fantasy and crossing generic borders. These intertextual links generate a web of images in which various implicit meanings engage in mutual dialogue.

Veikko Anttonen (University of Turku) examined the nature of mythological knowledge as manifest in the Sampo poems of the Kalevala in a paper entitled "The origin of the Sampo. Epic singers as mediators of mythological knowledge". At more general level he debated cognitive and cultural features of the transmission of myth tradition; how has mythical knowledge been transmitted and preserved in traditional cultures? Mythical knowledge occupies a very central position in culture, as a means of making known and passing on explanations for the natural, ambient reality. Mythical tradition is manifest at three levels of human experience: the general, the communal and the individual. Mythical narration is an attempt to lay the foundations for communal knowledge by demonstrating how ancestors, "gods" and supernatural actors in animal or human form played a part in the emergence of phenomena that still influence human deeds, action and experience.

Anttonen examined the mythological knowledge borne by epic singers from a cognitive perspective; as individual competence to produce, preserve and reproduce traditional texts and mythical knowledge. The cognitive mechanisms in the transmission of mythological knowledge and tradition are no different from those in the transmission of other cognitive structures. As an example Anttonen

mentioned the Sampo poetry constructed round the mental representation of a single object, the Sampo. The world in the Sampo poetry is conceptualised by means of a single core mythological idea connected with the other world. In just the same way, the Christian faith rests on a cognitive mechanism form-ed by a single core idea.

The primary message of the paper by Seppo Knuuttila (University of Joensuu) was that all epics are products of the imagination. The very existence of all myths or epics is dependent on human, cul-turally-stimulated mechanisms. Myths and the epics transmitting them should thus always be approached as products of the conceptual powers of the community. As products of culture, epics and myths have a continuity that spans generations. The "long durations" and "slow movements" of cultural constructs link us with the traditions within which we were born and grew up. Because myths are "slow", we come up against the enticements of their imaginary worlds again and again, a good example here being the products (texts) of popular culture that refer to "age-old" myths.

Annikki Kaivola-Bregenhøj, Sirkka Saarinen, Juha Pentikäinen and Ulla Piela. Photo by Arbnora Dushi.

The question posed by Juha Pentikäinen (University of Helsinki), "Did the Sami have epic singing or not?", raised the problem of defining epic: is the distinguishing feature content or length? In answer to his first question, Pentikäinen quoted two alternative examples. The work of Nils-Aslak Valkeapää, interpreter of the modern era of Sami mythology, may be examined as epic of a culture without a documented history. Valkeapää played a major role in enhancing the Sami identity and awareness from the 1970s onwards. In his work, the voice of the Sami identity springs from the synthesis of myth and history at a more universal level. As his second example of the potential of Sami epic, Pentikäinen described the fate of the story of The Son of the Sun, collected by Anders Fjellner, which was branded unauthentic tradition when published in 1849. The speedy definition of the Kalevala as the national epic was to a great extent the result of Finland's political situation, of the social and political needs of an emerging nation state. In the case of the Sami there was not, however, a similar group of political actors in Fjellner's day. Thus no national impetus existed for the ideological existence of Fjellner's epic.

Sirkka Saarinen (University of Turku) took a look at manifestations of the Finno-Ugrian epic, with special reference to the Mordvin. The topics of the epic tradition of the Mordvins, a people who have made their living from farming for thousands of years, are similar to those of the Baltic Finns, partly, of course, due to the similarity of their living conditions and culture. A number of epics have emerged from Mordvin epic. Literary examples are *Sijazhar* (first version 1960, second 1973) and *Tjushtja* (1991) composed by Vasili Radajev from folklore motifs in the style of folk poetry. *Mastorava* (1994), a work compiled from folk poems by Aleksandr Sharonov, may be classified as a traditional epic. Like Lönnrot, Sharonov combined elements of genuine sung epic to create a coherent plot telling the fate of the Mordvin people from mythical primeval times to the present day. *Mastorava* is a national symbol for the Mordvins.

Kristi Salve (University of Tartu) debated whether a Veps epic could have been created. The epic projects of the Finno-Ugrian peoples have tied in with the arousal and strengthening of national identity and have thus always been executed by the educated circles. The Veps do not, however, have a literary epic of their own, and nor do they have any cycles of epic poetry that could be classified as such. Kristi Salve considers that a Veps epic could nevertheless have been possible had a scholar with a profound feel for folk poetry encountered a tradition bearer fired by a "longing for a long epic".

Lönnrot and the Kalevalaic poetic world

Ulla Piela (Kalevala Society) examined the interaction between informant and collector established by Lönnrot during his first collection trip in 1828, mainly with reference to the informant's repertoire. What sort of impression did Lönnrot's first great singer, Juhana Kainulainen (1788–1847), make on the future epic collator? Piela outlined the characteristic features of Kainulainen's repertoire, consisting mainly of incantations, and the narrative world they created. Christian and folk-belief actors existed side by side, in syncretic harmony, in Kainulainen's worldview. His repertoire tends towards the markedly archaic narrative conventions of the Savo-Karelian region in which the mythical incantation tradition describing the origin of phenomena occupies a significant position. The various incantation motifs are connected with ritual use, rite situations in which the seer was in direct contact with the supranormal. Lönnrot clearly had an interest in living folk religion and beliefs in addition to an antiquarian interest and the study of archaic religion.

Lotte Tarkka (University of Helsinki) talked about inter-generic intertextuality in tradition in Kalevalaic metre. She demonstrated the encounter of Lönnrot and his informants as exemplified by Arhippa Perttu-

nen, a performer of material used by Lönnrot, as manifest in one *starina* recording (SKVR I_3 2008). The *starina* in question is a commentary on both inter-generic dialogue and on tradition competence based on intertextual knowledge. Lönnrot published the recording in question in his journal *Mehiläinen* aimed at both the rural and the educated population in October 1836 (SKVR I_3 2009). The worldviews and personal interpretations of Lönnrot and the performer of the *starina* did not fully coincide.

According to Tarkka, intertextuality can operate at many levels in Kalevalaic tradition: as thematic references, parallel styles or constructions, and clear textual borrowings or quotations. Different inter-generic combinations also carry clear meta-linguistic significance. For example, song or incantation performances embedded in epic evaluate and comment on tradition as an overall system, the impacts, force and significance of tradition in traditional cultures. Intertextuality is, claims Tarkka, particularly marked in the generic system and above all in the articulation of the main themes of that culture. How do the performer's personal emphases and interpretations benefit the metacommunication between genres? From the point of view of performance, inter-generic intertextuality provides a tool for examining the ties between the world of the text and the reality of the singer's life.

The Kalevala, its textualisation and reception

Pekka Hakamies (University of Helsinki) address-ed the dissimilarities and similarities in the characterisation of Ilmarinen in folklore sources and the Kalevala. The character of Ilmarinen is, he says, drawn more thinly than that of the other characters in the folk poetry; he says virtually nothing and is an outsider assisting others. His main achievements, the forging of the wondrous Sampo and the golden bride, point to the mythology surrounding the profession of smith and the handling of metal. The introduction of metals, claims Hakamies, sparked off a mental revolution, and the figure of Ilmarinen should be viewed as a new "mythical hero" that emerged as culture developed in the Iron Age. He operates with the new technology, and the production process, which differed from that for objects made of stone, gave rise to a mythology surrounding the smith's profession. The high mythical status of the smith's profession is basically archaic and widespread and may to some extent explain the sparse detail about Ilmarinen in folk poetry and his marginalisation vis-à-vis other heroes. Lönnrot nevertheless remoulded the figure of Ilmarinen for his Kalevala and, according to Hakamies, made the archaic and mythological dimension of his character more human. One motive may have been a desire to place greater emphasis, through Ilmarinen, on his educational ideal founded on a peaceful increase in wellbeing.

Niina Hämäläinen (Kalevala Institute) chose as the topic for her paper the Kullervo poem of Elias Lönnrot, taking a close look at his working methods, his choice of textualisation, in the light of the different versions of the Kullervo poem. Lönnrot developed his Kullervo cycle in the course of several versions (the Proto-Kalevala 1834, the Old Kalevala 1935–36, the New Kalevala 1849 and an abridged version for schools 1862). The paper by Hämäläinen concentrated on the episode in the Kullervo poem about the stone in the bread, surveying its textualisation history. This episode, in which Kullervo, having been forced to go out herding, breaks the knife inherited from his father on a stone baked inside his bread, is preserved in all the versions of the Kullervo poem and is the climax and core scene of the poem. Hämäläinen described how Lönnrot edited the episode, how his choices and alterations affected the description of Kullervo and the devices he used in constructing his text. Lönnrot was guided in his choices by a desire to make the tragic experience of Kullervo a subject for identification at a more universal level – an experience that conveys the feelings of a lonely orphan to the reader of the epic.

Eino Kiuru, translator of the Kalevala, asked how far Lönnrot's profound familiarity with the source material affected the ease of editing. According to Kiuru, Lönnrot immersed himself in the processing of tradition more deeply than the source studies of Väinö Kaukonen would suggest. In particular the digressions from the textualisation of the source lines would, in Kiuru's opinion, indicate that Lönnrot the editor acted "like a singer", relying on his own memory and command of the traditional idiom.

Pertti Anttonen embarked on an account of Lönnrot's Kalevala from an ethnopoetic perspective. His basic premise was that Lönnrot's product cannot be detached from the cultural-political context of its inception. He stressed that the arena for Lönnrot's "performance" was quite unlike the context in which folklore was normally performed. Through the deliberate choices he made while editing, Lönnrot guided the reading and interpretation of the epic. The target audience of his epic performance was the entire nation. Hence, both the mode of address and the ideological messages were aimed at the nation. In using the epic to create a cultural foundation for the nation, he was forced to harness the Viena-Karelian source material as national heritage.

Anttonen then went on to discuss the way the relationship between the Kalevala and its source poetry has been handled in research history. One of the topics for debate has been a classification based on the distinction "Kalevala vs. non-Kalevala"; in defining the Kalevala, we also rule out what does not belong to it. Tying in with this has been a general tendency to make no distinction between the epic and its source poetry. The politicisation of the epic and the discourse maintaining this also embrace the sources for the Kalevala in their entirety, i.e. all Kalevalaic folklore.

Jouni Hyvönen (University of Helsinki) asked how Lönnrot's deep familiarity with the cultural meanings of folk poetry and his ability to immerse himself in the world it represents affected the textualisation of his Kalevala. Hyvönen's primary thesis was that while developing the plot structure of his epic, Lönnrot also sought to cast it in a suitable format. "Finding" a coherent plot structure and making economical use of the source materials were major editorial challenges for him.

Hyvönen concentrated on describing the scientific methods and objectives that affected the textualisation of the Kalevala. Lönnrot felt the need for some kind of scientific basis in collating his epic instead of the Porthanian/classical text-critical method prevailing at the time in the publication of folk poetry. He therefore decided to observe the scientific line of the Enlightenment, the principles of the encyclopaedic research legacy. According to Hyvönen, the encyclopaedic striving towards a holistic view of a general nature combined with the principles of coverage and representativeness in the choice of line material constituted the scientific foundations for Lönnrot's textualisation. Lönnrot's aim was to produce as full a reconstruction as possible of the worldview embodied in Kalevalaic poetry. He nevertheless needed some sort of loophole for constructing a coherent plot and some means of safeguarding the "folk ethos" and "authenticity" of the work. In setting himself up as the narrator of the performance instead of the singer, Lönnrot in a way reveals his own role in the work. Hyvönen stressed that the Kalevala was, both for Lönnrot and possibly his contemporaries, as was his intention, just as much a presentation of ethnographic research and a study of antiquity as a poetic work acting as an artistic, narrative entity.

Satu Apo (University of Helsinki) spoke about the Kalevala process, singing *vs*. writing, as reflected in Elias Lönnrot. The question of whether Lönnrot produced his written epic text in the same way as singers of oral epic their performance is not, to her mind, relevant. Rather, she said, the Kalevala should be examined within the literary context and philosophical climate generated in the early 19th century by interest in ancient Germanic-Norse poetry.

Lauri Harvilahti and Pertti Karkama. Photo by Arbnora Dushi.

Her paper gave an account of the editing of the New Kalevala of 1849 and referred to Lönnrot's letters and concrete manuscripts as sources throwing light on the process by which the epic was written. By examining these sources, it is possible to trace the choices made by Lönnrot and the editorial process itself, which should, she claims, be thought of as the systematic raking together of materials by a scholar intent on creating a literary epic. A glance at the interleaved edition of the Old Kalevala commissioned by Lönnrot reveals that the editing of the New Kalevala consisted of the systematic identification of source materials and their insertion in a ready plot frame. It is evident from scrutiny of this "raking together" technique that when the volume of material obtained from different variants reached saturation point, Lönnrot might draw the line on that particular item. The first thing we should note, according to Apo, on examining the arrangement of the materials within the episodes is the cumulative nature of the materials; this was a natural consequence of the editing technique adopted by Lönnrot in which earlier versions provided a basis for developing new ones. This resulted in a wealth of lines in the different versions and the protracted handling of the motifs in episodes. Secondly, Lönnrot was a systematic scholar with the attitude of an ethnographer and anthropologist to the recording and publishing of poetic materials. His basic premises as the editor of the epic made him a writer and his position thus differed from that of the singers of long epic. He cannot therefore, Apo claims, be likened to a traditional singer.

Pertti Karkama (University of Turku), author of a broad monograph on Elias Lönnrot and contemporary thought (*Kansakunnan asialla – Elias Lönnrot ja ajan aatteet*, 2001), sought to comment on aspects raised during the symposium of the status and role of Lönnrot as the creator of an epic, the Kalevala. According to him, the Kalevala was born dialogically, as Lönnrot engaged in and helped to mould contemporary debate. The debate among the early 19th century intelligentsia was marked by equality; different schools of thought engaged in open dialogue with one another, and there was no single authorised line of thought. The result was an innovative atmosphere. The historical juncture at the time was a precondition for this dialogue: the confines imposed by Finland's autonomous status. First, the arts were significant media in Finland due to the political censorship. Second, Lönnrot's project to develop a literary form of Finnish sought to create the democratic conditions for public enlightenment. The Finnish language was of great significance in defining the nation's institutions. The Kalevala cannot be reduced to any one ideal. Rather, its inception must be placed in the context of the pluralistic ideals that characterised contemporary debate.

Heikki Laitinen (Sibelius Academy, Helsinki) examined the metrics of four singers of epic. His approach provided an insight into the competence of the Finnish-Karelian singer and in particular the delicate poetic and melodic systems. Laitinen

approached the metrics of Arhippa Perttunen and Elias Lönnrot, both musically "silent", by means of recorded performances by Anni Tenisova. Exhaustive critical research does, according to Laitinen, provide some indications of the nature of 18th–19th century rune singing. The problem is that there is a long time or research gap between the "performances" noted down only in writing or with only sketchy indications of melody and those recorded on sound tape. It must be borne in mind that the poetic culture did not remain stable. The essence of Kalevalaic poetry singing is captured in unaccompanied solo performance. The vital feature of Kalevalaic singing is, in Laitinen's opinion, the seamless partnership of poetry and music, which merge in the performer's competence to become a musical-poetic vernacular.

Liisa Voßschmidt (University of Vaasa) talked about the Kalevala and Lönnrot in 20th century epic discourse in German. The main lines in the 20th century reception of the Kalevala in the German-speaking regions were, she reported, 1) scientific, 2) ideological, 3) commercial and 4) popular-cultural. In her paper she focused on the scientific and ideological fronts. Debate on the former has been conducted in two disciplines: in linguistically-oriented translation studies and in comparative epic research addressing the classical issues. This debate has waned since the Kalevala jubilee year in 1985. The ideological line may be divided into discourse connected with political activities and the anthroposophical movement.

The long epic of the folk singer

Paul Hagu (University of Tartu) presented the description of weddings given by the Setu Estonian singer Anne Vabarna. He began with a comparison of the description of a traditional Setu wedding in the first epic (The Great Wedding) recorded by A.O. Väisänen in 1923 with the accounts given by Anne Vabarna in later epic entities. The variation in Vabarna's description was based on her earlier role-oriented mental texts of the wedding rite. Her idiolect is characterised by the skilful variation of multiforms and their adaptation to the textual context. Hagu demonstrated how a singer's competence can permit the creative re-interpretation and adaptation of tradition.

Vaike Sarv (Institute of the Estonian Language, Tallinn) analysed the structure of the metrics of the 56 melodies used by Anna Vabarna and recorded in 1932-37. The metrics of her narrative poems have a clear hierarchy in which musical aspects take precedence. This is a feature of the performing conventions of all Setu narrative poetry. The words had to fit the rules of the melody, and this did not make them easy to understand. Sarv stressed that the most important thing in Setu epic was the aesthetic enjoyment of the performance.

The Kalevala and J. R. R. Tolkien

A slot was also reserved at the symposium for papers examining the role played by the Kalevala in inspiring the literary fantasies of J. R. R. Tolkien. Dr Clive Tolley delivered a paper entitled "Tolkien and the Kalevala and Volsunga Saga: the interplay of Finnish and Norse elements in The Silmarillion's tale of Turin Turambar". He gave a detailed account of Kalevala influences taken from the story of Kullervo and used by Tolkien in fabricating the character of Turin Turambar. Tolkien's Silmarillion was edited and published posthumously by his son Christopher Tolkien, himself a medievalist like his father, in 1977. Tolkien first wrote a prose study called "The Story of Kullervo" based on the Kullervo story in the Kalevala in 1913, but the tragic fate of Kullervo refused to remain a mere study and Tolkien later adapted it to Turin Turambar. According to Tolley, the significance of the Kalevala cannot be overestimated in view of Tolkien's multi-level working method. The Volsunga Saga clearly, he said, influenced the basic tenor of the mythological world of Silmarillion and Turin Turambar. The heroes of the Volsunga Saga served as models for the Tolkien heroes. Tolley clearly demonstrated how, in the light of these two models, the complex process by which Tolkien wrote his works was founded on the use of extensive, varied source material. In this process, materials that were originally oral merged to become part of a work of literature.

Jonathan B. Himes (Texas A&M University) gave a paper on the topic of "Singers of the Sampo and the Silmarils: how Lönnrot and Tolkien constructed their quest objects". In it he sought out similarities and dissimilarities between the literary mythological worlds of the Kalevala and Tolkien. The Kalevala made a great impression on Tolkien, but the difference in the way Tolkien and Lönnrot worked was naturally that the former sought material in archives and literature, whereas the latter relied mainly on oral poetry. Despite the dissimilarities, Himes drew a parallel between Lönnrot's role as the collator of an epic and the piecing together and literary work of Tolkien. Being a philologist, Tolkien was interested in languages and even read the Kalevala in the original Finnish. The influence of Finnish can be detected in the Elvish language of his creation, which bears vowel combinations and words reminiscent of Finnish.

Himes compared the plot structures of Silmarillion and the Kalevala and noted a number of similarities. Lönnrot, he claimed, greatly influenced the work of Tolkien. Just as Lönnrot had compiled the Kalevala, so Tolkien wanted to give his country a national epic and make the material he used part of the national heritage.

The epic-maker

Thomas A. Hale (Pennsylvania State University) spoke on "Griot and researcher: a symbiotic relation-

ship". He described the relationship between the researcher and the West African professional keeper of the oral tradition, regionally known as the griot or griotte (locally by other terms such as guewel, jali or jesere). Griots/griottes have a multi-functional role

Anna-Leena Siikala and Thomas A. Hale.
Photo by Arbnora Dushi.

in their society; they can perform as or be in roles like epic-singer, master of ceremonies, spokesperson, adviser and diplomat, singer of praises, ambassador, historian, etc. Hale gave an account of how the informant and researcher relationship can be collaborative and ultimately productive for both parties. In the case of professional informants such as griots and griottes, the griot expects compensation for his performances. Money is a natural part of the relationship, because the researcher's quest reframes the position of the griot/griotte in society and role-taking by the professional performer thus takes place. Just how a collaborative result can ensue from a brief relationship between a researcher with his or her own research agenda and a professional performer who lives by the rewards he or she receives from the audience is a question that may well be asked.

Karl Reichl (University of Bonn) described in a paper entitled "The epic singer as performer, friend and guide: the recording end editing of a Karakalpak singer's repertoire" his long relationship with the epic singer Zhumabay-zhyrau (born 1927). He is one of the few singers of heroic epics of the Karakalpaks, a small Turkic-speaking people in NW Uzbekistan. Reichl gave a report of his collaboration with the singer, of the circumstances of the different recording sessions over a period of nearly twenty years, and variation in different modes of performance, both dictated and sung. The singer genealogy shows how the epic tradition is fostered by student–professional relationships. The plot of different epic cycles has a strict form, and the learning process takes "one year per epic". Reichl made some remarks on how the recording circumstances influenced the singer's performance. Two examples were given; one where the collector is working in an official performing situation with a native audience and the other where collaboration with the singer is based on an intimate collector-singer relationship. According to Reichl, the presence of a researcher in an official situation seems to motivate the singer "to do his best". Building up a productive, intimate relationship naturally requires more effort.

Lauri Harvilahti (University of Helsinki) spoke of the acoustic analysis of Altay epics. He described ways of analysing acoustic and physiological variety between the different styles of partial tone singing in Central Asia, and paid special attention to the style of epic singing called qay in the Upper Altay region and among the Hakas. The performers in the qay style are able to sing epic songs using a technique of partial tone singing, and by clearly distinguishing words, but at the same time overtones constantly resonate very high above the text recited. Harvilahti used as an example Aleksei Kalkin, the master of qay style singing, who maintains that the magic capacity of a qay singer is superior to that of a shaman. This indicates that overtone singing has a wide-spread shamanistic background. In his historical review Harvilahti proposed how throat singing, overtone singing and shamanism were tied together. For example, the Jew's harp (a traditional instrument) was widely known in the shamanistic cultures of Asia, from the Ainu to Central Asia.

Conclusion

Lauri Honko attempted a redefinition of the position of the Kalevala in epic literature by classifying it as a tradition-oriented epic. In doing so he was not, however, seeking to refute the role of the literary aspect of Lönnrot's work as editor. On the contrary, he used the term "singing scribe" to win wider understanding for the process by which the Kalevala came to be created. Honko's view of Lönnrot as a "singer" and of the five "performances" of the Kalevala may be regarded as an opening hypothesis in the debate on the textualisation of the Kalevala as a process. The foremost question in debating the essence of the Kalevala is how to define it. Should it be regarded as a purely literary epic and a piece of literature, analysing its structure and its editor's choices, or should we look at the synchronic reality of the textualisation process, the editorial choices and the editor's adaptation to the traditional register? The way in which different scholars regard the status of the Kalevala on the tradition-oriented vs. literary axis to a large extent also guides the choice of features to which they pay most attention in examining the textualisation of the Kalevala and Lönnrot's working methods. The Kalevala should indeed be approached from as many directions as possible, and with a combination of perspectives. The role repertoire of the author of the Kalevala was surely as wide as the range of perspectives presented at this symposium; Lönnrot can be approached as a writer, a singer of epic, the narrator of a great story, a singer relying on

the status of the rune singer, a singing scribe and a scholar rooted in his day and age.

The symposium on comparative epic research paid homage to the late Lauri Honko. The initiator and convener of a seminar that was to become his memorial symposium, Lauri Honko was no longer able to share his views with us. The passing of an innovative scholar always eager to engage in discussion has left a worldwide gap in the field of folkloristics. In the world of scholarship, death is not, however, a border beyond which all existence ceases. Luckily, anyone can continue the discussion and honour his memory and academic legacy.

Reviews

Lönnrot and Kalevala

Lönnrotin hengessä 2002. Ed. by Pekka Laaksonen and Ulla Piela. (Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 81.) Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society.

Delivery: kirjakauppa@finlit.fi

The year 2002 marked the 200th anniversary of the birth of Elias Lönnrot, one of the most important figures in the history of Finland and one of a small international cadre of nineteenth-century scholar-literati whose works definitively shaped Western ideas of nation, literature, and folklore. In recognition of this important anniversary, Pekka Laaksonen and Ulla Piela have edited an anthology of essays entitled *Lönnrotin hengessä 2002* (Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja 81). The outgrowth of papers presented over the course of the anniversary year, this collection provides an interesting overview of the varying ways in which Finnish scholars view Lönnrot and his work at a single moment in history.

Lönnrot and his epic became the disputed legacy of both literary studies and folkloristics. Thus, it makes sense that the essays included in the volume give voice to both disciplinary viewpoints. Although they may differ in emphasis and detail, however, the authors from the two camps present a surprisingly unified view. None of the authors addressing Lönnrot's project here argue for an understanding of his work that would absorb him into the community or the tradition he set out to present in print. Rather, Lönnrot is repeatedly and prodigiously contextualized within the intellectual milieu of nineteenth-century Europe. The only real source of difference between articles lies in which figures or movements are put forward as most significant. And a subtle issue of agency lurks in the background as well: the literary scholars seem to accord Lönnrot a good deal of conscious control over the ideas that became important in his works, while the folklorists tend to subsume Lönnrot, as well as his literary production, into broader social movements in which they are but a single element.

Chief among the literary contextualizers, and presenting the lead article in the collection, is the literary historian Pertti Karkama. Indeed, Karkama's recent study *Kansankunnan asialla. Elias Lönnrot ja ajan aatteet* (2001) is perhaps the single most-cited work in the entire collection after the Kalevala. Karkama presents Lönnrot as a cogent and intellectually engaged scholar of his era, deeply engrossed in both Herderian and Hegelian notions of the folk song and the epic, and fervently committed to the project of enlightening ("civilizing") the peasantry. Karkama traces the influences of contemporaries like Tengström, Snellman, Topelius and Collan on Lönnrot and his published works, and explores the content and tone of the newspaper articles Lönnrot wrote for the edification of common people. Liberally spiced with wisdom from Franklin's Poor Richard's Almanac as well as the Book of Sirach, Lönnrot's writings, Karkama argues, place him squarely in the role of a civilizer, seeking to instill in his countrymen a sense of diligence and thrift associated with Weber's Protestant work ethic. Other essays supplement this contextualization. Eino Karhu surveys Lönnrot's activities within a pan-European as well as a specifically Russian intellectual milieu. Michael Branch reprises his own earlier work on the role of A. J. Sjögren in shaping Lönnrot's project. Raija Majamaa, whose fine editing of Lönnrot's collected works has so facilitated recent research on the topic, presents a lively overview of Lönnrot's collecting expeditions, particularly those with Castrén. Here we see Lönnrot in personal contact with the people who shared his ideas and glimpse through diary entries his evident creativity, charisma and stamina. Kaisa Häkkinen presents an analysis of Lönnrot as a contributor to the linguistic theories of his day, contextualizing the unique and demanding linguistic labor behind both the Kalevala and Lönnrot's great Finnish-Swedish dictionary.

The bulk of folkloristic essays devoted to Lönnrot show an awareness of or direct engagement with Karkama's study. Pertti Anttonen presents a folkloristic rejoinder to Karkama, examining both Lönnrot and the Kalevala within a broader social process of national identity formation. Anna-Leena Siikala places Lönnrot within trends in Scandinavian Enlightenment empiricism as well as Romanticism. Of particular interest is her survey of Lönnrot's perceptions of the Viena Karelians from whom he collected the bulk of his songs and the ways in which these became portrayed in his travelogue and eventual publications. Lotte Tarkka delves into Lönnrot's power relations with his peasant informants in her examination of Martiska Karjalainen. Lönnrot was collecting from the singer in 1834, when, under the influence of alcohol, the singer drew from various elements of the song tradition to create his own self-incriminating "hybrid" song about conflicts in the local reindeer industry. Tarkka examines the published song's episodes, traces elements to disputes in the border area of Finland and Russia, and discusses the fate of Martiska in his subsequent trial, imprisonment, and execution.

Protestantism appears a favorite theme in the collection. Lönnrot's Lutheran viewpoints and the ways these shape both his Kalevala and his writings

for the edification of the peasantry are repeatedly raised as topics in the essays. The balancing tendency toward representing a valorized pre-Christian Finnish religion is also discussed, often in conjunction with the Protestant theme, as the authors touch upon the erasure of Catholic and Orthodox elements from Lönnrot's epic and the resultant suturing of pre-Christian and Lutheran worldviews that the text entails. Jouni Hyvönen examines Lönnrot's understandings of mythology and the ways in which these influenced his presentation of folk belief and characters in his works. The topic is further explored variously by Karkama, Anttonen, Karhu, Siikala, and Apo.

Of the essays included, only a few present textual analyses of Lönnrot's Kalevala. Satu Apo, proceeding from Karkama as a basic premise, writes: "Lönnrot wrote his work for readers who were accustomed to early nineteenth-century literary conventions and whose worldview differed markedly from the ideas and imaginings of folk singers" (p. 108; translated). She then shows how an examination of the narrator function in the Kalevala, as well as an analysis of certain key scenes, such as Aino's death, reveal Lönnrot's literary techniques, tastes, and agenda. Tarja Kupiainen examines the Kullervo story in folk tradition as well as Lönnrot's renderings of it in the first and second editions of the Kalevala, commenting also on the figure's subsequent treatment in Finnish art and letters.

A largely autonomous block of essays within the collection address Lönnrot's work as a medical doctor. These articles derive from a separate conference on Lönnrot and public health held at Kajaani during the anniversary year. Of great interest is Ervo Vesterinen's examination of Lönnrot's handbook for home healthcare, *Suomalaisen Talonpojan Koti-Lääkäri*, which was a substantially reworked translation of a roughly contemporaneous Swedish tract. Risto Pelkonen presents a sketchy but interesting overview of the history of Western medicine from earliest times, while Kauko Kouvalainen presents a doctor's view of the healthcare described in Lönnrot's medical text and in the Kalevala in particular. Heikki Rytkölä similarly examines the work of district physicians in Lönnrot's day and Lönnrot's own efforts and calls for improved health care on both sides of the Russian border. Hindrik Strandberg explores the work of Lönnrot's colleague and friend Frans Johan Rabbe, who set out to write a history of Finnish medicine, with Lönnrot and the Kalevala as key sources for its earliest chapters. Lauri Honko also addresses the subject in his essay, suggesting that the Kalevala can be seen as reflecting the insights of a modern medical anthropologist, particularly in the area of healing rituals.

Other essays in the collection present materials from more independent disciplinary perspectives. Heikki Laitinen examines Lönnrot's understandings of Finnish prosody, both in his translations of Swedish poems and in his rendering of lines in the Kalevala. Timo Leisiö reveals how Lönnrot's original transcription of a Viena Karelian melody in fact captured better the nature of the musical performance than the rendering it received by others in preparation for publication in the Kanteletar. Poet Matti Rossi describes his own use of the Finnish folk meter (trochaic tetrameter) in contemporary poetry, touching on other poets like Leino and Mustapää (Haavio) as well as writers from the rest of Europe.

A final group of essays contribute to future writing in the history of the discipline by chronicling research experiences as they occurred in the late twentieth century. Markku Nieminen presents memories of his own visits to Karelian song villages during the 1980s and 90s. Heikki Rytkölä and Helena Lonkila add their own reminiscences from Karelian research in the 1990s. Pekka Laaksonen presents correspondence and interviews from the 1980s and early 90s between himself, Väinö Kaukonen, and Lauri Honko.

As a historical snapshot of literary and folkloristic appraisals of Lönnrot and his works in the year 2002, this collection is of great value. Surprising, however, is the extent to which some elements of Lönnrot's life and work are not included in the authors' forays. Scant research is presented on Lönnrot's many other publications, such as his compendia of flora, proverbs, riddles, or charms, each of which offers tremendous insights into Lönnrot's thoughts, methods, and aims. And few of the essays seek to interrelate differing viewpoints that emerge in Lönnrot's oeuvre over the course of his long and varied career, allowing for the changes or contradictions that accompany any person's thoughts over time. Further, aside from Branch's interesting overview of Lönnrot's reception in English and North American scholarship, and Karhu's observations on Lönnrot's reception in Russian as well as French circles, little attention is paid to Lönnrot as a figure of signifiance in other scholarly histories. None of the essays, for instance, examines Lönnrot's reception in Swedish literary and folkloristic circles over the course of the last two centuries, even though the recent Huldén translation of the Kalevala drew considerable interest from the Swedish press just a few years ago. Similar examinations of Lönnrot's legacy in the Baltics, Germany, and Hungary (to name just a few obvious places) would certainly prove of interest. Lönnrot remains for Finns, apparently, a stolidly national figure, even while the influence of foreign writers like Herder, Hegel, and Franklin can be chronicled in Finland. In the end, the collection's unremittingly Finnish focus says a great deal about Finnish scholarly understandings of this important European thinker two hundred years after his birth.

Thomas A. DuBois
University of Wisconsin-Madison

Kalevala and the world's traditional epics

The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics. Ed. by Lauri Honko. (Studia Fennica Folkloristica 12.) Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society, 2002. 487 pp.

Delivery: tiedekirja@tsv.fi

My task in reviewing this bulky collection of articles is both sad and inspiring. This was apparently the last publication Lauri Honko nearly saw through before passing away suddenly last year. And yet he has left future students of the world's epic tradition one more amazingly comprehensive and instructive array of writings on the subject. Lauri Honko's epic

project spanning nearly two decades has been overwhelming in scope, and ambitiously extensive, aspiring to include a wide variety of epic traditions of the world. It has resulted in contacts to many scholars doing research in epic studies far and wide.

As if in keeping with the poetic genre examined, the book edited by Lauri Honko is of impressive length, as have most of his recent publications been. This collection of articles runs to nearly five-hundred pages. It contains twenty-eight contributions, two by Honko himself. Represented are twelve countries, while the material discussed originates from four continents, rendering a truly global perspective. The volume falls into five major parts: 1) The Kalevala across borders; 2) European traditional epics; 3) American and African traditional epics; 4) Asian epics; and 5) Traditional epics of the Eastern Baltic Sea region.

Although this collection of articles was merely edited by Honko, one may strongly sense his presence in many of the contributions, most explicitly in the framing of the theme. The title *The Kalevala and the World's Traditional Epics* obviously indicates that the bulk of the research presented concerns the Finnish Kalevala and/or its contextual background, while the book basically reflects a conference held in Turku, Finland on the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the (New) Kalevala. This landmark of Finnish poetic tradition has been a phenomenal influence in both the socio-cultural and the academic context in the world, and its salient research context (not to mention its exquisite initiator) has attracted major scholars in their field, some of whom appear in the book reviewed here. This collection of articles focuses on "traditional" or "tradition-oriented" epics, to follow Honko's classification, but the range of approaches seems quite versatile, if not occasionally antithetical. In the hefty volume we may find explorations of oral-formulaic composition in performance opposed by considerations advocating the process of memorisation; the composer of an epic may be regarded as a mere penman, being elsewhere considered a creative singer; some contributions analyse the socio-historical context, others stick strictly to the linguistic aspects of a poetic tradition.

The first Kalevala cycle includes an introductory discussion by Lauri Honko on the recurring performance of the Finnish epic by the "singing scribe" Elias Lönnrot, and the progress of his mental text. Anna-Leena Siikala looks into the cultural sources of the epic's creative process, and in her analysis of the historical and social context of the Archangel (Viena) Karelian poetic culture reveals how research has conceptualised performers. John Karkala suggests a comparative glance at the epic "culture cosmos" to reach beyond textualising studies. The other two contributions by American scholars provide an insight into the reception of the Kalevala: by discussing translations into English, David Elton Gay shows the emergence of a representation of Finnish mythology from fictional history, and Susan Ella Walima's ethnographic survey indicates the epic's symbolic value for an immigrant community.

Various types of oral poetry are discussed in the European section. Minna Skafte Jensen considers the formalised verbal communication discernible in the Homeric presentation of the presumably oral *Iliad* and *Odyssey* poems, while analysing them from the perspective of performance. John Miles Foley looks at the (Moslem) South Slavic epic songs to investigate the performer's and audience's application of metonymic selections from the "pool of tradition", and then extends the performance arena and emulating interplay to Homeric and Old English traditional verbal art. Another Slavic tradition is presented by Elka Agoston-Nikolova, who gives an overview of the development of Bulgarian folkloristics by observing the implementation of folk epic in identity construction. Clive Tolley argues against the universality of the oral-formulaic method of composition, while asserting that in the Nordic tradition it appears applicable in studying Eddic poems, but not memorised Skaldic verse. Margaretha Mellberg also indicates in her examination of Faroese ballads, which she regards as an epic tradition where the form of the performance is inherently associated with the message of the text, that operating with oral-formulaic theory proves impossible. In his short item, Osmo Pekonen relates *Beowulf* in a jocular manner to Finland.

In the section on American and African traditional epics are two articles with outstanding appendices of epic texts. Dell Hymes analyses the lineaments of a Mohave historical epic discernible in ethnopoetic interpretation even in the approximate patterning available in translations. In his discussion of the poetic tradition of Sub-Saharan Africa, John William Johnson juxtaposes theories of oral composition, and argues for the involvement of the use of memory, while considering different modes of oral composition (oral-formulaic, memorisation and free-style).

In the part designated as Asian epics, Karl Reichl analyses Turkic oral epics in their role of preserving knowledge about genealogy. He contends that epics have formative functions to recount genealogical descent, and normative functions to present social norms. In his short contribution, Jaan Puhvel questions the historicity of *Shâh-nâme*, advocating the concept of myth. Mehri Bagheri addresses the same topic in searching the Book of Kings for themes and patterns that reflect Iranian mythico-religious ideology. Ulrich Marzolph takes a wider look at the historical context of both the Persian epic and its research, to contend their rootedness in and dependence on particular cultural, historical and political conditions. Sabir Badalkhan continues to investigate Indo-Iranian tradition focusing on the separate roles of composers and performing reciters who apply memorisation in Balochi narrative poetry. C. N. Ramachandran extends critical discussion to Indian folk epics, which ambivalently relate to caste hierarchy and upwardly mobile aspirations while actually reflecting local collective history and identity.

The longest section of the book returns to the geographical Kalevala area, defined as the Eastern Baltic Sea region, with a thorough introductory article by Lauri Honko on a separate research project. Besides giving a methodical overview of his previous research and main findings in the field of tradition-oriented epic studies, concerning the role of the scribe, the idealised length of composition and constraints of national identity, Honko fills in the contextual background to the articles that follow. Senni Timonen examines Elias Lönnrot's

interpretation of the oral poetry he encountered, also detecting its workings in the mind of the "singing scribe" from the gender perspective and focusing on Lemminkäinen's mother. Niina Hämäläinen and Elina Rahimova look at the documented oral poetry which provided the source for the Kalevala, the former discussing the inspirational origins and composition of the Kullervo theme, the latter studying formulaic aspects and variation in the oral poetry recorded in Archangel Karelia. Moving on to the Kalevala's southern neighbours, Ülo Valk takes a critical stance on the role of authorship in the textualisation process of the Estonian epic *Kalevipoeg*, providing a contextual study of relevant etiological legends and landscapes. Dace Bula, who discusses the Latvian poetic landmark *Lāčplēsis*, takes a look at the historical context and individuals involved in creating that literary composition. Madis Arukask considers Estonian oral poetry, *Kalevipoeg* and the Setu epic *Peko* from the perspective of national cultural heritage. Paul Hagu presents an impressive (though prose) account of the epic poetry composed by the Setu singer Anne Vabarna, to which Seppo Suhonen adds remarks on translating her verse from *Peko* into Finnish. In his introduction to this the longest section of the book, Lauri Honko considered it necessary to explain the "narrow scope" of local studies, and admittedly a descriptive insider approach can be discerned (as was occasionally the case elsewhere), but in accordance with his aim of expanding epic research to lesser-known territories, this material should also be available to international comparative research.

However, this general programme of inclusiveness inevitably generates certain problems that become more emphasised in a published volume, and that can make it somewhat heavy reading, through size alone. The editor's geographic outreach and thematic coverage of oral tradition indicate an implicit quest for a universal long epic form. Yet after working through such a versatile array of examples, one cannot help but question attempts at universality in theories about epic, because traditions around the world tend to be too varied. There is similar variety in the scholars, the methodologies used and obviously engagement in the field. The generous gesture to publish all the papers given at a conference may therefore prove problematic. The quality of the contributions is disturbingly inconsistent: some are substantial scholarly studies of reasonable length, while others are relatively short presentations, and in some cases inclusion in the edition seems not quite justified. With such a variety of authors, a short note on the contributors might have helped. Considering also the weight of the volume, and the number of articles, there were other instances, too, when additional information would have been welcome. For example, the first Kalevala cycle provides rather contradictory approaches and research perspectives by five scholars, whereas the only tangible link might be the naming of the epic in the title. Perhaps an introductory passage to each of the five major parts of the book could have made the unavoidably hectic transition smoother. Then, on the other hand, the sequence of texts in a section sometimes seems questionable. For instance, in order to appreciate the points of the argument if one happens to be less familiar with the Persian tradition discussed in the three articles on the Book of Kings, one should actually start with the third contribution by Marzolph and proceed backwards to Puhvel's advice to comparativists.

Regardless of those critical remarks, we nevertheless have here an impressive publication on epic studies presenting versatile aspects of research in this prominent field. The analysis connected with the Kalevala addresses the issues of textualisation and its historical background most directly (Siikala, Timonen), being consequently engaged with the problems of categorising epics (Honko). Inquiry into the applicability of oral-formulaic methodology (Tolley, Mellberg, Foley) involves research across cultural areas, and appears to be intrinsically related to the role of memorisation (Johnson, Badalkhan). Some contributions focus on an overview of a lesser-known tradition, a few without poetic analysis of an epic (Agoston-Nikolova, Bula), while others give a more extensive presentation of (original) material (Hymes, Johnson, Badalkhan, Hagu, Foley, Hämäläinen), with occasional consideration of translation. Epic traditions are analysed in a wider historical and research context (Reichl, Ramachandran, the Persian cluster), from the perspective of performance (Badalkhan, Jensen), or in juxtaposition to other oral performance recorded in a culture (Siikala, Timonen, Hämäläinen, Rahimova, Valk).

In conclusion, we will remain grateful to Lauri Honko for his continuous promotion of fieldwork in living epic traditions, his inquiries into mental composition and epic performance, and the process of textualisation. The book reviewed here undoubtedly serves the goal of enriching comparative research of the world's epics, for which Honko's work will be remembered and studied by future generations.

Kristin Kuutma
Estonian Cultural Archives / Estonian Literary Museum

FF Communications in print

FF Communicatons No. 281

Lauri Honko in collaboration with Anneli Honko and Paul Hagu: *The Maiden's Death Song & The Great Wedding. Anne Vabarna's Oral Twin Epic written down by A. O. Väisänen*. 529 pp. December 2003.

For centuries, the eastern shores of the Baltic Sea have nourished poetic cultures developing oral epic traditions that mostly survived in lays of a few hundred lines but that eventually gave rise to much longer traditional epics. Epic traditions existed in several languages and dialects of the region, but it was Finnish, Karelian, Setu, Estonian and Latvian that took the step toward a truly long epic. Far from being identical as to their oral materials or history of composition, these epics reflect a quest for a literary manifestation of oral tradition epitomised in talented and ambitious individuals wishing to make an impact on the cultural identity of a nation or ethnic group.

The twin epic *The Maiden's Death Song & The Great Wedding* composed by the Setu "song mother" Anne Vabarna and written down by Armas Otto Väisänen, a Finn, is a manifestation of a long epic format rare in Baltic-Finnish folk poetry and of two alternative storylines. It is also a masterpiece that serves as a reminder of the poetry of a gifted minority culture that tends to be forgotten. The present scientific edition, intended for world epic scholars, is the work of a team consisting of Lauri Honko, Anneli Honko and Paul Hagu.

FF Communicatons No. 282

Lauri Harvilahti in collaboration with Zoja Sergeevna Kazagačeva: *The Holy Mountain. Studies on Upper Altay Oral Poetry.* 167 pp. December 2003.

The Holy Mountain is based on cooperation between the Institute for Altaistics of the Altay Republic, the Institute of World Literature at the Russian Academy of Science, and the University of Helsinki, Department of Folklore Studies.

In the course of a joint project financed by the Academy of Finland the research team conducted a survey of the state of archaic genres of tradition (epic poetry, shamanism, Burhanism) in the Altay Republic, a member of the Russian Federation. During the expedition carried out in autumn 1996 and 1997 the Altay–Finnish–Russian research team worked with Aleksej Kalkin, the best-known performer of shamanistic epics in a peculiar overtone singing style, and Tabar Čačijakov, a performer of epics in recited prose.

The aim of the study is to achieve a synthesis in forming a new overall view of the stylistic-poetic and structural devices used to produce the archaic mythical and epic cultural tradition of the Upper Altay region. Attention is also being paid to the inherent ethnic nature of the Altaian ethnic groups, to cultural influences and to some extent their present cultural identity.

FOLKLORE FELLOWS' NETWORK

Publisher: The Folklore Fellows by courtesy of the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters and the Kalevala Institute
Editor: Anna-Leena Siikala (email: Anna-Leena.Siikala@helsinki.fi)
Editorial assistant: Maria Vasenkari (email: marvas@utu.fi)
Address: P. O. Box 14, 20501 Turku, Finland

FOLKLORE FELLOWS' COMMUNICATIONS (ISSN 0014-5815)
has been published for the Folklore Fellows since 1910 by the Academia Scientiarum Fennica (Finnish Academy of Science and Letters) in Helsinki.
Editor: Anna-Leena Siikala
Editorial secretary: Maria Vasenkari
Editorial office: FF Communications, P. O. Box 14, 20501 Turku, Finland
Tel. +358 2 333 5213 Fax: +358 2 333 5991
http://www.folklorefellows.fi

To avoid additional costs and to receive FF membership discount address your order to:

TIEDEKIRJA Bookstore
Address: Kirkkokatu 14, 00170 Helsinki, Finland
Tel. +358 9 635 177 Fax: +358 9 635 017 E-mail: tiedekirja@tsv.fi
http://www.tsv.fi

Painola – Kaarina 2003