A young man is carefully preparing his first canoe for its launch in the Cook Islands. It will be put to the test in a communal flying-fish chase at night time. 'Canoe', *vaka*, also refers to a social unit with a common chief. Migration myths relate that the members of the same *vaka* came from the original homeland in one canoe. Photo by Jukka Siikala.
Diverse Research Histories

by Anna-Leena Siikala
Folklore Fellows Network, Chair

Last January I was present at Umeå University in Sweden as opponent at the doctoral defence of Olle Sundström. Sundström’s thesis deals with research into the beliefs of the northern Siberian Ngan asan Samoyeds. A focus of interest in the work is the way in which Sundström delineates the long development of Russian ethnographic research. The march of ethnography and fieldwork-based research in the nineteenth century led during the Soviet period, especially in the 1930s, to notice being taken of the ideals of the masters of the new régime. Those who failed to do so found themselves losing their work and even their life. Towards the end of the Soviet period the control weakened and international relations brought winds of change to research. When I was gathering research material for my doctoral dissertation on Siberian shamanism in the 1970s in St Petersburg and Moscow I encountered a lively scientific community. Familiarity with those heavy years in the history of research does not necessarily lessen the value of the research undertaken at that time. For example, Galina Gracheva’s observations, in which the female perspective was already being emphasised in the 1950s, were ahead of their time. On the other hand, knowledge of the theoretical direction favoured by the ruling party and the situation of the research community helps us to understand the conclusions drawn at this time.

In a corresponding manner the political elite had their influence in Nazi Germany of the 1930s. A research culture directed by power-holders cannot be marginalised as an exceptional phenomenon. For research nowhere lives apart from its own society. Lines of influence may persist be hidden, but only the funding needed by research milieux and researchers determines aims and choices. In place of a state regime we in the west are directed by topical ideologies and communally approved principles. As the centenary of the Folklore Fellows’ Communications approaches the history of research feels topical, and it is worth remembering how bound to society folklore research is.

Finnish folkloristics of the early twentieth century answered the needs of its own community as it transformed into a nation state. Later it also had its role in constructing the Nordic welfare state. The post-modern world of recent decades, in which folklore in the old mould no longer had a place, created its own research needs. Rapid cultural changes in the western world strengthened research into modern culture, and the thoughts, feelings and experiences of the individual took the place of communities as focuses and multiconceptual theories were swiftly aired in changing key-word discussions. In Asia, Africa and the many regions of Russia classical folklore has, however, lived on longer, just as face-to-face contacts also make possible tight-knit small communities. Hence in international folkloristics there are many research fronts and they have their own aims dependent on local circumstances.

Now that globalisation has taken place it behoves those drawing up a research history to focus on their object from a wide-angle perspective. This particularly concerns all western research, which has regarded itself as representing the research tradition with a capital T. In the multi-focal world of today, whose centres of power lie on many continents, it should be remembered that the questions posed by folklore are not, nor have ever been, everywhere the same. Instead of one history of research, folklore in fact has many, which, however, have influenced each other in many ways. It would be interesting to know more about the stages of Chinese or Indian folklore research, and how they correlate to the western research tradition. Only a comparative viewpoint reveals the true nature of folkloristics. It helps us understand why and how even generally distributed theoretical and methodological dogmas have acquired different forms in the research of different groups and peoples.

Familiarity with the past is a necessity when imagining the future. At the present moment, of course, everyone is interested in where we are going now. The objectives of research evidently define themselves according to those ideological currents which influence the direction of funding and the quantity of teaching scholars. Whither then is the global world, on the brink of environmental catastrophe and living on the crisis of financial capitalism, headed? These questions need good answers, ones valid in all the countries they affect.
Those Who Know: the *Tumu Korero* of the Cook Islands

by Jukka Siikala, Professor of Social Anthropology
University of Helsinki

**Civilization and the Bourkean error**

The year 1888 marked the beginning of civilization in the Cook Islands. One has to admit that the way civilization began somehow characterizes the nature of the new era. After lengthy petitions by the chiefs of the Cook Islands the British government had decided to grant protection to the Cook Islands against the threatening French and the dangerous heresy its Catholic missionaries posed for the newly converted Protestants there. At the same time, however, other, more mundane perspectives were also in the minds of the British. *The Times* had complained the previous year that ‘Between Sydney and Panama not a single British coaling station exists, without Rarotonga, France on this route is supreme; with Rarotonga the balance of power is materially altered’ (Gilson 1980: 59–60).

The motives were also twofold, to give moral support in the fight against heretics and to provide a coaling station for the British seafarers in the middle of the Pacific.

This double motivation led to a famous mistake in Cook Islands history. When Captain Bourke of *HMS Hyacinth* sailed into Rarotonga harbour the purpose of this man-of-war’s visit was to declare the islands a British protectorate. Captain Bourke made the official declaration:

> The English Government being petitioned to grant the Protection of the British flag to the Cook Group of Islands... I do hereby declare... that the territory has become part of the British dominions... remember that you now belong to that Great Country which has done so much for the advancement of civilization in all parts of the world (CA. Bourke 13.11.1888).

Instead of proclaiming a protectorate he had annexed the Cook Island group and confirmed his error by flying the Union Jack on all six inhabited islands of the Southern Group.

The history of civilization thus began with an error in the Cook Islands. This error is precisely the event in history which Immanuel Wallerstein calls incorporation, describing the erroneous historical agent in the following extremely illuminating manner:

> periodically, the capitalist world economy has seen the need to expand the geographical boundaries of the system as a whole, creating thereby new loci of production to participate in its axial division of labour. . . . The successive expansions that have occurred have been a conscious process . . . We call this process incorporation. (Wallerstein 1990: 16.)

The consciousness of the capitalist world system and its ability to act as an active historical agent—and to make Bourkean errors—is reflected, of course, in the intellectual appropriation of the cultures and societies recently incorporated into the system. Participation in the axial division of production meant at the same time a very special role in the intellectual division of labour. The resident commissioner of the Cook Islands, Walter Edward Gudgeon, expressed this division of labour in his letter to the New Zealand government in 1906:

> Of what possible use can education be to such islands as Penrhyn, Rakahanga, Manihiki, Pukapuka, Mitiaro, or even Mauke? In such communities education can only create a desire for things unobtainable. At the best only one in twenty boys will obtain employment as clerks or storemen and the rest will be spoiled for the work for which they are best fitted, the cultivation of the soil. (CA. Parliamentary Paper 1906.)

The anthropological laboratory of the South Pacific thus began to take shape; the nature of this laboratory was characterised by Felix Keesing in his classic, *Modern Samoa*, in 1934:

> Intriguing as are the Samoan dependencies for their own sake as representing problems arising as the outside world breaks in upon a hitherto isolated human group and the incoming peoples seek to introduce control over the changes taking place, they gain a greater importance when regarded as one type of experiment in the vast Pacific racial and cultural laboratory. (Keesing 1934: 475.)

In every instance from Bourke to Wallerstein, Gudgeon to Keesing the processes were ascribed a unilateral agency. This is, of course, nothing exceptional. During the last thirty or so years in every critical discussion about colonialism this bias has been emphasised. Despite this emphasis the Bourkean er-
ror continues to sneak into our notion of the world and the ways in which we still tend to divide it into protectors and protected, planners and planters, researchers and researched, those who know and those about whom the knowledge is created—as in Keesing’s laboratories. That is, after all, the question around which the recent discussions about modernism, postmodernism, objectivism, pluralism and multivocalism have circled. The great amazement amongst some anthropologists—such as that of the retired participant at the Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu 1992, who commented: ‘So many natives attending the conference—even giving papers’—about the role of our knowledge in relation to the native’s point of view, might just be a repetition of Bourke’s error of the annexation of the Cook Islands. The intention was to do one thing, but the end result is something else. The natives not only attend conferences, they even give papers. In our annexation, one might think, we have given them the opportunity to appropriate our modernity in the form of a reflective relationship to their own culture, which makes of them objects of laboratory research doing research on themselves. This kind of assumed revolution has led John Knight to declare that a redivision of the intellectual space has occurred: books originally intended for colleagues are now read by the people they deal with (1992: 244). The natives have not been satisfied with their designated roles as planters of *taro* and feeders of pigs: instead they write books.

Clearly this notion and theory of the distribution of knowledge has roots in colonialism. Coming from Finland, where domestic ethnology and folklore studies have a long history—even longer than the study of foreign cultures—this kind of argumentation is for me very hard to understand. It is hard too to understand if we look at the problem from the point of view of the production and distribution of knowledge in the island world.

**Tumu korero—those who know**

Robert Borofsky highlights the opposition between the knowledge of the anthropologist and the knowledge of the islanders in his analysis of Pukapukan culture in his *Making History: Pukapukan and Anthropological Constructions of Knowledge* (1987). His main problem is how the western anthropologists who had previously studied Pukapuka had not been aware of the form of social organisation known in Pukapuka as *akatawa*, a form of dual organisation as vague as every dual organisation in Polynesia. According to Borofsky *akatawa* was revived after a meeting of the ‘Council of Important People’ of the island in 1976 and its revival was based on notions of tradition—and even on the personal memories of some old people who claimed to have lived it out in their youth. Borofsky’s amazement in the face of the ignorance of the earlier anthropologists seems to me astonishing. Although he stresses the partiality of all ethnographic accounts—a total and exhaustive description of a culture is of course an impossibility—he also fails to recognize what was going in the Cook Islands in the mid-1970s.

The Cook Islands government had in the early 1970s established the department of culture as part of its administrative structure. The aim of the department was to preserve and revive Cook Island culture and for this purpose it had begun a nationwide project of recording the traditions of the various islands. The sources for this information were the *tumu korero*, which can literally be translated as the sources of tradition. The *tumu korero* are the guardians of tribal traditions, they are historians, genealogists and sources, the main pillars and final authorities on tribal lore, history and genealogical
structure. At the same time they are the authorities on whom one has to rely in organising tribal rituals. The meeting of the ‘Council of Important People’ on Pukapuka which decided on the revival of *akatava* was a result of government policy aimed at the revival of tribal traditions. Similar things happened on other islands too.

The *tumu korero* project of the Cook Islands government provides an excellent example with which to analyse the ways in which anthropological descriptions, local constructions and government inventions relate to each other. The relationship of these different projects demands an analysis of the basic modernist assumption of the ethnographer’s authority and his supposedly unique relationship to his knowledge.

Reflectivity is, of course, at the centre of this relationship and it is reflectivity which has been viewed as unique to modernity. Thus, according to Giddens (1994) the modern self is reflectively organised because it can take itself as an object, create itself in terms of its representations and objectifications. In other, more conventional, terms, one can look at the modern–traditional great divide in Hobsbawm’s terms and claim that there are two kinds of societies, the traditional ones which are natural and unreflective, and in which cultural traditions are lived out, not reflected upon, and modern, invented, ones, with artificially constructed, invented cultures and cultural artefacts (Hobsbawm 1983).

When the *tumu korero* of the Cook Islands began their meeting and tried to reach a consensus on each island about the traditions, they were employed in the nation state’s project of inventing national culture (see Siikala & Siikala 2005). To the state has been ascribed the agency of the process of invention in most of the Hobsbawmian ‘invention of tradition’ discussions. There accordingly exists a strong resemblance between the critique of the invention of tradition and traditional functionalist thinking. The state, or those who fight for their status in the state machinery, is supposed to benefit most from the invention of tradition, the aim of which according to Hobsbawm is to reinforce the status of the inventors and legitimise their claims in straightforward functionalist terms. The mission of the *tumu korero* can be claimed to be simple. But what did they do? Did they invent a national culture?

*Ura* performances are an essential part of the most important events in the Cook Islands. The main parts of the legends are danced and sung. Photo by Jukka Siikala.
The same question can be modified to relate to the anthropologist, desperately looking for the oldest and most knowledgeable informant. This informant is supposed to provide information about no more and no less than the culture of the place or people and that in as comprehensive a way as possible. What do the informants really do? Why did the anthropological knowledge about Pukapuka not contain any information about akatawau? Was it a result of a serious omission by the anthropologist or did the islanders just invent the whole thing after the earlier anthropologists had departed?

The intention of the invention of tradition project is to produce a culture, national, tribal or some other kind of culture. The project itself and the functions the culture has to play determines the nature of the end product. It has to be a product, an artefact which can be used. As an artefact it should constitute information about something else. They are objectified culture in a formal, performative way and thus adaptable as objects of ritual attention. The frustrating meeting of the tumu korero similarly did not consist of discussions which could be characterised in Grice’s terms as rational cooperation. The irrationality, and accordingly also the inconclusiveness of the discussions experienced not only by me, but also by Borofsky on Pukapuka, was only a misunderstanding. The tumu korero were not talking about culture, they were performing it.

Bourkean error and knowledge

While the error of Captain Bourke mentioned at the beginning seemed to be a very slight one, a mere terminological difference meant a lot for the fate of the Cook Islands. Most of the discussions about tradition, its authenticity, its truth value are based on a kind of Bourkean error, a mixing of concepts. The performative character of the tumu korero knowledge is aptly analysed by Valerio Valeri in his discussion about the mele inoa, name chants, of the Hawaiians. According to Valeri:

The same question can be modified to relate to the anthropologist, desperately looking for the oldest and most knowledgeable informant. This informant is supposed to provide information about no more and no less than the culture of the place or people and that in as comprehensive a way as possible. What do the informants really do? Why did the anthropological knowledge about Pukapuka not contain any information about akatawau? Was it a result of a serious omission by the anthropologist or did the islanders just invent the whole thing after the earlier anthropologists had departed?

The intention of the invention of tradition project is to produce a culture, national, tribal or some other kind of culture. The project itself and the functions the culture has to play determines the nature of the end product. It has to be a product, an artefact which can be used. As an artefact it should be suitable as an object of ritual attention; it should be valuable. The anthropologist, on the other hand, does not attempt to create a culture but a representation of it.

**Reflection, representation and performance**

The mode of the existence of the knowledge of those who know—the tumu korero—is of great importance for the analysis of the questions at hand. I have spent days in discussion with three tumu koreros on Mauke and Atiu in the southern group of the Cook Islands, and it took some time before I began to see the way they were answering my enquiries. The bulk of the answers to the questions consist of historical or mythical narratives, tua ta’ito, which are of a closed form with clear beginning and ending formulae. The characterisation or determination of the genre of the narratives is of great importance. If it is question about tua ta’ito, the narrative is the ‘work of the ancestors’ and its validity as such cannot be contested. If the tumu korero are requested to explain the narratives they have told, the answer is just another narrative.

The narratives, although conveying the necessary authority of the past, are mostly written down. The family books of the Cook Islanders seem to follow a general Austronesian pattern of the manuscript cultures analysed in Bali by James Boon (1982). The texts themselves are, like the narrative performances of the tumu korero, not open to ready explanation or exegesis. The performances of the tumu korero are based on the texts and thus the texts are scripts of performances, prone to individual and situational variations and combinations. As scripts they are, however, not descriptions of the cultural whole or collections of historical wisdom; they are not representations of something but they are the basis of the thing itself. Similarly the performance of the tumu korero is not a representation but a presentation, it is performing the culture. As such it cannot be evaluated according to its truth value, its authenticity or its refentiality. The only thing it refers to is itself. In a way the narrative performances of the tumu korero correspond to the famous song with which you cannot argue. On the other hand it does not mean that you cannot oppose it but the only means of opposing it is with a counterperformance.

In this way the performances of the tumu korero seem to be better suited for the invention of tradition project than as sources of ethnographic information. The simple reason is that they do not constitute information about something else. They are objectified culture in a formal, performative way and thus adaptable as objects of ritual attention.

**The irrationality of the discussions experienced not only by me, but also by Borofsky on Pukapuka, was only a misunderstanding. The tumu korero were not talking about culture, they were performing it.**

**Bourkean error and knowledge**

While the error of Captain Bourke mentioned at the beginning seemed to be a very slight one, a mere terminological difference meant a lot for the fate of the Cook Islands. Most of the discussions about tradition, its authenticity, its truth value are based on a kind of Bourkean error, a mixing of concepts. The performative character of the tumu korero knowledge is aptly analysed by Valerio Valeri in his discussion about the mele inoa, name chants, of the Hawaiians. According to Valeri:

The chant is a total work of art. It seduces its audience with its beauties, which can be perceived independently of its propositional content. . . . Precisely because there is a belief that words recited in the appropriate context by an appropriate person do not simply communicate what already exists but are capable of validating and even bringing about what they communicate, the appropriate performance of an appropriate chat is considered by the audience as sufficient grounds for believing in its effects. (Valeri 1990: 183.)

Bourke’s declaration was a historical mistake but despite this it had the effect of annexing the Cook Islands. The knowledge of the tumu korero has similar
qualities. The performances are objectified, reflected upon, but they are works of art behind which you cannot find anything. They do not communicate, they are the culture. And as the Cook Islands examples demonstrate well enough, parts of that culture can be employed in the creation and invention of a national culture but at the same time other parts of it are opposed to that project through their counterperformative activities. The nationalist projects are not able to exhaust the complete repertoire of those who know—and neither are the anthropologists, as the Pukapuka example demonstrates.
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Theoretical discussions on culture and folklore have bifurcated into two major directions. Individualistic interpretations have emphasised performance and culture as being a product of individual strategic choices. Put in a wider social context culture has been reduced to hegemonic tradition in service of the interests of the elites. The analysis of Polynesian cultural practices in this volume reassesses the importance of theoretical understanding of culture which enables an analytic understanding of social action, political structure, narrative practices and thus the culturally constituted life-world of the people.

Pacific oral tradition is not a free-floating and easily circulating ‘folklore’, but an integral part of social life with direct political consequences. It has not been detached from social life and therefore it is not easily interpretable without a thorough knowledge of the whole cultural system. By analysing a wide range of cultural materials this volume argues strongly for the notion of culture as ordering order which systematically determines the significance of differences.
Before and After ‘Folktales and Fairy Tales: Translation, Colonialism, and Cinema’ (September 23–26, 2008, Honolulu, Hawai‘i)

by Cristina Bacchilega, Professor
Department of English, University of Hawai‘i-Manoa

We have all heard how in the nineteenth century folktales became associated with the pre-modern past and fairy tales with the nursery. But folklorists also know that these ‘traditional’ narratives continue to exercise their powers on contemporary culture in ways that escape those confines, as such very different but globally popular films as *Whale Rider* and *Pan’s Labyrinth* exemplify.

The announcement to faculty and students at the University of Hawai‘i-Mānoa publicizing the international symposium ‘Folktales and Fairy Tales: Translation, Colonialism, and Cinema’ said: ‘We intend to explore the significance of folk and fairy tales within the contemporary world in a manner that is interdisciplinary and attentive to our location in the Pacific. This symposium seeks to stimulate conversations among scholars of folktales, fairy tales, and contemporary culture by focusing on social practices—translation and colonialism—that have, in different ways, shaped the history of both genres. Through public lectures, panel responses, and a public roundtable in which the group’s leaders discuss issues and findings, we seek to make Hawaiian, Hawai‘i-based, Pacific, and Asian concerns more visibly connected with and in critical dialog with the interdisciplinary fields of folklore and fairy-tale studies.’

Featured speakers included scholars from a range of disciplines. *FF Network* readers are likely to be familiar with the work of Donald Haase, Maria Kaliambou, Sadhana Naithani, and Jack Zipes in folktale and fairy-tale studies. But probably not with Vilsoni Hereniko and Steven Winduo, prominent scholars in Pacific Islands Studies and Literature; or Noenoe Silva and Waziyatawin, well-known intellectuals in the fields of Hawaiian and Native American indigenous politics, respectively. Other participating scholars, most of them from my university, came from translation studies, film studies, creative writing, Hawaiian literature, American studies, international cultural studies, and folklore. While some of the lectures attracted an audience of a hundred or more, true to the symposium format, we conducted most of our discussions as a working group of fifty or so, including active student participants. The final roundtable was run by graduate students from the Comparativism and Translation in Literary/Cultural Studies research cluster. Whether they came from afar or from within the campus and other local communities, the individuals who gathered around the topic engaged each other at the edge or outside of their home disciplines. The symposium was thus meant to function as a productive disciplinary borderland, and at the same time the discussion remained firmly grounded in the history, knowledges, and perspectives of Hawai‘i and Oceania.

Collectively, the sessions took up interrelated questions about genre, history, translation, media, and place. What needs do folk and fairy tales serve today? What are the implications of the most basic working definitions of folktale and fairy tale in today’s popular culture? How has colonialism enabled and thwarted the translation of such narratives and their cultural meanings? How has colonialism shaped dominant discourses about orality and literature? How are the folk and fairy tale being ‘de-colonized’ today? What roles does translation play in transmitting traditional narratives? What is translation’s role in colonialism and de-colonization? Who is transforming stories and for whom? How are these dynamics played out differently depending on the history of a place or people? How are these dynamics played out in Hawai‘i and the Pacific? How have new technologies, from photography and film to the internet, affected translation practices and the construction of tradition? How does film speak effectively to culture-specific and global audiences?

We wanted to focus on folktales and fairy tales within a historicizing framework to which questions of transmission and power are crucial, working against the grain of the popular assumption that the folktale calls out some kind of identity construction (ethnic, national, gendered) based in ‘non literary’ simplicity, while the fairy tale functions as both
a ‘universal’ and artful genre. Even though scholars know that the fairy tale is not an exclusively literary tradition and the folktale is not only an oral narrative, it remains common to polarize the two, and at the same time to invest the modern fairy tale with the magical powers of older or ‘forgotten’ narratives.

In a parallel movement, the translation of stories from Western Asia (like the *Arabian Nights*) and other ‘exotic’ places and cultures (including Native America and Hawai‘i) into European languages in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has served an ethnocentric narrative that fed on fantasizing about the ‘other’, whose histories were trivialized as ‘folk’ or ‘fairy’ stories. In a parallel movement, the translation of stories from Western Asia (like the *Arabian Nights*) and other ‘exotic’ places and cultures (including Native America and Hawai‘i) into European languages in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has served an ethnocentric narrative that fed on fantasizing about the ‘other’, whose histories were trivialized as ‘folk’ or ‘fairy’ stories. Within this ethnocentric construction of the imagination and the ‘supernatural’, some peoples and some groups have imaginations that reach for the truth, and others have limited ones that are hopelessly untrue and ultimately obsolete.

Clearly, translation—from one language to another, from one medium to another, and from one discourse to another—plays a crucial role in the transmission of ‘traditional’ narratives. In the process of translation, these stories are re-contextualized and re-codified—say, from the oral to the page; or from the discourse of history to that of education to that of children’s entertainment. Thinking of the translation of ‘traditional’ narratives such as folk and fairy tales in relation to colonial practices is not only productive but imperative because ‘although the history of colonialism varies significantly according to place and period, it does reveal a consistent, no, inevitable reliance on translation’ (Venuti 1998: 165). At the same time, translation can be a powerful tool to de-colonize the mind.

Since the 1970s in particular, writers, filmmakers, illustrators, and creative artists of all kinds have repeatedly turned to the folktale and the fairy tale to help them explore new artistic forms and to challenge socio-cultural values. Scholars from many different disciplines have also re-evaluated conventional wisdom about the fairy tale, rediscovered forgotten folk and fairy-tale traditions, and published important anthologies and new translations that have had academic significance as well as popular success. While feminism placed the fairy tale firmly at the center of an ongoing cultural debate over gender and sexual politics, the worldwide revival of storytelling has sparked renewed interest in traditional tales and, most important to those of us located in Hawai‘i and Oceania, indigenous movements have urged a re-cognition of oral traditions as history and knowledge (Hau‘ofa 2008, Wendt 1993, Whaitiri 2008). Countering both the Hollywood stereotypes of the ‘native’ and the Disneyfication of magic, film has proved a particularly powerful form of translation for this renewed interest in folk and fairy tales. Thus, the translation of folk and fairy tales into film—which has been part of the history of cinema from its beginning—was a central focus for our symposium.

I was one of the organizers of the symposium, together with colleagues Professor Vilsoni Hereniako from the Center for Pacific Islands Research and Professor Noenoe Silva from the Political Science and Hawaiian Language, so it is not my place to assess whether or how well its intentions came to fruition. But in this brief article let me take the opportunity to present some of the questions that animated our symposium and to situate the symposium within a larger scholarly conversation within and about folklore studies.
Although folklore is often associated with nationalism, it is not as commonly thought of in connection with colonialism. Yet, just as translation has been integral to the making of colonialism, so have been the collection, publication, and popularization of folklore, its transformation from living practices, narratives, and memory into a ‘culture’ that is othered. At the American Folklore Society meeting in 2007, the panel ‘The Coloniality of Power in Folkloristics’ (for which I was a respondent) brought together folklorists from different parts of the globe to present different stories of colonialism, each contributing to the thesis that the politics of cultural inequality are basic to the construction of both folkloristics and folklore. You can most likely recall similar presentations at other scholarly gatherings; this one made an impression on me.

At that panel, Diarmud Ó Giolláin expanded Antonio Gramsci’s intuitions about the ‘questione meridionale’ in Italy in order to focus on European nation-states’ internal colonialism. And papers by Charles Briggs and Sadhana Naithani made the case for looking to the fifteenth-century colonization of South America (see Mignolo 2005) as encounters that crystallized the orality vs. writing opposition into a hierarchy where the illiterate colonized are defined as inferior people with no history other than that which the colonizers will construct for them, by deracinating, textualizing, and translating the stories of the colonized into a teleological framework of progress, the ultimate attainment of which the colonized are structurally denied.

By now as folklorists we know that this colonial representation of the ‘other’ is one of the ways in which modernity shapes itself in contrast to a ‘traditional’ or ‘pre-modern’ subject that is defined not only in terms of class, gender, and education, but political subjugation and racial inferiority as well. This argument rewrites the history of folklore studies as always already inflected and infected by the colonial encounter of Europeans with non-Europeans and by the power structures of colonialism. It’s a powerful argument, one I believe needs to be made and remade. It is not new, but it is not as widely ‘heard’ and attended to as it should be.

Of course, as a discursive formation, folklore studies—as Stuart Hall wrote of cultural studies in 1992—have ‘no simple origin’ but ‘multiple discourses’, ‘a number of different histories’, and ‘many trajectories’. Reading colonialism as a generative force that has shaped folkloristics can provide key insights into this multiplicity. At the same time, it is important for this argument to draw on multiple reckonings with colonialism because, as anthropologist Julie Cruikshank writes in Do Glaciers Listen? Local Knowledge, Colonial Encounters, & Social Imagination, ‘the aftermaths of colonialism are always local’ (2005: 9). Recognition of the coupling of colonialism and folkloristics therefore will bring about different projects in different locations.

Nonetheless the legacy of colonialism—as the economic and political control of one people over another—is not itself an isolated local phenomenon, but rather lives on in what Briggs calls the ‘coloniality of power’ that structures not only the economics and ideology of, let’s say, ‘North’ and ‘South’, but also the economics and ideology of contemporary folkloristics in a globalized production and marketing of knowledge. Just as it is a fallacy to think of folklore as a cultural expression confined to the past, we may not have the luxury to think of ourselves today, wherever we are located, as living and writing outside of the economy of colonial ideology. Accepting this coloniality of power in folkloristics may be difficult because colonialism has been one of the most violent agents of change on this planet, yet its effects are with us, even if they are not always in plain sight. Here I want to offer my localized experience of how this acceptance, while challenging, can be productive.

For some of us colonialism and coloniality are in plain sight, which makes the first step—recognizing how the histories of colonialism and folkloristics are interwoven together—as easier. As an Anglo-Indian Italian woman who grew up in Rome (not the imperial Rome or the fascist colonizing one, but still a city that thrives touristically on that record) and was educated within literature departments in Europe and the United States, I have lived and worked for the last 25 years in Hawai‘i. Hawai‘i was a sovereign and internationally recognized nation until it was annexed to the United States in 1898 against the will of the majority of Hawaiians, whose petitions and resistance were to no avail. Hawaiian resistance to that violent occupation or, put differently, Hawaiians’ insistence on their rights to sovereignty and decision-making about their language, education, land use, and more is ongoing.

So there is no need for me to politicize cultural production about and in Hawai‘i: the colonization of Hawai‘i does it for me. The effects of both colonialism and coloniality are evident to me everyday in and out of the classroom. As a scholar, recognizing their marks on the representation of Hawaiian culture has meant, for instance, noticing that, while paperback editions of post-annexation English-lan-
guage collections of Hawai‘i legends remain steadily popular, there was no substantive study of these publications taking a historizing and critical approach. Why? To take on this project, which I did over ten years ago, required me to self-identify as a settler, but also to do so in an engaged rather than guilt-ridden way.

I say this because guilt can be paralyzing, but at least in my experience as a teacher and scholar, taking responsibility for change has not been—and that is part of what I want to communicate to those who, myself included, may feel unsettled by the realization that we are settlers and/or we have a range of ways been in complicity with colonial power structures. I think of Cruikshank again, a settler in a very different place, writing about ‘the sedimentation of colonialisat categories in much contemporary scholarship: what sinks into history and what floats away is not random’ (2005: 151).

Ramón Saldívar—who was one of the speakers at the important panels of the 2008 American Folklore Society meeting marking the 50th anniversary of Américo Paredes’s ‘With His Pistol in His Hand’—has written: ‘Fifty years before the current focus on the issue of coloniality and its relationship to history, power, knowledge, and subaltern modernities, before our focus on processes of globalization and the transnational nature of economic and social forms, and before the related questions of imagined communities and the transnational imaginary, Américo Paredes addresses these same issues of the colonality of knowledge In the context of border modernities’ (Saldívar 2006: 55). Some argue that this is why Paredes has been erased from the genealogy of folkloristics. But there are multiple genealogies and we play a part in retracing and performing them.

Not surprisingly, several of the discussions led to questions of ownership and ethical responsibility, competing truths and expectations of authenticity, universalism and hegemony, the relationship between performance and master-narratives, memory and history, emplaced culture and language-culture. The conversations that the symposium initiated are continuing in various formats, formally and informally. Films like Vilsoni Hereniko’s The Land Has Eyes (2004) and David Kaplan’s Red Riding Hood (1997) have crossed audiences and moved them in unexpected ways. Waziyatawin’s multimedia performance of oral and visual history in today’s struggles of the displaced Dakota people in the face of Minnesota’s 150 years of statehood prompted both activism and reflection in light of Hawai‘i upcoming 50th anniversary. For me, as a scholar and person, it was a difficult conversation, not a dialog conducted in the middle ground, but a disorienting experience of tensions. I came away with ku‘ualoha ho‘omanawanui’s comment on how the Disneyfication or appropriation of indigenous cultures means that a lot of ‘unteaching’ must take place before ‘teaching’ is possible; with John Zuern’s firm reminder of the incommensurability of the de-colonizing and de-Disneyfying projects; with students’ excited realization that folklore matters in more ways than one; and with further commitment to reflect on the politics of wonder today.

My deep appreciation to MA candidate in English at UHM Aiko Yamashiro, student assistant for the symposium.
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Touching Things: Ethnological Aspects of Modern Material Culture

Material culture is something we can touch and can be touched by. It is simultaneously concrete artefacts and expression of values produced and shared by humans. But what is modern material culture like?

Material culture has always played an essential role in ethnological studies. The object of ethnological study has been the culture itself, the life reflected in things and artefacts, and the beliefs that lie behind the material. But like the definitions of subjects and concepts, the very meaning of material culture in modern ethnology is manifold and therefore needs to be considered continuously and repeatedly anew. This book discusses material culture from various viewpoints, such as museums, everyday life and consuming. The focus is on modern things from honeymoon mementos to sweaters and summer cottages.

Articles are based on the papers presented at the IX Finnish-Hungarian Symposium on Ethnology, which was held in Jyväskylä, Finland on 24–27 August 2006.

Industry and Modernism: Companies, Architecture, and Identity in the Nordic and Baltic Countries during the High-Industrial Period

For postwar Europe, industrial production and its methods of rationalization and modernization were adopted as a model for societies more generally. To replace the nationalism of the 1930s that had led to a catastrophe, universal values and technologies were seen as important. Modernism in architecture was both an instrument to realize these goals and the symbol of modern society. Modernism meant technological progress, economic security, relative political stability and social equality, that is, what being European was about.

In the book Industry and Modernism, the meaning of industrial production is discussed particularly in the context of the Nordic and Baltic postwar histories. The polarities of the Cold War suppressed similarities between the two worlds such as the shared belief in the power of architecture, planning and technology to construct new societies. For many western European countries, Nordic countries represented a model of the welfare state, just as Baltic countries were seen as models within the Soviet hegemony. In the book, economic and social history is integrated with business history, architectural history, and the study of industrial heritage.

The anthology is a result of the multidisciplinary project led by Dr Anja Kervanto Nevanlinna, Academy Research Fellow and the editor of the book. The authors are from Nordic and Baltic universities and institutions of cultural heritage.
The Landscape of Food: The Food Relationship of Town and Country in Modern Times
Edited by Marjatta Hietala & Tanja Vahtikari.

The Landscape of Food introduces new perspectives on the social history of food by focusing on the food relationships between urban and rural areas in Europe from the late eighteenth century to the present day. The theme is approached by historians, ethnologists and geographers through a series of studies of the Netherlands, Germany, Slovenia, Switzerland, Britain, Finland, Italy, Greece and Norway.

The volume examines a multitude of aspects of the urban–rural interface, such as provisioning of cities and towns with fresh foodstuffs, urban food productions, and changes in the diet. The Landscape of Food takes readers back to the nineteenth-century town with its commercial cowsheds, cattle markets, piggeries, and market gardens and its self-provisioning from allotments and backyard chicken coops and rabbit hutches. The environmental problems associated with these activities presented targets for veterinary surgeons and public health reformers.

The emergence in the twentieth century of industrial provisioning of the towns and the preservation of food, with its branded and heavily advertised goods and increasingly standardized recipes and restaurants is discussed, as is the changing role of the countryside. During the second half of the twentieth century, the provision of meals in the home is shown to have developed from the rationing and privation of the Second World War up to the heating of supermarket products in a microwave oven, while cooking, in some urban societies at least, has been reduced to a form of television entertainment. The reaction to this industrialization of the diet is also discussed, particularly in terms of the utilization of ‘foods from nature’.

Memories of My Town: The Identities of Town Dwellers and Their Places in Three Finnish Towns
Edited by Anna-Maria Åström, Pirjo Korkiakangas & Pia Olsson.

Memories of My Town is an exploration into how town dwellers experience their environment in a complicated way. As people in urban milieus relate themselves to the environment, this takes place on many levels, where especially the time level becomes problematic. The urban buildings and settings can be looked upon as a kind of collective history, as carriers or witnesses of times past. But it is only the town dwellers that experience urban time itself, the time they live in, but through their memories also times past. In this past some elements take symbolically dense expressions. Through reliving and narrating their experiences the symbolically important factors in this urban relationship will be outlined for investigations concerning three towns, Helsinki, the capital, Vyborg, the ceded and lost Karelian town, and Jyväskylä, a town with dense commercial and cultural dimensions in the middle of Finland. The aim of the book is to use different theoretical concepts as guidelines in analysing the different narrative texts.
After the New Folkloristics? The Eighth Folklore Fellows’ Summer School at Lammi, Finland

The eighth Folklore Fellows’ Summer School will be held at the biological station of Helsinki University at Lammi on 2–8 August 2010. The title, ‘After the New Folkloristics?’, focuses on questions of present-day theories and methods in folkloristics. The course will, however, also continue to discuss the place of folklore studies within the humanities and within interdisciplinary studies.

After the New Folkloristics?

Like other humanities subjects, folkloristics has in the past century undergone many paradigmatic changes: the various text-based historical-developmental, diffusionist, functionalist and structuralist research topics have left deep vestiges in the history of learning within folkloristics internationally.

From the 1960s folklorists began to speak and write of new research perspectives and questions in folkloristics. An attempt was made to separate the subject fundamentally from the old-fashioned notion of the people, from fossilised categories of tradition-types and from essentialising dogmas of collective tradition. At this time, among other things new perspectives on the significance of contexts were presented, as well as research into the production of performances and text and questions of interpretation of patterns of ethnic thought and worldview.

The FF Summer School of 2010 will investigate the question of how things have fared for ‘new folkloristics’ over the decades, of which perspectives, new in their time, have persisted and which have changed. The intention is to focus particularly on methodological questions affecting the substance of modern folkloristics, or how modern folkloristics manufactures itself. What is the relationship of folkloristics nowadays to closely related fields—and what are they? What form
does multi-, inter- and transdisciplinarity take from a folkloristics perspective? How have research objectives and materials changed over recent decades, and what do old texts such as myths, folktales and fairy stories look like in the light of the new questions? Is cultural constructionism a controlling dogma in modern folkloristics? What sort of constructionism are we talking about, and does it have challengers?

Setting and practices
The Lammi biological station proved to be a pleasant FFSS venue in 1997 and 2002. It is near a village surrounded by typical Finnish landscape with fields, forests and lakes and is furnished with all the modern equipment needed for fieldwork and small seminars. There are both indoor and lakeside saunas, boats for those wishing to spend their free time on the lake, and plenty of forest paths to explore.

The organising committee of the eighth Folklore Fellows’ Summer School includes members from Finnish folklore departments, the Graduate School of Cultural Interpretations, the Folklore Archives of the Finnish Literary Society, the Kalevala Institute and the Kalevala Society.

Participants are to find their own means of funding the travel costs. The participation fee is 400 euros. The organising committee will, however, aim to cover the costs of board and lodging in Finland for a limited number of participants who are unable to do so themselves.

The language of lectures and seminars is English, hence a good knowledge of English is a precondition for participation.

Twenty applicants may be accepted on the course. When choosing the participants, the FFSS will pay special attention to the thematic field of research interest and the motivation shown. The organisers will select the participants at the beginning of 2010.

The application form is enclosed. See also the Folklore Fellows’ website at www.folklorefellows.fi.

Twenty Years of Summer School

The Folklore Fellows’ Summer School was established twenty years ago, in 1989, through the agency of the folklorists members of the Finnish Academy of Sciences, Prof. Lauri Honko, Prof. Matti Kuusi, Prof. Anna-Leena Siikala and Prof. Leena Virtanen. The idea was Lauri Honko’s, and he had a strong influence upon the working methods of the first summer schools. He acted as chairman of the summer schools in Turku in 1991 and 1999. Prof. Anna-Leena Siikala was the director of five summer schools held at Turku (1993), Mokri-Järvi research station (1995), Lammi biological station (1997, 2002) and Kuhmo and Archangel Karelia (2007), and over the course of the years the summer schools began to take on new forms.

The summer school was from the beginning a joint project of the folklore group of the Finnish Academy of Sciences, of Finnish departments of folkloristics, and of the Finnish Literature Society’s folklore archive. Its aim has been to foster research training on a global level. In the early 1990s a time began when international relations were strengthened by the increase in mobility and the spread of modern information technology. UNESCO and other funding bodies regarded the internationalisation of research as a priority.

In the summer schools, lectures by internationally renowned scholars have been presented and many of them have viewed it as important to lecture on new courses. Perhaps the most significant contribution, however, has been the views of the over two hundred participants, representing many nations and regions, on the nature of folkloristics and on research needs and future possibilities, views which have been heard both in the form of presentations, and as comments in group sessions as well as informally in free time. The Folklore Fellows’ Summer Schools have been able to bring folklorists with different backgrounds into deep face-to-face conversations, and to build bridges between cultures. The Folklore Fellows’ Summer School is continuing its work, but its working methods change according to the changes in the scientific climate.
Professor Anna-Leena Siikala Receives the Honorary Title of Academician

President of the Republic Tarja Halonen has granted the honorary title of Academician of Science to Professor Emerita Anna-Leena Siikala. The letter of appointment was presented by the President in Helsinki on 12 June 2009.

Based on nominations by the Academy, the President of the Republic of Finland may confer the honorary title of Academician on highly distinguished Finnish or foreign scientists and scholars. The title of Academician can be held by no more than twelve Finnish scientists and scholars at a time. Three of them represent research in arts subjects. The grounds for nomination are excellence in research.

On the grounds for the nomination of Anna-Leena Siikala (www.aka.fi/en-gl/A/, Academy releases), the Academy noted:

Academician Anna-Leena Siikala has forged an impressive and well-respected career as a scholar of cultures. She has studied the religious customs of aboriginal populations in northern Eurasia, shamanism, mythical and historical interpretations of Kalevala-metre poems as well as methods of researching oral tradition. She has also studied how an ethnic-minority group uses its mythology and tradition in seeking to revive and maintain its own language and way of life under the dominance of mainstream culture.

The studies by Academician Siikala on the methods and theories of the poetry of oral tradition are considered pioneering. On her numerous field-study trips she has compiled extensive materials not only in Finland but in the Pacific region as well as in Russia among Finno-Ugric peoples, the Udmurts, the Komi and the Khanty in Siberia.

Academician Siikala’s extensive production has contributed to strengthening the international standing of Finnish folkloristic research. Her work represents the absolute cutting edge in this field. She has been a major influence in the science policy field both in Finland and internationally, and she has been active in leadership positions in various humanities associations at home and abroad. She has served as Professor of Folkloristics at the universities of Turku, Joensuu and Helsinki, and as Academy Professor in 1999–2004.

The nomination, while being an honour to Prof. Siikala for her many years of work in this field, is also, as Prof. Siikala herself is keen to emphasise, a recognition of the strength and importance of folklore studies, and cultural studies in general, in Finland. Folklore studies have a long tradition in Finland stretching back, in various forms, over two centuries, with the more recent tradition reflected for example in the thriving Folklore Fellows’ Communications series, now almost a century old. Prof. Siikala is the third folklorist to hold the position of Academician, following in the footsteps of Martti Haavio, professor of folklore studies at Helsinki University (1956) and Matti Kuusi from the same department (1985); it is exceptional to find a field which has produced three Academicians, which is further proof of the vitality of Finnish folklore studies and the awareness by the wider academic world of this vitality. ■
The Kalevala Institute: First Ten Years

by Pekka Hakamies, Professor of Folkloristics, Director of the Kalevala Institute
University of Turku

The Kalevala Institute was founded at the University of Turku in 1998. The Institute’s main task has from the beginning been comparative research into epics. A more precisely defined task is to further research into the *Kalevala* and other epics and epic traditions of the world, and to carry out editorial work on publications relating to the field of international folkloristics, to provide information in this area and to help in the training of researchers.

The Institute’s work was strongly connected in its first years of operation with the research of Professor Emeritus Lauri Honko and his collaboration with scholars of epic worldwide. Research concentrated especially on the Indian epic tradition, and on follow-up research on the Siri epic, published by Honko in 1998. After his death the work of the Institute grew quiet for some time, but in recent years it has again thrust itself into a more active fulfilment of its role.

In 2004 a cooperation agreement between the University of Turku, the Finnish Academy of Science and Letters, the Finnish Literature Society, the Kalevala Society and the Alfred Kordelin Foundation was adopted as a basis for the Institute’s activities, and its constitution was changed so that the professor of folkloristics at the University of Turku would act as director of the Institute, as well as undertaking his own work. Apart from the director, the Institute’s only continuous employee is the editorial secretary, Maria Vasenkari, who works in the service of the Institute on a part-time basis. The highest official body over the Institute is the board of directors appointed by the Rector of the University of Turku, which is composed of academic specialists and representatives of the signatory institutes of the cooperation agreement. The practical running of the Institute is taken care of in the department of cultural research.

Through such a ‘personal union’ the Kalevala Institute, originally a unit working very independently, has become a tight-knit part of the department of cultural research, and the relationship between the fields of study of the Institute and of folkloristics is very close—to the extent that separating them would be artificial.

In its first stages the Institute was closely concerned with the scientific work of its founder and first director, Lauri Honko, professor emeritus of comparative religion (and earlier of folkloristics). Honko was an internationally well known and respected scholar, and he organised a broad international epic seminar at the Institute in 1999. He also began work on a second international seminar on the bicentenary of Elias Lönnrot’s birth in 2002. Regrettably, the international epic-singer seminar in the autumn of 2002 turned into his memorial seminar.

After Honko’s death, the Institute was led by Anna-Leena Siikala, professor of folkloristics at the University of Helsinki, and herself a scholar of mythic epic and shamanism. In 2006 Pekka Hakamies was appointed as professor of folkloristics at the University of Turku and thus he became the director of the Institute.

In 2007 the Kalevala Institute participated in organising the FF Summer School; the school was held partly on the Finnish side of the border in Kuhmo and partly in Russian Karelia at Vuokkiniemi. There was a large international group of both teachers and participants, from as far apart as China and USA. The FF Summer School has been held since 1991 at intervals of a few years, and the Institute is taking part in the preparations for the 2010 school in the same way as before. The Institute’s standing has become more significant than hitherto because the cooperation agreement of the state Graduate School of Cultural Interpretations moved to the University of Turku at the beginning of 2009, and Pekka Hakamies works as its director and Maria Vasenkari as coordinator.

The Institute receives the basic funding for its work from the University of Turku, but for all its wider activities project funding is sought separately, primarily from outside the university.

Apart from Indian epic, Lauri Honko was for the whole of his academic career interested in the Finnish *Kalevala*—in fact, it was a desire to find some sort of parallel to the Finnish epic process that inspired him to set off for India. In India Honko came to experience what it is like to begin the documenting of mythic epic presented in conjunction with rituals, such as had not previously attained written form. A result of the project was, apart from the printed Siri epic, a significant piece of research into the problems of the textualisation of epic tradition.
Honko investigated the work of Elias Lönnrot in a new way and developed a theory of the mental text, a variety of which Lönnrot too had for the *Kalevala*, as Honko proved. The formation of this mental text can be followed through the five different versions of the *Kalevala*. Thus Honko developed a theory of the fundamental distinction between a short and a long epic and the ways of presenting them, and he also formulated a hypothesis about the existence of a long epic in White Sea Karelia before Lönnrot began his collection work.

‘The Kalevala and the World’s Traditional Epics’ symposium in 1999 and the epic-singer symposium organised three years later were international scientific gatherings. In January 2009 the Kalevala Institute organised with the Graduate School of Cultural Interpretations and the Kalevala Society a methodological seminar on Kalevala-style poetry, whose participants were primarily from Finland. On a smaller scale, it was a continuation of the work begun by Lauri Honko, and the aim was to critique the new perspectives and methodologies which have appeared in recent decades in the field of folk-poetry research in Finland. In Finland, research into Kalevala-style poetry all but ceased in the 1960s as new paradigms took hold in folkloristics and old archive materials were pushed to one side. Later, especially since the 1990s, researchers have sought new ways of approaching the poetry and of presenting the archive materials with new questions which surprisingly they have been able to answer. Such for example is the empathetic hermeneutical research into lyric and the examination of the poetry as a legacy of the nineteenth-century performers’ own society rather than as vestiges of ancient verse.

Apart from the epic traditions of Finland and India, the epic traditions of Baltic Finnic peoples and the way in which oral tradition has been used to create written epics have been researched at the Institute thanks to Lauri Honko. An example is the Peko epic of the Setu people, who live on both sides of the border between Russia and south-east Estonia. This research has resulted in the publication in 2003 of *The Maiden’s Death Song and The Great Wedding. Anne Vabarna’s Oral Twin-Epic written down by A. O. Väisänen* (FF Communications 281).

The role of the Kalevala Institute also includes providing information and the dissemination of the results of research. In fact, this dialogue between university and society in general is defined administratively in Finland as the third task of universities alongside research and teaching. The Institute fulfilled this role in April 2009 by organising a day-
long seminar in conjunction with teachers of Finnish (as a mother tongue) in Turku, where the focus of attention was the teaching of the *Kalevala* and folk tradition in schools. The participants were teachers from schools throughout Finland. The programme included lectures by researchers on new directions and conclusions in folk poetry and *Kalevala* research, and workshops in which teachers had the opportunity to exchange their experiences of bringing the *Kalevala* and folk tradition to life in school lessons. It was also shown how baseless the mythical concept is, still found alive and kicking in Finland, that the teaching of the *Kalevala* in schools consists of the tedious reading aloud of hundreds of lines of poetry.

The Institute also oversees the editorial work on publications. It does not have its own publication channels, but participates in the publication of the *FF Network*, above all in that the editing work for it is carried out in conjunction with the editor-in-chief, Prof. Anna-Leena Siikala, by Maria Vasenkari, who also works for the Institute. In accordance with the collaboration agreement the Institute also takes part in the editing of the FF Communications series in the same way as with the *FF Network*. The editor-in-chief and place of publication are in Helsinki, but the technical work is carried out in the Kalevala Institute at the University of Turku.

In addition to its editorial work, the Institute is also actively involved in archival work with the Finnish Literature Society. A result of this collaboration has been the preparation of a pilot version in digital database form of the letters sent by Elias Lönnrot. In addition, a database has been constructed in the Institute which facilitates comparison between the five versions of the *Kalevala*. Niina Hämäläinen, a researcher at the Institute, is preparing her doctorate on the textualisation of the *Kalevala*. The Institute has also continued the sorting, cataloguing and archiving of Lauri Honko’s far-reaching collections of fieldwork materials.

As a promotor of international collaboration and a hub of a scholarly network, the institute welcomes visiting researchers. Thus in spring 2008 Prof. Andrei Toporkov from the Moscow University of Humanities, and correspondent member of the Russian Academy of Sciences, was a guest at the Kalevala Institute for a month, researching early-twentieth-century Finnish-Russian collaboration in the field of folkloristics and in particular the work and writings of V. J. Mansikka. Researchers who are interested in this sort of visit may make contact with the Institute (www.kalevalainstituutti.fi).

---

**The Kalevala and the World’s Traditional Epics**

Edited by Lauri Honko.


On the occasion of the 150th anniversary of the (New) Kalevala thirty experts on comparative epic research from 12 countries met in Turku, Finland in August 1999 to debate the role of the Finnish national epic and its scientific significance.

The keyword of this volume is textualisation. International epic research views textualisation as a process in which oral and mental composition is followed up by recording, translation and editing. The comparative research on epics is based on texts which either directly reflect oral performance or, in the case of tradition-oriented epics, take their inspiration and loyalties from traditional poetic rules and expressions. The co-operation between fieldworkers documenting living oral epics and textual analysts utilising old texts and archive sources sets the tone of the articles of this volume, which brings the singer of epics and his/her cultural world closer to the modern editors and publishers of epics. The paradox of oral performance in writing is brought one step nearer to its optimal solution.
Reviews

The Catalogue of Catalan Folktales in English


In Woody Allen’s recent movie, Vicky Cristina Barcelona, an American student goes to Barcelona to finish her master’s thesis on Catalan identity, something she connects with the work of the famous Catalan architect Gaudí. Vicky (who does not even speak Spanish) is not at all aware of the fact that there is a language called Catalan—a language with a rich literary past in the Middle Ages, spoken by most of the population in the autonomous community of Catalonia and on the Balearic islands as well as in other areas in and outside Spain (for more detail see the catalogue under consideration, pp. 10–11). Language and identity are indeed very closely linked; consequently so-called minority languages tend to be repressed by the national states: along with Basque and Galician, Catalan was forbidden in Franco’s Spain and has also suffered from disastrous language politics in France and Italy. Moreover, the definition as a minority language is subjective: speakers of Catalan (7.2 million) not only outnumber the population of Finland but also the population of the three Baltic countries Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania taken together.

As the bibliography of the present catalogue shows (pp. 304–13), Catalan folktales have been collected since the middle of the nineteenth century and continue to be recorded to this day. The history of classification of this rich narrative tradition (see pp. 13–15) begins with Walter Anderson, who specifically dealt with the important collection made by Joan Amades (1950). Anderson’s results were included in the second revision of the Aarne/Thompson tale-type index (1961), which unfortunately introduced numerous mistakes. In the 1970s, the work of Antoni M. Alcover (1896–1931) was classified by Josep Antoni Grimalt, and in the 1980s works by the authors of the present catalogue followed; Josep M. Pujol’s classification of the remaining Catalan collections and Carme Oriol’s reclassification of Amades in the light of earlier tale collections. These three important contributions have remained unpublished but have been made accessible to other researchers within and outside Spain. A regional catalogue which also contains Catalan material is the Aragonese index by Carlos González Sanz (1996). The Catalan tales included in the still unfinished Spanish tale-type index by Julio Camarena and Maxime Chevalier (1995–2003; 4 vols., covering ATU 1–999), which divides the narrative material according to language groups, are only indicative of the wealth of Catalan tale traditions.

The present English-language catalogue by Oriol and Pujol makes Catalan folktales published in books between 1853 and 2007 at last accessible to international scholarship. It has been preceded by a publication in Catalan (Índex tipològic de la rondalla catalana, 2003) by the same authors, which they have considerably enlarged and updated for the purpose of the English version. Even new tale-types could be identified, for example—thanks to the original

Oriol and Pujol’s catalogue, cleverly devised and prepared with much care, can be regarded as exemplary: in view of the amount of information that is given concerning both the material and its contents, it provides an excellent introduction to the Catalan tale material, for researchers as well as for the interested public.

The plot summaries show the specificity of the Catalonian tales, viz. deviations from the general patterns as well as elaborations. For example, in type 304, The Dangerous Night-Watch, the very typical episode that gave the name to the tale-type is missing, the antagonists are giants, not robbers, and the hero, by mistake, drops some wax on the princess’s face—a trait known from the tale of Amor and Psyche which in the context of type 304 may have a euphemistic function (see Enzyklopädie des Märchens 7, cols. 411–20); type 516, Faithful John, seems to borrow the beginning and the helper figure from the Grimm version, but lacks the helper’s final disenchantment and thereby deviates wholly both from literary and oral tradition; in type 709, Snow White, the heroine’s name, Magraneta (Little Pomegranate) or Tarongineta (Little Bitter Orange), is suggestive of a relationship with type 408, The Three Oranges (which in fact is apparent in other regional repertoires; see Snow White special issue in Fabula 49, 3/4), while the girl’s hosts are thieves as usual, and she gains access to their dwelling place by reciting a magic formula—a reminiscence of type 954, The Forty Thieves, that is not unusual in Snow White.

The lists of variants following the plot descriptions emphasises regional aspects by dividing the material according to their areas of origin: Catalonian, 2) the Fringe of Aragon (i.e. the eastern border area of Aragon; in Catalan: Franja d’Aragó), 3) Northern Catalonia (i.e. the French region of Roussillon; in Catalan: Rosselló), 4) Andorra, the Balearic islands of 5) Majorca, 6) Minorca, 7) Ibiza and 8) Formentera, 9) the autonomous region of Valencia, 10) the Carxe area in the province of Murcia and 11) the city of Alghero (in Catalan: L’Alguer) on Sardinia; a category ‘not stated’ has been introduced for tales collected by Marià Aguilo. Furthermore, the district (comarca) and town of provenance of each variant is stated.

For each tale variant, titles are cited. These are often revealing with regard to the content of the tales. For example, among the variants of type 709, Snow White, the title La filla de l’hostalera (see also La filla de la molineria) shows that the Iberian-Italian oicotype of the beautiful innkeeper and her more beautiful daughter (which is not mentioned in the plot summary) has also been recorded in Catalonia; titles such as La pagaseta que va ésser reina (The country girl that became a queen) found under variants of type 921, The King and the Farmer’s Son, suggest approximation to type 875, The Clever Farmgirl; and from De quant sant Pere va fer companya amb Judas (When St Peter kept Judas company) as a variant of type 1030, The Crop Division, it appears that Judas takes the place of the devil in the group of tales with holy figures as actors (see Enzyklopädie des Märchens 4, col. 226).

Combinations or contaminations with other tale-types are also indicated. Furthermore, interconnections between individual variants are stated; most notably, in the case of many of Amades’s tales it can be observed, as a result of Oriol’s study (1984) of Amades’s Rondallística, that they are based on the publications of other collectors. Deviant classifications by Camarena/Chevalier and other folklorists dealing with Catalan or other Iberian material (including the authors of the present catalogue) are systematically pointed out so that users of the Catalan catalogue will be able to draw their own conclusions.

A certain overlap with legend material concerning historical matters can be perceived among the so-called novelle or realistic tales. Tales surrounding castles occur, for example, among the variants of types 970, 974 and 992. Jaume el Conqueridor (James the Conqueror, king of Aragon; 1208–76) is a protagonist in variants of types 921A, 922, 922B, 925, 950 and 958; the count Ramon Berenguer III (1082–1131) appears in a variant of type 992; a version of type 960A, The Cranes of Ibycus, thematises the murder of count Ramon Berenguer II (1053/4–82) allegedly committed by his twin brother Berenguer Ramon. A figure from literary history we meet is one of the foremost Spanish poets, Francisco de Quevedo (1580–1645; types 921D, 925); a migratory legend of demonological content (type 329*, Man Gives [Sells] His Shadow to the Devil) presents a curious anachronism in combining Seneca and Luther as its active characters.

The last-mentioned tale-type is cited among the ‘suppressed types’ (i.e. tales found in Aarne/Thompson 1961, but discarded by Hans-Jörg Uther in his 2004 revision). In the case of the Catalan catalogue, this concerns seventeen tale-types, and al-
though it is true that nine of these are only attested by one variant (another ‘suppressed’ tale-type has two variants, and two ‘suppressed’ types have three), they nevertheless exist (and have international parallels); moreover, it is probably legitimate to say that types attested by four, five (two types each) and even eight variants (one type) are firmly established in tale tradition. It is therefore to be welcomed that this tale material remains represented in the Catalan index even though it is relegated to the end of the volume. Another problem linked with the reorganisation of the international tale-type system and in turn adopted by recent regional catalogues is the amalgamation of different types or subtypes, which has entailed a decrease in differentiation. In the English version of the Catalan catalogue, for example, we find two plot summaries for tale-type 403, *The Black and the White Bride*, but all variants are lumped together, followed by a short and, in fact, not very informative note: ‘403A: See Type 403; 403B: See Type 403’; whereas the Catalan version has both forms still clearly separated. The same is true for type 332: *Godfather Death*, formerly divided into subtypes A–D, and here the subtypes B and C are passed over in silence altogether. A slightly different case is type 313, *The Magic Flight*, where the description of the plot suggests that all variants end with the episode of the *Forgotten Bride* (formerly type 313C) whereas the Catalan version of the catalogue clearly separates variants lacking or including this episode. Within the cycle of the *Lost Husband* tales the cross-references from types 425G, H, L, N, P and type 428 to types 425A, C, E, B, type 302 and type 425B, respectively, are somewhat puzzling, as the former are not mentioned in the Catalan version of the catalogue (and 425L is defined only through its use by other cataloguers). In my opinion, the omission of numerous types and subtypes from the new tale-type system represents its greatest flaw and is something that should be reconsidered.

Another general problem for compilers and users of catalogues concerns a practice which has been prevalent among many cataloguers for several decades: an attempt at squeezing all their tale material into the preexisting Aarne/Thompson system, regardless of whether it fits or not. This is the case, for example, with type 333, *Little Red Riding Hood*, the international ‘variants’ of which include all kinds of chain tales about gluttons (see *Cahiers de littérature orale* 57–8, pp. 28–9; *Enzyklopädie des Märchens* 11, cols. 855–6). The editors of the present Catalan catalogue have strictly avoided such procedures: their English version includes 2766 entries corresponding to the international system, but in their archives they have another 3304 which they plan to publish separately. This will give access to a Catalan repertoire most of which may probably be unique, but which may in part also consist of tale-types found in other areas although until now obscured by different indexing practices. The whole corpus of tales is already accessible in the RondCat database at www.sre.urv.cat/rondcat.

The Catalan tale-type catalogue represents a great achievement, the result of several decades of indefatigable work for which we should be grateful. The authors have provided folk-narrative research with a most valuable tool, outstanding in many ways. It is therefore with anticipation that we look forward to the completion of the pioneer work of their second catalogue, the Catalan tales still seeking correspondence.

*Christine Shoaji-Kawan*

*Enzyklopädie des Märchens*, Göttingen
New Volumes in the FF Communications


Medieval Norse written sources, ranging from poems originally handed down in oral tradition from pagan times to prose sagas composed in literate Christian Iceland, as well as histories and laws, present acts of magic and initiation, performed both by humans in fictionalised histories and by gods in myths. The summoning of spirits, journeys to the otherworld, the taking of animal shape, and drumming are some of the features of these rites that have prompted many to see in pre-Christian Scandinavian practices some form of shamanism. But what exactly are the features of shamanism that are being compared? And how reliable are the Norse sources in revealing the true nature of pre-Christian practices? In this study, Clive Tolley presents the main features of Siberian shamanism, as they are relevant for comparison with Norse sources, and examines the Norse texts in detail to determine how far it is reasonable to assign a label of “shamanism” to the human and divine magical practices of pre-Christian Scandinavia, whose existence, it is argued, in many cases resides mainly in the imaginative tradition of the poets.


Ce livre explore le thème de l’anthropophagie imaginaire dans le conte merveilleux grec de tradition orale. Il analyse sept contes-types, dans lesquels le cannibalisme détermine le chemin initiatique du héros/de l’héroïne: Cendrillon (AT/ATU 510A), La sœur cannibale (AT/ATU 315A), Petit frère et Petite sœur (AT/ATU 450), L’enfant dans le sac (AT/ATU 327C), Dekatreis (le Treizième), AT/ATU 327B (+ AT/ATU 328), La jeune fille qui l’emporta sur l’ogre (AT/ATU 311) et Le maître d’école ogre (AT/ATU 894, proposition de nouveau classement comme AT/ATU 710B). Chaque conte est envisagé comme une unité sémantique et sont analysées ses versions grecques par rapport aux catalogues internationaux Aarne /Thompson et ATU. L’analyse narrative et comparative en combinaison avec des informations de l’ethnologie, de l’anthropologie, du folklore et de la psychanalyse aident à éclaircir le sens du cannibalisme, qui paraît toujours lié à la problématique concernant les rapports familiales, le développement sexuel et les phantasmes oraux et incestueux.

Delivery: tiedekirja@tsv.fi
**A Recent Volume in the FF Communications**


*Edige* is one of the most esteemed oral epics of the Karakalpaks, a Turkic-speaking people, who live on the mouth of the Amu Darya and the shores of the Aral Sea in Uzbekistan. Edige is a historical personage from the time of Timur and the turn of the fourteenth to the fifteenth century. He is considered the founding father of the Noghay Horde, from which the Karakalpaks and the other Turkic peoples have emerged, and his tale is therefore for the Karakalpaks intimately linked to their historical roots and ethnic identity.

The singer, Jumabay Bazarov, was the last Karakalpak singer of heroic epics who stood in an entirely oral tradition. In this edition and translation an attempt has been made to capture as much of his oral performance as possible, including the singer’s dialect features and his musical style. The singer’s performance is also illustrated by audio and video clips on the CD accompanying this book.

---
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