SCRIPTUM

Kirjallisuuskatsaus:

Areas of Scriptum
Creative Writing Studies

Artistic research: authors researching their own art, art as research.

Literary theory: Studies on narratology, intertextuality, tropes and the figures of the text or metafiction. Theories related in creative writing.

Media writing: Studies on film and multimedia and writing, manuscripts, adaptation of literature on multimedia, visual narrative, voice in narrative and poetry.

Pedagogy of writing: Studies on teaching children and young in verbal art, writing in schools, free groups and internet forums, workshops of writing, master and novice, comments between authors.

Poetics; Studies on composing the text; the genres of prose, lyrics and drama, the style, experimental and methodical writing, programmed poetry, writing as philosophical asking.

POETRY THERAPY: Studies in writing and mourning, depression, mental health, individual therapy, healing narratives and metaphors, healing groups, writing and self care, web healing.

PROCESS OF WRITING: Studies on schemes and composing the text, skills and virtuosity of writing, creative process, different versions of the text, textual criticism, verbal choices, shadows of the story, online writing, improvisation, editing, co-operation and collaborative writing.

RHETORIC: Studies on expression and audience, reader, public spheres.

SOCIAL MEDIA: Studies on digital writing, visual rhetoric with writing, social publicity, networks between writers.

Submitted articles undergo a supportive review process and a referee process by two mentors. We welcome 400 word abstracts and proposals for reviews. The editorial board reserves the right to evaluate which articles will be published, based on the referee statements. Authors must confirm that the submitted manuscript has not been published previously or submitted for publication elsewhere. More information and instructions for authors by email: creativewritingstudies@jyu.fi

Risto Niemi-Pynttäri

Kirjoittaja on potilaan omainen

KATSAUS

Luovan kirjoittamisen psykologia tarkastelee kirjoittamisterapiaa samasta lähteestä kumpuavana kuin luova kirjoittaminen. Kosketus tiedostamattomaan on keskeistä molemmille, tältä luovuuden ja terapeuttisuuden yhteiseltä alueelta ne erkaantuvat suuntiinsa. Luovuus on inhimillisten kykyjen ydinaluetta, se ei kuulu vain taiteelle, vaan kaikkeen missä kuvitellaan ja hahmotetaan jotain potentiaalista. Teen seuraavassa katsauksen siihen, mitä mahdollisuuksia luovan kirjoittamisen ja terapeuttisen paranemisen välillä olevasta yhteydestä seuraa erilaisissa kirjoittamisryhmissä. Tarkastelen sitä, kuinka luova ihminen on mentaalissa mielessä potilaan läheinen ja siksi huolenpitoon haastava.

Kuvittelukykyyn liittyy uutta luova, uudistava ja hoitava merkitys. Taiteellinen luovuus voidaan myös ymmärtää psyykkisenä prosessina, jossa alitajuinen on produktiivisessa kosketuksessa todelliseen. Samaa voi sanoa terapeuttisuudesta. Molempien lähtökohtana voidaan nähdä se, mitä leikki merkitsee lapselle.

Alitajuisen ja luovuuden suhdetta on käsitteellistetty monella tavalla, näin on tarkennettu sitä, mitä todellisen ja alitajuisen välinen yhteys luovuudessa tarkoittaa. Imeväi-

siä tutkiessaan W. D. Winnicott osoitti kuinka luova leikki mahdollistaa sisäisen maailman esille tuomisen ja todellisuuden koettelun. Ulkoiseen todellisuuteen sijoitettu leikki on sisäisten mielikuvien muuntamista ja todellisuustestiä. Olennaista on, että leikki otetaan ikään kuin (as if) totena: se tehdään todelliseksi leluihin satsattujen mielikuvien, terapeuttisen siirtymäobjektin tai kirjailijan tekemän teoksen avulla. Kirjallinen teos on objekti, johon kirjailija tuo sisäistä maailmaansa tuottaen jotain, jonka leikkiin myös lukija voi osallistua. Terapeuttisessa prosessissa on samanlaisia piirteitä, mutta sisäistä puhetta ja alitajuista aineistoa tuodaan esille vain itseyden kannalta.

Nykyään ymmärretään myös potemisen merkitys, potilas tarvitsee aikaa muuntaakseen haitallista mielikuvastoa. Luova työstäminen, kirjoittajalle tuttu hidas muuntamistyö, on hyväksi myös potilaalle. Pikainen haitallisen mielikuvan oikaiseminen voi palauttaa potilaan toimintakyvyn, mutta muuntamistyö, hitaasti ja perinpohjaisesti etenevä kehittely on varsinaista paranemista.

Luovassa kirjoittamisessa ja terapeuttisessa prosessissa tulee parhaimmillaan esille sellaista, mikä yllättää tekijän tietoisen hallinnan. Tämä on yhteistä sekä hyvän tekstin että hoitavan kirjoittamisen välillä. *Scriptum*-lehden ensimmäisessä numerossa Fiona Hamilton (2014) aloitti kirjoittamisterapian tarkastelun viittaamalla alitajuisen aineiston merkitykseen runoilijoiden työssä. Suhde alitajuiseen on erilainen kuin terapiassa, kuten Don Paterson Eliot-palkintopuheessaan (2004):

Incidentally, the systematic interrogation of the unconscious, which is part of the serious practice of poetry, is the worst form of

self-help you could possibly devise. There is a reason why poets enjoy the highest statistical incidence of mental illness among all the professions. Your unconscious is your unconscious for an awfully good reason. If you want to help yourself, read a poem but don't write one. (Paterson 2004.)

Omiin kokemuksiin perustuva tietoinen käsittely ei ole keskeistä kirjailijan työssä, eikä se aina ole hyväksi tekstille. Prosessissa heränneiden omien tunteiden ja ajatusten, mielikuvien aineisto ei ole kirjailijan reflektoinnin kohteena. Näin siis terapeuttinen kirjoittaminen ei ole kirjailijan kiinnostuksen kohteena. (Hamilton 2014, 34.)

Vaikka runoilijan suhde alitajuiseen eroaa itse-hoidosta, runouden ja terapeuttisen kirjoittamisen on löydettävissä perheyhtäläisyyksiä, ja siinä mielessä ne ovat toistensa omaisia. Monet seikat osoittavat, että luovaa työtä tekevä kirjailija voi tunnistaa itsensä eräänlaisena omaisena ja henkisesti läheisenä potilaan kanssa. Siksi hänellä on myös mahdollisuus tehdä jotain potevan hyväksi. Henkisesti liikkuva ja aktiivinen mieli voi tunnistaa myös tasapainottomuuden. Luova mieli voi tunnistaa millaista on maanisuus ja innostus josta puuttuu kyky tarttua mihinkään. Samankaltaisuus ja sukulaisuus voi toimia myös toiseen suuntaan, paranemisen suunta on tasapainottomuudesta henkiseen liikkuvuuteen ja maanisuudesta luovan työskentelyn kykyyn.

Poteminen ja parantaminen eivät ole termejä, jotka kuuluisivat vain terveydenhuollon instituutioon. Suomen kielen sana parantaminen johdattaa osuvasti kysymykseen luovan opiskelun ja terapian yhteisestä perustasta. Kyse voi olla joko kirjoituksen parantamisesta tai kirjoittajan paran-

tamisesta: hoitaminen ja kehittyminen sekä työn laadun parantaminen liittyvät monin tavin yhteen. On siis hyvä ajatella ihmisen hoitamista jonain laajempana kuin pelkästään terveeksi tulemisena. Tervein ihminen voi parantua jatkuvasti, ja kehittyä kohti mahdollisimman hyvää. Kokemus on osoittanut, että kirjoituksen kehittyminen on samalla kirjoittajan persoonan kehittymistä. Itseilmaisuun kuuluu myös pyrkimys kehittyä, ja ilmaista itseä paremmin. Luovaa kirjoittamista ja kirjoittamisterapiaa yhdistää siis parantamisen ja paremmaksi tulemisen horisontti.

Philip Gross (2015) korostaa tässä julkaisussa sitä, että luova kirjoittaminen on käytännöllistä ja luovaa opiskelua. Keskeistä siinä on itsen kautta tekemisen oppiminen. Gross (2010) on myös hahmottanut sitä, millä tavalla kirjoittajan identiteettityö tähtää eri suuntaan, kuin mihin terapeuttisessa kirjoittamisessa tähdätään. Luova kirjoittaminen on erityisen persoonallista opiskelua, henkilökohtaisempaa kuin useimmat muut opiskelun alueet. Gross sanoo, että luova kirjoittaminen antaa käytännöllistä tietoa itsestä; se on itseyden käsittelyä ja kehittämistä. Silti tämä itsen kanssa toimiminen ja opiskelu ei tähtää pelkästään opiskelijan itsensä hyvinvointiin, vaan julkiseen työhön ja toimintaan. Gross esittää selkeästi, että vaikka luova kirjoittaminen on itse-työskentelyä, sen tavoitteet itsen suhteen ovat erilaiset kuin kirjoittamisterapiassa. (Gross 2010,53–54.)

Jyväskylän yliopisto ja Oriveden opisto järjestivät syksyllä 2014 EACWP:n konferenssin, jossa esittelimme kirjoittamisterapiaa eurooppalaisten taidekoulujen ja yliopistojen opettajille. Suomalainen kirjoittamisterapia on alan edelläkävijöitä. Suomessa on Euroopan ensimmäinen ja laajin kirjallisuusterapian verkosto, ja koulutuskin on laajempaa

vain Englannissa. Konferenssissa halusimme tuoda hoita-
van kirjoittamisen näkökulman osaksi kirjoittamisen peda-
gogiaa. Käsitteellinen ero opettamisen ja pedagogian välil-
lä on sikäli selvä, että opettaminen kohdistuu taitoon kun
taas pedagogia kohdistuu ihmiseen näiden taitojen käyttä-
jänä. Yksittäisten tekstien tekemisen taitojen opettamisella
on rajatummat tavoitteet kuin kirjoittamisen pedagogialla,
jossa tavoitteena on pätevän kirjoittajan identiteetin kehit-
tyminen.

TYÖPAJAT

Rinnastan seuraavassa luovan kirjoittamisen työpajojen
haasteita terapeuttisten ryhmien haasteisiin. Rinnastan
katsauksessani työpajat (workshops) ja kirjoittamisen kas-
vuryhmät (developmental groups), mutta ja kuntouttavan
kirjoittamisterapian potilasryhmät rajaan pois.

Katsauksen perusteella voi sanoa, että luovan kirjoittami-
sen pedagogiaan sopisi myös perehtymistä ryhmäterapiaan
ja potilaiden kohtaamiseen kasvuryhmissä. Toisaalta luo-
van työskentelyn menetelmistä terapeuttiset kasvuryhmät
voisivat löytää hyödyllisiä mahdollisuuksia. Artikkeliko-
koelma "The Psychology of Creative Writing" (Kaufman
and Kaufman 2009) osoittaa käytännössä, kuinka suhteelli-
nen on ero luovuuden ja terapeuttisuuden välillä.
    Työpajaa, luovan kirjoittamisen opiskelussa keskeisin-
tä työskentelytapaa, on hyvä verrata terapeuttisen kasvu-
ryhmän toimintaan. Työpajoja on kritisoitu ja moitittu
tasapäistäviksi konsensuspajoiksi, joissa erilaisuus ei pääse

kukoistamaan. Kritiikki on osuvaa varsinkin sellaista ryhmäyttämistä kohtaan, missä yhteishenkeä luodaan erojen vaientamisella. Tekstit kehittyvät liikaa samaan suuntaan, jos erot eivät pääse esiin. Ihmisten erilaisista taustoista ja lähtökohdista kumpuava erilaisuus voidaan tuoda osaksi työskentelyä ja samalla myös teksteistä tulee moninaisempia. Voidaan kysyä, kuinka muuten persoonallisuus voi tulla esiin muuten kuin eroina toisiin. Tässäkin mielessä erilaisuutta vahvistavat ryhmät ovat olennaisia, ne muodostavat kokonaisuuden, jota vasten kukin voi esiintyä yksilönä.

Ihmisten kohtaaminen ja sosiaalinen tarkkuus ovat seikkoja, joihin luovat työpajat voisivat saada hyödyllistä mallia terapeuttisten ryhmien käytännöistä. Luovan kirjoittamisen ryhmissä on syytä huomioida kirjoittajien tunteet, eri tavoin koetut asiat, sekä osallistujien erilainen ilmaisutapa. Tämä on tärkeää, koska kirjoittajaryhmissä työskennellään myös persoonallisuuden kehittämiseksi.

Tekstipajoihin kuuluu kriittinen pohdiskelu myös itse pajan onnistumisesta. Grossin (2015) mukaan työpajat kehittyvät niin kauan kun niitä kritisoidaan, epäillään – ja niihin liitetään odotuksia. Palautteeseen liittyvät odotukset ovat suuret, usein ne kohdistuvat vain ohjaajan neuvoihin, vaikka käytännön työskentelyssä korostuukin vertaiskommentointi.

Luovan työskentelyn oppiminen ryhmässä voi sopia myös sosiaalisesti varautuneille, vaikka juuri seurasta vetäytyminen voi olla kirjoittamiseen suuntautumisen syy. Kokemus aidoista suhteista ja ennen kaikkea parityöskentely – yksin tai ryhmässä toimimisen välimuoto – voi olla avartava. Se voi tuoda tervehdyttävää vastapainoa yksinäiselle kirjoittamiselle, mielikuvien ja sisäisen äänen kanssa toi-

mimiselle. Toisaalta sosiaalisuuden vääristyneitä käytäntöjä voi muuttaa työparin kanssa – kahdenkeskisyyteen liittyy erityisiä aitouden mahdollisuuksia. Sosiaalisuuden välttäminen voi joskus johtua yksinkertaisesti epätyydyttävästä seurasta, kirjoittamista voi näin käyttää välineenä sosiaalisen elämän parantamiseen.

Ryhmät voivat toimia monella eri tavalla kirjoittamisen parissa: toisinaan painotetaan tekstin valmistamista ja toisinaan kehittymistä persoonana. Termien avulla voi tehdä erottelua ryhmän luonteen mukaan: onko kyseessä kirjoittajaryhmä, kirjoittamiskurssi tai tekstipaja. Kirjoittajaryhmä on termi, joka viittaa vapaaseen ryhmään, jossa keskeistä on kunkin kehittyminen kirjoittajana. Vapaasti yhteen hakeutumisella on olennainen merkitys sitoutumisen kannalta. Kirjoittamiskurssilla ihmiset eivät valitse itse ryhmää, erilaisuudesta voi olla hyötyä tai ristiriidat voivat pilata ryhmän. Joskus kirjoittajat valitsevat ohjaajan, joskus opiskelupaikan; sosiaaliset suhteet muodostuvat vasta näiden ratkaisujen jälkeen. Tekstipajat puolestaan voivat olla joko vapaita piirejä tai kursseja, keskeistä on kuitenkin tekstien lukeminen ryhmässä sekä palautekeskustelut. Arkikielessä kirjoittajaryhmällä ja tekstipajalla ei ole suurta eroa. Kirjoittamista ei voi erottaa kirjoittajasta, eikä kirjoittajan identiteetti kehity muuten kuin kirjoitettujen tekstien myötä.

Kirjoittajien erot ovat suuret sekä kurssien tekstipajoissa että kirjoittamisen kasvuryhmissä. Opiskelijat ovat rakentamassa identiteettiään ja julkisen kirjoittamisen taitoja. Luovan työskentelyn, kerronnan ja sanallistamisen taitojen kehittäminen kuuluu tavoitteelliseen opiskeluun. Kasvuryhmissä puolestaan on kyse persoonan kehittämi-

sestä. Taitoja keskeisemmässä asemassa ovat asiat, joita ilmaistaan ja joista keskustellaan. On kuitenkin selvää, että molempien toiminta kuuluu samankaltaiselle luovuuden alueelle, koska itseilmaisun sisällöt ovat sidoksissa luovan kirjoittamisen taitoihin.

IDEOLOGISET RAJAT

Jyrkässä taiteen ja terapian erottamisessa on ideologisia piirteitä. Jos luovan kirjoittamisen alue vakiintuu liikaa, sen sisällöstä kiistelyn ja dynaamisen kehityksen sijaan nousee alueen rajaaminen. Toteamus, että kirjoittamisen työpajoissa "ei terapoida ketään" on oikeuttanut joskus epäinhimillisiä loukkauksia ja nöyryyttämisiä. Tällaista hoitavuuden pois sulkemista voi sanoa ideologiseksi. Yleisesti tiedetään silti, että työpajojen ohjaajat tarvitsevat erityisiä ihmissuhdetaitoja ryhmää ohjatessaan, mutta niitä ei haluta ottaa esille.

Pyrkimys sulkea terapeuttiset aspektit luovan kirjoittamisen ulkopuolelle on ideologinen rajaus, eikä kirjoittamisen luonteeseen liittyvä. Toisaalta taiteen mukauttaminen hyvinvointia tuottamaan on voimakkaasti laajeneva ideologia. Arkitasolla siihen kuuluu terapiakulttuuri ja itsehoidon lukuisat muodot. Taiteesta hyvinvointia -ohjelmissa siihen kuuluu kapeiden terveyshyötyjen hakeminen, taiteen omista mahdollisuuksista huolimatta. Näin taiteen ja terapian yhteinen alue on vaarassa kadota hyvinvointipuheeseen. Paljon siis menetetään, jos luova kirjoittaminen vetäytyy erityisreviirilleen – tai jos se antautuu hyvinvointi-ideologialle.

Kirjoittajaryhmissä, työpajoissa ja terapeuttisissa kasvuryhmissä voidaan lieventää jyrkkiä eroja terveiden ja sairaiden, lahjakkaiden ja ongelmaisten välillä. Luovan kirjoittamisen ideologialle olennainen lahjakkuuksien etsiminen on tapahtunut jossain määrin muiden kirjoittajien itsetunnon kustannuksella. Se on hyväksytty välttämättömänä, ikään kuin luonnollisena karsintana. Tekstien suhteen vaativa ohjaaja voi korostaa tasoeroja kirjoittajien välillä ja suosia tähtioppilaita. Väärin asennoitunut ohjaaja voi pitää saavutuksena sitä, että löytää yhden kyvyn samalla kun loukkaa kymmentä muuta. Sanonta "if it ain't hurting, it ain't working" on haitallinen (Gross 2015).

Hyvä ryhmä voi kuitenkin toimia vain, jos nöyryyttävät käytännöt eivät lamauta ryhmäläisten luovuutta. Kirjoittaminen voi olla osa monenlaista luovaa ja persoonallista toimintaa, ja kirjoittajan ohjaaminen eteenpäin voi myös olla tärkeää. Kaikkien ei tarvitse tehdä runoja tai kertomuksia, kirjoittaminen voi toimia esimerkiksi visuaalisen luovuuden tukena.

Työpajojen ryhmädynamiikkaan liittyvät ongelmat liittyvät ihmisten persoonallisiin taipumuksiin ja heidän suhteisiinsa, siksi esimerkiksi kasvuryhmiin liittyvästä tiedosta on ohjaajille apua. Dominointiin liittyvät ongelmat kertovat huonosta ryhmädynamiikasta: ohjaaja tai tähtioppilas tai suulas kommentoija voi vaientaa muut ryhmäläiset. Kasvuryhmissä korostetaan tasaveroisuutta, sitä että dominoinnin sijaan ryhmä tunnistaa miksi kaikkien panos on tärkeä keskustelussa. Toinen ongelma on päinvastainen dominoinnille: kukaan ei ole halukas antautumaan ryhmän toimintaan eikä ota osaltaan vastuuta keskustelusta.

Ryhmissä voidaan kehittää herkkyyttä toisten ihmis-

ten suhteen ja oppia välttämään persoonaan kohdistuvia loukkauksia. Toisaalta myös minuuden korostuminen ja kyky erottautua kuuluu luovan ja usein kannustavan mutta myös erimielisen ryhmän vahvuuksiin.

Herkkyyden ja vahvuuden, erimielisyyden ja tuen repertuaari on kohdattavissa myös tekstiin keskittyvissä ryhmissä. Työpajat toimivat parhaiten avoimissa tilanteissa, jossa edes ohjaaja ei vielä tiedä millaiseksi testit kehittyvät. Grossin (2010) mukaan työpaja on parhaimmillaan keskeneräisten tekstiaihioiden (work in progress) parissa. Silloin kirjoittaja on valmis löytämään uusia ratkaisuja tekstiinsä, vapaa hyväksymään ja hylkäämään. Kommentoijat puolestaan tietävät, että keskeneräisten tekstien suhteen heidän huomioillaan on merkitystä; se muodostaa eräänlaisen maaston, jossa kirjoittaja voi tehdä valintojaan.

KOKEMUSTEN JAKAMINEN

Omaelämäkerrallisen kirjoittamisen työpajat asettuvat kiinnostavalla tavalla luovan kirjoittamisen ja terapeuttisen kasvuryhmän välille. Tämä edellyttää luottamuksellista ja yksityisyyttä kunnioittavaa ryhmää, koska työskentelyn kohteena on kunkin oma elämä. Mary Ellen Bertolini (2010) on nuorten surutyöpajaa ohjatessaan tehnyt huomioita siitä, miten työpajassa voi käsitellä henkilökohtaista surua. Hän perusti "Writing to heal" -ryhmän opiskelijoille, joiden neljä ystävää oli kuollut auto-onnettomuudessa. Työskentelyä ei voinut aloittaa oitis henkilökohtaisten tarinoiden jakamisella, vaikka se tiedettiinkin työpajan tavoitteeksi. Aluksi Bertolini kehitteli surusta puhumisen kieltä

yhdessä ryhmäläisten kanssa: "… they needed a familiar discourse for discussing loss" (Bertolini 2010,161). Menetyksestä johtuvaa surua käsiteltiin siis ensiksi etäännytetysti, tarinoiden kautta.

He lukivat surua käsitteleviä kertomuksia ja keskustelivat siitä, miten menetykset vaikuttivat hahmoihin tarinoissa. Seuraavaksi Bertolini rohkaisi opiskelijoita liittämään henkilökohtaisia kokemuksia lukemiinsa teksteihin. Näiden vaiheiden myötä luottamus lisääntyi. Vasta työpajan jälkimmäisellä puoliskolla he kirjoittivat omista kokemuksistaan. Silloinkaan tekstiä ei tarvinnut lukea toisille jos ei halunnut. Opiskelijoille tarjottiin aina kolme vaihtoehtoa: lukea mitä on kirjoittanut, kuvailla mitä on kirjoittanut – tai kertoa vitsi. Näin Bertolini tarjosi ryhmäläisille mahdollisuuden säädellä itse sitä, missä määrin he ottivat kokemuksiaan esille. Vaikka luottamus syntyi, kommenteille alttiiksi asettuminen oli vaikeaa – joskin palkitsevaa. Kuunteleminen ja kommentoiminen surupajassa vaatii harjoittelua, sitä että välttää tyrkyttämästä omia näkemyksiään vaan rohkaisee jokaista vahvistamaan omaansa.

Kirjoittaminen sopii Bertolinin mukaan surutyön välineeksi koska se edistää reflektoinnin lisäksi myös surun tunneperäistä kohtaamista. Puheessa asia kohdataan pikaisemmin kuin kirjoituksessa. Kun ihminen haluaa puhua traumaattisesta tapahtumasta, hän hyppää nopeasti ajatuksesta toiseen, usein seuraamatta asioita loppuun saakka. Mutta kun tunteet palautetaan mieleen kirjoittamalla, prosessi hidastuu, asiat kohdataan perin pohjin, se auttaa selviytymistä (Bertolini 2010, 167). Kirjoittaminen tuo tunteet kohdattavaksi, koska se hidastaa ilmaisua, tunteet kohdattaviksi. Juratė Sučylaitė (2015) korostaa tämän leh-

den artikkelissa sitä, kuinka psyykkisen trauman kokenut henkilö voi myös puhua liian pian, haudaten negatiiviset tunteet, toistaen samaa, vailla kosketusta varsinaiseen kokemukseen. Tervehdyttävä mieleen palauttaminen rinnastuu kiinnostavalla tavalla myös kerronnalliseen hahmottamiseen, jota lukija tarvitsee. Asiat täytyy tuoda esiin siten, että lukija voi elää ne. Samalla tunnekokemus otetaan erilleen välittömästä sisäisestä puheesta. Kirjoittaminen voi avata kirjoittajalle perinpohjaisesti tunteen, mitä hän käsittelee hahmottaessaan sitä lukijalle.

Ryhmän kommentit voivat tuoda esiin myös alitajuisesti olennaisia seikkoja. Tiukasti tavoitehakuinen, editoiva ja teknisesti tekstiä paranteleva kirjoittaja voi torjua jotain omakohtaisesti tärkeää Lukija kokee elottomaksi tekstin, joka on liian suunniteltu ja kontrolloitu. Eläväksi koettu teksti puolestaan voi ilmaista jotain, mitä kirjoittaja on tietämättään päästänyt esiin. Kirjoittaja saattaa odottaa ryhmältä vain rationaalisia huomioita, ja torjuu häiritsevinä sellaiset kommentit, jotka koostuvat tulkinnoista joita hän ei ajatellutkaan. Kommentit jotka tuntuvat kirjoittajasta häiritseviltä voivat lisätä itsetuntemusta, siinä mielessä tämän moninaisuuden kuunteleminen voi olla hyödyksi. Luovaan tekstipajaan sopii siis se, mitä Bolton (1999) suosittelee terapeuttisille ryhmille. Teksti voi kertoa tekijälle jotain, kosketus alitajuiseen voi tarjota jotain parempaa kuin se mikä on tietoisesti kontrolloitua. Siksi ryhmän kommentit saattavat olla arvokkaita toisella tavalla kuin mitä kirjoittaja odotti.

Kertomuksen fiktiivisyys tuo kuvitteellisuuteen liittyvät mahdollisuudet terapeuttisiin ryhmiin, siinä voidaan kehitellä jotain mikä pelkästään keskustelemalla ei onnistu.

Fiktion kirjoittaminen mahdollistaa sen, että teksteistä voidaan keskustella itsestä irrallisina tarinoina. Bolton kirjoittaa:

> *"It is this last which helps the members to lay bare some of their most secret places to each other. They are not actually exposing themselves, but their writing. This is the vital difference from a group that which relies on talking rather than writing. - - The discussion will then remain relatively safely focused on the writing rather than on the hinterland of the account." (Bolton 1999, 130.)*

Ryhmässä ei siis tarvitse tehdä eroa sille, onko kertomus totta vai fiktiota; se voi jäädä vain kirjoittajan tietoon. Näin fiktio mahdollistaa yksityisten asioiden kertomisen tai kokemusten käsittelyn niitä muuntamalla.

Voimaantuminen (empowerment) fiktion avulla edellyttää oikean laisia harjoituksia. Niina Repo on tutkinut voimauttavia kirjoitusharjoituksia kriisipiirissä, sairastumisen jälkeiseen toipumiseen keskittyvässä ryhmässä. Scriptumin (1/2014) artikkelissa hän korostaa kirjoitusharjoituksia, joissa luodaan yhteyttä uniin ja alitajuntaan. Kognitiiviselta kannalta voimaantuminen on kykenevyyden, merkitsevyyden ja toiminnallisen vapauden tunne (Repo 2014, 88). Vaikka kyseessä on siis tietoinen ja toiminnallinen kokemus, sen energisyys kumpuaa syvemmältä. Repo pitää unien aluetta voimaantumisen eräänä lähteenä. Kun Niina Revon kriisiryhmässä kirjoitettiin unista, erityisen hyödylliseksi harjoitukseksi osoittautui unien muokkaaminen, ja niiden työstäminen erilaisiin tekstilajeihin. Repo huomasi, että uniaineiston muokkaamisen prosessi voimauttaa

enemmän kuin pelkkä unien kirjaaminen.

LUOVA TILA

Fiktion kirjoittaminen voi tuntua harjaantumattomalta vaikealta. Vaikka kirjoitamisterapiassa korostetaan itseilmaisua, myös mielikuvitus ja alitajuisen aineiston luova työstäminen on tärkeää. Traumaattisen kokemuksen jälkeen ihmiset kokevat usein juuri tuon tilan olevan raunioina, kuten Sycilaite (2015) muistuttaa, yhteys sisäiseen maailmaan tuntuu jopa uhkaavalta. Kirjoittamisterapiassa voidaan antaa kirjoitustehtäviä, jossa hahmotetaan sekä ulkoista että sisäistä. Termi alexithymia viittaa vammautumiseen, jossa henkilö on menettänyt kyvyn ilmaista verbaalisti sisäistä tilaansa. Ensimmäinen askel kadotetun verbaalisuuden tavoittamiseksi on ympärillä olevien esineiden havainnointi ja sisäiseen maailmaan kuuluvien asioiden nimeäminen.

Rohkaistuminen mielikuvituksen käyttöön edellyttää sopivaa mielentilaa ja ympäristöä, ja leikin kautta tällainen voi löytyä. Luovissa ryhmissä on aina jotain leikin piirteitä, lapsuudesta tuttuja ja leikin kautta jokaisella on suhde luovuuteen. (Sučylaitė 2015.)

Toinen parantava seikka on arjesta irrottautumisen mahdollisuus. Arkiminä ja sen roolit voivat olla rajoittavia, mutta ilmapiiri ja tila voi rohkaista kaikkia kuvittelemaan, myös niitä jotka eivät koe normaalisti olevansa erityisen luovia. Huomion kiinnittäminen kuvittelulle olennaiseen vapauden tunteeseen ja henkiseen liikkumatilaan on voimauttavaa.

D. W. Winnicott osoitti jo varhain, että luovan toimin-

nan terapeuttiset vaikutukset perustuvat leikkiin. Viimeaikoina keskeiseksi on noussut hänen huomionsa luovasta mahdollisuuksien tilasta, ja sen suhteesta lapsuuden varhaisiin kokemuksiin. Leikin tarkastelussa hän päätyi painottamaan luovia mentaalisia tiloja, mahdollisuuksien avautumista kuviteltuun tilaan. Näin Winnicott on selkeyttänyt myös taiteen ja terapian suhdetta.

Taideteoksen valmistaminen lähtee kuvittelulle luodusta tilasta, mutta tähtää teokseen toisin kuin terapia. Taiteen tekeminen on toimintaa, jossa taiteilija käyttää kuvittelukykyään, usein sisäistä ja alitajuista aineistoaan, tuodakseen sen ulkoiseen todellisuuteen taideteoksena. Kirjallinen teos on objekti, jota kirjoittaja luo itsensä kautta. Winnicottin termi siirtymäobjekti viittaa tällaiseen kohteeseen: se on siirtymä subjektiivisesta kohti ulkoista. Teoksessa sisäinen maailma tehdään ulkoiseksi ja toisten omaksuttavaksi.

Tässä prosessissa on periaatteessa myös jotain tervehdyttävää. Sisäisten mielikuvien satsaaminen siirtymäobjektiin kehittää samalla joustavuutta persoonallisuuden rakenteeseen. Luova ihminen on vähemmän eristynyt ympäristöstään, koska minän ja objektien välinen suhde ei ole konventioiden määräämä. Aivotutkimus on osoittanut yhteyksiä luovuuden ja henkisen epätasapainon välille (Kaikkonen and Kähmi 2014). Luovuuden rinnastaminen sairauteen on ennakkoluuloista, mutta jos luovuutta pidetään eräänlaisena jatkuvan paranemisen merkkinä, sillä voi olla merkitystä henkisen epävakauden hoidossa.

Winnicottin avulla voidaan ymmärtää kirjoittamisterapian minää eheyttäviä ja voimaannuttavia prosesseja. Kirjoittaen luotu tila fantasian ja todellisuuden välille, voi taidetta ja terapiaa. Potentiaalisen ja mahdollisuuksien

maailman vahvistaminen potilailla tarjoaa mahdollisuuksia muutokseen.

Potentiaalinen tila, Winnicottin tarkoittamassa mielessä, voi kuulua fiktiiviseen maailmaan, mutta se voi olla myös konkreettisen leikkipaikan tapainen tila. Luovien ryhmien tilat voivat olla tällaisia. Sekä työpajassa että kasvuryhmässä voidaan kehitellä arkisista rajoitteista vapaita tiloja.

Kun työpajassa on tilaa ilmaisulle, se innostaa kirjoittajaa kokeilemaan jotain sellaista, mistä hän ei ole varma. Ryhmätilanteessa itsessään on siis potentiaalia, yhteistä mentaalista tilaa, joka voi vahvistaa kirjoittajan pyrkimyksiä. Yksinkertaisesti, ilmapiiri edistää rohkeutta luovuuteen, mielikuvien toteuttamiseen ja henkilökohtaisten kokemusten hoitavaan muuntamiseen. Kasvuryhmien kannalta on olennaista, että osallistujat voivat tuoda itsensä esiin arkirooleista eroavalla tavalla. Näin he voivat kokeilla jotain muuta haitallisiksi koettujen arkisten mallien sijaan.

Lopuksi otan esille muutaman uusimman tutkimuksen, jotka korostavat myös potentiaalisen tilan merkitystä. Potentiaalisen kirjoittamisen tilan tutkiminen on tarkentunut rituaalisten tilojen teorian myötä. Emilia Karjula (2015) käsittelee tämän lehden artikkelissa kirjoittamisryhmässä syntyvää tilaa, arkitodellisuudesta erottuvaa subjunktiivista tilaa. Karjulan sanoin:

> *indikatiivinen järjestys on siirretty syrjään: sitä ei haluta paikalle, jotta voisimme olla ja kirjoittaa vapaasti, kokeillen, "kuin hullut kuvataidekerhossa". Tämä ei välttämättä onnistuisi, jos todellinen maailma tavoitteineen ja pyrintöineen olisi näkyvästi läsnä. (Karjula 2015.)*

Kirjoittamisesta ja keskustelusta kehittyvä, sekä ympäristön vaikutuksesta muodostuva tila on leikin tavoin ulkoisen ja sisäisen välillä. Tuossa tilassa "fyysinen ja mentaalinen, luettu ja tunnettu tila kietoutuvat yhteen" kuten Karjula (2015) kirjoittaa.

Karjulan tavoin konkreettinen tila korostuu myös Graeme Harperin (2013) lanseeraamassa luovan kirjoittamisen habilitaatin käsitteessä. Se on monessakin mielessä paikka, mistä kirjoittaja löytyy. Asumiseen yleensä viittaava habilitaatti merkitsee kirjoittajan kohdalla työhuonetta, kirjoittamisen rutiineja, teksteissä ja ympäristössä olemisen tapaa.

Rebecca Luce-Kapler (2004) puolestaan on painottanut sitä, kuinka itse kirjoitus osallistuu kirjoittajaryhmän mentaalisen tilan luomiseen, sillä keskustelijat osallistuvat kirjoitettuihin teksteihin. Rebecka Luce-Kapler (2004) kiinnitti tutkimuksessaan huomiota siihen, kuinka kirjoittajaryhmän ilmapiiri vaikuttaa siihen miten rohkeita tarinoiden juonen käänteet ovat, ja millaisia ratkaisuja päähenkilöt tekevät. Hän tarkasteli ohjaamansa työttömien naisten kirjoittajaryhmää ja heidän tarinoitaan. Kirjoittajat kertoivat myös niistä mielikuvistaan, joita eivät olleet uskaltaneet kirjoittaa tarinoihinsa. Luce-Kapler kehitteli fiktiolle ominaisia rohkaisemisen tapoja, kuinka varjomaisia ja heikosti esiin tuotuja mielikuvia voi vahvistaa. Kirjoittaminen voi auttaa kuvittelulle otollisen tilan saavuttamista, ja fiktion harjoittaminen parantaa kuvittelukykyä.

Fiona Hamilton (2014) tekee olennaisen tarkennuksen ja katsoo, että leikin ja mielikuvien kehittelyn tila edellyttää vastapainokseen reflektiota. Kirjoittamisen vahvaa aluetta oleva reflektio ja mielikuvien käsittely kuuluu terapeuttiseen prosessiin. Hän päätyy korostamaan kirjoittami-

sen työskentelyrytmiä, vaihtelua mielikuviin uppoamisen ja niiden tietoisen työstämisen välillä.

LÄHTEET

Bertolini, Mary Ellen (2010) "Workshopping Lives" in Donnelly Dianne (ed.), Does the Writing Workshop Still Work? Bristol, Tonawanda, North York: Multilingual Matters, 160–168.

Bolton, Gillie (1999) "Writing and Groups. Laugh and Cry with Each Other" The Therapeutic Potential of Creative Writing. Writing Myself (1999)

Gross, Philip (2010) "What Works in Workshops" in Donnerly Diane (ed.), Does the Writing Workshop Still Work? Bristol, Tonawanda, North York: Multilingual Matters, 52–62.

Gross, Philip (2015) "ROOTS IN THE AIR … the teaching of Creative Writing in UK universities" in Scriptum vol 2, 1/2015, Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä University Library.

Hamilton, Fiona (2014) "Words and Thresholds, An exploration of writing process and practice" in Scriptum vol 1.1/2014, Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä University Library, 32–59.

Harper, Graeme 2013. "Creative Writing Habitats" in Diane Donnelly & Graeme Harper (ed.) New Writing Viewpoints: Key Issues in Creative Writing. Bristol, Tonawanda, North York: Multilingual Matters, 48–60.

Karjula, Emilia (2015) "Subjunktiivinen tila kirjoittajaryhmässä" in Scriptum vol 2, 1/2015, Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä University Library.

Kaikkonen, Noora and Kähmi, Karoliina (2014) "Creativity and Mental Disorders – is There a Connection?" in Scriptum vol 1.1/2014, Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä University Library, 65–85.

Kaufman, Scott Barry and Kaufman, James C. (ed.) 2009, The Psychology of Creative Writing, New York, Cambridge University Press.

Luce-Kapler, Rebecca 2004. Writing with, through, and beyond the text: an ecology of language. New York & London: Routledge.

Paterson, Don (2004) "The Dark Art of Poerty", http://www.donpaterson.com/files/arspoetica/1.html

Repo Niina ja Kuuskorpi Taina (2014) "Sanataidetta kriisipiirille" Scriptum vol 1.1/2014, Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä University Library, 86–120.

Sučylaitė, Jūratė (2015) "Creative Writing as a Tool in Rehabilitation and Educational Work" in Scriptum 1/2015, Jyväskylä. Jyväskylä University Library.

Winnicott, D.W. (1971) Playing and Reality London: Tavistock.

Philip Gross

"Roots in the Air"

THE TEACHING OF CREATIVE WRITING IN UK UNIVERSITIES

Keynote talk to Creative Writing: Pedagogy and Well-Being conference, Jyväskylä, 22.10.2014

In many other settings, especially at home in the UK, I would be using this talk to justify the still-young discipline of Creative Writing as bona fide part of the academic landscape. Fifteen years ago, I might have felt the need to defend its scholarly respectability, responding to concern or even disparagement from colleagues in long-established subjects. With an increasing infrastructure of peer-reviewed journals, conferences and study to Doctoral level, that battle at least has been won. Today, the more likely challenge is to account for our methods and aims in the increasingly standardised and bureaucratic language in which higher education teachers have to justify themselves to their own management and to the sources of funding beyond.

That is not my subject here, though we may converge with it obliquely later on. No, I am going to trust this audience, the conference participants and the readers after the event: we know that we have something important to con-

tribute to the university in terms both of knowledge and of pedagogy. Starting from that conviction, I want to encourage us to be bold – to use our own distinctive language, that comes from the experience of our creative work, and to insist we make our contribution best by celebrating what is distinctive at our subject's heart.

In the process, I will sketch a picture of the almost accidental birth and growth of Creative Writing in UK universities. This is not a guilty admission; I am inclined to value the tensions, even conflicts, in that history - for example, between the academic and the commercial principles, between the critical and the creative mind-set, or between the urge to write for self-expression and the craft of writing for professional ends. We writers learn to value frictions, because we know from our experience that this holding such apparent contradictions in balance is the root of creativity.

I am not here to talk about myself, but I will use a writer's technique of taking a character as focaliser for this story. A good choice is always a character who happens to be there when the story begins to unfold… as indeed I was at the time when Creative Writing started to expand in British universities. That character, myself, was already a working writer, publishing poems in magazines and in my own collections, earning not enough to live on, supplementing that income from teaching adult classes, leading writing workshops, visiting schools and sharing the craft in other ways, when a climate change in UK higher education opened a demand for these same skills inside the expanding world of universities.

In such a story, the character should have a voice, and that is why this talk will weave itself around some of my

poems. A novelist might do the same in an extended narrative, a playwright in a dialogue on stage, but poems are the way I think most clearly, by which I mean I register most clearly the many internal and external voices of which writers are aware. Maybe this is the plainest way to make the point about speaking from the heart of our creative practice. Poetry is the most self-reflexive and self-questioning of writing forms. For me, it always hopes to be experimental space where logical thinking, emotion, sensual experience and intuition come together. I would like Creative Writing as a subject to have the confidence to think poetically.

THE -ING IN WRITING

But the history… Creative Writing in UK grew from a practitioner-taught ethos, which had more in common with historic art school practice than with that of universities. Art students expected to be exposed to the advice of working painters, sculptors, etc. Usually these practitioners would teach part time because (and this was seen as a proof of their value) their first priority was their own creative career. Gradually, sometimes uneasily, a dialogue grew up between such working writers, often with no formal training as teachers, and those lecturers in Literary Studies or Education who at least had a respect for the creative work, and maybe a secret writing life of their own. Over time, a surprising number of the practitioners turned out to be quite gifted teachers, while the academics slipped their novels-in-progress out of their back pockets… and a community of practitioner-teachers was born. It is only recent-

ly, with the logic of the growth of postgraduate research in the subject, that most new entrants have been qualified in Creative Writing as such.

There was of course a family relationship, for Creative Writers in the UK, writing in the English language, with the disciplines of English / English Literature. Should they in fact be seen as separate? That was the question at one stage. Articulating why the answer was No led to expressing the difference between the way a literary critic on the one hand and a working writer on the other might read the same text.

Creative Writing is precisely what it says: a practice centered on the writing, not the written. Reading the written, yes, but where Literary Studies reads in order to develop a theory of that literature, Creative Writing reads to help the writing process on. The concept that emerged was that of 'reading like a writer' – a practical rigour geared to discerning techniques, strategies and understandings that would stimulate, refine and feed the practice of our own creative work.

The phrase 'creative writing' expresses the process of creativity as well as the specific craft of writing, so it is logical to extend the concept of 'reading like…' to 'thinking like a writer'. I say that with no assumption that any two writers think alike. Getting a sight of the individuality of practices, as well as common factors, is vital. So, in a way that need have nothing to do with solipsism or self-promotion, one part of our study is bound to be ourselves, the way we work. Analysing the literary factors, influences and poetics only told part of the story, without developing an awareness of how we manage our own processes – even, how we

manage manage our own working / thinking / feeling lives.

I sense a raising of eyebrows when I say these words. Indeed, it might be my own eyebrows I sense raising. Given the well-known personalities of many writers - famously rivalrous and petty, factional together and chaotic in their private lives - who would wish to school anybody else in that? Let me put it another way: the goal is not so much to think like a writer as to think like the writing itself.

As to what we might mean by that… Well, why not ask the writing?

House of Paper

A low table. Two cushions. Two
cups set. And no-one here but me
in a room with no walls,
only thin paper screens,
paper screens beyond screens
hung from ceiling to floor. Light
moves in and is moved among them
from I don't know where.
If I'm the guest
I'm unannounced or uninvited.
Say I'm the host…?
As if a door opened somewhere
a rustling spreads. Almost
a whisper. I can almost hear.

When I wrote this poem, maybe twenty years ago, without the current title, I did not imagine this was writing

about writing. Nor is any living poem likely to be only about one thing. Slowly over the years I realised how close it had come to the apprehension I seemed to have about the process I was practising and helping to foster in others: the creative work as an emergent thing, to which our first responsibility was to attend, as much as making it.

EMERGENCE, TENSION, PARADOX

Maybe it comes as no surprise, then, to see the growth of Creative Writing in UK universities as an emergence, a phenomenon to be discerned and worked-with, rather than intended in advance. This is not to say it came about by random chance. Most working writers and artists will recognise the principle of serendipity – the readiness to spot and use emerging opportunity and lucky accident.

One seed of that emergence, quite specific to the UK, was the Arvon Foundation, founded in 1968 by poets John Moat and John Fairfax, and soon involving Ted Hughes, would would become the Poet Laureate. The distinctive residential courses offered by Arvon in its secluded centres, with groups of up to 16 students living and working for five days alongside two experienced writers, responding to writing exercises and giving feedback in workshops, entered the bloodstream of Creative Writing in the UK. For many of the practitioners who came into universities during the 1980s and 1990s, this blend of apprenticeship and peer critique, was the benchmark for the best transmission of their craft and art.

Another seed lay in the history of Creative Writing in

the USA. This dated back to Iowa Writers Workshop in the 1930s, and again the central and creative tension was between charismatic leadership of groups by well-known writers and the principle of peer critique. (Both the forcefulness of that leadership and the ferocity of peer critique has tended to be more marked in the US writing culture than that of the UK.) At a certain point writers and writer-academics from the UK who had attended American MFA programmes began to import that US experience and use it as a precedent for courses that they started in their own universities.

This marriage between the craft-work of writing and the academy brought its own tensions. Even at the beginning of the process in the UK, there was a suspicion that in the US, Creative Writing courses has become an institution, creating its own orthodoxy – the perfectly worked bland 'workshop poem'. My point here is not to judge whether that suspicion was, on average, justified. The fact that the tension existed was good. By a neat double-bind, the only orthodoxy I would propose for the creative arts is that scepticism should come as standard. Any time we start feeling sure about ourselves, suspect a cliché taking shape.

That was the fear on the practitioner side of the equation. On the other, and maybe more fundamental, was the working writer's suspicion of the critical and theoretical tools that their academic colleagues used.

In the late 1980s, I found myself exchanging letter, then exchanging poems, with the poet Sylvia Kantaris. All we know was that we were exploring an imaginary land, somewhere in the clouds of the high Andes. What emerged from the mists was a surreal, teasing culture prone to Zen

non sequiturs and sly satirical asides about our world…
and a collaborative book titled The Air Mines of Mistila.
Into this world, a visiting professor strayed.

Dr Crampfold's Complaint

*Dear Sirs, While sensible of the trust your august institution
has reposed in me I have to report that my contribution to the
World Digest of Critical Socio-philology will be delayed. My
expenses here are nil, as are my findings. This - can one strictly
call it a community? - has nothing one might properly term a
custom. I have explained to them that all known cultures have
such things. They express surprise, or interest (or are simply po-
lite) and say 'You are a great professor of this. Teach us. May
we do a custom this very night?'*

*Their dialect appears a hybrid of the common tongue and an
uncommon desire to confound. 'Our roots are in the air,' they
say. 'The leaves reach to the earth and brush it with a speaking
sound.'*

*The deep structure of their grammar resembles the labyrinth
of shafts, mostly disused, that litter these slopes. 'The wind,' they
say, 'strays into them and cries aloud, confused, like a hundred
whales.' They have never seen a whale. They have forty words
for a certain bean they never eat. 'Forty beans make only wind,'
they say. 'Please tell us what we mean.'*

This was slightly before I myself had had a deep enough
immersion in the world of universities to be aware of the
ascendancy of Deconstruction, or even of Barthes with the
author is dead. Whether a Derridean or Deleuzian have

made himself more at home among the people of Mistila, I don't know. For now, I am content with the irony that I would one day wake up to find myself a Professor myself.

But Creative Writing emerged in UK universities. Like many creative works, it grew by paradox. Though the very first postgraduate students, in very small numbers, had been enrolled at the University of East Anglia in the early 1970s, the surge in demand came later. When it did, the leading edge was in the new universities – UEA itself, Lancaster, Warwick… When an important Act of Parliament in 1992 allowed a wave of former polytechnics to gain university status, institutions like my own (Glamorgan then, now South Wales) became significant players. In the highest-status and historic universities of Oxford and Cambridge, Creative Writing still has only a marginal presence, in extramural courses mainly, while one of the leading programmes is at Bath Spa University, a small institution also awarded the power to award their own degrees in 1992. Creative Writing grew fastest in those institutions with least anxiety about damaging a historic reputation by embracing the new discipline.

A second creative anomaly was that Creative Writing took root (these are the 'roots in the air' of my title) at the level of the Masters, not the standard undergraduate, degree. The one or two years of a Masters programme offered itself as a period of focused and intensive work in which ambitious and developing writers could aspire to complete their novel or their collection of stories or poems. The impetus was often practical, personal, professional – rather than primarily academic.

But finding a place in the structure of academic awards

had a logic of its own. In due course, undergraduate BA programmes grew to 'feed' the Masters level study, and graduates from those MAs, especially those who hope to become university Creative Writing educators in their turn, looked logically to progression to a PhD. Now, a complete through-path exists through all the levels of study… almost as if it had been planned that way from the beginning.

A third anomaly might be presenting itself now. In the bleak financial times now shared by most of Europe, university funding in the UK now depends on higher student fees, and Creative Writing can be seen as one of those the not-simply-vocational subjects which is called on to justify itself in terms of students' futures. Very few undergraduates will go on to be best-selling writers. Even for good postgraduate students, who may justifiably expect to see their book in print not long after the end of their course, the most likely future is that writing and publication will be one strand in a 'portfolio' working life. The most hostile critics accuse the discipline of enticing students with promises of fame and fortune that will almost certainly prove false.

This is to miss the point. I know no Creative Writing teacher who promises fame and fortune; for most of us, the evidence of our own lives says otherwise. What we do offer is a practical and intellectual schooling in creative process… and what employer does not at least pay lip-service to wanting their employees to be good creative thinkers? Some students will always come to us motivated by the pleasure and self-expression of the act of writing, and these things are likely to be there, incidentally, for anyone who writes, but for students who ask 'What use is this going

to be?' we have an answer, if we care to give it. The harsh economic agenda may seem like a threat, but as writers we understand the creative act of blinking and looking again. By another productive paradox, this challenge might help us to see the great resource that lies in what we already, and naturally, do.

WORKSHOPPING THE WORKSHOP

Creative Writing educators who are writers teach from the practice that comes naturally to us. One of those practices, and one of the roots of our subject, is the workshop.

'Workshop': some people see the word as affectation, writers pretending to be horny-handed craftsmen at their trade. As writers, we know that words are fluid, often metaphorical, and always to be understood in terms of their use. Historically, writers have formed groups and circles, in schools cohering round an influential individual or in one-to-one reciprocities such as that which gave a powerful dynamic to the English poets Wordsworth and Coleridge at a crucial stage of their lives. The Romantic image of the solitary 'writer in the garret' rarely applied even to the Romantics themselves. Rather, writers have felt the need for each other as readers, sharing work in progress, noting each other's response, testing techniques and judgments in that semi-collaborative space. The Iowa practice simply made a method of it. The word 'workshop' may rouse feelings and associations for and against, but it has persisted, and seems needed – if only to distinguish from seminar, lecture, and other academic terms.

Still, the workshop as a teaching tool might seem like

orthodoxy in our subject, and the scepticism I mention above should still apply. The title of a recent compilation of scholarly articles, 'Does The Workshop Model Still Work?' (Donnelly, D. (ed) London: Multilingual Matters, 2011) hints at ongoing question and a scope for reconsideration. In the spirit of 'workshop', the term itself and the practice it refers to both invite response, experiment and future development.

In fact, the 'pure' workshop scarcely exists. It is rare for any workshop group in education to sit down untutored, un-led, un-framed, simply to throw raw work to the wolves of response. In practice, almost all Creative Writing educators think about the learning needs, skills, experience, readiness, of students in our care. And it is the principles that this alertness reveals to be good workshop practice that I propose as valuable, essential knowledge not only within but way beyond the discipline. Like most good subject knowledge, at least in literary studies and creative arts, what we know and practice points to wider applications. Attending to language, in exacting ways, we are working with the basic human business of expression and communication, after all.

So, what is so special about the workshop, that brings me all this way to talk about it?

For a start, the workshop asserts that the work we bring to it is always work-in-progress. The workshop is not summative assessment. It is formative, dynamic, done while choices are still open, options not yet realised. The allegiance of the workshop is, or should be, to those possibilities – to their emergence – what the work in progress might become.

How to address them, that seethe
of loose connections—half ink, half itch in the neurones?
For every halfway-to-whole

thing that gathers its membrane
in the evolution gloop, to slouch up the shores of the page,
hundreds stay fluid, indistinguishable

from what they breathe, eat and excrete,
mulching into each other. Or perhaps they slope off, deeper
in their element, to be… what

I can't name. You know I mean you,
you untouchables, children of God, you secret sharers who
keep the house warm, swept

and to everyday acquaintance
empty… Keep a light on, though, please, on the off-chance
tonight's when I find my way home.

Far from being counterposed to the individual, interior creative process, it can create a space between us in which that process becomes visible.

As a peer-response group, the workshop has an ethos of equality. Or rather, equality is one factor in another good productive paradox. Historically, workshop groups might often cluster round a dominant individual; the principle of apprenticeship is frequently in play as well. In the university setting, Creative Writing educators are paid to be, in some sense, experts. People come clearly unequal in experience, craft, ambition, confidence and reading.

But as writers we also know the principle that T. S. Eliot names when he says that each poem is a new 'raid on the inarticulate'. Each new work starts equal, even if their writers do not. We also know that if you know how to do it in advance, the work in hand is very likely not worth doing; it will be a duplication of what have you already achieved.

So the Creative Writing teacher has something to teach – in terms of craft, yes, clearly. But maybe more important is the meta-knowledge of our discipline: Creative Writing teachers, speaking from experience of writing, are expert at knowing the questions we share, not the answers individual students need to find to fit individual needs.

Meanwhile it is easy to anatomise the malfunctions of the workshop, where the balance between opposites that make best practice is lost. At one end of the spectrum is what we might call the Boot Camp approach. This favours sentiments like 'if it ain't hurting, it ain't working' and 'if you don't like the heat stay out of the kitchen' and rates its own virility in terms of the harshness of its criticism. At the other end lies the Flotation Tank – that alternative therapy where the subject is suspended weightless in a bath of blood-heat water… or in this case a bath of undifferentiated reassurance, where the person or the poem have no way of sensing the point at which they touch or have relationship with anything beyond themselves. At one extreme, the emergent process can be stung into submission; at the other, disempowered and left to feel vaguely patronised.

Somewhere nearby, to one side of this spectrum, there are other dead ends. The academic environment can easily promote the workshop as a Deferential Guessing Game; the lecturer asks apparently open-ended questions, and the

real challenge for the student is to guess which answer the authority figure wants to hear.

Meanwhile, in the virtual world, the Internet Forum is a common mode – 'interactive', yes, but in a way that privileges unsubstantiated opinion, in which we hear critical voices in a vacuum, without real relationship. At worst, this becomes (if I can use that word in Finland) a happy hunting ground for troll.

As against all of these, I would like to propose a quietly radical model of the workshop, seen in relational terms. What applies in the process of the group is similar to what operates in an emergent piece of writing as it finds its coherence, its 'voice' – a matter not so much of individual elements as of the (dynamic and creative) *Space Between*.

Syntax is the least of it: what holds together,
for its moment,
       when the air
is a pliant and see-through cartilage
between the words,
        between them and what's
not said, what's known somewhere else but here,
hardly known that it's known.
          (My father
at the end spoke himself into fragments in five languages;
we worked by inference, like constellations drawn from stars
as far from each other as any from us. Where
was he then?)

SOME PRACTICAL BENCHMARKS

This and the previous poem come from an unpublished notebook sequence called Benchmarks, and incidentally some of the ideas in this talk have clarified while serving on a working group for the Quality Assurance Agency, a body whose remit is to oversee the terms in which the quality of universities' provision can be assessed. This includes producing Benchmark Statements for each subject. Currently, Creative Writing, as a still-new discipline, does not have a Benchmark Statement of its own, and our working group is tasked with producing one.

The list below aims to lay out the range of practical variations on the workshop, as a step to showing just what a flexible and distinctive tool our pedagogy has at its disposal, and to indicate what its wider implications might be.

Response to named or anonymous pieces

The workshop as an experiment with our perception of what we actually respond to in writing, our expectations and preconceptions as opposed to what is on the page.

Written or spoken feedback

Experiments with modes of response encourages self-observation of the ways one's own thoughts form into words, as well as of group process, eg how who speaks first sets an agenda that moulds the succeeding responses.

Online or virtual work shopping
An extension of this experiment with feedback in the con-

text of new media and platforms; this also gives a ground for reflection on those media themselves, and how the medium moulds the response.

Response in groups of different sizes

…including self-selected or randomly chosen pairs.

Response involving pre-arranged roles

Different participants are temporarily assigned the roles of punctuation fiend, character counsellor, language lover, formalist, as well as the classic 'hard cop / soft cop' dyad (created in a way that makes clear it is not to be taken personally). In the 'goldfish bowl' technique an outer circle of participants observe the smaller inner workshop process, and may offer advice… then participants may be asked to change places. All these variant of group roles serve to defocus the group process from ourselves as individuals to the work in hand, and help participants conceive of themselves as collaborators in the workshop process, for the sake of that work.

Role play of specific industry-based situations

e.g. editorial or scripting meeting

This list relates to the peer-response aspect of the workshop, rather than an equally rich set of variants dealing with writing practice led by a tutor-set task. The latter fosters related skills relating to creative embrace of the given, the unasked-for, as material – in other words, a practical

self knowledge of working with an element of not-knowing and uncertainty. Collaborative writing exercises are a specific case of this, illustrating the creative value of letting one's 'ownership' of the work in progress go, at least for a while. This is a long way from the common distrust of collaboration as 'writing by committee'. Rather, the metaphor is of releasing one's work into the wild; the valuable knowledge our discipline has is that, in a collaboration rightly understood, that work comes back to you, as if of its own accord, and comes back enriched.

All these experiments are also, almost incidentally, about learning the skills of establishing trust between individuals and in group situations. The workshop leads us to be (awarely) a member of a culture… as a writer, however solitary their personality and practice, always is. For the individual writer, equally, they have the long-term goal of each person internalising the workshop. By finding that you can play all the different roles in workshop, the participant leaves the group at the end of the course with a sense of the continuing workshop in their head.

This goal of gradually emancipating the learning writer into creative autonomy produces the principle that this pedagogy is to do with process as much as with product – learning the skill of questioning, rather than being taught the answers. Far from the worry, mentioned earlier, about writing workshops creating conformity, it stresses that different readers have, and must have, different responses. This difference is what enables the method to work, by creating that dynamic 'space between'.

Out of this space, the skill the writer learns is that of choice. Any honest reaction from their readers – even mis-

taken reactions, based on mis-reading – is evidence the writer can potentially use. The skill is to weigh up the range of possible responses they hear, test it against their own judgment, and see if on that evidence the work is achieving the effects the author wants. Then they choose.

As for each participant in their roles of reader and respondent, the discipline of creative reading and creative listening is very practically based. On a human, social, interactive level, they are practising a discipline of empathy, instanced by the writerly questions of discerning what another writer's goals, stage of development and abilities are, what their agenda is as writers, and what kind of feedback they can use. It is off the point to talk about whether a response is 'kind' or 'savage'; the criterion we learn to orient towards, together, is what works: what is fruitful in practice. What works will relate to the understanding, and self-understanding, of individual participants. No writer can really take advice they do not come to recognise in their own responses. Even if they can act out of obedience, once, they will not incorporate the learning in their later work.

THE INDIVIDUAL IN THE WRITING

It may seem I have lost track of my early plan to build a narrative around the viewpoint of a character, who happens to be myself. If that self and his life story has dissolved a little into the work, both of the teaching and the poems, that might be an accurate reflection of the way it feels to me. I know that I have come to conceive of my own writing process, and other central features of my life including person-

al relationships and worship in a Quaker meeting, through the process I have observed in writing groups. The model is that of creative individuals standing together around that shifting and palpable 'space between', a space that is anything but emptiness. As in the well-known optical figure of the two faces and the candlestick, we blink and see the space between the faces as a figure in itself. In groups and in the writing, we blink and shift the focus from ourselves. By taking and sharing the responsibility for the holding and the care of that space between us, attentive to what is emergent form it, we can learn to let the process, and the work become itself.

This perspective offers a fresh way of figuring collaboration, as creating a shared space into which individuals can release exclusive ownership and – here's the beauty of it – find the work in progress coming back to them, willing and changed.

Having been invited to speak on the subject of Creative Writing pedagogy talk, I cannot avoid a glance towards the other theme of this conference, that of writing for health and wellbeing. Many students are drawn to Creative Writing by the wish to work with their own life experiences, frequently traumatic ones, and sometimes a conflict can be proposed between writing for literary purposes and the overlapping subject area of writing for personal growth or therapy. The arguments above suggest, in passing, one last good creative paradox: that making the best art we can, which we do by seeing the work itself as other, as a living and evolving organism, with dynamics of its own, may be the best therapy too. The part of us that writes may know implicitly, or potentially, what our everyday self and

conscious self-reflection might not. Most Creative Writing teachers have witnessed that moment when a student's understanding - maybe in the form of memory or insight - is suddenly released by what had seemed an arbitrary writing game. A serious part of the discipline that writers know is play.

If the practice of the writing workshop can reflect the principle that the space we hold between us is a model of the space inside us too, so the workshop art of questioning our imagination – 'what if…?' and 'what then…?' – can be internalised, enabling different perceptions inside us to speak.

All I have been saying here might sound ambitious, idealistic, utopian. On the contrary, I am arguing that it is simple: we do not have to devise a radically new technique. We simply have to see, and say, that all I have laid out here is what we can already do. We do it not out of extraordinary wisdom, but simply because are human… language users… and we write. At its heart is a kind of love, partly for language, for the human business that is done in language, and partly for that moment when we know that we are in the presence of something that simultaneously we recognise… and, in the same breath, know to be new.

This stands apart

from me. Or will
when it has become…

Is that ellipsis? No,
I mean simply

'become'. Intransitive,
nothing in apposition.

To say 'itself'
would be tautology. (Thus

the old grammarian
stares at a snippet of text, amazed,

as if at his wife
robed suddenly in moonlight

after all these years.)

The poems here are currently unpublished in book form, apart from Dr Crampfold's Complaint, in The Air Mines of Mistila (Bloodaxe Books, 1988) and House of Paper, in Changes of Address: Poems 1980-98 (Bloodaxe Books, 2001).

Philip Gross is a professor of the University of South Wales and a creative writing teacher. He is also a poet and a fiction writer for both adult and children.

Gross has won several major awards within the last few years such as the T S Eliot poetry prize 2009 for The Water Table, Wales Book of the Year 2010 for I Spy Pinhole Eye and the CLPE Poetry Award 2011 for children's poetry Off Road To Everywhere. Gross' new collection, Deep Field, is an exploration of his father's loss of language to aphasia in the last years of his life. The book was shortlisted for Wales Book of the Year 2012.

He was one of the working writers involved in first wave of Creative Writing courses in British universities. Reflecting on three decades since then, he will in his own words "explore the subtly shifting balances and tensions in this growing discipline between a robust practicality, a commitment to knowledge and the serious play and indeterminacy vital to creative process".

Alain André

Do our early readings matter for the way we write and teach?

Keynote talk to Creative Writing:
Pedagogy and Well-Being conference,
Jyväskylä, 22.10.2014

One of the key-points, in the initial training we are delivering to young creative writing teachers in Aleph-Écriture, lies in their attitudes towards reading and literature.

- What do they read and what not?
- How far do they feel comfortable in the literary field or do they feel terrified by the "monster" literature?
- Which tools do they use, when it comes to reading complex texts?
- In other words: what is their connection with literary knowledge?

I will have to come back to this connection, as a specialized aspect of a research field related to the more general concept of "connection with knowledge".

Then I shall give a few examples of my work prompts in this area and finish with what I am discovering about

myself and writing about my own readings when I was between 6 and 11 year old. It is a work still in progress, probably a collection of both literary and theoretical fragments – maybe an essay?

I. OUR CONNECTION WITH LITERARY KNOWLEDGE

Initial teachers' training

I have been training young teachers since 1987 and now we have about fifty students every year. We had to build up a team of specialized teachers and a modular training system, with a ninety-hour long basic training and another ninety-hour long specialized curriculum that depends on each student's project as a creative writing teacher.

This initial training includes tools – a survival kit for teaching situations. It also includes a lot of experimenting and sharing about the collection of professional gestures composing the "posture" of a creative writing teacher: the way we live in it, its ethics and its horizons (it is more important, in the long run, than technique).

The teachers and writers who helped me to give its shape to Aleph in the first years were coming from the so-called New Education. We tried to achieve something valuable from a constructivist point of view. We were aiming at building, for each student, an "intimate knowledge. The term of "intimate knowledge" was later suggested by the American psychologist Albert Bandura, who stated that the psychological structure of our knowledge gathers men-

tal representations, affects and motivations. It means the so-called "posture" we are using when transmitting this knowledge is as important as the knowledge itself[1].

We first focus our teaching by determining a series of questions, such as problems linked to specific situations that may be told and analysed. The basic training is then dealing with the key-points that are worked through with the help of prompts and writing, work in small groups, role-plays, documentation research, mini-lessons and sharing.

The key-points are the following ones: (1) writing as a topic and as a process; (2) writing behaviours; (3) socialization and interactions; (4) giving feedback; (5) devices: holding a frame and group regulations; (6) professional gestures (such as welcoming, reformulating, wording a prompt, and so on); (7) inventing and experimenting prompts; (8) reflexivity and pedagogical detours; (9) posture (accompanying & teaching); (10) evaluation. We also use 5 additional tools: a training diary, privileged readers, along with writing about practice and case studies; role-games; and a commented and shared bibliography.

One of the main aspects in this training consists of helping the young teachers to locate and work through a few blind spots. One of them is the way they manage with their desires of teaching and writing, usually connected with both their writing difficulties and their connection with knowledge and transmission of knowledge.

As I was teaching in this basic training, around 1993, one of the students who was first, from a professional point of view, a psychoanalyst, proposed not autobiographical fragments, but a tale. From this moment on, I have sug-

gested the students to write a similar tale. A craftsman is moving to a new town and settling there. Two rivers flow through this town, as in Lyons for instance with the Rhône and the Saone. In Finland I would not know a similar example. A craftsman is looking at one of the rivers from his new shop. He discovers a ferryman is settling close to the river. A while later, he is looking at a traveller arriving near the ferryman and his boat. This traveller does not look like anybody. You jsbr 7 minutes to imagine the scene. I sometimes ask my student to imagine: the craftsman, the shop, the ferryman and the strange traveller.

It is not necessary to sort of undress the metaphor of this tale for such an audience as that of Scriptum's. When I tried to write a tale like that myself, my unknown traveller was a reader.]

I am now teaching in a specialized session of this teacher training devoted to "literary texts". The session is 54 hours long, organized in nine days (3 three-day long modules). They are roughly devoted to:

- Reading, as a desire and as a work;
- Writing problems, with case-studies including oneself; and the way to help students come to reading from different perspectives and editing;
- And pedagogical invention (that is partly related to reading too, of course).

You can see how reading is important in this session. My idea is that our connection with reading is the main aspect of our connexion with knowledge in the field of literary writing.

Connection with knowledge

I am not using the concept "relationship with knowledge" because this concept of "connection with knowledge" has got a long history in French education sciences[2]. The term appeared in the sixties in the fields of psychoanalysis, critical sociology and adult training. Jacques Lacan used it first, then Pierre Bourdieu and many other sociologists. The French term "rapport au savoir" stems from the Marxist tradition, where we for instance talk about the economical "rapports de production". I am trying to do the same when I am using the word "connection" instead of "relationship". It is a means to omit our affectivity from our notion, or to highlight the questionable dignity of the concept.

The term was also used in education sciences later on. Several groups of researchers began to work from a clinical point of view that includes the question of our subjective desire to know or not to know. According to them, the connection with knowledge is slowly built up in a social context, including first the subject's family, as well as his education and experiences in other institutions delivering knowledge.

Other researchers then began to study what they called our "connection with writing". Christine Barré-De Miniac is the main one and I co-directed a research with her for the INRP (the French Pedagogical Research National Institute). This connection with writing may be defined as the combination of our social history with writing and of our effective writing attitudes and procedures[3].

Connection with reading

Our connection with reading is significant to our connection with knowledge as writers and teachers. The personal project of teaching literature and creative writing has a background in a versatile experience of reading.

How are we passing on our literary traditions and innovations? Do we feel we have the social and professional legitimacies to do it or not? Michel Foucault, I apologize for all these French references, wrote (in: Archéologie du savoir / Archeology of knowledge, Gallimard, 1969): "Un savoir, c'est ce dont on peut parler dans une pratique discursive qui se trouve par là spécifiée (…) Un savoir, c'est aussi l'espace dans lequel le sujet peut prendre position pour parler des objets auxquels il a affaire dans son discours." ("A knowledge is what we may tell about it in a discursive practice that is therefore specified by this knowledge (…) A knowledge includes the place where the talking subject is able to adopt a definite position about the matters he is dealing with in his own speech."[4]

Therefore, knowledge is here closely linked to our speech, about literature and texts for instance, and to its possible powers. It is used in the context of social interactions. Knowledge exists but only through actions it allows. It is transmitted through a speech. It is a reflexive reality, implying the awareness of knowing.

For this reason I have tried, in this session called "Literary texts", to question and build up our young teachers' self-confidence as readers and literature transmitters.

2. building up
young teachers' self-confidence

I suggest that my students write and talk about their mental representations and questions in the field, then I ask them to write from my prompts. I'd like to give one or two examples of these prompts about reading.

A small history of my readings (prompt 1)

Of course, I am not starting with the technical aspects of reading and giving feedback, but with the intimate connection young teachers have got with reading. I'm still not interested in the way they read, but in the way they have been read by the books they met. This is the way a young French writer, Grégoire Bouillier, is telling the way he was interpreted by Homer's Odyssey: "Never before had I lived such an experience with a book. I was offering my face to the sun. Every verse had been written for me and was flowing into me, through my eyes and my ears. I was the act of reading itself. The Odyssey was decoding me. Everything was clear. Amazing coincidences emerged. My life was Ulysses' life. Boarders were abolished. For instance, I had known four loves in my short life, exactly as Ulysses did in the book. Everything was proved. Calypso, Circé, Nausicaa, Pénélope: I knew their faces. I had even kept their pictures and phone numbers…"[5]

If we are teaching literature and creative writing, maybe it is because of encounters such as this with books.

Then I read one or two extracts of another book, by the

poet Raymond Federman. I do not know how to translate "coups de pompes" in English: in French it means both "a sudden access of tiredness" and a "strong kick in the ass". Anyway, one of the texts is "A short history of my readings". I have tried to translate the following extracts:

"When I was eleven, I was reading Jules Verne in the night under my blankets, with the help of a small electric lamp. I wanted to become Michel Strogoff. I was thinking that one day I would have wonderful adventures and write novels such as those of Jules Verne's.

"When I was sixteen, I tried Marquis de Sade. I wanted to know what a real sexual enjoyment was exactly. I was fed up with self pleasure. I was thinking that one day everybody would say that I was writing porno books, just as Sade did, and I would be thrown to jail.

"When I was nineteen, I read my first novel in English – Dangling man, by Saul Bellow. I did not want to become this poor guy in the novel, who appeared to be totally unable to make up his mind about anything. I wanted to speed along and shoot bang bang! I was thinking I would one day write a novel with guys who speed along and shoot, not such a depressing novel."[6]

And so on. Students then are invited to write such fragments, about a dozen of them. They may use the same structure as what the poet has used: an age, the memory of a book and a commentary – not a literary one: a commentary about the effect of the book, in terms of desire and identification. Of course, something else may happen, e.g. a film, or a painting.

Such a simple prompt initiates the writing of autobiographies as readers. It helps me to work with young teachers

about what I sometimes call the Indian track or the "hidden side" of the creative writing workshop, a sort of equivalent of the Northern track for a mountain peak – a silenced or hidden approach for those who believe in the old idea of "spontaneous writing" (a skill that just exists and cannot be learnt). It is also a way to establish a strong distinction between reading as an intimate and projective activity and reading as an intellectual effort and training. I encouragethe first one because the other, reading as a technical work, is the only one used in schools, I mean the French ones, especially at the worst possible age, between 14 and 18, when teenagers are trying to find out who they are and to have sexual experiences instead of intellectual ones.

A reading that changed my life (prompt 2)

Before the next step (close readings, poetics, feedbacks etc.), I therefore prefer to deepen the approach to the aspect of identification. One of my favourite prompts here deals with a book that changed your life.

The prompt is based on what happened to me on the 7th of October, 1995. I had planned to go and see the film Moonfleet, by Fritz Lang, in a Latin district of Paris cinema. A critic from the movie magazine Les Cahiers du cinema (Antoine de Baeque) was there, along with the Italian writer Antonio Tabucchi. They had just published a book titled Le cinema des écrivains / Writers' movies (Éditions de l'Étoile-Cahiers du cinema). It was a collection of texts from several writers. Each text discussed a film that had been significant in the writer's life. The idea was to forget

about criticism and "initiate a conversation about shared emotions". The writer then had to write not a review, but an intimate experience he lived with the film he had chosen, sort of a letter or a personal story about a bedside film, if you like. A film does exist, explained Antoine de Baeque, only if somebody writes about it.

Tabucchi was one of these writers. He told us he had written about La Dolce Vita, by Federico Fellini. He had watched it in 1961, as he was eighteen year old and living in Florence. At the time, he assumed Italy was a sort of post-fascist paradise. After seeing the film, he realized how suffocating and narrow the real Italian situation in the sixties was. Nobody is saved in this film, neither the stupid bourgeoisie nor workers or intellectuals. He realized he needed a huge amount of fresh air and decided to spend a whole year in Paris. And there, as he was wandering along the river Seine, surrounded by second-hand books on both sides, looking at the stand of a bookseller, he found Bureau de tabac / The Tobacconist's shop, an extraordinary poem written by Fernando Pessoa. Then this book changed his life again, as he decided to learn Spanish and Portuguese and write a thesis about Pessoa, who never stopped accompanying him into his writer's life.

The prompt itself has three steps. First, can you locate a book that changed your life, or at least exerted a real influence on it? It does not matter whether you have read it recently or in your childhood or during your university years. It does not matter if it is a proletarian or popular book, because I am not suggesting a decorative exercise. As another Antonio – Lobo Antunes – wrote: "Important books are the ones we read as we were kids and, later, books

that are not much from a very literary point of view, such as Antoine Blondin's or John Updike's for myself. I owe a lot to them, even though hardly anybody talks about them anymore".

It does not matter either if your remember something else instead of a book. It's a secret I am asking to share. Forget your present literary norm. It is a message from the inner world that I am asking for, from your inner world.

When the choice is made, approach the book from a narrative point of view. Do not name it. Try to memorise when and where you bought the book, in a bar of Helsinki or a Greek beach or a Mexican village. What were the atmosphere and the precise moment like when you bought the book or opened it for the first time. Were you standing or lying then? Work out the circumstances, even if you have to make them up for some parts, because you will anyway.

Then try to tell the story. If you change it, it will be greatly significant and maybe a good impulse for writing something. Do not name the book yet. Try to tell the main passage if you can, or the image, or the verse or the sentence. Try to share a word about the repercussion the reading of this book had in your life.

Then, maybe you can add some sort of a commentary. What book was it? What do you think about it now? Has it still an influence on you or not? Name it at last, or choose not to do it.

Of course I have many similar prompts. I may ask the young teachers to create their "erutarettil", an old surrealist – and probably more widely used – practice that consists of imagining one's own imaginary family-tree as a writer.

"Erutarettil" is the French word "literature" read backwards. It refers to a page written by André Breton in the magazine Littérature (n° 11 -12, 1923), where poets, artists etc. he considered as the sources for the Surrealist movement are mentioned.

Or I may ask for an inventory of literary debts, just like the Roman Emperor and philosopher Marcus Aurelius was already doing in his Meditations. Patrick Chamoiseau, for instance, did it more recently, in a book titled *Writing in a dominated country*[7]. In that book he is building an inventory of what literature planned for himself, in order to help him find his own voice and way in spite of the French colonial, ideological and literary dominations.

A few derived questions

I do not, however, want to discuss these prompts too deeply. I would just like to point out that the following ones, when the main aim is to train young teachers, are devoted to a few recurrent questions, such as:

- Which sort of reading do we need?
- Is it important to have a good university background in classical literature or in contemporary literature or in linguistics or in poetics or…?
- Is it a danger to a writer to read too much?
- Are there some books that we absolutely must have read?
- How can I manage with literary influences, in my writing and in my students' writings?

- Which are the most important literary tools for feedback?
- How may I help my students, as a creative writing teacher, to find their own specific music or voice?

Sharing about them is the beginning of finding some tools and gaining more self-confidence. It may of course also lead to changes. Some students go to university, for a literature specialized curriculum or something else. Some revise their aims or audience. Some make up their minds: they want to write, not to teach.

3. ABOUT OUR PERSONAL CONNECTIONS WITH READING

Fish keep their eyes open

 I have been teaching the training session "Literary texts" and reading publications in this field for about 20 years. I have never got bored, as I have got bored with a lot of other sessions (three to five times are enough).

When teaching, I was often writing about my own history as a writer and/or as a reader and a teacher: my own readings, the books that changed my own life, my own literary debts (generally creating a literary family-tree of one kind, from Homer and Montaigne to Marcel Proust, Claude Simon and to yours truly, a tree I have to change every five years). I have been collecting those teaching diaries for a long time. I was even adding post-its at the very pages where I had written something about my own writ-

ings and readings. But I had not done much with them yet. Something else happened. During the summer of 2013, I bought and read a small novella written by Erri De Luca. It was titled Fish sleep with open eyes. No, it should have been Fish keep their eyes open, not "sleep with open eyes". I suppose readers are sleeping and dreaming with open eyes…

It is a story about the end of a childhood: the young hero is about ten. It is obviously an autobiographical story, including a love story, an initiation tale and the writer's self-portrait as a sixty-year old man. Growing up is a matriochka affair here, apart from the fact that the matriochka is a small Italian peasant. In this novella, reading is a part of growing up, but I must confess the slow awakening to the excitements and flutterings of flesh and gender roles, was more important for me when I discovered the story.

I was with my daughter who was five or six years old at the time, in sort of a playing hall designed for children, where the owners had been wise enough to plan a bar and internet connections for the parents. This was the first time I read the book and I have read it three times after that but, this afternoon of 2013, I used the 8 or 9 blank pages at the very end of the book, to write about the similar period in my own life.

Going back to one's own roots

I knew that a few periods are decisive when reading and one's relationship with it develops with age.

I might have returned to the times when I was prepar-

ing entrance examination for the prestigious French "École Normale Supérieure", as Pierre Bourdieu had done, with more success, some years before (he wrote a great small book about it[8]). In those years, I learnt most of the tools I am using when I am working on any literary text. I might have returned again to the way we were taught to read and write commentaries and commentaries of commentaries in our secondary French schools. But Erri De Luca, in his own wonderful novella, has written about the end of childhood.

I wanted to do that my own way. It did not develop into a love story, I am afraid, even though sexual initiation has a role in it. Instead, I moved towards what I confusedly already knew, especially about the links between sexual desires and desires to know in general and the desire to read in particular… As many of you probably know, a psycho-analytical cure is not so much different: you discover what you already knew but did not really wish to know…

I decided to do three things: first write everything I could remember about the period when I was living in a small village where my parents were the only schoolmasters and, unhappily enough, my own schoolmasters. This was the case between the ages of 6 and 11, because at 11 I was imprisoned in one of the worst French state boarding schools and this sort of old-fashioned Bastille meant the very end of childhood.

The village stands by a river. It flows from the French Central Massif to Angoulême, Cognac and the old royal military harbour of Rochefort-sur-mer, still dreaming about the times when La Fayette left the place to help the American army against England. This was between 1955 and 1960. I was born at the very end of the first half of the

bloody twentieth century: just a year after the last French concentration camp designed for Tzigans had been closed.

The second idea was to write about a selection of pictures I have from this period, thanks to the family album combined with a chronological logbook where my father has written down the most significant events of our family life.

The third idea was to write about all the books I had read at that time. I had kept some and my mother had kept nearly all others. She is 88 years old and she has memory problems but, when it comes to the times when my sister and I were children, she instantly remembers every detail, even the precise month when I was reading such or such a book…

The book I would write would be based on this material: my memories, photographs and the books that I have read. Its provisory title is: An intimate legend.

Results

I discovered reading helped me to achieve four vital aims:

- Survive and live, as a boy and the son of school-masters. It meant life in the woods, to put it briefly: neither the life at home or in the school, which were the two places where my terrible father was ruling hard;
- Learn, in my parents' classes;
- Talk, imagine possible speeches, especially in order to survive the wide family which lived outside of

the village, that included thirteen schoolmasters and teachers, all of them politically left or extreme left-wing, which meant a place where you just could not utter a single word without an elaborated strategy;

- Imagine some outer places where life might be more pleasant.

Well, but what did I read? Here is a list of the works that have influenced me strongest:

- *Tom Thumb*. This tale was written in 1630 and later adapted for children. How to survive when you are one inch tall, which exploits will you have to perform, will you be recognized and loved or will death be faster? In the tale, Tom is eventually loved but he dies.
- *The war of the fire* (La Guerre du feu), by Rosny Aîné, a Belgian writer who writes in French, a precursor or fore-runner of sci-fi literature in France and the un-challenged master of pre-historical novel. The dec-imated tribe of the Oulhamr are running away in the marshlands. They have lost the fire cages. Two rival groups are sent to go and fetch the precious re-source. The chief of the winning group will have the beautiful Gammla to himself. This is an initiation novel, of course, asking important questions: how to survive? Which sort of man to become?
- *Au vent de fortune* (translates roughly: On the wings of fortune?). This is a story for young readers written by totally unknown Michèle Massane. It is an ad-venture novel, beginning on a French corsair ship.

The hero is one of the ship-boys, Corsic (which means small corsair in the Bask language). They discover an English boat, "The Indefatigable". After a fight, the English boat explodes and the French one is sent to the bottom. Corsic succeeds in reaching another island. With the help of the English commander of the "Indefatigable", abandoned there because he got the Black Plague, and Anhoa, an Abenaqui Indian girl who was tied up and thrown to a sure death on a small wooden canoe, he succeeds in reaching New France, now the East of Canada. The story ties two strong traditions in the adventure novel: the maritime one and the Indian one. It asks good questions: how to survive, how to become a man, and also how to behave with other cultures, which begins with the girls' culture? This was my favourite book as a child. I think one should build a monument for unknown writers.

- *The Arkansas trappers.* This is an adaptation again, from a novel written by Gustave Aimard, a French writer in the style of Eugène Sue or Paul Feval and others. He wrote a lot of western novels, along with maritime and popular ones. His own life was nearly as dangerous as his heroes' lives. The story takes place in Mexico and shows a real taste for unending plotting, mysteries and changes of fortune. It's a drama, with Comanches this time.

- *The Mysterious Island*, by Jules Verne, the most-widely translated French writer. I liked the story, the balloon in the air, then the island they name after Lincoln. Without understanding it at the time, Verne

was rewriting Robinson Crusoe, until the discovery of Captain Nemo and the exploding volcano. It was long, a bit too didactic for the child I was, but it gave me the idea I might become a journalist like Gideon Spilett was.

- *The Pardaillan*, by Michel Zévaco. These novels are a series of cloak and dagger ones again, in the tradition of Paul Féval, Jean Rostand, Eugène Sue, Ponson du Terrail and Alexandre Dumas. It refers to the 15th century, but all the books in this series were published at the beginning of the 20eth century. Zévaco was a Corsican. As Gustave Aymard had hardships in his youth and an adventurous life. His hero, Pardaillan, is constantly serving the poor ones. In fact, these novels are deeply political.

- *Osceola the Seminole*. Under the title Le roi des Séminoles, the French adaptation for young readers of this novel by Mayne Reid, was one of the most important books in my life. It is the first book I ever chose and bought. Forget Abenaquis and Comanches, with this novel we are in Florida with Seminoles. The hero is a young half-bred Indian called Powel, who will become the Seminole warrior Osceola, a historical character. The book contains plenty of racial stereotypes, pure youngsters, a war for survival, dangers everywhere, noble friendship and love as a reward.

- *The Last of the Mohicans*, by James Fenimore Cooper. When I decided to read the original version of this very famous novel, which I had read only as an adaptation for young readers previously, I remem-

bered the name of Uncas and that he was Delaware, to be exact. The Delawares are one of the Mohican tribes. This story begins in the very middle of the woods. Forest here plays the part of a character, maybe even the main one.

These eight books have made the most significant effect on me. Three US ones, an English one, four French ones. The distribution is not intentional. A pre-historical novel, a sci-fi novel, a medieval tale, a cloak-and-dagger novel and 4 others related to the American West. I must confess my absolute favourite are On the Wind of Fortune, which is well-written and combines maritime and Indian aspects, not forgetting war, conflicts and a love affair; and The War of the Fire, because of its heroic and epic style.

Comments

So… I have been fed with popular literature. It means I have been supplied mainly with narratives, I was nearly shocked as I realized my list did notinclude poetry, music or paintings.

I was also fed, however, with educative literature. Most of these books are initiation novels, not only translated, but adapted for a younger audience. They were written mainly for a male audience, gender stereotypes are everywhere. My parents were struggling rather hard to avoid not the gender stereotypes but the pure domination of US by-products. Zévaco for instance, as a French anarchist and free-thinker, or Jules Verne, as a French writer, counterbalanced the

Americans Cooper and Reid. I think all men in my family, my father, uncles and I, were reading Zévaco.

I have been fed with literature discussing mainly the American West, as a straight result of the superiority of the US tanks. (I sincerely thank them for that.) At my grandparents' family house, I could connect myself with my father and my two uncles' education, or with their sediments. They had built miniature models of American, British and German military ships or aircraft, they had read American comic strips, I was following in their footsteps. That is one aspect of being born just after WW2. The blood stained fun fair hardly finished, I quested beauty through a cloak, a mask, a sword, an aircraft, or a forest and its glades.

When it comes to the American influence, I must say Indians were everywhere and I hated the stupid cowboys. What I needed was… escape, and woods were the place for it, in my real life as well as in books. At the very end of The Last of the Mohicans, the good British soldiers win and the naughty Frenchmen lose, but I just did not mind at the time. My only hero was Uncas. I think I was connected to Indians exactly as, at school, I had been connected with the Gauls and the hairy Gaul instead of with the Romans and their capital.

When I read the English original version of Osceola the Seminole, a few months ago, I was totally surprised as I realised how much this literature, which I did not consider as high literature because it had nothing to do with James Joyce, Claude Simon or Georges Perec, was deeply alive in myself. Maybe nothing is as straightforward or all-encompassing as the process where a child receives his identity, through his readings, with such or such a character of

the stories he has totally absorbed. I was not making any difference between the stories I wanted to read the stories I wanted to live. Sometimes I think my real life is just a dream compared with the harsh reality of these stories. I was identifying myself with heroes, as I went on with writers who were literary heroes. Maybe my life is just the story of the successive compromises I had to make between my real and imaginary lives.

Through this small research, I am discovering to what extent I have been the son of French republican schoolmasters. For my parents, nothing was above knowledge, even religion or politics. They were militant teachers, standing first for the old standards, that were not that funny, then moving on to become post-68 libertarian pedagogues. But they were readers first, and they transmitted it to me, no doubt. What was legitimate in this family was knowledge and teaching. Creation, on the contrary, was not pertinent at all. Literature was produced in another world, a far and invisible one, somewhere around the very centre of the world, I mean in Paris.

I realize that I almost never wrote for children nor imagined to write a single adventure novel. There is one poor exception to the rule: a school manual called J'écris un roman d'aventures I write an adventure novel (Paris, Hatier, 1991).

I think all these experiences as a child and a reader have been severely repressed, back in my unconscious, by my French literature teacher ego. Even when I was writing the manual J'écris un roman d'aventures, in 1991, I did not realise how important this literature was for my intimate self.

I think the more I remember my early reading history

the more I am the writer I am. It confirms that writing and sharing about the genesis of one's connection with reading might be one of the ways for us to become more conscious of our not so spontaneously built literary norms. And to keep some distance with them of course.

Does it affect the way I teach?

It influenced my general attitudes as a teacher.

I am still enjoying collective adventures. I like leading groups. I like it better when it looks like a quest for survival, with obstacles and problems to be solved. That is why I have always been fond of small associations. I once was an Indian and an extreme-left militant and now I am involved in two rather small tribes (Aleph-Écriture and EACWP).

I still enjoy disappearing, towards the deep forests, in order to breathe deeper, and walk and settle down in a lonely shelter, then read and write. Probably it is always the same childish dream: loving one's mother and going on with the same conversation we had before I was even born, up to now, through the books…

Alain André <alain.andre@aleph-ecriture.fr> is the vice-president of EACWP, in charge of pedagogical affairs. He organized the first EACWP International Pedagogical Conference in Paris (2012).

A former French literature teacher, he founded in 1985 the French writing school Aleph-Écriture <www.aleph-ecriture.fr>. He teaches creative writing, accompanies groups of young writers

involved in personal projects and is in charge of young creative writing teachers' training. He is one of the main contributors for the Internet collaborative creative writing French magazine L'Inventoire <www.inventoire.com>.

As a writer, he has published novels (La Passion, dit Max / "Passion", said Max, Thierry Magnier, 2007, or Rien que du bleu ou Presque / Only blue or almost, Denoël, 2000), short stories, creative writing manuals, scientific papers in French language didactics and essays about creative writing and its teaching: Babel heureuse. L'atelier d'écriture au service de la creation littéraire / Happy Babel. Writing workshops and literary creation, Syros, 1989 & Aleph-I-Kiosque, 2011, Devenir écrivain (un peu, beaucoup, passionnément) / Becoming a writer – a little, a lot or passionately?, Leduc.s, 2007 et Aleph/I-Kiosque, and Écrire l'expérience. Vers la reconnaissance des pratiques professionnelles / Writing about experience. Towards the recognition of professional practices, in collaboration with Mireille Cifali, Presses Universitaires de France, 2007 and 2012.

NOTES

1 Bandura, A., Auto-efficacité. Le sentiment d'efficacité personnelle / Self-efficiency. The feeling of personal efficiency, De Boeck, Brussels, 2002.

2 A good introduction to the history of this concept may be found in a French book: Savoir, apprendre, transmettre. Une approche psychanalytique du rapport au savoir, Françoise Hatchuel, Paris, La Découverte, 2005, 2007.

3 Barré-De Miniac, Christine, *Le rapport à l'écriture - Aspects théoriques et didactiques*, Presses Universitaires du Septentrion, Lille, 2000.

4 *Archéologie du savoir / Archeology of knowledge*, Gallimard, 1969.

5 *Rapport sur moi,* Allia, 2002

6 *Coups de pompes*, Le mot et le reste, 2007.

7 *Écrire en pays dominé*, Paris, Gallimard, 1997.

8 *Esquisse pour une auto-analyse*, Raisons d'agir, 2004

Jūratė Sučylaitė

Creative writing as a tool in rehabilitation and educational work

*Keynote talk to Creative Writing:
Pedagogy and Well-Being conference,
Jyväskylä, 22.10.2014*

AIM OF THIS ARTICLE – to present personal creative writing experience in rehabilitation and educational work in Lithuania

REHABILITATION is understood like a complex of medical, social, educational and professional tools, used to improve the functional activity of disabled or ill people. Trauma or illness can disturb ability to take part in the cultural, professional life, to satisfy spiritual needs. Usually psychosocial rehabilitation has a goal to help to get out of loneliness, to find social confirmation in the community, to deal with grief, despair, big losses and lost dreams about future. After psychotrauma an individual can lose feeling of identity – it is a challenge to strengthen ego. When the ego is strong, personality is more able to deal with trauma, to face reality, to accept what has happened.

Personality after trauma needs to understand the self to know the strongest and weakest parts of the self, to have a

wish to survive, to concentrate vital powers for withdrawal, needs to make spiritual connections between him / her and Nature, and the Community. A person, who experiences psychotrauma, often has a wish to speak from within, but experiences failure trying to speak up. In the most difficult situations an individual experiences sensation of heaviness, not understandable darkness and has thoughts of suicide.

People often want to speak in a right way: they inhibit negative emotions, repeat what they have learned about positive thinking instead of sharing feelings and thoughts in authentic way. Writing exercises can help to reduce emotional tension, to increase spontaneity and to express inner truth. At first it is necessary to create a healing environment. The same things (tolerance, sense of freedom, mutual trust, and a sense of belonging, change-acceptance, and intellectual curiosity) describe a creative and healing environment. In guided writing therapeutic goals are client's liberation from the role of victimized person; inspiration to survive, guided motion after beacon of hope, enlightenment. Some material from unconscious level is brought into conscious level and it gives new future insight during writing, but our verbal and inner intelligences are different, abilities to find new power to survive are different, so it is not enough to have only writing activities in a therapeutic group, it is useful to combine writing, reading and dialog or discussion.

Social workers, psychologists, occupational therapists use the same writing therapy techniques: some of them haven't got a gift in artistic speaking / creative writing, but they all are able to strengthen personalities, to develop their communication skills. An occupational therapist tests the patient, explores the strongest and weakest parts of a

person, and suggests writing as a form of activities to reach emotional life with positive emotions, to develop self – understanding and communication skills. An occupational therapist is able to give emotional support, but sometimes it is necessary to get out of cocoon – to go through inner transformation. An occupational therapist is weak as a leader in a difficult existential journey to new horizon. A writer is able to inspire, to be an emphatic listener, to revitalise client's narrative: to transfer client's biography from poor language with fragmented sentences into vivid language. A writer is able to change person's self – image and an image of surroundings thanks to the writing gift; the inner intelligence and meaningful writing production. A writer often doesn't want to know, what health is, and doesn't want to try to live healthier. A writer is able to look at writing therapy from phenomenological perspective, to create writing techniques "here and now", inspire and make strong impact on emotions, facilitate a person's journey to new horizon through inner transformations.

Professional writing therapist means 2 in 1: an instructor of writing and counselor of personality (psychologist). A writer can develop the skills of counselor and can work in clinical settings, psychologist or occupational therapist can learn techniques how to encourage people to write. In many cases it is enough to have a healing environment, a group leader able to inspire writing, and the chance to read written piece for good listeners. We discuss in Lithuania today the benefits of poetry or writing therapy, therapist's competences, but there are other fruitful methods – collaboration with a client and the creation of literary text using concrete facts from the client's life. A person's self-esteem

can be improved with the individual's story told by the writer, and it can lead to new insight and help to discover the meaning of life. Writer's residence program could be discussed more often in the contexts of health and culture.

If we are creative persons, we can change our environment, but at first we need courage to liberate creative powers, we need patience to move through darkness into the light, the courage to witness our existence, to believe that our testimony advocates for humanity, and that the inner power is the most important. This leads to authentic life and authentic language. When we focus on the value of a literary text, we focus on both: on literary aesthetics and on the interaction with the reader, and when we focus on therapy the main thing is to express personally important truth and to have a sensitive listener (reader).

Healing through writing can be described interdisciplinary (psychological access, educational, spiritual, language arts). Main writing methods are diary (blog) writing, poetry writing, storytelling, and collaborative writing. A written piece in therapy group seldom has aesthetic value, but always expresses personal meanings and witness individual's existence. This is important not only in therapeutic context, but in cultural context as well. "The creation of cultural environment and understanding are part of life, the existential project of every individual. Existential objectives form his / her social environment as the cultural part and the whole",- writes Lithuanian philosopher T. Kačerauskas, in "Philosophical poetics", 2006.

Strong wish to write beautiful poetic text is the reason of increased anxiety, and it blocks spontaneity of writing. We escape the blocking power of anxiety if we focus on senses.

FOCUS ON SENSES

Stimulation of sensations reduces intensity of feelings and enlarges perception. In therapy we use simple exercises: examples are given below.

First exercise: look around and write about what you see in front of you. What sounds do you hear? What smells?

Second exercise: take a cup of tea. How does it smell? How does it taste? Do you often drink tea with other people or do you usually drink alone? Write about your tea.

The third exercise: imagine a favorite and safe place, focus on sensations (What do you see there? What do you hear? What do you taste? What can you smell? Are you alone? Are there any birds, animal, people?). Write about this place.

The benefit of writing was confirmed in my writing therapy groups. It was confirmed by clients' observation and by their witnessing.

…Woman experienced continuous trauma. Often uneasiness and not understandable sensation of heaviness blocked her energy to do something and to live. She found a way to survive: it was diary (blog) writing. Every time she began writing from the description of the environment, she often looked through the window and focused on the trees, birds, grass, and only after writing about the nature and surroundings, she was able to express her inner feelings and difficult thoughts. View of nature reduced her emotional tension and liberated power to keep hope of more easy future.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL WRITING

Writing is speaking from within, from the depths of soul. Writing means liberation from suffering, helplessness, and means the drawing the contours of a new life. Autobiographical writing is a way to sense and to confirm personal identity. In therapeutic sessions I invite clients to put his / her memories into his / her story, and help them to evoke reminiscences. History of life looks like a necklace made of different beads, so it is useful to encourage to focus on details. For example, I ask the client to tell a piece of personal story, to imagine one of her important moments: the first time at school, the first time at the sea coast, I ask to remember a concrete view of nature, for example, a white seagull on the top of a beacon…

INNER EMPTINESS AND WRITING

Among mentally ill people I met those who told that life is grey, without meaning and memories. They didn't want to write, but they attended my poetry therapy hours. We sat in a circle. We all were equal. My clients wanted to listen to each other, and (it is very important) they all wanted to share feelings and thoughts, but faced inner emptiness, so they asked me to read poems. The content of the poems gave us topics for the conversation. The discussion was based on the existential similarities of the participants and the hero of the literature and on the partcipants' personal meanings.

Another time I gave them a list with 10 different words

and asked them to choose one word, to write it down, and to use this word in writing a sentence. These writing games deepened our discussion about personally important meanings and helped clients to remember that they had a life and to remember some nice moments. Memories and reminiscences helped them to perceive the self easier and improved their self-esteem. Inner emptiness can occur when person inhibits painful feelings, loses self-esteem, feels himself (herself) different and loses community feeling.

A person always has his/her living space. Sometimes he/she faces the threat, sometimes – the ruins, always wants peace. A person has to name objects in the world around, and name inner objects – this helps him (her) to understand his (her) living space and the self. We need the words to name our nearest surroundings and inner processes. It is easy to find words for description, what is here and now. It is more difficult to find words to express inner experiences. Usually we need symbols, metaphors to express complexity of inner state. The more difficult feelings we experience, the more difficult we find the words to describe them. Psychologists and psychotherapists know the term alexithymia. Psychologically wounded persons, depressed persons loose ability to express inner state verbally. The first step to recapture the lost verbal skills requires to stop and to look around, to say what is in front of you, to identify sounds, colors, smells. Writing develops self-understanding, reduces emotional tension and helps to achieve better quality of life, but therapeutic writing or writing for wellbeing is a process. Inner emptiness is like a desert in our heart. When we write about the sun, clouds, rainbow, we transfer these

objects into our inner life. Language connects inner life and external world. When we begin to speak about external world, first rain drops brings water into the heart's desert. When we find ties between us and external world and abilities to speak (to write) about simple things, we can look for similarities between inner and outer world. If thoughts and emotions are heavy, it is possible to imagine them as dark heavy clouds or like heavy stones in the heart. When we identify the problem of our unique situation, we can reflect and ask ourselves: "Am I defeated?"- And answer: "If I am alive, I can imagine a bright tunnel in the darkness. I can change the picture of my life in my imagination, I can ignore despair". When our words have personal meanings, naming of the situation means creation. We create our biography, we meet and recognize our self, and we begin to understand who we are and where we are going.

NARRATIVE

When we enrich an individual's narrative we enrich person's life. We can work with narrative of contemporary period of life; with narrative of traumatic period, with narrative of whole life. It is always possible to find new points of view to the same situation, to discover ties between separated phenomena and to conceive them as wholeness. Deep listening and questioning helps to develop a dialog, but at a psychiatric clinic the client sometimes has difficulties in expressing emotions and thoughts verbally. Some people have problems due to too demanding requirements for their writing and a need to control their writing process

– in this case we can notice a lack of authentic life in writing and a lack authentic writing style. Exercise of Acrostic writing helps to bring some information from unconscious level to consciousness and helps to disclosure more authentic details of life.

ACROSTIC WRITING EXERCISE

Ask you client to use his (her) name for acrostic writing.

- N (write word with first letter N)
- A (write word with first letter A)
- M (write word with first letter M)
- E (write word with first letter E)

Ask your client to use written words in sentences. This exercise is used in the work with different groups (schizophrenic, depressed, healthy…) this exercise is useful when our clients have a fear to write. If our clients did this exercise easy, we can ask to write a coherent text. If an individual has poor language and difficulties in writing, we can use acrostic writing material for dialog. Often patient's written sentences can be very simple. For example: "Bag was red". Our intention to know more about the meaning of written simple sentence can change client's relationship with us and helps to develop his (her) speaking skills.

EMPHATIC WRITING

Client's acrostic writing gives the material for deep dialog. I ask a person about personal meaning of every sentence; try to explore not only biographical facts, but the context as well. During listening to the client I catch essential details and other information useful to imagine situations of client's life. Later I stand into the shoes of the client and write a blog. I use views of nature, express client's thoughts and mood, and show the direction to future life. The person recognizes his story, written by me, and finds there beauty. This helps to enlarge the field of consciousness, and to increase self – esteem, and strengthens ego.

SPIRITUALITY AND WRITING

Spirituality means individual's experience with the sacred, which can be experienced anywhere. Spirituality can be understood as "heart knowledge", as power that comes from within and acts on our feelings; as power connected with knowing our deepest selves and what is sacred in us; the nourishing of the inner life can lead to more meaningful and productive outer life (Fox, 1994). By Goddard (1995) spirituality is described as integrative energy. Nowadays life is often fragmented, sometimes cruel. The voice of the soul is often fragmented, and connections with Nature often weak. The voice of the soul can often be characterized by sharp, metallic ringing. Individuals often experience loneliness in society and are longing for spiritual conversations. Fragmented, our life is very far from the harmony

of Greek mythology, but it is necessary to find that healing and poetry have the same roots. Sunlight God Apollo was the patron of music and poetry, Muses choir leader and the famous musician, known as the prophet and physician. The goal of heeling is to find healing light within us and to put it into words in our fragmented, sometimes cruel life. Love, peace, sense of wellbeing, hope, forgiveness, and beauty are the attributes of spirituality (Ashmos, Duchon 2000). Poetry therapy or writing therapy begins to act on us when we find power to open our souls to pain, to understanding of temporal being, to dialog, to future project, to creation of new situation. Some clients are able to open their souls only to nearest place (the room of therapy hour) and the voice of therapist. My therapy hours always have direction: from darkness to dawn; from silence to the first word, from lost self – esteem to new understanding of identity. Personal, social and spiritual growth is the result of poetry / writing therapy.

WORK WITH SCHIZOPHRENIC CLIENTS

Low self-evaluation and low self – esteem have negative impact on behavior and social communication. Low self-esteem is a quality useful to describe the group of schizophrenic clients. Low self – evaluation is associated with suffering: with fear to experience loneliness between people, with feeling of quilt that his/her life is different, that dreams are shattered. When person tries to escape suffering he/she tries to escape contacts, and loses abilities to use language for deep and spiritual dialog. Superficial

communication do not liberate from loneliness. We know different forms of schizophrenia, and different outcomes of this disease. It is necessary to evaluate client's ego: to evaluate ability to see the world in realistic way, the power to integrate emotions into one emotional state, ability to open the self to new relationship without fear to lose the self. Often their ego is weak. This person often isn't able to answer to a simple question: "How are you?" The person answers: "You are the physicians, you know better, you can decide about my mood". Daily impressions are poor or negative. The speech is poor: fragmentary sentences. Sometimes I meet hyper rational schizophrenic clients. A rational patient (hyper rational) is able to express desire to recover from mental illness, makes efforts for recovery, is able to write normal sentences, but speaking / writing is disconnected from emotional biography. This person has difficulties when he wants to tell what is in front of him now; are these objects important for him or not. In the work with schizophrenic there is always a lack of ties between inner and outer worlds, and the connectedness with self, with others and with environment is insufficient. In therapy hours a poem inspires them to pay attention to nature, and we learn to be observers of nature, to share our findings and to discuss our relationship with nature. Speaking about nature inspires to speak more openly. People begin to share negative or painful experiences. The more painful or negative experiences they confess, the more power they get to be observers and to speak. One of the clients evaluated poetry therapy hour: "… we find that nature is beautiful, magical, and after poetry therapy hour, a full day, we are able to see the trees, the grass, and so it

becomes quiet, it seems that even people became better. This is not only my experience. I spoke with other people". Client's acrostic writing and therapist's emphatic writing helps schizophrenic client to find the fragments of personal life story. Client's narrative becomes more understandable and lighter.

WORK WITH DEPRESSED CLIENTS

Characteristics of depressed patient: fear to feel, tied with fear to experience negative emotions, and negative painful memories. No horizon, fault, self-blame, isolation and self-imposed isolation (social, psychological). These clients need existential knowledge, how to survive. Our task is to help the clients to discover that peace can be found in nature, to find the myth hero and inspiration to survive, to find a way to wholeness, to confirm what is – is, and to help to recapture lost positive memories. Poetry reading, sharing of personally important things, writing about favourite places confirms personality, strengthens self – esteem and the community feeling. The effect of therapy can be strengthened by poetic improvisation.

POETIC IMPROVISATION

I take a few words or sentences of every client and I imagine life as a journey to more light future. The main thing is to show the direction, to confirm clients' efforts to survive.

> *Difficult day → more easy day → difficult day, but I am stronger and more able to survive, I go to easier day → easy day…*

Depressed or schizophrenic clients usually haven't any future dreams, but we try to stimulate their imagination, ask them to imagine a nice future day. The main thing is to repeat all clients' words and to show the direction to the hope. I as a poetical improvisator sometimes identify myself with the tree and testify my growth. I describe what my land is like (dry land, wet land), how did it look earlier, what are my roots like, how does my branches look, what is mys top like, how does the sky look? Again the most important thing is to repeat clients' words and to confirm the growth. Useful symbols: roots – history (personal, national), land (conditions to live), the top (desire), the sky (desire), night, darkness, dark clouds (difficult period), the buds (state before changes), sunny sky (good conditions to live, joy). Clients recognize their words in the poetical text and feel themselves very inspired. This tendency was seen in all groups: healthy, depressed, schizophrenic. There was seen a big influence on the person's verbal skills in the group of depressed individuals. After poetical improvisation all persons, especially depressed individuals wanted to share their feelings and thoughts.

In poetic improvisation I use the words of all clients. Clients' words with important personal meaning are used in therapeutic poetic improvisation and open new, more positive view of world, which in the moment of identification with hero of poetic improvisation is perceptible as more positive experience and as more light future perspective. Recurrence of these experiences in continues poetic

therapy process transfers client's "I" from the context of disability into the context of empowering.

WORK WITH ELDERLY PEOPLE

Reading, discussion and writing in elderly people's group is a way to achieve a better quality of life.

80–85 years old women hadn't any experience in sharing of memories aroused by the poetry reading, and they were disturbed when hearing my invitation to share personal experiences. Some of them had the collections of poetry and expressed a wish to read their poems, but they as well as other participants had a fear to try writing in the class. Old women had strong desire to write nice and meaningful texts and had doubts about success. It was a challenge to accept acrostic writing as a game, to write acrostic spontaneously, and to use its words in the coherent text. Acrostic writing let to use some experiences from unconsciousness level and consciously to find their personal importance. Women, invited to read the created texts, complained about the lack of literary skills, but agreed to read out aloud. They were very excited reading their texts: they inhaled loudly, sometimes for a moment hold their breath, some of the words were spoken louder; one of the women said that she has warmed reading her text. Due to the acrostic writing women got a power to write about authentic things; thanks to reading aloud they found each other as spiritual personality: group members listened deeply to every person's writing, and found everyone's writing interesting.

After writing about the bread and reading the text aloud

one woman told: "Wonders happen here. For more than half a year, I could not write, and I wrote here, – and added, – and it is very warm here". Writing in the class helped elderly people to release emotions, and to speak up about the unique experience. Listening to stories and storytelling has improved communication, strengthened self-esteem and aesthetic literary needs.

Loss of social meaning is one of the factors causing depression. Symptoms of depression were often noticed due to poverty (pension is much less than the salary), deterioration of health related to aging, and big changes taken place in the orientation of people's values in Lithuania over the last two decades and also a preference given to tangible values strengthen old women's feeling of social isolation. Emotional inhibition reduces the ability to focus on new things, to understand the whole of human existence, to integrate individual episodes of personal life into a whole, to understand the meaning of life, and it causes a very strong feeling of loneliness. Inhibited negative emotions reinforce the inflexibility of thinking. Writing, based on personally important meanings, disclosure of these meanings, and sharing of written pieces with the group members enriched emotional and social life of elderly.

In conclusion, elderly are motivated to learn for reasons of self- fulfilment (Boulton – Lewis, Kuys, Lowie Kitchin, 2006), participation in writing therapy group can be understood as transformative learning in language arts.

WORK WITH NURSING STUDENTS

We supposed that nurses are more able to provide nursing care spiritually when they are comfortable with own spirituality and therefor we suggested an alternative course – Poetic therapy. We used reading, discussion and writing to disclose students' values and to strengthen focus on inner life, to promote understanding of emotions, to reflect on personal experience and personal life meanings, to disclose and identify own existential problems and their connectedness with inner self, to improve the use of the self in interpersonal relationships, to analyze patient's need for attachment and its impact on nurse's psyche. We read poems about death written by medical professionals and tried to understand our own similar experiences, paying attention to own senses: seeing, hearing, smells. Students have learned to find their most favorite poem, to read it out loud in the group, and to tell about their personal inner experience, and its connection with poet's words.

Students learned to use the poem's line or strophe as a tool for disclosure of their colleague's feelings and thoughts. Students wrote acrostic and used their names for this exercise, during discussion learned to understand, how writing helps to disclose their inner experience, and to bring knowledge from unconscious level to consciousness

Students wrote about a beloved, meaningful person, wrote about their patient, imagined themselves in the role of their patient and wrote a letter to a nurse. Before writing exercises students always were asked to pay attention to their senses: seeing, hearing, smells, tastes in the mouth. All discussions were enriched with psychology or literature

SCRIPTUM 1/2015

knowledge, but always we focused on personally important meanings. At the end of every session students reflected what they have learnt in the session and wrote down their reflections. Analyzing students' written reflections, we found out that daytime students have a fear to speak openly. They are depended on group members' opinion and they have a fear that other students will devalue their opinions. Students discovered that creative writing exercises gave them courage to write, and that reading developed courage and skills to speak before audience. They evaluated images of nature as very important things to inspire writing. By words of informants opening up and sharing experiences were the biggest values of poetic therapy course.

Some students (informants) confessed that they became able to disclose important inner experiences, and that they have never imagined that such open speaking could be exist. Full time students wrote that earlier they couldn't imagine that human being is such complicated and rich. Full time students more often confessed that they have difficulties when they deal with patient's death. Nursing students found that everyone wants to share feelings, thoughts and reminiscences, and found joy in communication with the group. Opening up and sharing experiences let them discover inner beauty of colleagues and understand how different they are.

Students wrote about learning experience in the wheel, and told that the wheel gives power to feel equality with other. They evaluated poetry reading as a way to find common topics for discussion and as a way to create safety – possibility to speak more about poetic images and less about own experience when the theme is very painful. All

students wrote about relaxed, reduced emotional tension, and about energy growth in poetic therapy sessions. Opening up, sharing feelings strengthened connectedness to self and to others, strengthened perception of wholeness, acted on behavior and professional attitudes. In conclusion, Goldberg (1998) noted that nurses are carrying spiritual care at unconscious level, and it is possible dramatically to improve patients care by bringing spiritual care experience from unconscious level into conscious awareness. It is clear that increased self-awareness lead to an improved use of the self in interpersonal relationship, poetry therapy / writing therapy is good method to increase self-awareness.

CONCLUSION

The analysis of qualitative data collected during practice in variuos poetry therapy groups 14 years revealed that guided writing is a tool for self – disclosure, gives material for deep dialog and discussion, empower individuals to find spiritual ties between them and other group members, between them and the nature. Focus on senses (smells, sounds, colours) inspire participants in all groups to write; acrostic writing techniques often liberate personally important words and enables participants to find dialog between individuals when there is a deficit of verbal skills. Acrostic writing brings to consciousness some unresolved problems or not claryfied points of view in all groups; makes the dialog deeper, creates precondition for personal, social and emotional growth. A client's words with his or her personally important meaning used in poetic improvisation

open a new more positive view of the world, which in a moment of identification with the hero of poetical improvisation is perceptible as a more positive experience and perspective of the future. Writing is a tool of empowering to find new inner powers within us, theoretically this model is based on conceptions of individual psychology (Adler, 2009), logotherapy (Frankl, 1997), cultural spiritual tradition (Tisdel, 2006), on Buber (2001) dialog priciples and modified Freire social emancipation learning theory (Sucylaite, 2011), philosophical poetics (Kačerauskas, 2006)

Jūratė Sučylaitė is an associate professor of the Klaipeda University in Lithuania.

She is also physician psychiatrist (psychotherapist) at the Klaipeda County Hospital (Department of Psychiatry) as well as a fiction writer and a poet.

Sučylaitė's first novel was published in a state magazine when she was only 17; around the same time she was also one of the winners of the Soviet Union's children's literature competition.

At the Medical University, she was an active participant in the movement of Lithuanian medical poets. She has had several groups of poetry therapy in psychiatric hospital and rehabilitative contexts and she has given courses for teachers on creative writing. Currently, Dr. Sučylaitė is a member of the Lithuanian Psychiatric Association, the Lithuanian Writers' Union and the Lithuanian Arts Therapy Association.

REFERENCES

Adler, A. (2009). Žmogaus pažinimas. Vilnius: Vaga

Ashmos D .P, Duchon D. (2000). Spirituality at Work. Journal of management Inquiry.9 (2): 134–145

Boulton – Lewis, G.M. (2010). Education and learning for the elderly; why, how, what. Educational gerontology, 36, 213-228

Buber, M. (2001). Dialogo principas II. Vilnius: Katalikųpasaulis

Girdzijauskienė, R. (2014) Kūrybiškumui ugdyti palanki aplinka Lietuvos mokyklose.Tiltai 4 (61): 79-91.

Goddard, N. C. (1995): Spirituality as integrative energy: a philosophical analysis as requisite precursor to holistic nursing practice. Journal of Advanced Nursing 22.4 : 808-815.

Goldberg B (1998). Connection: an exploration of spirituality in nursing care. Journal of Advanced Nursing. 27; 836-842

Fox M. (1994). The reinvention of work. San Francisco: Harper

Franklis, V. (1997). Žmogus ieško prasmės. Vilnius

Freire, P. (1970) Pedagogy of the Oppressed. New York: Seabury

Kačerauskas T. (2006). Filosofinė poetika. Vilnius: Versus Aureus

Sučylaitė, J (2011) Educational poetic therapy as a tool for empowerment of adults ill with schizophrenia or depression (dissertation), Vilnius

Tisdell, E. J. (2003) Exploring Spirituality and Culture in Adult and Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Fritz Ostermayer

Creativity is overrated!
Is creativity overrated?

NEW STRATEGIES FOR THE GOOD OLD
"OUVROIR DE LITTÉRATURE POTENTIELLE"?

Lecture to Creative Writing:
Pedagogy and Well-Being conference,
Jyväskylä, 22.10.2014

Additional addendum: No manifesto!

Art-isms as ideologies of exclusion and discrimination belong to the 20th century with which they have also disappeared. Likewise: the "avant-garde" as machinery for distinction.

After the termination of all literary avant-gardes and their often totalitarian as well as visionary projects, poetry now seems to be caught in an eternal postmodernism: on the one hand, without a conceptual regime, narration can be again quite conventional, on the other hand a new literary conceptualism adapts tried and tested avant-garde techniques from the visual arts and "experimental" music. Not even the by now also discredited "originality" has to be called upon in order to state: really impressive results

neither come from the conservative neo-narrative front nor from this second-hand avant-garde who believes that new poetic territory can be conquered by borrowed strategies such as sampling, remix, mashup or appropriation. Nevertheless, in reality this only marginally goes beyond the already proven techniques of cut and montage, of serialism and permutation – all of which were developed by classic modernism.

"Writing is 50 years behind painting", claimed Brion Gysin in 1959, co-inventor of the literary cut-up-technique. "Brion Gysin might still be right", fears Kenneth Goldsmith in 2011, tireless propagandist of "uncreative writing" as well as numerous other methods for doing away with conventional narrative. One would almost like to agree with Goldsmith, were it not for numerous artists who actually step on "post conceptual" virgin soil. These artists are relatively unknown in literature circles, as a result of many of those authors locating themselves in the context of performance, transmedia and net-activism, because those fields better provide for a process-oriented, combinatorial and boundary-expanding writing than the space between two book covers.

For example: printing out the internet! If someone publicly announced he would "print out the entire internet", then I would heavily applaud this fantastic fool as if he had announced that he would now go and guzzle the entire Atlantic ocean. Or at least swim across it – just like Herbert Achternbusch had planned in his terrific film "the Atlantic swimmer" and how he had buoyed himself up: "You have no chance, but use it".

The aforementioned Kenneth Goldsmith used his

non-existing chance in the summer of 2013. In a Mexico City gallery measuring 500 square metres "the entire internet" should be stacked as paper. In his blog Goldsmith asked for printouts of websites and emails that should be sent to him via the good old postal service.

Within two months the pages delivered, including those he diligently printed out himself, already weighed ten tons. Of course, quickly some nit-pickers calculated that the internet on paper would, at that time, already consist of 4.73 billion A4-pages, which, if put on top of each other, would result in a tower 500 kilometres high. This did not further bother Sisyphus Goldsmith. Because first of all, with this mission impossible, the artist wanted to build a monument to net activist Aaron Svartz who shortly beforehand had departed from life by suicide, because he had seen in him an ally in the fight against restricted access to scientific publications and art on the web. And secondly: simply "conceptual literature". With special regard to divulging each singular authorship, respectively enforcement of an unlimited and multiple one, on the border to sheer cacophony: all postings of all posters in this world – only as an example – as one single poem crying (stinking?) out to heaven!

For sure, in the late 60's this is not what the funerary speakers of structuralism had in mind when they proclaimed the "death of the author" (Roland Barthes) or at least his/her "demise in favour of a universal intertextuality" (Julia Kristeva). Their - and with them also many other poets' - main concern was the deconstruction of the author as "creative authority" and the overthrow of an individual command over a discourse in favour of a collective speech

(one was actually positioned in and around 1968!).

In the digital today of blog-culture and social media each reader actually has now also become a writer (so called "wreaders"), but the noble aim of the structuralists, to recognise text per se as alien, as sampled, in order to throttle the highfalutin phantasm of first-person narrator, has stupidly backfired: millions of egos cry out on the web "I! I! I!" and just mean themselves and their small narratives of which they believe to hold the only correct truth and with which they can thrash all those other first-person criers. (It is like in the good old punk times: democracy has won, everyone plays in punk-bands who not a soul wants to listen to.) All I want to say is: neither the old reader nor the new wreader gave/gives a shit about the "death of the author".

And not only them. The literary establishment, too, is relieved that the majority of contemporary writers does not rack their brains anymore about semiotic questions on "originality" and "text as multidimensional room", but finally obediently narrates, preferably in first-person. And of course autobiographical, with a few borrowed semi-I's as postmodern "liquidation". If I were a cynic, who I never ever want to be, then I would go on: Happy the writer who can still call a Nazi-great-grandfather his own! Lucky the writer with a terrible childhood in the DDR! Happy the next "discovery of the season" who has fled his/her parents' house into precarious employment: they can all tell about things which go down well with the readership and the establishment: stories about "blame and responsibility of the later-borns", about "search for inner self and meaning", about "attempts for freeing the individual" and what

else such literary family constellations may sound like in hot-air blurbs.

But I am not such a cynic: all this shall be! As long as we homunculus can be met by fate (who knows for how long!) and our hearts are overflowing or drowning because of it, we have every right and enough reason to put such impertinence into words.

What is nerve-wrecking is the reactionary reduction of literature to the narrative, the getting it off one's chest the easy or hard way and thus the proliferating creative-writing-trained sensitivity prose. The culprits for this backlash in the history of literature are easily found: the big publishing houses with their neo-liberal view on the book as a mere commodity, the mostly hyper-conservative critics of the feature pages, whose radar does not scan anything outside the field of fiction, of course also the readership's conservatism is thus being kept alive and – last but not least – the famous literature institutes such as Leipzig and Hildesheim (regarding the German-speaking countries), all those academic poetry schools, creative writing and weekend courses and workshops that are mostly held by authors whose understanding of poetry does not even touch on the avant-gardes of the 20th century, not to mention honour them with relish.

This is why apparently writers today do not have a problem saying "I", thus to speak and write on their own behalf, talking about their own experiences and sensitivities upfront, present their own opinion about each and everything, relate their own life-story, the story of their own family, of their own father, their mother, often with a claim to produce the novel of a generation, if not even

the "novel of today". What's more, preferably other people's biographies are being adopted, supported by personal experience and feeling, but then still presented with a historic backdrop and historic complexion – the big literary successes of late were won nearly without exception by an amalgamation of biographic and autobiographic writing, often in connection with historic, also contemporary, topics and materials. Therefore, fiction – not only the one in German – is being enriched by a hybrid genre which brings together fiction and documentation, narration and reportage, a description of one's own experience and essay-writing, all of which – as one reads and wonders – has by no means led to a multiplication of personal styles, but on the contrary has generated a more or less uniform (narrative as well as lyrical) "style of the period" which, because of its chance of success, is then being taught worldwide at national and regional literature institutes.

This current "style of the period" is primarily set to be suitable for the market and the taste of the audience, but also for easy translation from one language to another or from one medium to another (literature/audio book, literature/film, etc.). Therefore, it has to be inscribed into a predefined range of expectation outside literature and leaves only little leeway for individual innovation. Literary originality, especially when it is practised with form, nearly and basically counts as impertinence, as too "demanding", as "difficult" or "elitist", whereas conscious, at best ironically exaggerated constructions of clichés and trivia continue to be attested, even if they are not named as such. It is a notable paradox that the so-called "return of the author" has not really led to stylistic differentiation, but even more

to a global unification of authorial speech. The pragmatic dissolution of this paradox does not cause any difficulties, but its actual problem is hardly being noticed. And all this in the name of the often evoked "creativity", a term that has been owned by the "enemy" for a long time already: the creative industries, PR agencies and advertisement with their neo-liberal dictate of self-optimisation: creativity is the disgusting capitalistic imperative, today, each random corporate manager and each ambitious hairdresser is creative. No hard feelings towards hairdressers! However, they all go towards creative "Me-plc's", especially if they appear as contemporary writers.

Nowadays one can hardly imagine how much, and not so long ago, such individual authorship was frowned upon on the international literary front and that one could have brought it back – according to Roland Barthes – to "writing's point of origin".

Word artists such as Georges Perec, Raymond Queneau, Jacques Roubaud, Ladislav Novak, Eugen Gomringer, Oskar Pastior or the "Wiener Gruppe" turned up and became protagonists of a poetry called "concrete", "visual" or "auditive", in general of a "combinatorial art of poetry", for which the "workshop of potential literature" (Oulipo) established itself as central laboratory in Paris.

It is our duty to support and propagandise this tradition of multiple authorship and conceptual writing, which imposes on itself rules outside literature in order to limit the poetic ego – or as Oskar Pastior nicely and paradoxically phrases it: "I can express myself much better in a corset" – this strand of literature that is primarily not narrative, so that it eventually does not die off in the near future like a

dead branch of history.

For this reason the vienna poetry school recently organised a two-day festival, "the death of the author (reloaded)", which presented different positions of poetry beyond subject-related literature. For example, at the the venue, the "Literaturhaus Wien", the Canadian conceptualist Christian Bök presented his equally megalomaniac and pataphysical project "Xenotext Experiment". Quite simplified, it is about injecting the DNA-sequence of a Bök-poem into an extremely resistant bacterium called "Deinococcus radiodurans". For more than ten years the author has been working together with a biochemist on this bacterial poetry machine, the goal is now finally within reach: the poem will soon more and more procreate authorless and thanks to the resistance of the bacterium it will also survive a nuclear catastrophe. The death of the author in an immortal poem: what a grotesque paradox. Bök's beginnings were thoroughly "conventional": his famous book "Eunoia", published in 2001, is fully bound to the French "workshop of potential literature", to be precise to George Perecs' "Novel without E", "La Disparation", where the letter E never ever appears. In Bök's paraphrase and homage each of the five chapters consists of only words with the same vowel: in chapter 1 there is only the A, in chapter two only the E, etc. This limitation in form necessarily also defines the content and at the same time prevents any first-person-directed speech. Just like Elias Canetti brings it to the point so well in his "recordings": "The words want to speak themselves, so that they are there."

In line with the tradition of visual poetry as well as the one of surreal "Écriture automatique" one can locate the

project "Science of Sleep/Poetry of Sleep" by Sandra Huber and Thomas Curie, which was also presented at our festival. In this case, the experimental poet Huber from Vancouver and the renowned sleep-researcher Curie from Lausanne transcend the dream experiments of the surrealists inspired by Freud's writings to the absurdly sober sphere of sleep laboratories and electroencephalography (EEG). Together they create some kind of REM-sleep-poetry based on Huber's alpha waves which are made visible via EEG. One could say: the literary "stream of consciousness"-technique is being updated on a neuro-physiologically scientific basis. And the ego as the author even remains: the super-ego, the id.

I do not want to recite the entire programme of our conceptual-poetry-festival – what I am concerned with is the necessary shift of focus towards literature that is taking risks again: risks on the basis of trial and error, newly created rules, fantastic constructions, experimental dilettantism and, resulting form all this, self-empowerment. So to say on methods of creativity that can neither be taught nor studied, but towards which one can be encouraged.

One does not have to agree with E.M. Ciorans devastating verdict – "For a writer the university is death" – but it also cannot be denied that numerous literature institutes have turned out as collaborators of the market and the primacy of the aesthetic has made room for that of economy. Whether those responsible like it or not, in these courses a double phasing is taking place. In terms of production aesthetics, the students are being re-programmed from inner to outer control, this means that they learn to work at the push of a button and to replace the inner impulse

by outside requirements such as supply and demand. At the same time, the need for individuality, even for non-interchangeability is being played down. Writing the same way as everyone else does and putting that down on paper, today, what has gone through a multitude of other heads in a similar and interchangeable way, does not cause discomfort or problem awareness anymore. However, this is the victory of the craft, the victory of the slick masters, the tedious realists. It had already hurt the great Flannery O'Connor decades ago: „The idea of being a writer attracts a good many shiftless people. … It is a fact that if, either by nature or training, these people can learn to write badly enough, they can make a great deal of money, and in a way it seems a shame to deny them this opportunity; but then, unless the college is a trade school, it still has its responsibility to truth, and I believe myself that these people should be stifled with a deliberate speed".

Of course Flannery O'Connor knew all too well that a college and a university that defends this "elitist" definition of literature and that uses terms such as "truth", "vision" and "education towards sales-inefficiency" is taking itself off the market. One's market value is just better as a "bestseller factory". What if not even poets, with the courage born out of despair, don't give a damn about big business and hold on to visions and unrealistic dreams against all odds – who else does?

There is a hilariously absurd sentence by Groucho Marx. It says: "Outside of a dog, a book is a man's best friend. Inside of a dog, it's too dark to read." O.K. – if it is too dark to read inside of a dog, then we should probably start to dance and sing inside a dog. Or make love. This also works

in a Dark Room.

Pataphysical conclusion: Let's turn poetry schools into Dark Rooms. Writing poetry by touching! Go to writing's point of origin in the dark. Then we'll see further. Hopefully!

Fritz Ostermayer is the artistic leader of Vienna School of Poetry since 2012. He is author and musician. He has been also music and culture journalist (Der Standard, Profil, Falter) and radio broadcaster.

Hanna Kuusela

Writing together

MAPPING THE TERRAIN OF CONTEMPORARY COLLABORATIVE WRITING

These days, collaboration seems to be almost ubiquitous. From hotel ratings to Wikipedia and installations, today's cultural goods and services are increasingly being created and designed collaboratively.

This trend, that at first seems to be deeply rooted in commercial culture, has been paralleled by a new wave of collaborations in the so-called high arts. Collective paintings, collaborative composing, and collaboratively written literature are all questioning the figure of the individual artist, and substituting it with a more collective creative subject.

Even if collaboration seems to be on the rise in all fields of art, its practices vary significantly between artistic genres. In the film industry or performance arts, for example, co-creation has a long tradition, whereas classical music or oil paintings are often considered to be individual creations. In order to receive a richer and more detailed image of a phenomenon that appears to be nearly everywhere, this article concentrates on one cultural form only, that of literature, which is often considered the epitome of indi-

viduality and solitary creation. The article maps the field of contemporary collaborative practices in writing and literature and offers a taxonomy-like introduction to contemporary collaborative writing. It approaches the different cases from the perspective of participation in the writing process.

WHAT COUNTS AS LITERARY COLLABORATION?

By collaborative literary practices, I refer to different forms of writing, the creation or production of which is highly dependent on more than one writer. Moreover, the term suggests a certain questioning or erosion of the individual, autonomous author. What does this mean more precisely? What counts as literary collaboration?

According to one increasingly popular view, all writing and creation is collective by nature. This view, advocated for example by Howard S. Becker (2008), suggests that creation and the production of art always requires several individuals. Authors need editors, as well as lumberjacks who cut the trees from which the paper for books is made. Movie directors are dependent not only on actors, but also on roughnecks who drill the oil from which the plastic for the DVDs is made, and so on and so forth. Similar ethos can be found in theories that highlight the multiplicity of creative input and the myriad of influences behind every text. For example, in his title *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius*, Jack Stillinger (1991) proposes that behind authorial intent or creative voice lies a history of mutual influences and collaborations which is often either invisible to the readers, or which tends to be seen as subordinate

to the individual voice. This view echoes many post-structuralist theories of text and intertextuality, according to which a text is always a meeting point of numerous voices, the origin of which cannot be traced as it echoes the voice of every speaker of a language (Barthes 1981). These ideas have also been in the background of the most rigorous theoretical deconstructions of authorship (Barthes 1978, Foucault 1991).

Even if it is difficult to disagree with these theories, and even if they offer an important argument in favour of a less proprietary and individualized regime of culture, the analytical usefulness of these theories for understanding collaborative cultural practices remains weak. As Sondra Bacharach and Deborah Tollefsen (2010, 25) note, at least intuitively, there "is a difference between *contributing* to (the making of) a work of art and authoring it", but these differences cannot be analysed any further, if all production is labelled collective.

Consequently, this article discusses literary practices that deliberately, or by nature, deconstruct or challenge the modern myth of the solitary genius. It does not try to reveal collaboration behind supposed individuality as, for example, Stillinger (1991, see also Crawford 2008) has done, but concentrates on texts that themselves reveal these dependencies or multiple subjectivities, make them visible, or play on them. Consequently, the article offers one possible classification for the various contemporary practices that argue against or implicitly deconstruct the image of the modern individual author.

Focusing on contemporary literary collaborations does not, however, mean that collaboration in literature is a

recent phenomenon. On the contrary, it is often noted that the individual author is a creation of the modern era, whereas in the early modern or pre-modern periods, collaboration, collectivity, and even anonymity, were central attributes of literary creation. Historians have investigated these literary collaborations in the pre-modern era, and problematized the myth of the author, reminding us that "the author in the modern sense is a relatively recent invention" (Woodmansee 1994, 15).

CATEGORIZING COLLABORATIONS

Despite their growing popularity, contemporary literary collaborations have received very little critical attention. The situation is unfortunate, not least because co-creation and artistic collaboration seem to receive media attention and are easily hyped. There is a minor boom around crowdsourcing, co-creation, and participation also in literature, but many commentators are not particularly aware of what constitutes the field and how different practices relate to each other. Thus, critical reflections are also rare. Most studies concentrate only on one genre of literary collaboration, such as digital literature (Rettberg 2013), poetry (Watten 2003), or non-fiction, such as academic writing (Ede & Lunsford 1992, Gale & Wyatt 2009), which is perhaps the most common and most studied area of collaborative writing. These studies offer valuable material, but in order to draw a more comprehensive picture, this article is cross-generic.

Contemporary literary collaborations could be catego-

rized according to different logics. A taxonomy could be based, for example, on the number of participating writers, on the medium of the collaboration, or on the motives behind writing: Has the decision to use several contributors been a pragmatic one (more minds can create faster or imply more knowledge), or is the motive to experiment with the idea of writing itself, as many avant-garde projects do? Does the idea for collaboration arise from some anti-capitalist sentiments, as it often does, or does it rest on the prospect of exploiting the free labour of as many people as possible, as might be the case in many industry-led projects? All these approaches, and many others, would constitute an interesting starting point for a taxonomy-like introduction. The approach of this article is, however, based on the levels of participation in such projects. The question of participation deserves critical elaboration, because it is often seen as the positive outcome of, or the positive background behind, collaborative projects. A lot of optimism surrounds collaboration as a means to democratize (cultural) production. People formerly known as audiences, so the argument goes, have become producers of their own, which challenges the existing media system. For example, writings on fan fiction often include an assumption that such practices subvert existing and unequal consumer-producer relations. (Napoli 2010, Löwgren & Reimer 2013, Jenkins 2008.) Because of such rather uncritical optimism, the question of the distribution of power in collaborative projects needs more scrutiny and transparency.

Collaborations in literature range from projects in which the different authors are equally conscious participants, to those in which the contributors are not at all conscious

that their activity is resulting in artistic production. Because of this range, Scott Rettberg (2013) has categorized the forms of participation in collaborative literary production into three: 1) *conscious participation*, in which participators are fully conscious of the nature of the project, and how their contribution might be utilized; 2) *contributory participation*, in which contributors may not be aware of how their contribution fits into the overall architecture of the project, or even of the nature of the project, but they do take conscious steps to make their contribution available to the project; and 3) *unwitting participation*, in which texts utilized in the narrative are gathered [in the case of new media art] by the text-machine itself, and contributors have no conscious involvement in the process of gathering the material.

These three categories form the backbone of the categories below. As such, my introduction to contemporary collaborative practices can be described as a taxonomy that moves from the strongest form of collaboration to weaker forms. Unlike Rettberg, who specializes in electronic literature, I will also discuss print literature.

CONSCIOUS PARTICIPATION

Many writing projects promoted under the ideas of collectivity or collaboration give the impression that they are a result of conscious participation by several equally powerful individuals. They often implicitly suggest that the collaboration has happened between peers, or between equals, and consequently, managed to challenge the hier-

archies typical for cultural production. This does not, however, mean that such projects would constitute the majority of literary collaborations. Collaborations in which every participator is fully aware of the overall project and has – together with others – the power to influence the architecture of the project, constitute the most demanding and exceptional form of collaborative writing.

Such projects can be categorized in two: conscious participation can occur first, in permanent or semi-permanent writing collectives, and second, in collectives that have been formed or come together for a specific project.

The first form, *the permanent or semi-permanent writing collectives*, are rare because of the level of commitment they require. The core working method of such groups is to write literature together so that the roles of the individual members are not necessarily highlighted or identified. In such undertakings, the name of the collective may appear on the covers of the publications, its history may be explained in reviews, and it may be discussed as a collective subject in public. The collective may have its own promotional materials and narrate its own history. Consequently, the name of the collective may substitute for those of the authors and, eventually, fulfil similar functions.

One of the most internationally well-known and long lasting examples of such a collective is the Italian Wu Ming Foundation, which has published several novels and other texts since the 1990s. According to the story told by the members, the roots of Wu Ming are in the multiple name Luther Blisset, which was also the name under which the novel, *Q,* was published. Later, the group changed its name to the Wu Ming Foundation. In an interview, a member of

the collective explains their writing method in the following way:

> *It's like a jam session between jazz musicians. That's what we do and that's where we take our inspiration. And also it's comparable to role playing game. We improvise together. We create stories by throwing bits of plot on to the table. We sit around a table for weeks. (Wu Ming 2013)*

Consequently, Wu Ming is an example of a writing group in which all members are apparently participating fully in the process of writing. One member even defines their method as "a kind of telepathy" (Ibid.).

Wu Ming is particularly conscious of its role and goals in the field of artistic creation and its relationships to the politics and economies of writing. According to one member:

> *being a literary collective is a radical gesture itself, because you know literature is very backward, the publishing industry is still based upon the writer as an individual genius, [a] highly sensitive person, living in a higher level of reality. (Ibid.)*

In order to deconstruct or challenge this image, Wu Ming does not post pictures of itself, or appear on TV. Its books are freely available online for non-commercial purposes. This gesture challenges the conjuncture in which authorship equals full ownership or control over a cultural good. Wu Ming has managed to create a new artistic name, one that is strong enough to substitute almost entirely for the individual names.

Another more recent example of a permanent literary collective that writes texts together is the poetry group G13 in Germany. G13 has published only one book-long poem, *das war absicht*, under the collective name, but they regularly perform together and organise text meetings. Most of the work done in the context of G13 is, however, still done and published under the name of the individual members. The website promotes works written and published by the different members, and most entries are written under the names of individuals. Thus, it is a much looser collective than Wu Ming. Still, the ethos of G13 leans towards collective production and artistic collaboration. According to their website, the group does not follow a specific plan in order to develop a uniform poetics, but they state, "whenever we can, we want to work against the tendency towards competition and isolation on the literary market, and are in the belief that collective forms of solidary-critical exchange have a positive impact on writing" (G13, 2014). Some members explicitly see their work being in tension with the classical figure of the author. In a radio interview, Friederike Scheffler, a member of the collective, states that G13 tries to break with the poetic tradition of the genius author (Deutschlandradio 2013). Another member characterizes the motives for the collective work by referring to a sense of liberation: "It is somehow liberating to have a space that you share with others and in which you can write and meet and discuss with others as opposed to being on your own and writing on your own" (Magyar & Schneider 2014).

A further example of a long-time writing collaboration are the 10 writers of *The Grand Piano*, "a collaborative au-

tobiography", consisting of 10 volumes and published between 2007 and 2010. This group of writers does not form a collective with a name, and all the chapters of the books are published under the individual names of the authors, but the writers share a common history in the so-called language poetry movement of 1970s San Francisco.

In an interview, one author of The Grand Piano, Barrett Watten, saw that the collaborative autobiography was a continuation of a longer interest in collaboration among the writers:

> *There is a spirit of collaboration among or in and out and around this group of people for a long time. So a collective practice is something that we have all engaged in, in quite many different ways. (Harryman & Watten 2014.)*

He also linked this interest to the critique of the single author, often found in the texts or practices of the language poets. Furthermore, Watten explained the motives by describing how collaboration can create:

> *. . . a situation or environment in which things can happen, can create forms that you cannot anticipate in advance. We can have a structure but what is the form, what are the consequences, of what occurs here? And so there is a kind of dialogic unknown that occurs. We create a different kind of construction for a critical space among writers, that doesn't reproduce the same kinds of systems that already are in place. (Ibid.)*

What keeps such initiatives together are often either political or social ideals or needs. Particularly, Wu Ming has a

strong anti-capitalist or anti-private property ethos, whereas G13 advocates their work as an answer to the competitive nature of today's literary culture. Similarly, the writer of *The Grand Piano* believes that collaboration creates a space in which something new is possible:

There's largely a view that the dialogue between writers creates an environment for making work that would not happen in isolation. There is a political dimension to that, a kind of open dialogic form, and this is where the part of the problem of utopia possibly comes in. (Ibid.)

Such long-lasting collaborative initiatives are difficult to maintain, because of the commitment they necessitate. Regarding The Grand Piano, Watten (2013, 106) writes that during and after the writing of the series, "there occurred a substantial change in the groups self-understanding, something like a crisis of community and even belief in the project, which may not be resolved".

The category of permanent or semi-permanent collaborations also includes *writing couples or collaborations between a writer and an artist of some other field*. Such partnerships have interested both historians who have studied collaborations between or behind famous authors, and many feminist researchers, in particular, who have looked for the intimate relationships between women or the forgotten and hidden roles of women behind male writers (see e.g. Crawford 2008, Ehnenn 2008, London 1999, Stone & Thompson 2007).

The writing methods of such permanent or semi-permanent collaborations vary between groups. One conceptual

way to discuss the differences in the methods is to make a distinction between co-authors and multiple authors, as Bacharach and Tollefsen (2010) suggest. For Bacharach and Tollefsen (2010, 25), the first denotes work done together, whereas the latter refers to work done individually but for the common purpose: "For example, Wikipedia is certainly authored by multiple people, but it does not qualify as co-authored, because the authors are all working (for the most part) individually rather than working together."

The working method of Wu Ming belongs to the category of co-authorship, whereas the writers of *The Grand Piano* are multiple authors working for a common goal. G13 has experimented with both writing strategies. Differentiating between co-authors and multiple authors can be difficult, if not impossible, without empirical case-to-case research on the production process. The end product, the book, does not reveal the nature of the writing process. Often, for example, famous names are used to promote works, whereas less famous writers may be credited only in parentheses. The entire praxis of *ghost writing* rests on this kind of a division of labour. Everyone who has written together knows the risks of an unevenly distributed fame. The same applies equally to the second type of conscious collaborations, discussed next.

The second form of conscious participation or collaboration includes *collectives that have been formed or come together for a specific and temporary project*, or collectives that exist for some other purpose but create one collaborative text together as part of their more general collective work or friendship.

One example is the punk novel, *Seaton Point*, published

in 1998 and written by seven people. In an interview, two of the writers stated that the project was an ad hoc project of fun. The initiator of the project, Robert Dellar, explained the reasons behind the project: "I thought it might be quite fun to write… or just to get a group of people together and try and write a book together, because I quite like working with other people in creative projects" (Curtis & Dellar 2013). This resonated more broadly with his ideas of social togetherness, which he explained in the following way:

> *I'm more motivated if I'm working with other people than if I'm working in isolation. And there's this thing about writers being people who sit down at a typewriter on their own and just work in isolation. I experience that as being quite alienating really. I think I'm quite aware of myself as a social being. (Ibid.)*

Having its roots in the London underground scene, the foreword to the novel promotes a strong political ethos reminiscent of the proclamations of the Wu Ming. According to the foreword:

> *…the modern novel of single authorship came into being only in the modern era…We [the authors of* Seaton Point*] are a corrective to such cultural imperialism. In this work, the process is transparent and we lay no exclusive claim to it. But we do lay claim to our culture. (Dellar et al. 1998, 5.)*

In the interview, the two writers affirmed that such motivations partly guided the writing, but not in a very serious way. According to Dellar:

> *…in the underground there was a lot of people dismissing the idea of things like copyright, authorial ownership and identity, and seeing it as some sort of bourgeois thing that developed with capitalism. And although we didn't take ourselves too seriously … I know I was looking at some way of undermining that, or at least taking the piss out of it. (Curtis & Dellar 2013)*

According to the interviewees, each author created one character and wrote a chapter. After that, a certain confusion entered the project, and when several writers left because of personal reasons or travels, the novel was finished by three writers. According to Dellar:

> *…the last half of the book – and maybe more than that – is written entirely by me, Ted [Curtis] and Martin [Cooper]. And actually it was a lot easier in some ways working with just the three of us, than trying to keep the seven of us going. (Ibid.)*

Seaton Point is an example of a project that started as a free-time amusement for a group of friends who shared some political motivations and a desire to do things together. In the end, however, it turned into a writing project for a few core members of the ad hoc group. It included the conscious participation of several people; however, most of them were not strongly devoted and, thus, left the project soon after the first round of writing.

Another recent example from the field of non-fiction is an unauthorized biography of a Nordic finance mogul, Björn Wahlroos, written by 25 Finnish journalism students and their professor. As the biography was written during a

university course, the division of labour was not equal but rather based on institutional requirements. The book was published under the authorship of "Tuomo Pietiläinen [the professor] and the investigative workgroup". It is an interesting case to mention, because the motivation behind the collaboration was purely pragmatic, not ideological, experimental or political. As the initiator of the project noted, the group was formed because it was an excellent opportunity to realize a project that would otherwise have been too expensive to conduct. Without the class, "it would have cost around 600 000 euros in the form of someone's salary expenses", the professor said in the interview (Pietiläinen 2013). The students gained course credits and valuable experience from the project, and made the laborious research possible.

The category of temporary collaborations also includes several *collaboratively written manifestos* or texts that have a particularly strong political goal. One example is the book, *A la Deriva: por los Circuitos de la Precariedad Femenina*, written by a militant research collective, Precarias a la Deriva. The book discusses the feminine work of precarious service workers, and travels between fiction and fact. Such manifesto-like writings follow more generally the tradition of manifestos, which are often written, or at least signed, by several individuals. A further example of temporary collaborations is *academic writing*, which has a long tradition of collaboration. This tradition, along with the tradition of *pedagogical writing in classrooms*, has also been studied more extensively than many other forms of collaborative writing (see e.g. Lunsford & Ede 1992, 2011, Gale & Wyatt 2009).

Thus, it is important to note that the motivations be-

hind such temporal projects vary significantly: some may have a purely pragmatic motivation, some are more political, while others are cultural. Some are organised around a specific goal, whereas in many instances, the process itself, with its social dimensions, may also be the actual motivation.

What differentiates these projects from the first category is their transitory nature or their nature as by-products of other projects, such as a university course, a conceptual art group, or friendship. What these first two categories share in common is their willingness to promote the idea of writing consciously in a collective, and they often subscribe, at least in public, to some ideals of dialogue and togetherness. However, these self-proclaimed commitments to the lofty ideals may also be primarily promotional acts that are not necessarily based in the real practice. Consequently, many of the projects described here can at times lean towards the third category, that of contributory participation, because many such projects end up being controlled or led by one or a few members. Sometimes this is a deliberate choice, sometimes a result of the chaotic process, and sometimes some people simply tend to dominate collective projects more than others.

Three further examples of collaborative writing linger on the border of conscious and contributory participation. The first, *PHILIP*, is a novel written by eight writers during workshops. However, the novel has been advertised as being based on the concept of the artist Heman Chong, thus suggesting that it was above all a project of one artist to which other writers participated. Chong has also been the main spokesperson for the novel. The novel was pub-

lished by the Project Arts Centre, Dublin and, as such, it is conceived perhaps more as conceptual art of Chong than as a collaborative novel with conscious participation of the entire group.

A slightly similar project of temporary collaboration that included conscious participation but also a leading person or a core group is *Reena Spaulings*, a novel written under the author name of Bernadette Corporation and published by Semiotext(e) in 2005. Bernadette Corporation is a US-born group or project that has worked in and around the fashion business and conceptual art since the 1990s. The group has continuously played on questions of identity in their works, and the same blurring of identities continued in *Reena Spaulings*. In one article, the novel was defined as being "the product of over 150 anonymous contributors" (Farago 2013), whereas in another it was said to be created by "fusing up to 50 unnamed authors' subjectivities and linguistic styles" (Artists Space 2012). All in all, the group conceals this information, thus blurring the boundaries of what we might conceive as participation, collaboration or collectivity. However, as many art collectives, Bernadette Corporation also has some spokespersons; when in public, the group is often promoted by two individuals, John Kelsey and Bernadette Van-Hu.

The third example of temporary collaboration that lingers on the border of conscious and contributory participation is a collaborative novel currently being written, in 2015, by Finnish novelists, poets, and literary scholars gathered around a group called *Mahdollisen kirjallisuuden seura* (in English, The Society of Possible Literature). Allegedly a project of 14 writers, the initiative has received attention in

the media, the participants have given some performances, and the project includes self-conscious theorization of literary collaboration. However, it remains to be seen whether a publication will eventually come out and whether the different levels of participation and contribution come to view. The writing is said to be strictly procedural, so that the forms of participation are determined in advance by the rules. Even if all the members participate consciously, the overall architecture is partly determined by those members who have written the procedure for the collaboration.

The cases discussed above are projects that have received relatively much attention (perhaps with the exception of *Seaton Point*). They are often presented as challenging experiments, which intervene or disturb the individualistic traditions of literary production. However, similar projects have also occurred in literary genres that are closer to popular culture. These projects may be written by amateur enthusiasts, or lesser known authors, and they can have a strong fan base, or local visibility, but national and international critics tend to ignore them. Such projects include, for example: *Thin Slice of Life* (2012), a thriller written by Miles Arceneaux, the storytelling alter ego of Texas-based writers Brent Douglass, John T. Davis and James R. Dennis; *At the Edge* (2013), a novel written by 16 writers and initiated by Marjorie Anderson and Deborah Schnitzer; and *Keeping Mum* (2014), a crowd-funded novel written by a collective of 15 people called Dark Angels.

Some of these last examples lean towards the next category, that of contributory participation.

CONTRIBUTORY PARTICIPATION

Contributory participation is perhaps the most common form of contemporary literary collaboration, and it has been on the rise ever since digital technology and Web 2.0 made textual collaboration easier. Such writing projects can be divided roughly into three: projects initiated by commercial or other institutional actors, projects initiated by individual artists or activists, and projects that do not have (or that work against) any forms of centralized control.

In such projects, a number of people participate, but they are unaware of what happens to the fragments of texts they write, or they do not have a say in the overall project. Often such projects include editors with limited or limitless power, or an artist who reserves the right to use the texts in any way she or he desires.

Corporate-led initiatives of contributory participation are writing projects in which a corporation invites people to join. These projects are often discussed under the phenomenon of crowdsourcing.

One early and often referenced example is *A Million Penguins*, a wikinovel project initiated in 2007 by the publisher, Penguin Books, and De Montfort University. The story could be contributed to by any site visitor, but a team of students moderated the contributions. The project was discussed to some degree afterwards. Amy Spencer (2011) characterized the experiment as chaotic: "As anyone could edit or delete anyone else's words, many of its collaborating authors appeared to embrace a sense of chaos and radically edited and deleted sections of text." Later, the Institute of Creative Technologies of De Montfort

University published A Million Penguins Research Report, which highlighted the importance of the process as a performance against, or in addition to, the textual outcome. According to the report:

> *…it would be appropriate to depict of 'A Million Penguins' as somewhat like a carnival where the audience reacts to various performances while the performers react to each other and the audience. It is possible that members of the audience may briefly become performers as they interact and performers themselves may join the audience in a fluid interchange of roles. (Mason & Thomas 2008, 16)*

A Million Penguins almost demonstrated the impossibility of open crowdsourced novels, which might be one reason why later examples of company-led crowdsourced novels have rested more heavily on editing. In 2012, *The Sydney Morning Herald* invited its readers to write what it called "a new art form", a "crowdsourced" novel, *The Necklace*. As the story was unveiled online, readers could submit the next chapter, and the newspaper editors chose which chapters were used. The final book contained nine chapters written by 10 authors.

Similarly, in 2014, a company called Grammarly published a novel, *The Lonely Wish-giver*, that, according to its own information, had been written by 300 writers from 27 countries. For each chapter, the company assigned 25 or 26 writers who would receive a Google Document and were asked to write on the day. To share comments, writers participated in chapter-specific Facebook groups or commented in the Google Document.

Such methods have also found their way to other genres of fiction. In 2010, the Savonlinna Opera Festival launched a crowdsourced project for writing an opera.

It was marketed as the "world's first online community opera project", and the online community was said to have been open for everyone (Savonlinnan oopperajuhlat 2012). According to the initiators, the project proceeded gradually and each part of it included communal brainstorming online. In 2012, the opera *Free Will* was performed.

Overall, the past decade has seen a wave of so-called crowdsourced literature. In addition to the projects run by companies, *individual artists or (want)-to-be-artists have also initiated a large number of crowdsourced texts* in which the participants do not have control over the overall architecture of the project, or only have a very limited ability to control the direction of the text (for example in the form of online voting). One example of an attempt to write a crowdsourced novel is *The Collabowriters*, launched in 2012 and created by artist, Willy Chyr. Another is the crowdsourced project by Natalie Linden, who called herself the Unreliable Novelist, who needed help writing her "feminist fairytale spy novel".

Also belonging to this category of individual-led initiatives of contributory participation are many conceptual works that rely on a specific idea, to which people are invited to participate. One such project is Barbara Campbell's *1001 Nights Cast*, discussed by Rettberg (2013). In her project, Campbell read and webcasted for 1,001 consecutive nights a short text written by a participant during that day. Although Campbell gave writing prompts, she did

not write any of the texts that she read. A similar artist-led conceptual project with a collaborative twist was Kenneth Goldsmith's *Printing out the Internet*. The project's website defines it as "a crowdsourced project to literally print out the entire internet". Concretely, Goldsmith distributed an open call for people to print a page from the Internet and send it to him. According to Goldsmith (2014), "Over 20,000 people from around the world contributed tens of thousands of pieces of printed internet, which was displayed in a six meter high pile in a gallery in Mexico City during the summer of 2013". All of the power remained in the hands of the artist, even if the call was open.

It is easy to claim that in most such projects the distribution of power and fame is unequal. The copyrights often stay in the hands of the initiator, or the initiator may reserve the full right to modify the material contributed by the participants. If nothing else, the initiator is often the only one who accumulates cultural capital through such projects. Furthermore, the power to define the rules as well as to choose, distribute, and edit the texts usually remains solely with the initiator. Or, when there is some distribution of power, it is the initiator who decides how it is distributed. Consequently, such projects easily tend towards economic or cultural exploitation. It is, however, important to remember that in such projects the participants "do take conscious steps to make their contribution available to the project", as Rettberg (2013, 190) has noted. The exploitation is so to speak voluntary, and participators may feel that, instead of monetary compensation or fame, they gain something else. This applies for most crowdsourced projects, which can be criticized from the perspective of

political economy, but which nevertheless are immensely popular.

The last category of writing that necessitates contributory participation, worth mentioning, is *multiple author names* (or nom de plume). The most famous example is Anonymous and another often cited name is Luther Blisset (the history of which is intertwined with the Wu Ming). These projects are entirely uncontrollable in a sense that no one has power over them. Consequently, the participants are contributing voluntarily, but they do not control the overall architecture of the project, but neither does anyone else.

UNWITTING PARTICIPATION

Projects characterized by unwitting participation constitute the last main category of literary collaborations discussed in this article. This category includes a wide range of writing practices from fan fiction and parody novels to erasure poetry and other appropriative procedures. The common denominator between these practices is their reliance and dependence on already existing texts that have been written by someone other than the person named as the author. In most cases, the writers of these source texts are unaware that their texts are being used, or they have not written these texts with such a future use in mind. In other words, these practices are not collaborative in the sense that the texts are written together or with a common goal in mind, but they have a more implicit connection to the ideas of collaboration. Many appropriators would not themselves call their works collaborative, nor would those

whose texts have been appropriated, but nevertheless, such practices end up deconstructing the ideologies of individual creation and the stable author figure.

For example, Kenneth Goldsmith (2011) and Marjorie Perloff (2010) have written about literary strategies that are based on the re-use of existing textual material. Goldsmith calls such practices uncreative writing, whereas Perloff has named the writing figure that emerges out of such strategies the unoriginal genius. Both concepts describe practices that rely on existing texts, and both writers highlight the role of choice in these procedures, in contrast to creation.

In order to further the analysis of unwitting collaborations, one can distinguish between cases in which *texts or fragments of texts are appropriated* (as in collages and cut-ups) *and cases in which the context or the fictional environment is appropriated* (as in fan fiction and parody novels). Both categories can also lean towards literary pastiche, a term used to describe works that imitate one characteristic style, or alternatively draw elements and styles from various other works (Nyqvist 2010).

To start with the first category, following Annette Gilbert's (2014, 17) conceptualisation, one can further distinguish between literary *appropriations in which a piece of text is appropriated and transferred into a new larger context, and acts in which a whole text is appropriated and published under a new author*. In her title, *Re-Print*, Gilbert (2014, 51) develops the concept of appropriation literature and reserves it for appropriations of entire works in their full materiality, instead of selective transfers in which pieces of pre-existing texts are "embedded into a larger context in a manner that is either assimilating or contrasting". In this article, the ex-

amples represent acts of selective transfers, whereas an excellent account of the appropriations of entire works can be found in Gilbert's book. Furthermore, it is possible to distinguish between a*ppropriations in which the material used is not modified or rewritten in any sense and appropriations in which the source material is modified.*

Examples that require selecting but still rely entirely on texts written by others than the recorded author include, for example, Cory Arcangel's book, *Working On My Novel* (2014) and Karri Kokko's book-long poem, *Varjofinlandia* (2005). *Working On My Novel* is a collection of tweets, all of which contain the phrase "working on my novel". It is a compilation of different approaches to, and manifestations of, the act of writing or the desire of becoming an author. In Arcangel's book, each tweet has its own page; thus, they do not create together another text, unlike *Varjofinlandia*. *Varjofinlandia* is a collage of sentences or textual passages that have been appropriated from web discussions and blogs that concern depression. Nearly 60 pages in length, the poem does not have paragraphs but is rather a mass of text in which it is impossible to distinguish between different voices.

Also different forms of flarf poetry, search engine poetry, found poetry, erasure poetry and poetic palimpsests oscillate between documenting the real and presenting artistic making or choosing, while still being examples of collaboration with unwitting participation. Flarf is a poetic movement or style, a central method of which is to mine the Internet with odd search terms and distil the results into often funny or disturbing poems. In its early stages, the collaborative character of flarf could be seen not only

in its treatment of the pre-existing material, but also in the nature of the movement itself; it started inside a "group of loosely connected friends" whose sociality has been described by Maria Damon (2013). However, today it can be defined more as a style than a movement. Flarf can be conceived as a type of found poetry, which is more generally a type of poetry that is created by taking words, phrases, or passages from other sources and reframing them as poetry. This is often done by making changes in spacing and lines or simply by calling it poetry and by publishing it under an author's name. Consequently, through the act of appropriation, texts that have not been produced for artistic purposes may turn into poetry. This does, however, not necessitate any lexical modification from the part of the appropriator. For example, Virpi Alanen's (on-going) blog, *Löytöretkue*, presents in the style of poetic readymades, fragments of texts found in old and sometimes strange books, whereas Annie Dillards' collection, *Mornings Like This* (1995), includes poems that rearrange sentences and bits of broken texts from old books. In erasure poetry, a similar transfer from everyday discourse to poetry is executed, but the poetic act requires at least some modification. Erasure poetry is created by erasing words from an existing text and framing the result on the page as a poem. A popular form of erasure poetry is newspaper poetry in which poems are made by redacting newspapers with a marker. Furthermore, different kinds of lists and transcriptions, in which existing texts are ordered anew or presented in a new material form, can be defined as collaborations with unwitting participation. Goldsmith himself has, for example, transcribed a day's issue of the *New York Times*, turning it into a 900-page

book, titled *Day* (2003).

Most of the above examples transfer everyday objects into literature, but appropriations can also take place inside the literary system. One famous example of the latter is Jonathan Safran Foer's erasure book, *Tree of Codes* (2010), in which Foer has cut Bruno Schulz's collection of short stories, *The Street of Crocodiles* (1934), into ribbons, making holes in the pages. Another is Tom Phillips' *A Humument* (1971/1973), in which Phillips has painted over W. H. Mallock's novel, *A Human Document* (1892), leaving part of the original text to show through. Hence, it is possible to make yet another distinction inside the category of unwitting participations, one between *transfers of everyday objects into literature and appropriations in which the appropriated material originates from the same discursive system, that of art* (Gilbert 2014).

A good and detailed list of the most used procedures in literary appropriations can be found in Gilbert's (2014, 66–71) book, in which she makes distinctions, for example, between different types of selections, reductions, compilations, variations, rearrangements, rewritings, transpositions and reframings.

If the examples presented above refer mainly to acts of appropriation in which the source texts are transferred without modifications or only with minor modifications or erasures, *the popular genres of fan fiction and parody novels* represent the other end of the spectrum of unwitting participation. These genres consciously build on existing texts or series without the original author's consent. Furthermore, they may appropriate large pieces of already existing texts, but are nevertheless entirely new texts. As such, they

come close to literary pastiche. The reason for discussing these genres in the context of unwitting participation is that these texts would not have come into being without the prior existence of the other texts. They necessitate the existence of several writing subjects and also challenge the original author's sole authority over the story. Examples include, for example, the fan literature built on *Harry Potter* or *The Lord of the Rings*, but also parody novels such as *Android Karenina*, published under the names of Leo Tolstoy and Ben Winters, or The Meowmorphosis (2011) by Franz Kafka and Coleridge Cook.

Some projects mentioned here include the unattributed use of existing texts. Many flarf poets, search engine poets, and collagists do not name the sources of their texts. In such cases, the collaboration is not only unwitting but also unattributed. When an unattributed use of one source is extensive, such practices are prone to create accusations of plagiarism. For example, Helene Hegemann's *Aksolotl Roadkill* (2010) was a celebrated novel published solely under the author name of Helene Hegemann. Only after being praised by the critics, did the public find out that Hegemann had appropriated vast amounts of texts from a blog written under the pseudonym Strobo. Such controversies are likely to increase in number in the future, as the abundance of texts and the pressures of the attention economy push writers towards inventing new ways to deal with the literary market.

WHAT NEXT?

All the practices discussed in this article are becoming more popular, and many of them have been inspired by the technological opportunities brought about by digitalization. They can be seen as culturally emergent practices, to use Raymond Williams' (1978) term. In order to map this emergent terrain, and help the work of future commentators, this article has offered a taxonomy-like introduction to contemporary literary collaborations from the perspective of participation. Such an attempt to create analytical tools for approaching an emergent phenomenon, however, leaves many large and important questions unanswered, most notably those that concern the role of collaborations in today's literary field, or in society, more generally. What are the possible wider implications of such practices? Do they change something essential in the literary field? And finally, do they manage to produce good literature? Are they worth celebrating? These are just some of the questions open for future research.

Hanna Kuusela is a post doctoral researcher funded by the Academy of Finland and working at the Tampere Research Centre for Journalism, Media and Communication (University of Tampere). She specializes in Cultural Studies and focuses both on contemporary literature and contemporary politics.

Her specific interests in literature include collective writing practices and literary appropriations; the materiality of literature and book studies in contemporary context; and Muslim figures in contemporary Western literature.

She received her PhD at Goldsmiths College, University of London in 2011.
She is also a frequent contributor to different newspapers and magazines, writing both on politics and literature, and a proud owner of a second hand bookstore in Helsinki.

REFERENCES

Artists Space (2012). "Bernadette Corporation: 2000 Wasted Years September 9 – December 16, 2012." http://artistsspace.org/exhibitions/bernadette-corporation

Bacharach, Sondra & Deborah Tollefsen (2010). "We Did It: From Mere Contributors to Coauthors." Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism 68, 1: 23–32.

Barthes, Roland (1978). "Death of the Author." In Image-Music-Text, 142–48. Hill and Wang.

——— (1981). "Theory of the Text." In Robert Young (ed) Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader, 31–47. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Becker, Howard (2008). Art Worlds. University of California Press.

Crawford, Holly (2008). Artistic Bedfellows: Histories, Theories and Conversations in Collaborative Art Practices. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Curtis, Ted & Robert Dellar (2013). Personal interview. London 14.11.2013.

Deutschlandradio (2013) "Lyriksommer: junge Lyriker dichten im Kollektiv." Radio interview with Friederike Scheffler. 23.8.2013.

Dewey, Anne, and Libbie Rifkin (2013). Among Friends: Engendering the Social Site of Poetry. University Of Iowa Press.

Ede, Professor Lisa, and Andrea Lunsford (1992). Singular Texts/Plural Authors: Perspectives on Collaborative Writing. Southern Illinois University Press.

Ehnenn, Jill R. (2008) Women's Literary Collaboration, Queerness, and Late-Victorian Culture. Ashgate.

Farago, Jason (2013) "Bernadette Corporation: 'Don't have sex with each other'" The Guardian, 24.3.2013.

Gale, Ken, and Jonathan Wyatt (2009). Between the Two: A Nomadic Inquiry into Collaborative Writing and Subjectivity. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars.

Gilbert, Annette (2014). Re-Print. Appropriation (&) Literature:

Eine Anthologie. Translated by Uljana Wolf. Wiesbaden: Luxbooks.

Goldsmith, Kenneth (2014). "Papers from philosophical transactions of the royal society." http://printingtheinternet.tumblr.com/post/81475510510/papers-from-philosophical-transactions-of-the-royal

———. (2011). Uncreative Writing: Managing Language in the Digital Age. Columbia University Press.

G13 (2014). Webpage of G13. http://gdreizehn.com/uber-g13/

Harryman, Carla & Barrett Watten (2014). Personal interview. Helsinki 31.8.2014.

Jenkins, Henry (2008). Convergence Culture: Where Old and New Media Collide. NYU Press.

London, Bette (1999). Writing Double: Women's Literary Partnerships. Cornell University Press.

Löwgren, Jonas, and Bo Reimer (2013). Collaborative Media: Production, Consumption, and Design Interventions. The MIT Press.

Lunsford, Andrea A. (2011) Writing Together: Collaboration in Theory and Practice. Boston, MA: Bedford/St. Martin's.

Mader, Rachel (2012). Kollektive Autorschaft in der Kunst: Alternatives Handeln und Denkmodell. Bern etc.: Peter Lang.

Magyar, Tabea & Lea Schneider (2014). Personal interview. Berlin 30.9.2014.

Mason, Bruce and Sue Thomas (2008) "Million Penguins Research Report." Institute of Creative Technologies, De Montfort University, UK. https://www.google.com/search?q=million+penguins+researcg+report&ie=utf-8&oe=utf-8&aq=t&rls=org.mozilla:fi:official&client=firefox-a&channel=sb.

Napoli, Philip M. (2010) Audience Evolution: New Technologies and the Transformation of Media Audiences. Columbia University Press.

Nyqvist, Sanna (2010). "Double-Edged Imitation: Theories and Practices of Pastiche in Literature", PhD thesis, University of Helsinki.

Perloff, Marjorie (2010). Unoriginal Genius: Poetry by Other Means

in the New Century. University of Chicago Press.

Pietiläinen, Tuomo (2013). Personal interview. Helsinki 12.9.2013.

Rettberg, Scott (2013). "Human Computation in Electronic Literature", in Pietro Michelucci (ed.), Handbook of Human Computation. Springer, 187–204.

Savonlinnan oopperajuhlat (2012). "Opera by You is the world's first online community opera project." Press release 14.3.2012.

Spencer, Amy (2011). "Author, Reader, Text: Collaboration and the Networked Book", PhD thesis, Goldsmiths College, University of London. http://research.gold.ac.uk/8040/.

Stillinger, Jack (1991). Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius. New York: Oxford University Press.

Stone, Marjorie, and Judith Thompson (2007). Literary Couplings: Writing Couples, Collaborators, and the Construction of Authorship. University of Wisconsin Press.

Watten, Barrett (2013). "After Literary Community: The Grand Piano and the Politics of Friendship." In Among Friends: Engendering the Social Site of Poetry, ed. Anne Dewey and Libbie Rifkin. University Of Iowa Press.

Woodmansee, Martha, and Peter Jaszi, eds (1994). The Construction of Authorship: Textual Appropriation in Law and Literature. Duke University Press Books.

Wu Ming (2013). Guardian Books podcast: Rebecca Miller and Wu Ming rewrite history. 19.7.2013. http://www.theguardian.com/books/audio/2013/jul/19/rebecca-miller-wu-ming-history-podcast

Emilia Karjula

Subjunktiivinen tila kirjoittajaryhmässä

JOHDANTO

Kirjoittaminen voi onnekkaissa olosuhteissa saada aikaan kokemuksen kirjoittajan ympärille levittäytyvästä kuplasta. Kuplan sisällä ei tarvitse huolehtia siitä, mitä kuplan ulkopuolella odottaa. Arki siirtyy kauemmaksi, kuvittelu ja keskittyminen ottavat vallan. Yhtäältä kuplakokemus voi tuntua laajentavan kirjoittajan yksityisen, sisäisen maailman rajoja: tämä kaikki vielä äsken tai jonakin toisena hetkenä mahdottomalta tuntunut on nyt mahdollista ja voi olla minulle totta. Toisaalta kupla voi myös vartioida ja vahvistaa rajoja, sillä keskittymisen ylläpitämiseksi ulkomaailman häiriöt on pidettävä mahdollisimman kaukana. Yhtä kaikki tällainen voimakaan uppoutuva kirjoittaminen voi siirtää tekijänsä tilasta toiseen, arjesta johonkin muuhun.

Arjen ja erityistilojen suhteita on tutkittu paitsi rituaalien- teatterin- ja juhlien tutkimuksessa (Turner 1982; Schechner 1993) myös esimerkiksi fanitutkimuksessa (Taira 2008) sekä muuttuneita tajunnantiloja käsittelevässä kulttuurintutkimuksessa (Goodman 1988; Hytönen 2006). Tässä artikkelissa näkökulmani on yksittäisen kirjoittajan

itselleen luoman kuplan sijaan kollektiivisessa kuplassa, jonka tulkitsen rakentuvan kirjoittajaryhmän kokoontuessa kirjoittamaan yhteiseen tilaan. Fyysinen, ulkoinen tila ei aina olekaan kirjoittamista haittaavien häiriöiden ja vaatimusten lähde, vaan sen voi nähdä myös kirjoittamista innostavana ja ruokkivana, erityisesti kirjoittamista varten muokattavissa olevana.

Tarkastelen artikkelissani, millaisilla tavoilla arjesta erillinen subjunktiivinen tila näyttäytyy väitöskirjatyössäni tutkimani kirjoittajaryhmän toiminnassa. Artikkelini aineisto muodostuu kolmen eri tilassa järjestetyn kirjoittajatapaamisten aikana tekemistäni muistiinpanoista sekä ryhmän yhteishaastatteluista.[1] Esittelen ensin lyhyesti tutkimukselleni merkittäviä subjunktiivisuuden teoretisointeja, paikannan tutkimukseni taiteellisen tutkimuksen ja etnografian perinteisiin ja esittelen tutkimani ryhmän. Sitten siirryn käsittelemään subjunktiivisen tilan aktivoitumisesta kertovia hetkiä. Puhuessani tilasta tarkoitan sekä fyysistä että mentaalista kirjoittamisen tilaa. Lähtökohtani on performatiivinen.[2] En ajattele subjunktiivisen tilan sellaisenaan olevan aineistossani. Sen sijaan tulkitsen ja kirjoitan sitä aktiivisesti esiin ryhmässä tekemieni havaintojen ja niiden tulkinnan apuna käyttämäni tutkimuskirjallisuuden pohjalta. Tapani käsitellä aineistoa on puolestaan velkaa folkloristiselle kerronnan tutkimukselle (esim. Enges 2012, Hänninen 2009, Koski 2011, Siikala 1984).

Artikkelini kokoavana ajatuksena on kirjoittajaryhmän toiminnan lukeminen vuorovaikutteisena, relationaalisena performanssina (O'Grady 2013b). Tämän näkökulman valinnalla haluan painottaa kirjoittavien subjektien kytköksellisyyttä toisiinsa ja tilaan, erotuksena yksin, eristyksis-

sä ja oman päänsä sisällä työtään tekevästä kirjoittajasta. Tutkimuksessani kirjoittajaryhmän performanssi tapahtuu tietyissä, kirjoittamista varten rakennetuissa tiloissa, joita lähestyn Graeme Harperin (2013a; 2013b) kehittämän luovan kirjoittamisen habitaatin (creative writing habitat) käsitteen avulla.

SUBJUNKTIIVINEN TILA

Subjunktiivinen tapaluokka, modus (Turner 1992, Schechner 1985), viittaa arjesta erotettuun, avoimeen ja sopimuksenvaraiseen tilaan. Sen sukulais- ja rinnakkaiskäsitteitä ovat esimerkiksi liminaalitila ja potentiaalinen tila. Käytän tässä artikkelissa subjunktiivisen moduksen sijaan nimitystä subjunktiivinen tila korostaakseni tapoja, joilla fyysinen ja mentaalinen, koettu ja tunnettu tila kietoutuvat yhteen kirjoittajaryhmän toiminnassa.

Tutkimukselleni tärkeistä subjunktiivisen tilan teoretisoinneista voi nähdäkseni karkeasti erottaa kaksi painotusta, kulttuurisen ja tekstuaalis-kielellisen. Molempia tulkintoja yhdistää jaetun suostumuksen ehto. Voidaksemme osallistua subjunktiiviseen tilanteeseen tai tekstiin ja tulkita sen oikein, meidän on hyväksyttävä, että toimimme tavalla tai toisella eritystilanteessa, muuttuneiden sääntöjen tai logiikan varassa. Kulttuurisen painotuksen edustajia ovat esimerkiksi performanssiorientoituneet rituaalien tutkijat Victor Turner ja Richard Schechner. Turner (1992) esittää kulttuurin toimivan kahdessa tapaluokassa, indikatiivissa ja subjunktiivissa. Indikatiivi kattaa tavanomaisen arkijärjestyksen, subjunktiivi taas hallitsee mielikuvituksen, tai-

teen, leikin ja rituaalin tiloja.

Turnerin ajatuksia soveltaneen esitystutkija/taiteilija Richard Schechnerin (1982; 1985) ajattelussa subjunktiivinen modus on sekä kulttuuristen että esteettisten performanssien lähde ja niiden tiettyjä vaiheita määrittävä piirre. Schechner näkee kaikki inhimilliset esittävät käytännöt, jollaisiksi hän nimeää mm. rituaalit, teatterin ja terapian, käyttäytymisen toisintoina (restorations of behaviour). Toisinnon avulla yhteisön jollain tapaa tärkeäksi kokema ilmiö tai kokemuksen osa-alue palautetaan nykyhetkessä käsiteltäväksi. Schechnerin oletuksena on, että performanssin lähteenä on esittäjien ulkopuolinen, esimerkiksi ajallisesti etäinen tai toisessa, fiktiivisessä tai myyttisessä todellisuudessa sijaitseva taso. Tähän tasoon otetaan esityksessä yhteys, se palautetaan, muistetaan tai keksitään. Performanssi voi siis ammentaa sekä indikatiivisesta, historiallisesta menneisyydestä että subjunktiivisesta, virtuaalisesta, fiktiivisestä menneisyydestä, tai näiden yhdistelmästä.

Jälkimmäistä, kielellis-tekstuaalista painotusta puolestaan edustaa kirjoittamisen tutkija Rebecca Luce-Kapler (2004), joka kuvaa subjunktiivisuutta kielen ja tekstin avoimuuden kautta. Luce-Kaplerin subjunktiivi näyttäytyy fiktiossa, jossa kirjoittaja vapaasti tulkitsee elämäänsä uudelleen. Oman elämän kirjoittaminen ikään kuin se olisi fiktiota antaa tilan kuvitella, mitä voisi tai olisi voinut tapahtua toisin.[3] Subjunktiivisessa ikään kuin tai entä jos -tilassa kirjoittaja uudelleentulkitsee kokemuksiaan, etsii teksteissään vaihtoehtoisia rakenteita, ratkaisuja ja kirjoittamisen tapoja. Mitä jos -tila avaa kirjoittajalle mahdollisuuksia kuvitella lineaarisesti etenevästä juonesta poikkeavia vaihtoehtoisia rakenteita, uusia loppuja, erilaisia elämän-

kulkuja, ratkaisuja ongelmiin. (Vrt. O'Grady 2012, 88.)

Subjunktiivinen tila mahdollistaa myös lukijan mukaantulon. Se, mitä kirjoittaja on todella kokenut, ei koskaan voi siirtyä tekstiin sellaisenaan. Juuri tämä kirjoittajan kokemuksen ja tekstiin kirjoitetun välinen kuilu avaa lukijalle mahdollisuuden osallistua tekstiin omalla tavallaan. Luce-Kaplerin työssä tämän osallistumisen ajatuksen voi laajentaa myös kirjoittajaryhmän toimintaan. Ryhmässä toimivat kirjoittajat voivat rohkaista toisiaan tutkimaan ja kyseenalaistamaan omia elämänkulkujaan ja -tulkintojaan. Näin tulkittuna subjunktiivinen tila laajenee myös tekstien ulkopuoliseen elämään. Luce-Kaplerin mukaan kirjoittamisen, tekstien jakamisen ja yhdessä tulkitsemisen kautta muotoutuva tietoisuus siitä, että kieli rakentaa toimijuuttamme, voi auttaa meitä käyttämään kieltä itseämme vahvistavasti. Laajasti ottaen myös rituaalien tutkimuksessa ajatellaan rituaalien usein vahvistavan yksilön ja yhteisön toimijuutta. Tätä ulottuvuutta voikin pitää toisena vahvana yhtymäkohtana kulttuurisen ja kielellis-tekstuaalisen tulkinnan välillä.

Omassa työssäni subjunktiivin kulttuurinen tulkinta auttaa lukemaan arjen ja kirjoittamisen välisiä suhteita: millaisilla tavoilla kirjoittaminen näyttäytyy muuna kuin arkena? Schechnerin (1982, 40) mukaan esimerkiksi maalaaminen, kuvanveisto tai kirjoittaminen eivät ole käyttäytymisen toisintoja samalla tavalla kuin kulttuuriset ja esteettiset esitykset. Kirjoittajan, taidemaalarin tai kuvanveistäjän performanssit näkyvätkin useimmiten vain heidän valmiisiin teoksiinsa pysähtyneinä. Kirjoittamisen kannalta toisinnon ajatus on kuitenkin kiehtova sikäli, että se voi auttaa käsitteellistämään tapoja, joilla kirjoittajan on

mahdollista poimia aineksia mistä tahansa: unista, toisten elämäntarinoista, kulttuurisista ja taiteellisista teksteistä. Näen, että käyttäytymisen toisinnon ajatusta voi laajentaa myös kirjoittajaryhmän keskusteluihin. Mitä yhteen kokoontunut ryhmä kirjoittajia palauttaa yhteisesti käsiteltäväksi keskustellessaan kirjoittamisesta tai lukiessaan tekstejään toisilleen? Luce-Kaplerin ajattelu puolestaan ohjaa huomioimaan kirjoittajien välistä vuorovaikutusta yhtenä subjunktiivisen tilan merkkinä. Jaan myös hänen käsityksensä kielen ja subjektin lähtökohtaisesta avoimuudesta.

TUTKIMUKSEN MENETELMÄT JA KIRJOITTAJARYHMÄ

Tutkimukseni menetelmät ammentavat etnografisesta ja taiteellisesta tutkimuksesta. Taiteellisen tutkimuksen keskeisen periaatteen mukaisesti näen luovan kirjoittamisen harjoittamisen keskeisenä tapana tutkia luovaa kirjoittamista.[4] Etnografia taas tuo työhön ryhmässä tapahtuvan osallistuvan havainnoinnin ja haastattelun menetelmät.

Etnografialla ja taiteilla on jo paljon yhteistä historiaa ja yhteisiä keskusteluja.[5] Etnografista ja taiteellista tutkimusotetta yhdistävät tietty luottamus yksilön kokemusperäiseen tietoon sekä tutkijan pyrkimys päästä mahdollisimman lähelle tutkimuskohdettaan (ks. Haveri 2012, 23). Kun tavoitteena on tutkimuskohteen näkökulman tavoittaminen, yksittäistä informanttia on pidettävä validina tietolähteenä. Samoin kuin kenttätyöhön kokonaisvaltaisesti heittäytyvä etnografi, tutkiva taiteilija saa tietoa tutkimuskohteestaan sen läheisyyden ja oman osallistumisensa avulla.[6] Lisäksi sekä etnografinen että taiteellinen tutkimus etsivät vaihto-

ehtoisia tutkimuksen esittämisen tapoja. Tieteellinen tutkielma ei välttämättä aina ole paras mahdollinen esitystapa taiteellisen prosessin tai kentän monisyisen todellisuuden kuvaamiseen (ks. vaihtoehtoisen etnografisen kirjoittamisen tavoista esim. Oikarinen-Jabai 2008).

Tapani harjoittaa etnografiaa painottaa refleksiivisyyttä (Fingerroos 2003) ja pyrkimystä mahdollisimman vastavuoroisten ja demokraattisten tutkimustilanteiden luomiseen. Myös (kenttä)tutkimuksen ruumiillisuuden ja affektiivisuuden huomioiminen on minulle tärkeää (vrt. Laukkanen 2012, 27). Kirjoittajaryhmässä toimin kaksoisroolissa. Kirjoitan omia tekstejä samoista ärsykkeistä kuin muutkin osallistujat, mutta useimmiten teen samalla myös muistiinpanoja siitä, mitä tilanteessa tapahtuu. Olen kutsunut ryhmän koolle ja suunnitellut suurimman osan sen tapaamisten ohjelmasta. Näen toimivani ryhmässä fasilitaattorina tai virittäjänä, joka huolehtii käytäntöjen sujuvuudesta ja avustaa kirjoittamisen käyntiin. Samalla tiedostan, että paitsi tapaamisten pääasiallisena suunnittelijana myös ryhmässä syntyvän aineiston käsittelijänä ja tulkitsijana käytän monenlaista määrittelyvaltaa suhteessa tutkittaviini.

Kirjoittajaryhmä on perustettu väitöskirjatyötäni varten. Tavoitteeni on ryhmän kanssa ja sen avulla selvittää, millaisena prosessina yksin ja yhdessä kirjoittaminen näyttäytyy rituaalin ja leikin teorioiden näkökulmasta tarkasteltuna. Kirjoittamistilanteet, joita tutkimuksessani tuotan ja tutkin, pyrkivät – vaihtelevilla tavoilla ja asteilla – rikkomaan arkisen päiväjärjestyksen. Tarkoitukseni on näin kiusoitella, kutsua tai houkutella subjunktiivista tilaa esiin sen lähempää tarkastelua varten. Tutkimuksessani ei siis ole kyse sellaisesta "perinteisestä" etnografiasta, jossa tutkimuskoh-

teena olisi selkeästi omaa normaalielämäänsä kentällä elävä ryhmä (vrt. Tuomaala 2011, 34). Koska oma panokseni tapaamisten suunnittelussa ja toteuttamisessa on niin voimakas, on perusteltua kysyä, missä määrin informanttini pyrkivät ryhmässä toimiessaan vastaamaan siihen, mistä olettavat tai odottavat minun olevan kiinnostunut. Alulle saattamani muoto ruokkii myös itse itseään, lietsoo ryhmässä tietyntyyppistä käyttäytymistä ja sulkee toisenlaista pois. Haastattelemalla kirjoittajia myös erikseen ja ryhmän ulkopuolella toivon voivani tuoda lisävalaistusta heidän yksilöllisiin kokemuksiinsa kirjoittamisesta.

Kerran kuussa kokoontuvaan ryhmään kuuluu entisiä ja nykyisiä luovan kirjoittamisen ja elokuvakäsikirjoittamisen opiskelijoita sekä muita paikallisia kirjoittajia. Heistä monilla on akateeminen tausta. Osallistujien ikä vaihtelee noin kahdestakymmenestä noin kuuteenkymmeneen. Tapaamisiin osallistuu aktiivisesti 5–9 kirjoittajaa.

Tapaamiset alkavat yhteisellä lämmittelyllä tai "tilaan laskeutumisella", kuten harjoitusta usein nimitän. Joskus tämä tarkoittaa kymmenen minuutin vapaata kirjoitusjaksoa, jolle määritän jonkin väljän teeman, kuten "pinnat ja aistimukset" tai "hengitys". Osassa tapaamisista alkuharjoitus on ollut strukturoidumpi. Olen avannut ryhmälle omia näkemyksiäni surrealistisesta automaattikirjoittamisesta (Breton 1978; 1996) ja Natalie Goldbergin (2011) treenikirjoittamisesta, mutta kukin tekee harjoituksen omalla tavallaan. Lämmittely voi olla myös muuta kuin kirjoittamista ja sen kesto voi vaihdella. Olemme kokeilleet kirjoittamista edeltävänä harjoituksena esimerkiksi piirtämistä, Nia-tanssia ja joogaa sekä erilaisista objekteista yhdessä koostettavaa installaatiota.

Laskeutumista seuraa varsinainen työskentely. Työskentelyjakso kestää yleensä puolesta tunnista neljäänkymmeneenviiteen minuuttiin. Tämä kesto on ollut ryhmän sopivaksi kokema. Olemme kokeilleet sekä täysin vapaita että ohjatumpia työskentelyjaksoja ja osa tapaamisista on keskittynyt kollektiiviseen työhön. Osa kirjoittajista on työstänyt tapaamisissa keskeneräistä, pitempää tekstiä, osa taas on tehnyt joka tapaamisessa uuden tekstin esimerkiksi alkuharjoituksesta nousseiden huomioiden pohjalta. Olen antanut jonkin teeman tai kokoavan ajatuksen työn tueksi myös muuten vapaiden jaksojen aikana.

Työskentelyjaksoa seuraa yhteinen purku. Keskustelemme siitä, mitä kirjoittamistilanteessa tapahtui. Millä tavalla siirtyminen lämmittelystä työskentelyyn sujui, millaisia tekstejä kukin lähti tekemään, vaikuttiko ympäristö tai toisten läsnäolo tekstiin, millaista kirjoittaminen oli, tuntuiko työskentelyyn käytetty aika sopivalta, liian lyhyeltä tai liian pitkältä, millaiseen vaiheeseen työstetty teksti jäi, ja niin edelleen.

Akateemisessa kontekstissa toimivien luovan kirjoittamisen ryhmien toimintaan on pitkään vaikuttanut Iowan yliopistossa 1930—1950 -luvuilla vakiintunut työpajamalli, jossa on painotettu kirjoittajien altistamista työn alla olevan tekstin ankarallekin kritiikille. Mallia on kritisoitu esimerkiksi siitä, että se ei huomioi kirjoittamista aktiivisena tekemisen prosessina, vaan keskittyy liiaksi työn lopputuloksiin eli valmisiin teksteihin. Työpajatyöskentelyn on nähty myös rohkaisevan yhdenmukaista, opettajaa ja opiskelutovereita miellyttämään pyrkivää ja riskejä välttävää kirjoittamista. (Harper 2010, Donnelly 2010, Vanderslice 2010.)

Tutkimassani kirjoittajaryhmässä etsimme uusia muoto- ja teksteihin ja niiden kommentointiin keskittyvän työpajamuodon rinnalle. Ryhmän toimintaan liittyy myös terapeuttinen tai voimauttava ulottuvuuus, sillä sen tavoitteena on luoda edellytykset kunkin kirjoittajan henkilökohtaiselle ja mahdollisimman vapaalle ilmaisulle. Se, missä määrin kirjoittajat haluavat käyttää ryhmää esimerkiksi omaelämäkerrallisten kysymysten käsittelyyn, on kunkin itse sovellettavissa. Kyse ei siis ole itsen tai tietyn elämänalueen tavoitteellisesta työstämisestä.

Schechnerin ajatuskulkua seuraten käsitykset siitä, mitä kirjoittajaryhmät ovat ja mitä niissä tehdään, ovat siis yksi esittäjien ulkopuolinen taso, joka tapaamisissa palautetaan käsiteltäväksi, uudelleen tulkittavaksi tai keksittäväksi. Tutkimuskonteksti antaa ryhmälle erityisen luonteen. Tietoisuus siitä, että kirjoittajat eivät ole ryhmässä vain kirjoittamassa, vaan myös tuottamassa materiaalia tutkimusta varten, vaikuttaa varmasti tapoihin, joilla he vastaavat kysymyksiini, ehdotuksiini ja virittämiini kirjoitusskenaarioihin.

Toinen tekstikeskeisestä työpajatyöskentelystä eroava tekijä on suhde kriittiseen palautteeseen, jota ryhmässämme ei teksteistä anneta. Useimmilla ryhmän kirjoittajilla on ulottuvillaan muita kanavia palautteen saamista varten ja he ovat kokeneet kritiikin poisjättämisen vapauttavana. Tästä huolimatta laadunvalvonta, arvottaminen ja pyrkimys kirjoittajana kehittymiseen, nousee ajoittain puheenaiheiksi. Tapaamisiin palautuu siis kirjoittajien kokemus- ja koulutustaustasta ammentuvia näkemyksiä hyvästä kirjoittamisesta, omasta kirjoittajanlaadusta ja kirjoittajana kehittymisestä. Kirjoittajat voivat esimerkiksi haluta haas-

taa itseään vastaamalla avoimeen tehtävänantoon itselleen epätyypillisellä tavalla.

KIRJOITTAMINEN, TILA JA HABITAATTI

Fyysisen tilan ja kirjoittamisen konkreettisen työprosessin merkitykset näyttäisivät olevan yhä ajankohtaisempi aihe kirjoittamisen tutkimuksen keskusteluissa (Kerr 2014). Myös esimerkiksi kirjallisuuden maantiede ja kirjallisuuden kartografia (literary geography / cartography, ks. Piatti 2009) tutkivat fiktion ja maantieteellisten paikkojen suhteita. Paikan merkitystä lukemiselle on puolestaan tutkittu kognitiivisessa kirjallisuudentutkimuksessa (Kuzmičová 2014).

Kirjoittamisen tutkija Graeme Harperin (2013a) mukaan tutkimuksen tulisi kartoittaa kirjoittamisen työtä, kirjoittamisen tekoja ja niistä jääneitä jälkiä. Pohtiessaan luovan kirjoittamisen työtiloja (vrt. Siukonen 2011) Harper on lanseerannut luovan kirjoittamisen habitaatin käsitteen.[7] Luovan kirjoittamisen habitaatti on paikka, josta kirjoittaja todennäköisimmin löytyy kirjoittamasta. Paitsi henkilökohtaista tai jaettua fyysistä tilaa, jossa kirjoittaja työskentelee, habitaatti pitää sisällään myös virtuaalista tilaa, liikettä tilassa, materiaalisia objekteja, kirjoittamisrutiineja, -mieltymyksiä ja -tapoja (vrt. Luce-Kapler 2004, 144). Habitaatin luovat habitaation, asettumisen tai asuttamisen teot (acts of habitation). Asuttaminen taas on vuorovaikutusta ajan ja paikan kerrosten kanssa. Paikan (ja siellä tehdyn kirjoittamisen) menneisyys voi lomittua nykyhetkeen. (Harper 2013a, 52–56.) Samoin kuin Schechnerin käyttäytymisen toisinto myös habitaattiin asettuminen voi siis "lainata"

menneisyydeltä. Kirjoittamisen habitaatteja luotaava tutkimus voi tarkastella esimerkiksi sitä, miten kirjoittamisen tiloja luodaan, millaisia ominaisuuksia niillä on, ja miten ne vaikuttavat tiloissa kirjoitettaviin teksteihin, tai toisin päin, miten työn alla olevat tekstin vaikuttavat tiloihin (Harper 2013a, 54; 2013b, 138).

Kirjoittajaryhmämme kokoontumistilat eivät ole niitä, joista kukin yksittäinen kirjoittaja todennäköisimmin löytyisi kirjoittamasta, vaan ne ovat ryhmää varten erikseen varattuja, rajattuja, joskus lavastettujakin. Olen rakentanut tiloja paitsi fyysisten objektien tai artefaktien avulla myös musiikin ja erilaisiin tunnelmiin pyrkivien harjoitusten keinoin. Tilan "tehostamisen" asteet ovat vaihdelleet, mutta sen tarkoitus on aina ollut sama: helpottaa tai inspiroida kirjoittamista, tai ainakin luoda varta vasten kirjoittamista varten varatut puitteet. Kokoontumistila onkin joka kerta vaikuttanut tapaamisten sisältöön, ilmapiiriin ja usein myös kirjoittamiimme teksteihin. Tutkimuksessani kirjoittamisen habitaatti on siis kirjoittamiselle varattu, lavastettu tai haltuun otettu fyysinen tila, jonka kirjoittajaryhmä kokoontuessaan asuttaa, tekee eläväksi. Ryhmän kanssa työskennellessäni rakennan ja asutan habitaatteja, kirjoitan niissä ja harjoitan niissä osallistuvaa havainnointia.

Ryhmän ensimmäinen tapaaminen järjestettiin keskiaikaiseen kellariin lavastetussa sanataidetilassa, toinen ulkona puistossa, ja kolmas neutraalissa, koristelemattomassa harjoitusteatterissa, jossa ryhmä on sittemmin kokoontunut. Käsittelen seuraavaksi kolmea näissä tiloissa järjestettyä tapaamista. Niitä yhdistävänä tekijänä nostan esille ilmiön, jota nimitän tarttumiseksi. Termi on peräisin aineistostani.[8] Tarkoitan sillä esimerkiksi tilanteita, joissa kir-

joittajat toisistaan tietämättä kirjoittavat samantyyppisistä aiheista.

Habitaatti 1: Kellari

Ryhmän ensimmäisenä kokoontumispaikkaa toiminut keskiaikainen kellari oli tiloista voimakkaimmin lavastettu. Harperin terminologiaa seuraten lavasteet muuntuivat luovan kirjoittamisen artefakteiksi ja auttoivat muuttamaan tilan luovan kirjoittamisen habitaatiksi. Tilassa oli esillä kahden kuvataiteilijan töitä, kaikki omistamani valkoiset ja mustat lakanat peittämässä pöytiä ja penkkejä sekä toista kirjoitushuonetta voimakkaasti hallitseva "alttari". Alttari syntyi käytännöllisen vahingon myötä, kun ylimääräiset pirtinpöydät pinottiin kahteen kasaan ja niiden päälle aseteltiin koristeeksi rivi orvokkeja. Kirjoittaminen keskittyi tilan aistimiseen. Esillä olleet teokset (kaksi maalausta ja kaksi videoteosta) ja muut tilan piirteet toimivat kirjoittamisen kimmokkeina.

Kellariin laskeudutaan jyrkkiä, epätasaisen korkuisia portaita pitkin. Portaat toimivat tehokkaina arjesta erottajina: ne johtavat alas pimeään ja niitä laskeutuessaan on oltava todella huolellinen. Kellari jakautuu kahteen huoneeseen, joiden väliin jää kapeampi tila. Kummassakin huoneessa ilmastointilaitteet on piilotettu ikkunaa muistuttavien luukkujen taakse, mikä luo jännittävän ja/tai ahdistavan illuusion. Useat tilassa vierailijat yrittivät avata näitä valeikkunoita ja ikkunat ei-mihinkään tulivat esiin myös ryhmäläisteni teksteissä.

Tilan ilmastointi toimi huonosti, minkä vuoksi ilma kävi

nopeasti hyvin raskaaksi. Pidin usein ulko-ovea raollaan, mistä tietysti kerroin myös tutkittaville. Ulko-ovi ei ole kovin näkyvällä paikalla, mutta käytännössä kuka tahansa ulkopuolinen olisi voinut kävellä sisään. Lisäksi tilasta olisi ollut jyrkkien portaiden takia vaikea päästä nopeasti pakoon, ja puhelimet toimivat siellä epäluotettavasti. Tilaan liittyi siis myös vaarantuntua ja konkreettisia riskejä. Loppukeskustelussa kaksi kirjoittajaa kertoikin käsitelleensä tekstissään kuolemaa. Seuraava keskustelusitaatti osoittaa, miten aiheen tulkittiin tarttuvan kirjoittajasta toiseen.

Ulla: ei ku mä aattelin vaan et sä sanoit siitä kuolemasta ja sä istuit siinä mun vieressä ensteks ja sit sä menit siihen nurkkaa ja mä [mietin] et miks mä rupesin kirjoittamaan kuolemasta

Johan: se tarttu minusta

Ulla: nimenomaan, siis mun mielestä kirjottaminen on täysin mystinen tapahtuma ylipäätään

Johan: joo

Ulla: ni mä aattelin vaan et tämmösessä tilassa vielä ja sit ku on lähellä vielä ja sit on tämmönen harras tunnelma ja me tiedetään et me ollaan saman asian äärellä, siis tämä alttari tässä

Johan: nii

Johan: just, sama

Ulla: ni sillon mä ajattelin et kuinka paljon sitte, että herranjumala mähän kirjotan ton juttua, tai että miten tää niinku tuli, että miten paljo on sitä semmosta henkistä joka sitten niinkun, yhteisenergiaa (…) tai että sä kirjotit ikkunasta ja mä kirjotan ikkunasta, ja sulla on varmaan erilainen ikkuna, että onko kaikki pokannut ton ikkunan vai (Kirjoittajatapaaminen 7.5.2013)

Ullan kuvailemia huomioita "yhteisenergiasta" ovat tehneet myös yhdessä soittavat jazz-muusikot, jotka voivat kokea ikään kuin soittavansa toisen instrumenttia (Hytönen 2006,7; vrt. Luce-Kapler 2004, 44). Aiheen tarttumista edistävät tässä keskustelussa kirjoittajien fyysinen läheisyys, yhteinen tavoite ja toiminta, fyysiseen tilaan liittyvät elementit (alttari ja ikkuna) sekä tilassa vallitseva tunnelma. Se, että maanalainen, tunkkainen, valaistukseltaan hämärä tila houkuttelee kirjoittamaan kuolemasta tai että tilan muista piirteistä voimakkaasti poikkeava, kellarissa oudolta vaikuttava ikkuna nousee monessa tekstissä esiin, ei itsessään ole kovin yllättävää. Kiinnostavaa on, että ensimmäistä kertaa toisensa tapaavat ihmiset voivat näinkin avoimesti keskustella "mystisestä tapahtumasta", joka aikaansaa sanattomien viestien kulkeutumista yhden kirjoittajan ruumiista ("sä istuit siinä mun vieressä") ja tekstistä toiseen. Kirjoittavan yksilön rajat kyseenalaistuvat mutta eivät kumoudu kokonaan, sillä jokaisen kirjoittajan ikkuna säilyy hänen omanaan, "erilaisena ikkunana".

Habitaatti 2: puisto

Kellariin verrattuna ryhmän seuraava tapaaminen edusti tilan kannalta toista äärilaitaa. Tapasimme kesäisessä puistossa, Tähtitorninmäen korkeimmalla kohdalla. Siirryimme siis maan alta taivasalle, vieläpä mahdollisimman korkealle. Ajatukseni oli, että aloitusharjoituksen jälkeen voisimme vaeltaa puistossa vapaasti ja kerätä teksteihimme inspiroivia teemoja tai yksityiskohtia. Vaikka tilaa oli käytössä paljon, asetuimme kaikki lehtiöinemme samalle

mäennyppylälle. Kukaan ei kuitenkaan istunut kenenkään kanssa kasvokkain. Kellaritapaamisen verrattuna asennon vaihtaminen oli silti ulkona eri tavalla mahdollista. Kirjoittajat asettuivat kirjoittamaan esimerkiksi vatsallaan tai selällään maaten. Ulkona spontaanisti alkanutta asentojen vaihtelua olemme sittemmin kokeilleetkin osana kirjoitusharjoituksia.

Kirjoittajat muodostivat epäsäännöllisen muotoisen rykelmän, joka oli tunnistettavissa samaan asiaan keskittyväksi yksiköksi. Yksikön rajat olivat kuitenkin väljät ja huokoiset (vrt. O'Grady 2013b). Joukossamme oleili jonkin aikaa ryhmän ulkopuolinen henkilö juomassa olutta. Tuomiokirkon kellot ja läheisen kesäteatterin harjoitukset kuuluivat kirjoituspaikkaamme selvästi ja puistossa oli muutenkin ihmisiä ja liikettä. Havaintojeni mukaan puiston muu elämä ikään kuin korosti kirjoittajien muodostamaa väliaikaista yksikköä, erotti meidät ympäristöstä ja sen toiminnoista ja siirsi huomion siihen, mitä olimme tekemässä yhdessä.

Toisten kirjoittajien ja ulkopuolisten henkilöiden läsnäolo ei kuitenkaan tällä kertaa saanut aiheita tarttumaan tekstistä toiseen. Kirjoittamiseen keskittymistä kuvailtiin niin voimakkaana, että kaikki muut tilanteessa olijat melkein häviävät. Anne kertoo, että paikan vaihtaminen saa hänet hetkeksi huomioimaan toiset kirjoittajat. Kirjoitusajan loppua kohden hänen keskittymisensä hellittää sen verran, että hän huomaa myös ohi kulkevat ulkopuoliset.

Mä kyl uppouduin, mä en nähny ketään muita, tai koko aikana juurikaan, sit mä vaihdoin kyl paikkaa jossain vaiheessa ja sit mä vähän huomasin että ai te ootte tuolla ylempänä, ja ihan tos lopuks mä huomasin et tossa kulki ihmisiä, mut siin

kirjottamisen aikana mä en kyl huomannut mitään.
Anne, 11.6.13.

Tarttumista tapahtui silti maisemasta tai tilasta kohti tekstejä:

En mä ollut niin tietoinen siitä mihin kohtaan mä siellä menin, ja sit kun mä käänsin pääni ja sit siinä olikin se, semmonen just… kun ne asiat mitä mä mietin liitty pudotuksiin ja reunoihin, niin siitä tuli monikerroksinen, kallio laskeutumassa, ja kaikkia kasveja seassa. Sattumalta kun kääntää päätään niin voi nähdä jotain odottamatonta.
Kaisa, 11.6.13.

Sen sijaan, että Kaisa käyttäisi ympäröivää tilaa tietoisesti tekstin rakennusaineena, kuten oletin useimpien tekevän, tarttumisen järjestys on tässä päinvastainen. Kirjoittaja löytää ja havaitsee maisemasta teemat, joita käsittelee tekstissään. Työn alla oleva teksti ja sattumankaltainen ”pään kääntäminen” – jonka voisi tässä tulkita sekä konkreettisena että kuvaannollisena näkökulman vaihtamisena – altistavat kirjoittajan näkemään maiseman tarkemmin, merkityksellisemmin. Ympäröivästä fyysisestä tilasta tulee näin kirjoittajalle merkittävämpi kuin pelkästään paikka, jossa hän sattui sillä hetkellä kirjoittamaan. Paikan valinta tapahtuu tiedostamatta, mutta kirjoittaja löytää siitä kirjoittamista tukevia piirteitä. Paikasta tulee hetkellinen, sattumalta muodostuva kirjoittamisen habitaatti.

Habitaatti 3: teatteri

Ryhmän seuraavat tapaamiset on järjestetty harjoitusteatterissa Turun yliopiston tiloissa. Tavanomaisesta luento- tai seminaaritilasta poiketen huoneessa ei ole pöytiä ja tuolejakin säilytetään pinoissa, joten keskilattialle jää paljon tilaa. Seinät ovat mustat lukuun ottamatta suurta valkokangasta. Tila on hiukan kylmä ja ensikokemalta melko karu. Verrattuna kellarin voimakkaaseen lavastukseen ja ulkona kirjoittamisen yltäkylläiseen maisemallisuuteen, harjoitusteatterissa kirjoittaminen vaatii toisenlaista keskittymistä muuttuakseen kirjoittamista tukevaksi. Tila on tyhjempi: siellä "on" korostuneemmin vain se, mitä viemme mukanamme. En ole lavastanut tilaa tapaamisia varten muuten kuin asettelemalla tuoleja väljään, yleensä rikkonaiseen ympyrään, mikä antaa kirjoittajille mahdollisuuden asettua joko toisten läheisyyteen tai hiukan etäämmäs. Jotkut ovat tuoneet mukanaan villtejä tai joogamattoja lattialla kirjoittamista varten.

Marraskuussa 2013 järjestetyssä tapaamisessa kokeilimme avausharjoituksena yhdessä piirtämistä. Heijastin valkokankaalle surrealistisia cadavre exquis -piirroksia[9] inspiraatioksi omille vastaaville töillemme, jotka toteutettiin kirjoittajien mukanaan tuomilla sekalaisilla tusseilla ja väriliiduilla. Työskentelyn taustalla kuuntelimme Miles Davisin Kind of Blue -levyä. Musiikki tuntui vahvistavan yhdessä tekemisen tunnetta, saman asian äärellä olemista, joka kellaritapaamisessa muodostui enemmän fyysisen tilan piirteistä.

Tapaamisen tunnelma oli intensiivinen, mutta rento. Useimmat kokivat itselleen vieraamman ilmaisutavan eli

piirtämisen vähentävän kirjoittamiseen liittyvää painetta. Joukossamme oli mukana yksi kuvataiteilija, mutta hänen ammatillinen taustansa ei näyttänyt vaikeuttavan kenenkään työtä. Piirtämisen jälkeen avasimme kuvat ja kirjoitimme kukin oman tekstimme niiden pohjalta.

Purkukeskustelussa analysoimme kuvia ja totesimme, että yhden piirtäjän aloittamat viivat näyttivät monessa työssä muodostavan rytmikkään kokonaisuuden. Esimerkiksi ruudukon muodostavat viivat muuttuivat labyrintiksi, joka muuttui pystysuoriksi viivoiksi ja palasi jälleen labyrinttimaisiksi poluiksi. Johan kuvasi yhtäläisyyksiä näin: "Rytmit on samat vaikka ei ole nähty [toisten töitä], se on telepatiaa."

Telepatiatulkinta ei herättänyt vastalauseita. Naureskelimme kyllä polveileville, assosioiville tulkinnoillemme, jotka Johanin mielestä toimivat kuin käsitetaide, jossa "selitykset ovat hienompia kuin itse työt". Samaan tapahtumaan on siis mahdollista yhtäältä liittää arjen ylittäviä elementtejä ja toisaalta pitää sitä tietyllä hetkellä käydyssä keskustelussa muotoutuvana, puhujien itse aikaansaamana asiana (vrt. Kaivola-Bregenhøj 1988, 91).

Naurusta ja keveydestä huolimatta intensiteetti, jopa kiivaus, jolla kuvista ja teksteistä keskustelimme, oli kaikkea muuta kuin huvittuneen vähättelevää. Käsillä olevan työn tekeminen näyttäytyy tekijöilleen merkittävänä ja siitä puhumisen hetki on merkittävä. Lopputulos on toisarvoisessa asemassa, muttei sekään yhdentekevä. Tämä tuli ilmi esimerkiksi tavassa, jolla eräs kirjoittajista luki tapaamisen päätteeksi tekstinsä ääneen.

Vaikka teksti on tuotettu hyvin lyhyen ajan sisällä, kirjoittaja ei ennen sen esittämistä selittele, mikä tekstissä

kenties on puutteellista tai kesken, mitä esimerkiksi luovan kirjoittamisen opetustilanteissa tapahtuu usein. Kuulijat saavat tekoprosessista ainoastaan lyhyen luonnehdinnan, joka kehystää[10] varsinaisen, esitettävän tekstin. Katja kertoo lukevansa nyt ääneen kaksi erillistä tekstiä, koska ne sopivat yhteen.

Mie tavallaan kirjotin kaksi eri pätkää, nää tavallaan, mä luen nää nyt yhteen koska nää sopii. Lähtee että katulamput ovat puita nuottiviivastolla, huojuvat tuulessa, huojuvat niin kuin kerrostalon valtamerialukset, kivitalot kertovat vuoria, neovalot olleensa joltain toiselta planeetalta. kaikki toistavat juuriaan, juuret ovat horisontissa, auringonlaskun tasalla ja maanpinnan alla. joenpinta näyttää toisen kaupungin, jossain ajatusten ja suunnitelmien tavoittamattomissa, hyvä niin, tämän toisen me olemme jo tappamassa kontrollinhalussamme. tuosta valomeressä kylpevästä kangastuksesta jää ainoastaan kuvia verkkokalvoille, tästä jonka tuulia hengitän otetaan digitaalisia tallenteita tulevien sukupolvien ihmeteltäviksi, ei voi tietää onko mitään muuta jäljellä enää silloin, mutta entä jos onkin kuvien todellisuus, jossa muistikuvat valokuvat elokuvat diakuvat harhakuvat muotokuvat ja tilakuvat ovat kaikki samassa albumissa, sitä suuri tietoisuus selailee tämän yksiulotteisen disneylandin tuolla puolen, eikä tämä paperinukke ymmärrä edes oman maailmankaikkeutensa lakeja.
KATJA, 29.11.13

Katja lukee tekstin sujuvasti, pitämättä juurikaan taukoja. Esitys tuo mieleen lavarunouden. Erityisesti kuva-sanan toisto tuo siihen voimakkaan rytmin. Rebecca Luce-Kapler (2004, 33) viittaa Dennis Leen rytminäkemykseen,

jonka mukaan rytmi kumoaa subjektin ja objektin välisen eron, avaa jaettua kinesteettistä tilaa (vrt. Laukkanen 2012, 189–190). Kirjoittajaryhmässä vastasimme Katjan esityksen rytmiin toisella rytmillä: nauhalle tallentuivat ryhmän ensimmäiset spontaanit aplodit. Lukemisen jälkeen Katja kommentoi tekstiään seuraavasti:

> *Toi niinku, noi just tuli siis, muutenkin tästä päivästä, matkasta kun tulin tänne näin, ja sit just tää musiikki, ni tuli just semmonen, ilta, kaupunkifiilis ja sit ne tavallaan ne kuvat (…) kaikki, kaikki mahdollinen yhdistyi ja sitten tavallaan tää piirtäminen autto just siihen, että pysty yhdistelemään noita eri ajatuksia helpommin.*
> KATJA, 29.11.13

Piirtäminen avaa Katjalle kirjoittamisen tilan, jossa hän voi tekstissään vapaasti yhdistellä elementtejä. Matkalla tapaamiseen koettu kaupunkimaisema ja musiikki kohtaavat tekstissä, joka sekin on kahden tapaamisessa kirjoitetun tekstin vasta ääneen luennassa muotonsa saava yhdistelmä. Tekstit tarttuvat toisiinsa esityksessään ja muodostavat kuulijoilleen yhtenäisen kokonaisuuden.

Olen ennen kaikkea kiinnostunut tavoista ja tilanteista, joilla tarttumisesta puhumme. Kirjoittamisen jälkeen käydyissä ryhmäkeskustelussa selitämme tuotostemme yhtäläisyyksiä esimerkiksi "mystiikan" ja "telepatian" kaltaisilla käsitteillä. Näiden käsitteiden käytön sävy on tulkintani mukaan yhtä aikaa kevyt ja vakava. Niille voidaan nauraa, mutta nauru ei poista yhteisessä puheessa vahvistettavaa kokemusta siitä, että jotakin tavallisesta arkijärjestyksestä poikkeavaa saattoi tapahtua tai että tilanne olisi ainakin

mahdollista tulkita arjesta poikkeavaksi. Sävyn keveys voi tässä lieventää stigmaa, joka voisi liittyä "yliluonnollisista" tai oudoista kokemuksista liian vakavasti puhumiseen (vrt. Hänninen 2009)[11]. Toisaalta mystiikan ja telepatin kaltaisten, yleisesti tunnettujen termien käyttö voi olla yksinkertaisin tapa vahvojen kokemusten kuvaamiseen (vrt. Hirsjärvi 2008, 151–152). Luovaan työhön liitetty merkitsevyys, sen erityisyys, tulee korosteisesti esiin ryhmän puheessa. Tuleekin olemaan mielenkiintoista verrata ryhmässä käytyjä keskusteluja kunkin kirjoittajan henkilökohtaisiin haastatteluihin. Kerrotaanko kirjoittamisen mystisyydestä yhä vahvasti ryhmän ulkopuolella?

Sattumalla on monissa kirjoitusharjoituksissamme varsin merkittävä rooli, mutta siitä keskusteleminen ei tähänastisen aineistoni perusteella vaikuta kiinnostavan ryhmää, itseni mukaan lukien, lainkaan yhtä paljon kuin jonkin selityksiä pakenevan kvaliteetin tavoittelu. Haluamme kenties tehdä tilanteesta erityisemmän kuin se ulkopuolisen silmiin olisi. Puhetavat liittyvät nähdäkseni outojen kokemusten kerronnallistamiseen ja myös ryhmän ja hetken intensiteetin vahvistamiseen kertomalla. On kuin meillä olisi näissä erityisissä hetkissä kollektiivinen tarve korostaa kirjoittamisen selittämättömyyttä, eikä tästä mystisyydestä vaikuta olevan lainkaan vaikea puhua (vrt. Hytönen 2006, 9). Ryhmän toiminnan nivoutuminen osaksi akateemista tutkimusta saattaa olla eräs outouspuheen runsauteen vaikuttava tekijä. Pidän tärkeänä, ettei kirjoittamisen affektiivinen, kokemuksellinen puoli jäisi tutkimuskontekstin analyyttisen otteen jalkoihin. Myös ryhmässä toimivat kirjoittajat ovat ilmaisseet pitävänsä mielenkiintoisena ja tärkeänä sitä, miten saan tutkimuksessani kirjoit-

tamisen "mystiikan" esiin. Huolen voi liittää luovan kirjoittamisen institutionalisoitumista koskevaan laajempaan keskusteluun (vrt. Harper 2013b, 134–135): häviääkö luovan kirjoittamisen luovuus akateemisen kielen ja ajattelun alle, voiko kirjoittaminen tai muu luova työ saada tutkimuksessa itsenäistä roolia, määrittyä muuksi kuin akateemisen toiminnan kohteeksi?

Ajattelen, että kirjoittamisen tulkitseminen tavalla tai toisella erityiseksi on jälleen yksi subjunktiivinen ikään kuin -taso, joka voi vahvistaa kirjoittamisen merkitystä kirjoittajalle itselleen (vrt. Koski 2011, 15). Koska kirjoittaminen on erityistä, intensiivistä, joskus jopa mystistä, harrasta tai outoa, se ansaitsee tilaa, aikaa ja henkilökohtaista panostusta. Kirjoittamisen puhuminen erityiseksi myös avaa mahdollisuuksia toisten kirjoittajien kanssa keskustelemiseen. Se antaa luvan kysyä, tapahtuuko sinulle koskaan näin, oletko huomannut, että?

OUTOUDEN HETKET

> *[kuin] hullut jossain kuvataidekerhossa, ja sitten sekopäitten taulut laitetaan seinille, näin tää menee.*
> ULLA, 29.11.2013.

Jako indikatiiviseen ja subjunktiiviseen järjestykseen voi ohjata ajattelemaan jähmeitä, toisensa poissulkevia fyysisiä ja mentaalisia tiloja, joiden rajat ovat aina selkeästi nähtävillä. Muun muassa buddhalaisia hautajaisrituaaleja tutkinut antropologi Robert Desjarlais (2014) on puhunut outouden hetkistä (moments of strangeness), jotka viittaa-

vat arkisen tajunnan ja todellisuuden keskeyttäviin hetkiin. Outouden hetki tekee tietoiseksi muuttuneista säännöistä, pysäyttää aistimaan, kysymään mitä oikein on tapahtumassa. Olennaista Desjarlain ajatuksessa on outouden hetkellisyys. Siirtymiä tai liukumia indikatiivista subjunktiiviin toi tapahtua ohikiitävissä hetkissä, jotka eivät aina vaadi tuekseen dramaattisia rituaalisia kehyksiä.

Schechnerille erityisesti esitykseen valmistautuminen, harjoittelu (workshop-rehearsal), tapahtuu subjunktiivisessa järjestyksessä. Harjoituksissa tehdään työtä, mutta niiden painotus on leikkisä, improvisoiva: kokeillaan näin, tämä voisi ehkä toimia. Indikatiivi, se mitä on, on puolestaan pinnan alla, näkymättömissä. Esityksessä suhteet kääntyvät toisinpäin. Indikatiivi, se mitä on, on esityksen näkyvä muoto, kun taas se mitä voisi olla, tai ikään kuin on, on piilotettu. (Schechner 1983, 71.)

Harjoittelun ”henki” kuvastaa ryhmämme tapaamisia sillä erotuksella että niillä ei ole julkisen esityksen kaltaista nimettyä, yhteistä päämäärää. Indikatiivinen järjestys on siirretty syrjään. Sitä ei haluta paikalle, jotta voimme olla ja kirjoittaa vapaasti, kokeillen, ”kuin hullut kuvataidekerhossa”. Tämä ei välttämättä onnistuisi jos ”todellinen maailma” tavoitteineen ja pyrintöineen olisi näkyvästi läsnä. Tästä huolimatta yksittäisillä kirjoittajilla voi olla ja on henkilökohtaisia tavoitteita: edistää käsikirjoitusta, kerätä tutkimusaineistoa, haastaa itseään kehittymään kirjoittajana. Todellinen tai tavallinen maailma palaa näkyviin purkuvaiheessa, jolloin on mahdollista esimerkiksi pohtia, miten työskentelyjakson aikana syntynyttä kirjoittamisen tapaa voisi tavoitella tai soveltaa ryhmän ulkopuolella tapahtuvaan kirjoittamiseen, tai reflektoida oman elämän-

tilanteen, vireystason, jne. vaikutusta kirjoittamiseen (vrt. Luce-Kapler 2004, 120).

KIRJOITTAJARYHMÄN PERFORMANSSIT

Sue Roe (2010, 196) luonnehtii luovaa kirjoittamista performanssiksi, jonka ominaislaatu muodostuu ja kehittyy esimerkiksi kirjoittajan kokemusten, unien, havaintojen, muistin, tahdon tai halun (desire) ja lukemisen myötä. Roe painottaa kuitenkin yksittäisen kirjoittajan performanssin lopputulosta, tekstiä. Entä kun kirjoittamisen performanssi määritellään toisin, ryhmän toiminnan kautta?

Nicolas Bourriad'n esittämän relationaalisen estetiikan ideaan nojaten Alice O'Grady (2013b) kutsuu relationaalisiksi performansseiksi sellaisia ihmistenvälisen kohtaamisen ja vaihdon tilanteita, jotka ilmaistaan puolistrukturoidun performanssin kehyksessä. Esimerkkeinä O'Grady (2013b, 134, 138) mainitsee performanssit, joiden kokeminen saattaa olla tilapäistä ja sattumanvaraista, jotka sijoittuvat arvaamattomiin, eläviin tilanteisiin ja painottavat katsojan omakohtaista, ruumiillista kokemusta ja osallistumista esitykseen. Relationaaliset performanssit tapahtuvat usein virallisesti esityksille varattujen tilojen reuna-alueilla.

O'Grady kuvailee tilaan mukautuvaa performanssia "huokoisen sferoidin" (porous spheroid) käsitteellä. Esitystä voidaan vierittää tilassa, se voi paisua tai pidentyä, sillä ei ole selkeää etu- ja taka-alaa vaan sitä voidaan seurata monesta eri katsojapositiosta käsin. Se ei myöskään välttämättä ole kertomusmuotoiseen, alusta loppuun etenevään kaavaan sidottu.

Kirjoittajaryhmän tapaamiset eroavat monin tavoin O'Gradyn analysoimista, vaihtoehtofestivaalien yhteyteen sijoittuvista kokeilevista performansseista. Osallistujat tietävät aina osallistuvansa kirjoittajatapaamiseen, tapaamiset ovat ajallisesti rajattuja ja usein myös siirtymät vaiheesta toiseen on merkitty. Yhtäläisyyksiäkin on monia. Suhteessa tekstikeskeisiin kirjoittajaryhmiin ryhmämme sijoittuu reuna-alueelle, taiteellista ilmaisua, terapeuttista leikkiä ja yhdessä kirjoittamisen muotoja yhdistelevine harjoitteineen. Ryhmän toiminta on osittain strukturoitua: lämmittelyn, työskentelyn ja purkamisen kaava toistuu tapaamisesta toiseen, mutta vaiheiden sisältö vaihtelee. Performatiivisuus tulee näkyvimmin ilmi tavoissa, joilla kirjoittajat vastaavat antamiini ehdotuksiin. Olemme kaikki sekä osallistujia että toistemme kirjoittamisperformanssin katsojia. Esimerkiksi tekstien ääneenlukemisesta on muodostumassa tapaamisten sisälle pienimuotoisia performansseja. Kirjoittajat asettuvat toistensa yleisöksi ja arvostuksen osoitukset, kuten aplodit ja innostuneet äännähdykset ovat korvanneet kriittiset huomiot.

Kirjoittamisen fyysisyys on korosteisesti läsnä. Emme vain istu ja kirjoita vaan vaihdamme paikkaa ja asentoa, vaihdamme paperia johon kirjoitamme tai piirrämme toisen aloittamaa tekstiä tai kuvaa. Liioittelemalla kirjoittamiseen liittyvää liikettä tai lisäämällä kirjoittamiseen uusia, siihen tavallisesti kuulumattomia liikkeitä (esimerkiksi harjoituksessa, jossa olen pyytänyt osallistujia kirjoittamaan itselleen vieraassa asennossa), yritän kiinnittää huomiota kaiken kirjoittamisen ruumiillisuuteen. Kirjoittamisen liike ei ole pelkkää käden, ranteen ja sormien tai käden ja huulten liikettä (silloin kun kirjoittaja esimerkiksi puoliääneen

lukee sitä mitä samaan aikaan kirjoittaa). Kirjoittaminen tuntuu ruumiissa ja liikuttaa sitä: voimakas samastuminen henkilöhahmon tunteisiin tai tekstin rytmiin aiheuttaa fyysisiä reaktioita, itkua, huimausta, halua tanssia, kuvailemansa miljöön reunoja voi kokeilla, testata henkilön liikeratoja kuvitteellisessa tilassa. Ruumista manipuloimalla voi myös lietsoa tunnetiloja. Esimerkiksi hengityksen rytmin muuttaminen vaikuttaa kokemukseni mukaan aina kirjoittamani tekstin rytmiin, tunnelmaan, usein aihepiiriinkin.

Osallistumisen ja vuorovaikutuksen vaihtelut sanelevat relationaalisen performanssin muotoa (O'Grady 2013b, 135). Näin tapahtuu myös kirjoittajaryhmässä. Tapaamisen muoto määrittyy tavoissa, joilla kirjoittajat päättävät tilanteeseen osallistua. Toisinaan tapaamiset ovat luonteeltaan sulkeutuneempia ja keskittyvät kunkin kirjoittajan omaan sisäiseen maailmaan, toisinaan taas pyrkimyksenä (tai tuloksena) on kirjoittajien avoimen kollektiivisen työn aikaansaama yhteinen kupla.

LOPUKSI

Edellä kirjoittamani perusteella esitän, että subjunktiivinen tila kirjoittajaryhmässä avaa rajoja kirjoittajien välillä (samoista aiheista kirjoittaminen ja kirjoittamisen prosessista avoimesti keskusteleminen) sekä kirjoittajien ja tilan välillä (maisemien, tilan "tunnelman" ja siihen kuuluvien elementtien vuotaminen teksteihin). Tilan subjunktiivisuus näyttäytyy sekä kirjoittajien vuorovaikutteisesti rakentaman vapaan harjoittelun ja improvisaation tilana, joka mahdollistaa kokeilut erilaisilla tekstilajeilla ja kirjoittami-

sen teoilla että konkreettisena tilana, joka on varattu, ra-
kennettu, haltuun otettu ikään kuin se olisi varta vasten
kirjoittamiselle tehty. Kirjoittamisen habitaatin subjunk-
tiivisuus rakentuu siis hetkissä, joita siellä työskentelevät
kirjoittajat saavat yhdessä aikaan. Kirjoittamisen fyysinen
habitaatti voi olla selkeästi muusta maailmasta erotettu,
kuten kellari tai harjoitusteatteri, tai se voidaan tehdä kir-
joittamisen tilaksi asettumalla sinne yhdessä kirjoittamaan,
kuten puistotapaamisessa. Ryhmän yhdessä tekemät teot
saavat siellä aikaan ilmapiirin tai mentaalisen tilan, jossa
kirjoittajien on mahdollista sekä kirjoittaa vapaasti että kes-
kustella omasta kirjoittamisestaan. Avoimuus tai sallivuus
eivät tietenkään ole tapaamisia objektiivisesti määrittäviä
asioita, vaan hetkiä – sama kirjoittaja voi hyvin kokea yh-
den tapaamisen aikana sekä avoimia ja vapauttavia että
pysähtyneitä tai rajoittavia kirjoittamisen hetkiä. Kritiikin
jättäminen ryhmän ulkopuolelle, pidättäytyminen arvioin-
nista, sallii monenlaiset variaatiot käsiteltävistä asioista.
Kirjoittajat ovat yhdessä päättäneet sallia nämä variaatiot,
eikä sallivuuden raja ole vielä tullut vastaan. Subjunktii-
visia hetkiä luovat esimerkiksi seuraavat kysymykset: Entä
jos kirjoittaja ei pysy paikallaan? Entä jos kirjoittaminen ei
olekaan vain kirjoittamista vaan myös esimerkiksi tanssia
tai piirtämistä? Entä jos kirjoittaminen ei olekaan vain yh-
den ihmisen työtä?

Kirjoittajaryhmän tapaamisiin tuodaan käsiteltäviksi
muun muassa käsityksiä (omasta) kirjoittajuudesta ja sen
suhteesta muuhun elämään, tekstin laadusta ja ulottuvuuk-
sista (millainen teksti on hyvää tai tarpeellista) ja ryhmäs-
sä toimimisesta. Kirjoittaminen on ryhmässä voimakkaan
toiminnallista, jopa performatiivista: siihen sisältyy paljon

muutakin kuin istumista ja käden liikettä.

Tässä artikkelissa esittämässäni luennassa relationaalinen performanssi laajentaa ja väljentää kirjoittavan subjektin rajoja, esittää ne mukautuvina, mutta ei perusteellisesti kajoa niihin. Kirjoittava subjekti kytkeytyy toisiin kirjoittaviin subjekteihin ja tilaan, jossa kirjoittaminen tapahtuu, mutta se, mikä kytkeytyy, on kuitenkin edelleen jossain määrin yksilöllinen, yksikkömuotoinen. Inhimillisen, intentionaalisen yksilösubjektin radikaali purkaminen ja subjektiuden uudelleen määritteleminen, jotka luonnehtivat esimerkiksi posthumanistista tutkimusta (Lummaa & Rojola 2014) ja affektien tutkimuksen anti-individualistisia suuntauksia (Brennan 2004, ks. Koivunen 2009), tarjoavatkin kirjoittamisen tutkimukselle haastavia suuntia, asettaen luovan kirjoittamisen hellimät omaperäisyyden ja omaäänisyyden ihanteet merkilliseen ja kiehtovaan valoon. Haluan silti tutkimuksessani huomioida ja ottaa vakavasti myös narratiiviset säikeet, joilla kokoamme, ylläpidämme, puramme ja (uudelleen)kirjoitamme itseämme.

Emilia Karjula turkulainen kirjoittamisen ohjaaja ja tutkija, joka on siirtynyt etnografisesta tutkimuksesta luovuuden- ja kirjoittamisen tutkimuksen alueelle. Hän valmistelee väitöskirjaa työnimellä Kirjoittaminen rituaalisena leikkinä.

Emilia Karjula on toimittanut teoksen Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito *(Atena 2014).*

VIITTEET

1 Haastattelut tullaan arkistoimaan Turun yliopiston Historian, kulttuurin ja taiteiden tutkimuksen arkistoon. Tässä artikkelissa siteeraamani haastattelut ovat touko- kesä- ja marraskuussa 2013 tehtyjä ryhmähaastatteluja. Käytän tutkittavistani peitenimiä.

2 Performatiivinen tutkimus osallistuu tutkimansa ilmiön tuottamiseen. Se etsii joustavaa ja prosessinomaista tietoa ja ymmärrystä, joka syntyy maailmassa, ei niinkään kohdistu siihen (ks. esim. Haseman 2006; Oikarinen-Jabai 2008, O'Grady 2013a). Tässä artikkelissa käsitän performatiivisuuden laajasti esityksellisyydeksi, enkä pureudu performatiivin ja performanssin käsitteiden sinänsä oleellisiin eroihin. Käsitteiden eroista ks. esim. Liljeström 2002.

3 Fiktiivisen tekstin subjunktiivisuutta on määritelty myös kirjallisuuden genreistä käsin, esimerkiksi fantasian ja scifin todellisuuskäsityksiä purkaen (Russ 1973/1995).

4 Näkökulma rinnastuu aiemmin mainitsemaani performatiiviseen tutkimukseen, jota käytetäänkin joskus taiteellisen tutkimuksen synonyyminä. Taiteellisesta tai käytäntölähtöisestä tutkimuksesta luovassa kirjoittamisessa ks. esim. Perry 2007; Webb & Brien 2010; Karjula 2014.

5 Kuvataiteen piirissä on puhuttu "etnografisesta käänteestä", joka voi viitata esimerkiksi nykytaiteen paikkasidonnaisiin mieltymyksiin, museo- ja galleriainstituutioiden kritiikkiin tai etnografisten menetelmien lainaamiseen osaksi taiteellista (tutkimus)prosessia (Hannula 2003). Myös etnografisen ja kaunokirjallisen ilmaisun rajoista on keskusteltu pitkään (Clifford & Marcus 1986), ja esimerkiksi autoetnografista tutkimusotetta on sovellettu taiteelliseen tutkimukseen (Kinnunen 2008). Etnografian esityksellisyyttä taas on tulkittu teatterin ja draaman käsitteistöstä käsin (esim. Castaneda 2006).

6 Alice O'Gradyn (2013a, 23) mukaan tutkijan omakohtainen luova osallistuminen tuottaa tietoa esimerkiksi intuition, vaiston, non-verbaalisen viestinnän, ryhmädynamiikan ja tilan kokemisen merkityksistä. Läheisyyden ideaalia etnografiassa on myös kyseenalaistettu ja kritisoitu siitä, että se pikemminkin peittelee tutkimuksen valtasuhteita kuin purkaa niitä (ks. esim. Stacey 1988).

7 Harper (2013b) ehdottaa luovan kirjoittamisen tutkimukselle

neljää fokusta: luovan kirjoittamisen habitaatit (creative writing habitats); luovat alueet (creative domains), jotka viittaavat kirjoittamista laajempaan luovuuden ulottuvuuteen; kirjoittamiseen liittyvät materiaaliset ja mentaaliset teot (activities), ja luovan kirjoittamisen artefaktit (artefacts of creative writing), jotka tarkoittavat paitsi kirjoittamisen lopputuloksia myös kaikkia ihmisten valmistamia objekteja, joita luovan kirjoittamisen tekoihin tarvitaan. Kaikki painottavat nähdäkseni kirjoittamisen konkreettista työtä ja pyrkivät käsitteellistämään kirjoittamisen prosessia kirjoittajien käytännöllisiä tarpeita varten.

8 Tarttumisen kaltaisia ilmiöitä on tutkittu monista lähtökohdista. Feministisessä tutkimuksessa esimerkiksi Sara Ahmed (2004; 2008) on kirjoittanut affektien liikkumisesta latautuneiden objektien välityksellä. Teresa Brennan (2004) yhdistää affektien välittymisen analyysissään tunteiden fysiologiset ja sosiaaliset ulottuvuudet. Antropologian klassikko, Mary Douglasin Puhtaus ja vaara (2000) analysoi rajoja ja tarttuvuutta rituaalisissa tilanteissa. Folkloristi Kaarina Koski (2012) on käsitellyt suomalaisen kansanuskon kuolemakäsitysten yhteydessä ns. kalman, epäpersoonallisen kuoleman voiman tarttumista.

9 *Cadavre exquis*, *exquisite corpse* tai *ihana raato* on surrealistinen seuraleikki, jossa tuotetaan yhdessä tekstiä tai kuvia niin, että kukaan ei näe toisten tuotoksia ennen kuin koko teos on valmis.

10 Kerronnan tutkimuksessa kehystys viittaa kertomuksen tapahtumien ja henkilöiden roolien määrittelemiseen. Se ilmaisee myös kertojan suhdetta ja asennoitumista kertomukseen. (Siikala 1984, 89–90; vrt. Turner 1992, 103.)

11 Yliluonnollisen käsitteestä ja sen käyttöön liittyvistä ongelmista ks. myös Enges 2012, 63–64.

LÄHTEET

Ahmed, Sara 2004. The Cultural Politics of Emotion. Edinburgh University Press.

Ahmed, Sara 2008. Multiculturalism and the Promise of Happiness. – New Formations 63, 121–137, http://www.mcgill.ca/igsf/files/igsf/Ahmed1_multiculturalism.pdf (20.1.2015.)

Brennan, Teresa 2004. The Transmission of Affect. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.

Breton, André 1996. Surrealismin manifesti. Suomentanut Väinö Kirstinä. Helsinki: Kustannusosakeyhtiö Taide 1996.

–1978. The Automatic Message. In Franklin Rosemont (ed.) What is Surrealism? New York: Pathfinder.

Castañeda, Quetzil E. 2006. The Invisible Theatre of Ethnography: Performative Principles of Fieldwork. Anthropological Quarterly, Winter 2006 Vol 79, Issue 1, 75–104.

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

Desjarlais, Robert 2014. Strangeness at the Mouth of Death. Luento Limits of and Beyond Experience -seminaarissa Turun yliopistossa 10.4.2014.

Donnelly, Dianne 2010. Introduction: If It Ain't Broke, Don't Fix it; Or Change is Inevitable, Excpet from a Vending Machine. In Donnelly, Dianne (ed.) Does the Writing Workshop Still Work?, Bristol, Tonawanda, North York: Multilingual Matters, 1-29.

Douglas, Mary 2000. Puhtaus ja vaara. Ritualistisen rajanvedon analyysi. Tampere: Vastapaino.

Enges, Pasi 2013. "Minä melkein uskon".Yliluonnollinen ja sen kohtaaminen tenonsaamelaisessa uskomusperinteessä. Turku: Turun yliopiston julkaisuja http://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/76830/Enges.pdf (20.1.2015.)

Fingerroos, Outi 2003. Refleksiivinen paikantaminen kulttuurien tutkimuksessa. Elore 2/2003 http://www.elore.fi/arkisto/2_03/fin203c.html (20.1.2015)

Goldberg, Natalie 2011. Avoin mieli. Kuinka elää kirjoittajan elämää. Helsinki: Kansanvalistusseura.

Goodman Felicitas D. 1988. Ecstasy, Ritual and Alternate Reality: Religion in a Pluralistic World. Bloomington & Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Hannula, Mika 2003. Kaikki tai ei mitään. Kriittinen teoria, nykytaide ja visuaalinen kulttuuri. Helsinki: Kuvataideakatemia.

Harper, Graeme 2013a. Creative Writing Habitats. In Diane Donnelly & Graeme Harper (eds.) Key Issues in Creative Writing. Bristol, Tonawanda, North York: Multilingual Matters, 48–60.

–2013b. The Generations of Creative Writing Research. In Jeri Kroll & Graeme Harper (eds.) Research Methods in Creative Writing. Houndmills Basingstoke & New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 133–154.

–2010. Foreword: On Experience. In Donnelly, Dianne (ed.) New Writing Viewpoints: Does the Writing Workshop Still Work?, xv–xx.

Haseman, Brad 2006. A Manifesto for Performative Research. Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy, theme issue "Practice-led Research"(no. 118), 98-106. http://eprints.qut.edu.au/3999/1/3999_1.pdf (20.1.2015.)

Haveri, Minna 2012. Kosketuksia ja kohdistuksia - taiteessa ja sen rajoilla. Teoksessa Minna Haveri ja Jouni Kiiskinen (toim.) Ihan taiteessa. Puheenvuoroja taiteen ja tutkimuksen suhteista. Aalto-yliopiston julkaisusarja, Taide + Muotoilu + Arkkitehtuuri 5/2012, Aalto-yliopiston taiteiden ja suunnittelun korkeakoulu | Taiteen laitos. Aalto ARTS Books | https://aaltodoc.aalto.fi/bitstream/handle/123456789/11825/isbn9789526047324.pdf (20.1.2015.)

Hirsjärvi, Irma 2008. Fandom ja maailmankuva. Suomalaisten science fiction-fanien suhteita uskonnollisuuteen. Teoksessa Kaarina Nikunen (toim.) Fanikirja. Tutkimuksia nykykulttuurin fani-ilmiöistä. Nykykulttuurin tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 142–157.

Hytönen, Elina 2006. Muuttuneen tajunnantilan pohdintaa: transsi ja jazzmuusikkojen huippukokemukset. Elore vol. 13–2/2006, http://www.elore.fi/arkisto/2_06/hyt2_06.pdf (20.1.2015.)

Hänninen, Kirsi 2009. The Construction of Self in Finnish First-Person Supernatural Encounter Narratives. Dissertation. Ohio State University, https://etd.ohiolink.edu/!etd.send_file?accession=osu1261592657&disposition=inline (20.1.2015)

Kaivola-Bregenhøj, Annikki 1988. Kertomus ja kerronta. Helsinki: SKS.

Karjula, Emilia 2014. Muusa kirjoittajan tukena – erään taiteellisen tutkimusmatkan alku. Teoksessa Emilia Karjula (toim.) Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito. Jyväskylä: Atena, 153–173.

Kerr, Calum 2014. Compeletely Here. Esitelmä Great Writing -konferenssissa 29.6.14.

Kinnunen, Helka-Maria 2008. Tarinat teatterin taiteellisessa prosessissa. Helsinki: Teatterikorkeakoulu.

Koivunen, Anu 2009: An affective turn? Reimagining the subject of feminist theory. Teoksessa Marianne

Liljeström & Susanna Paasonen (eds.) Working wih Affect in Feminist Readings. London & New York: Routledge, 8–28.

Koski, Kaarina 2011. Kuoleman voimat. Kirkonväki suomalaisessa uskomusperinteessä. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Kuzmičová, Anežka 2014. Does it matter where you read? Reading, Mind and Body- luentosarjassa Turun yliopistossa 8.5.2014.

Laukkanen, Anu 2012. Liikuttavat erot. Etnografisia kohtaamisia itämaisessa tanssissa. Turku: Turun yliopisto. http://www.doria.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/86566/AnnalesC355Laukkanen2012.pdf (20.1.2015.)

Liljeström, Marianne 2002. Omaelämäkerta performatiivina. – Naistutkimus 1/2002, 68–71.

Luce-Kapler, Rebecca 2004. Writing with, through, and beyond the text: an ecology of language. New York & London: Routledge.

Lummaa, Karoliina & Rojola, Lea (toim.) 2014. Posthumanismi. Turku: Eetos.

O'Grady, Alice 2012. Spaces of play: the spatial dimensions of underground club culture and locating the subjunctive. Dancecult: Journal of Electronic Dance Music Culture. The Exodus of

Psytrance. 4.1: 86–106.

−2013a. Interrupting Flow: Researching Play, Performance and Immersion in Festival Scenes. Dancecult: Journal of Electronic Dance Music Culture 5(1): 18–38.

−2013b. Exploring radical openness: A porous model for relational festival performance. Studies in Theatre & Performance, Volume 33 Number 2, 133–151.

Oikarinen-Jabai Helena 2008. Syrjän tiloja ja soraääniä. Performatiivista kirjoittamista Suomen ja Gambian välimaastoissa. Helsinki: Taideteollinen korkeakoulu.

Piatti, Barbara, Anne-Kathrin Reuschel, and Lorenz Hurni 2009. Literary Geography–or how cartographers open up a new dimension for literary studies. 24th International Cartography Conference, Chile.

Roe, Sue 2010. Introducing masterclasses. In Diane Donnelly (ed.) Does the Writing Workshop Still Work? Bristol, Tonawanda, North York: Multilingual Matters.

Russ, Joanna 1995. Speculations: The Subjunctivity of Science Fiction. In To Write Like a Woman: Essays in Feminism and Science Fiction. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

Schechner, Richard 1982. Collective Reflexivity: restorations of behavior. In Jay Ruby (ed.) A Crack in the Mirror: Reflexive Perspectives in Anthropology. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 39–81.

− 1985. Between Theater and Anthropology. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

− 1993. The future of ritual: Writings on culture and performance. London & New York: Routledge.

Siukonen, Jyrki 2011. Vasara ja hiljaisuus. Lyhyt johdatus työkalujen filosofiaan. Helsinki: Kuvataideakatemia.

Stacey, Judith 1988. Can there be a feminist ethnography? Women's Studies International Forum Vol II. No 1, 21–27.

Taira, Teemu 2008. Uskonto ja fanius. Teoksessa Kaarina Nikunen (toim.) Fanikirja. Tutkimuksia nykykulttuurin fani-ilmiöistä. Jyväskylä. Nykykulttuurin tutkimuskeskuksen julkaisuja,121–141.

Tuomaala, Salome 2011. Keskeytyksiä elämässä. Naisten toimijuu-det aborttikertomuksissa. Helsingin yliopisto: uskontotiede. https://helda.helsinki.fi/bitstream/handle/10138/25856/keskeyty.pdf (20.1.2015.)

Turner, Victor (ed.) 1982. Celebration: Studies in Festivity and Ritu-al. Washington D.C: Smithsonian Institution Press.

−1992. The Anthropology of Performance. New York: PAJ Publica-tions.

Vanderslice, Stephanie 2010. Once More to the Workshop: A Myth Caught in Time. In Donnelly, Dianne (ed.) Does the Writing Work-shop Still Work? Bristol, Tonawanda, North York: Multilingual Matters 30–35.

Tuomo Lahdelma and Jarmo Valkola

Guilty pleasures

MORAL ORDER, MEANING, AND CINEMATIC FORM IN ALFRED HITCHCOCK'S FILMS

One might say that a particular kind of interaction links sur-face structure to deep structure, where 'realism' (verisimilitude) competes with 'fantasy' (a complex of desire and prohibition) and 'intelligibility' with 'real contradiction'[1].

A retrospective view and perspective of Alfred Hitchcock's (1899–1980) films is at once extensive in its volume and methodically delimited in its range of philosophical specu-lation and inquiry. The dimensions of his morality, mea-ning, and codes of form are in some sense simple and in another sense complicated. The thematic and narrative qualities of Hitchcock's work rely on the audiovisual de-sign of the materials at hand. It points out the stretches of visual and aural materialism, which requires not just the command and readiness of an artist to see the elements of an individual shot, but also a larger, more developed *auteurial* vision needed to elaborate the interactions amidst all the other ingredients contributing to the language of cinema. It is clear that Hitchcock is one of the greatest in-ventors of the film form in the entire history of cinema.

Hitchcock was a true artist who directed in German, English and American studios. His art contains a reflection of the soul of the modern artist in a kind of a double pastiche. Although he worked inside the studio system, he retained a special control over his work. Although he created entertaining stories, he was still understood as an innovator of cinematic presentation and of technical mastery.

Myths of duality have haunted the imagination of all cultures and are consequently a significant aspect of their art. Reflections, doubles, lookalikes and twins, echoing the mimetic aspects of art as a mirror held up to nature, evoke a disquieting sense of the uncanny.[2] Doubles may suggest an inexplicable condition of symmetry and stasis, existing in the midst of a visual field that is simultaneously perceived as being chaotically asymmetrical and in a constant flux. Hitchcock uses parallelism and continuity to serve as bridges between the related levels of meaning in the fictional narrative and the formal structures by which these meanings are emphasized at the level of film design. Parallels, doubles and details in a Hitchcock film contribute to an intensification and stylization of the formal design that calls attention to the issues of art, aesthetics and psychological reality: associated by means of a character's ability to distinguish between direct, objective perceptions of reality and the need to modify or recast these perceptions by way of psychological subjectivity in a manner that echoes the similarly double articulation between reality and the mediating activities of the artist.

One of Hitchcock's strengths was his ability to frame and edit shots in such a way as to allow spectators to grasp character's thoughts.[3]

The word 'suspense', an epithet that is perhaps most commonly applied to Hitchcock's films, is inevitably a result of interaction between characters and situations through which Hitchcock presents the viewer a world that is tenuously poised between the double possibilities of evanescent order and, more often than not, the eruption of chaos. Hitchcock uses the seemingly direct system of representation of the film medium – as opposed to the more overtly mediating process of authorship in other, earlier narrative forms such as literature – to link these double possibilities for defining the nature of reality to the moral and aesthetic dilemmas that must be acknowledged and reconciled by the characters experiencing and acting upon them.

Consequently, the response and action of such characters may be spoken of in moral terms, insofar as Hitchcock effectively makes these choices appear from the action and consciousness of the characters in relation to their visible situations, located somewhere beyond the material boundaries of the frame, direction, and the hermetic space that defines the world of the narrative. Hitchcock was eager to develop new technical solutions as a way to surprise the audience.

> *The secret of Hitchcock's versatility is his constant references to what he calls 'pure cinema' – sharp angling, bold close-ups, taut cutting, the narrative crispness and emphasis on personal involvement characteristic of Hollywood classicism.*[4]

The evolution of the Hitchcock oeuvre takes authorship as one of its central subjects. This process defines the reflexi-

ve level of each film. The parallel, simultaneous processes through which the characters affect or create their destinies, which also account for the formation of the narrative, merge the moral with the aesthetic. More specifically, in aesthetic inquiry, statements on art are examined as to their logical and rational truth and their persuasive power.[5] In *Vertigo* (1958), Judy (Kim Novak) composes a letter to Scottie (James Stewart) and the spectator feels that she is deeply in love with him, while he is still in love with Madeleine (Novak). Hitchcock's images recall an earlier sequence showing Madeleine come to Scottie at dawn to recount her dream. The scenes resemble each other and invest the narrative with a double meaning. Even if all the connections are not immediately apparent, the spectator will nonetheless remain patient in waiting the narrative closure. Hitchcock's deepening concern with the moral implications of narrative art produce, from the very beginning and throughout his career, a kind of progressive intensification of moral and aesthetic balance, in which Hitchcock locates his own sense of the artist's or storyteller's most significant function. An artist must be capable of calling attention to the very means by which art often interposes a more satisfactory vision for the disquieting reality, the reflection of which it pretends to be. Hitchcock's use of morality, symmetry and doubles as both a subject of the films and the source of their formal organization and strategies allows one to trace the means and the sense of particularity, that is often an unavoidable self-declaration of the fictional narrative, by using the stylization of form as a means of enlarging the implications of fictional subjects to universality. The formal structure of his cinematic orchestrations

of incident, character and situation is the genesis of the formal complexity with which the issue of universal truth is treated. "Hitchcock's films can't be justified by reference to any one layer; their artistic impact is in the intermeshing of layers."[6]

The formal and thematic parallelism of Hitchcock's films may begin to come to terms with the symmetry that Hitchcock progressively assumes between the ethics of creation, incorporating a reflexive level of discourse, in which the responsibility for the outcome of the narrative appears to be directly related to visible action within its boundaries, and the larger issues of guilt, destiny, consciousness and personal authority over the events of one's life, for which the recurrent subjects of narrative art and its authorship serve as an epitome and paradigm. Films like *The Lodger* (1927), *Blackmail* (1929), and *Murder* (1930) are models by which one comes to understand the elaborate formal and thematic parallelism of the later American films. Containing the seeds of Hitchcock's ongoing pre-reflexive occupations, these films may be described as a trilogy related through parallelisms of formal composition. All three contain characters facing moral and aesthetic dilemmas, in which the ultimate reconciliation of the psychological divisions of personality is an act occurring simultaneously throughout a multiplicity of related divisions in the details of the narrative as well as in the formal symmetries of the overall creative filmic design. The formal and fictional narratives may be described as standing in reflexive opposition to one another. Now and then it may be difficult to accept a narrative take a certain attitude towards its events. There are, of course, differences between a fictional character

doing something and the viewer assuming an attitude toward the character because of what they have done.[7] Characters are polarized by contesting urges and pressures to confront reality directly or to re-form its most disturbing features by imposing the superficial, illusory symmetries of art upon them are identified from these films onward as surrogate artists: narrators, actors, and authors within a subjective reality.

Moral choices and the dilemmas around them are reflected in many of Hitchcock's films.[8] *Shadow of a Doubt* (1943) and *Strangers on a Train* (1951) treat and intensify the question of doubles as explicit concerns of narrative fiction. Admittedly, *Notorious* (1946) reflects the parallels and symmetries of the recurrent issue of how one may present and take responsibility of a public identity, whether in life or in dramatic situations. We may also consider it to reflect the contrivance and authorship, echoing the activities and conventions of theatrical roles and performances, an issue that is first introduced in the treatment of the central figure in *The Lodger*.

Defined this way, Hitchcock was an artist who could cut the conventions of narrative film like, for example, in *Psycho* (1960) by letting the sympathetic protagonist of the first part (Marion Crane, played by Janet Leigh) die early on in the narrative. Whether in the social or personal realm, Hitchcock emphasizes the objective basis of the cinematic medium for rendering the essentially non-visual, psychological or emotional states of his characters. From this decision emerges the structural irony of the classic Hitchcock situation: the intensity of frustration, guilt and terror, which a character experiences through a dilemma

pertaining to moral or spiritual isolation, is shown to be a complex set of material conditions. Metaphysical guilt, the transference of it through moving from the immanent to the transcendental, and a sort of substitute-suffering is described in *The Wrong Man* (1956). This is already characterized in the name of the film and becomes a major theme also in many other Hitchcock films. Let us make another point. The progression from psychological chaos through the events that lead to reconciliation and wholeness is presented as a picaresque journey through bizarre social and moral situations in which material objects and conditions are presented as the visual equivalents of psychological states. It is relevant that the elaborate composition of this metaphysical set-up varies from film to film in its specific locales and details, but remains constant in its repetition of prototypical structures and situations. This may help us to think that the theme of voyeurism goes through the visual structures of *Psycho*, and starts with the first movement of the camera in the beginning of the film. Psycho is untypical to the genre, since it represents larger symbolic meanings which deal with the 'real' nature of the psyche and the relationship between a film and its spectator.

DRAMATIC POWER

Doubling evokes the loss of selfhood more than the shadow of evil, which torments its literal and romantic predecessors.[9]

The strategy of contrast is applied in Hitchcock's narratives in which the central dramatic conflicts go together with

the struggle between personal, ethical and social values. Hitchcock's personal strategy includes a rare sense of understanding of how far dramatic conflicts can be complicated, and in which ways, in order to enhance the polarity of hope and fear, which itself remains emphatic and simple enough to galvanise everybody.[10] The creation and use of formal structures to signify co-existent philosophical and ideological positions is an important characteristic of Hitchcock's work. The cineaste was able to produce a collection of films which were sufficiently extensive and coherent to allow for an evolutionary analysis of the progressive synthesis of narrative and aesthetic content. Hitchcock's films indicate and refer to a stylistic and thematic unity which lends itself to analysis and interpretation as an evolving entity, and although the originators of the *politique des auteurs* distinguish between the English and American periods of his work, looking more favourably upon the earlier period because of Hitchcock's greater control over the studio situation, it is clear that each of the films, including those of the American period, continue to use characteristic forms to treat themes and situations introduced already in the British films. In fact, a survey of the films shows that the elaboration of formal devices used to signify particular narrative and ideological features becomes more self-confident as the work progresses, accompanying a deepening of moral and psychological insight in the world of Hitchcock. The viewer's feelings of emotion and empathy create spaces of mind related to these aspirations.

Generally speaking, there are lots of doubles in Hitchcock's world, such as contradictions between collective and private ideas, legal and illegal issues, order and chaos,

past and future, innocence and guilt, rationality and irratio-
nality. The structures of dreams and the unconscious come
into play, connected with the structures of external space.
These elements interact in many possible ways during the
horizons of the narrative. It is apparent that the idea of
repetition is itself central to the structure of Hitchcock's
films. Begun in a period of literary experimentation, which
is dominated by a concern for rendering psychological
states in prose by means of the stream of consciousness
and the interior monologue, Hitchcock uses the elabo-
rate composition of images and multiple points of view,
made possible through editing and montage, to suggest
the process of experience and observation through which
this consciousness is formed. Human nature and human
condition can be treated in an illuminating way, concer-
ning our experiences and contributions to understanding.[11]
Many of Hitchcock's important concerns are formed out
and developed against this perspective. The central charac-
ter in a Hitchcock film experiences, in a particularly sub-
jective way, the physical world around her/him. Objects
of particular significance recur again and again; situations
are repeated, permuted or symmetrically counterpointed.
Understated in this sense, Hitchcock seems to think that
there is something drawing the characters of his universe
together, and if both were shown in the same shot, their
movement toward one another could be arbitrary and
unstructured.[12] Through the use of repetitions, Hitchcock
creates a cinematic equivalent for the interior monologue,
having discovered, after incorporating this technique in his
films, that a cinematic interiority was possible through the
filmic form.

In many films, Hitchcock's use of the interior monologue creates the true dramatic power of the narration, which occurs usually through complex visual counterpoints. The suggestive images of Marion in *Psycho* reflect the double emphasis of personality in the mirror reflections. Hitchcock offers constant and unresolved conflicts in his films. Related to this is the idea that the very limitations of the interior monologue as a literary device indicate the superiority of cinematic compositions as they are used to counterpoint complex physical details and to underscore psychological significance. As a consequence, Hitchcock's return to the interior monologue at the end of *Psycho* continues to take an ironic view of this literary contrivance by placing Norman Bates' interior monologue to follow the glib analysis of a police psychiatrist. Already at an early stage of his artistic development, Hitchcock acknowledged that it was essential to find more formally appropriate means to indicate the unresolved conditions of the psyche that were to be integral to his narratives. It is clear that Hitchcock's minute concern for social and physical detail clearly owed a large debt to literary and other traditions, and may have been more immediately influenced by social documentaries.

Along these lines of thought, we can assert that German Expressionism was one of the early influences behind Hitchcock. Other key elements and issues include French Surrealism, Scandinavian nature films (Sjöström, Stiller), explorations of the darker side of the psyche (Dreyer), and Soviet constructivism (Eisenstein, Pudovkin, Vertov) with a special emphasis on montage. An admirer of F. W. Murnau's work, Hitchcock incorporated German expressionist and stylistic elements in his own films. German style of

filmmaking seemed melodramatic, and its use of obsession with psychotic and criminal behavior had produced a formal vocabulary and use of the camera, which were congenial to the sort of films Hitchcock had in mind. While the treatment of criminal activity in the British tradition tended to originate in the scientific observation of social conditions, the portrayal of criminals in German films developed from a long Gothic tradition that presented deviant behavior as originating from a compulsive urge, related to the creative urge, deeply rooted in the human psyche. Hitchcock's camera reiterates this compulsive spontaneity.

> *Hitchcock's sense of an implacable, severe, but somehow just moral order may well have come to him via the influence, on the British middle and lower-middle classes of Puritanism, which is the English expression of Calvinism.*[13]

From the perspective of historical understanding, for Hitchcock, the dualities of individual personality were a direct reflection of a world view in which the polarities of order and chaos are in constant opposition. Communication across cultural boundaries is possible. Consequently, these primary polarities provide the sub-structures or axes, or bridges, which account for analogical or double structures throughout the films. One might point out that formal axes establish symmetrical systems, which suggest, amidst the apparent confusion of an unsolved crime or an unidentified adversary, the possibility for synthesis and the restoration of a moral and ethical order.

Following this line of thought, *The Lodger* has a special place among Hitchcock's films, since it marks his first ex-

tended treatment of the existential issue of psychological identity as it is reflected in visible action, public figures, masks, disguises, and impersonation. It is evident that The Lodger deals with these issues in a narrative where the protagonist's appearance coincides with a series of murders of young blonde women. Vulnerable and chased, he is nearly killed in the hands of an angry mob because of his unwillingness, or inability, to declare his true identity. The mob scene contains a lot of Christian references. It is also a painterly reflection of Hitchcock's awareness of Christian imagery in painting. It appears that the sequence is like an act that has the power to dispel the illusions that proliferate the protagonist's silence and the threat that such ambiguity poses to the society at large. Similar aspects can be found later in *Marnie* (1964) in which the protagonist is a woman compelled to a life of crime because of her childhood experiences. She is driven to anxiety and suffering through her moral and guilt complexes and ultimately forced make the final and decisive decision concerning her own existence.[14]

In cinematic narration, the matter of this kind of division of personality can be observed in *The 39 Steps* (1935), in which Richard Hannay's (Robert Donat) entire journey between London and Scotland is an experience of chaos and disorder, reflected to us as an intensely subjective process, which dictates the actual narrative form. We can say that Hitchcock is equally capable of presenting both high and low culture as a mask for and an agent of crime. For example, in *The Man Who Knew Too Much* (1934 and 1955), a musical notation is called into question when used as a device for precipitating social disorder. It should be emphasized that both versions of *The Man Who Knew*

Too Much deal with the parallel ideas of personal and so-cial morality. In both versions a couple traveling abroad learns, by witnessing a murder which provides them with first material evidence, that there is a larger political plot for which their vision has made them in some way responsible. When their child is kidnapped, this ambiguity is clarified. As their roles as parents expand to those of detectives, they discover that the theatrical artifice of criminals is best countered by the parallel uses of theatre and disguise, equally necessary and capable of being utilized in performing moral acts. Later on, taking responsibility for recovering their child reiterates the simultaneous and larger process of assuming moral and ethical stance and perspective positions related to the society around them. All these larger variations are more or less noticeable and present in the narrative output of the film.

Returning to the Roman Catholic origins of Hitchcock's Jesuit education, Claude Chabrol provides a theological reading of the films in an attempt to explain the specific, recurrent structures of formal and narrative organization. Chabrol's observations about the formal use of the camera, varying its modes in relation to this objective–subjective division of the film (an objective use of the camera presents the character versus the dilemma; the subjective use presents the director versus the characters) is useful.[15] This would imply that these symmetries refer to the Jesuit morals and the dialectical formulation in which ethics becomes the central fulcrum between the two narrative units of a Hitchcock film. In this structure, crime is a test for the character and places him at the fulcrum: a battle that man must sustain between his own potential for good and evil.

This situation is the origin of Hitchcock's obsession with a world that is further divided by illusion and reality: the evil which can never he concretized but exists in a constant suggestion of the infernal among the details of the ordinary. We are surrounded by these views of Hitchcock, and in this deeply Catholic view, man is completely free and a place of battle; God cannot directly intervene in man's struggle for salvation.

André Bazin's remarks represent a somewhat cynical departure from his early auteurist position. Based on his unintentionally hilarious account of a Hitchcock interview, Bazin relates Hitchcock's puzzlement when questioned about the inclusion of theological jokes and references in his work. Largely, one gathers in the tone of the writing, from the frustrations of this interview, Bazin concluded that Hitchcock's inscription of theology is a "smokescreen" for the embarrassment he felt after having become the commercial storyteller Hollywood studios wanted him to be.[16] Bazin believed that his own questions had made Hitchcock aware of the moral themes in his films for the first time. Unable to make Hitchcock acknowledge the patterns and moral symmetries that he and the other auteur critics found in the films, Bazin concedes only the absolute control that Hitchcock exerts over the visual balance of the mise-en-scène, evident to the viewer in every frame.[17]

Of the French critics, it was left for Truffaut to navigate the endless traps and pitfalls of a Hitchcock interview. The extended form of his dialogue with Hitchcock, published as a separate volume, provides a point of departure for much of the analysis of specific films. Truffaut chides Bazin for his gullibility and goes on to bolster the theolo-

gical readings of Hitchcock's auteur partisans.[18] The article also provides the earliest and most convincing discussion of Hitchcock's obsessions and the association of his symmetrical unit with the theme of identity. Truffaut proceeds to test this hypothesis in the American films and concludes that it is through the use of reflective, symmetrical signifiers and the constant inclusion of doubles in joined images that Hitchcock treats the theme of identity in visual terms. Elaborating on this observation, Truffaut suggests that the struggle for domination in a Hitchcock couple is a visible extension of this division of the world. Truffaut affirms the centrality of *Shadow of a Doubt and Strangers on a Train* as evidence of Hitchcock's recurrent formal use of doubles as cosmological analogues.[19]

Some years later, Andrew Sarris places similar emphasis on the parallel but separate worlds of psychological and material reality, when he argues that material objects in Hitchcock's films are emblems of the characters' obsessions. For Sarris, Hitchcock is a rigorous moralist who counterpoints a 'dizzying number of levels' among which suspense and the comedy of manners are but two.[20] Sarris is also among the first American critic to apply an auteurist overview to the evolution of Hitchcock's editing structure as yet another level of narrative reiteration. According to Sarris, cutting is often used to underscore the difference between what people say and what they do, in addition to its other, more traditional functions.[21]

STRUCTURAL COMPLEXITY

> *Cinema suspends in advance the promised mimeticism literalized in the critical tradition's major trends (humanist, identificatory, Oedipalist, historicist, auteurist), as though replacing it with webs of cross-relays and trace chains.*[22]

Another insight may also serve as a justification: Bellour uses the word "rhyme" for the complex formal and thematic homologies which we have thus far been referring to as the symmetries of Hitchcock's narrative construction. His declared purpose is to avoid the linguistic restrictions of semiology in carrying out this sort of structural analysis, all the while sharing the semiological view that the notion of inviolate beauty does not place an aesthetic object beyond one's desire to analyze and know it. Bellour's methodical analysis of a single sequence indicates the level of structural complexity, which will be considered in establishing the evolution and progressively deepening significance of symmetry and pattern as sources of meaning in Hitchcock's films. The meaning emerges in the succession of a story in pictures by the double constraint of repetition and variation, hierarchized according to the logical progression of symmetry and asymmetry. Moreover, Bellour's analysis indicates the possible ramifications of applying this structural approach to the whole film and to all of Hitchcock's films. It stops considerably short, however, of Lévi-Strauss' prescription for establishing the relationships with the formal lexicon, creating a structural analysis, which places the meaning of individual units within an entire body of work.

Illuminatingly, Robin Wood noted that in *The Birds*

(1963), central things are (1) the mother–son relationship, and (2) the use of audience-identification techniques already familiar from *Vertigo*.[23] The birds in the film express the tensions between the characters. They are not there to punish the people or to take revenge, since the explanation for their behavior is unknown. Maybe they are more or less reflecting the anxieties of the main characters. Melanie (Tippi Hedren) was abandoned by her mother at the age of eleven; the birds' aggression derives metaphorically from this anger and frustration. There are straight references to this in how Melanie is positioned in relation to the birds. According to Robert J. Yanal, explanations concerning the presence of the birds fit into three types: 1) Natural explanations, which try to explain what experience has told us about birds, 2) pre-natural explanations, which try to explain why the birds are behaving with malevolent intent, and 3) theological explanations, which consider the birds as instruments of divine justice or as emanations of evil.[24] More than this, Hitchcock is telling us about the inexplicability of the birds: *The Birds* is not about fear of the unknown, but fear of the unknowable.[25] In this film, Hitchcock focuses on the attention and perception of the spectator, controlling their reactions with the rhythms of editing and camera movement. This would imply that the film gets a lot of value from the intensity of its images, and that uncertainty is the keynote of the film. Under this scrutiny, every action becomes ambiguous. *The Birds* finds a balance and precariousness that runs through all of Hitchcock's films.[26]

With respect to this, an exploration of the symmetry between formal structure and narrative meaning is provi-

ded in analyzing, for example, *Rope* (1948). In the film, a teacher called Rupert Cadell (James Stewart) is forced to confront the moral implications of his role in affecting the imaginations of his student audience, when his presence at a dinner party, given by two of his male students, becomes an occasion culminating in a homosexual murder, conceived by the students as an homage to Cadell's teaching of Nietzsche.

It is useful to approach the films in general, as well as provide specific insights into Hitchcock's methods and particularly into the aspects of the ontological connections between the film narrative and its subjects.[27] In considering the continuity of the Hitchcock canon, there is particular critical value in the discussion of the continuity of genres in general, and the persistence in film of the traditional or folk forms of narrative which presents characters as mythical types. These observations on the evolution of a narrative tradition lead to the considerations following Hitchcock's recurrent use of formal symmetry, the mythical type of the scapegoat, the archetypal resonance of narrative situations, and the subtle configuration of various types of characters in Hitchcock's films.

Furthermore, Hitchcock's close affinity with the reiterative patterns of other narratives, which deal with mysteries and their solutions, consider the cultural significance of a central character who pits himself against crime and assumes an explicitly psychological burden in committing himself to an analytical process, the solution of which brings the relief to his own anguish and restores the social order. The detective is an instance of the conventional isolated hero familiar from Romantic literature, so the re-

current identification of this character with the object of his pursuit, the multiplicity of disguises and mystifying situations in which the detective hero finds himself, elevates the question of identity and its many undercurrents to the status of a very real subject of the narrative.

MYSTERIOUS IDENTITIES

The fact that the attitude that we as spectators adopt towards fictional narratives are important to us is manifested most strikingly in the occasions that we resist or refuse to accept, on moral grounds, the attitudes that a narrative invites us to take.[28]

In *The Lodger*, the intrusion of the irrational into the mundane world of daily events is treated as an overture to the complex variations on this theme that are to follow this establishing section. The first of the film's symmetries is that of a murderer and a victim: a situation which establishes a model for other human relationships that occur throughout the narrative. It is not the murder, therefore, that must he solved in order to restore the normal symmetry of erotic possibility, free of criminal taint, but the deeper mystery of where the murderous impulses originate. Following this, we find that until a psychological cataclysm is precipitated, by publicly revealing the criminal potential of the entire society, all attempts to restore balance are deformed and thwarted by the taint of bias and suspicion. In this sense, the formal use of point-of-view shots and moral vision are correlatives.

On the narrative level, it is a process which leads to a

series of events, testing the limits of physical endurance. Parallel to it on the psychological level is the loss of spiritual innocence: a vision beyond illusory materiality to an awareness of what lies behind it. On both levels, Hitchcock fills the landscape with a wealth of physical detail, the false clues which simultaneously deceive the eye and confound the analytical process. Vision and choice become essential. In *The Lodger,* like in many of his later films, Hitchcock emphasizes his concern with two separate forms of vision, sensory and moral, presented as a single interdependent unit. Visual components are born out of this. They are more than stylish and combined with suspense.[29] The darkness in which the expansion of panic occurs at the beginning of the film establishes the connection between emotional disorder and impeded vision. The middle part of the film, bracketed by the murder and the mob scene, is set to symmetrically oppose the earlier public sequences by contrasting the visual field to the scenes which are generally set within the claustrophobic house. In the narrative, the domestic and the global are made to share the formal apposition of microcosm and macrocosm.

The metaphorical dynamics of this situation are characteristic of Hitchcock's repeated use of personal sexual attraction as an extended metaphor for the seductive affinities of good and evil. The daughter is emotionally torn toward the lodger and the detective, but the separate presence of each, formally emphasized through parallel editing, makes erotic completion impossible. The restoration of sexual calm, like the restoration of social order, can only come about when she witnesses the public reconciliation of good and evil brought about by the mob (a formal and physical

convergence of her metaphorical lovers). The real irony is that the two men are nearly doubles in their likeness: both are rather ordinary men driven to the brink of murder by hidden rage. They are suggestive of the more subtle doubles of Guy (Farley Granger) and Bruno (Robert Walker) in *Strangers on a Train*, and the heroine's situation surely prefigures the dilemma of Charlie Newton (Theresa Wright) in *Shadow of a Doubt*, who must choose to rely on what she sees in order to dispel her erotic illusions about Uncle Charlie (Joseph Cotten) and survive. Innocence is clearly established as a form of moral blindness in Hitchcock's world, and disillusionment leads to salvation.

Blackmail is a film that recounts the psychological vicissitudes of Alice White (Anny Ondra) after her having betrayed her boyfriend, murdered the artist who attempted to seduce her in his studio, and allowed Frank Webber (John Longden) to pursue the blackmailer, whose ultimate violent death leaves her own moral dilemma ambiguously unresolved. It marks Hitchcock's serious return to formal innovation, using the camera and the formal construction of the cinematic narrative to create a non-didactic linkage between parallel visual and psychological texts. In the opening sequence, a criminal is caught in his room and taken off in handcuffs and fingerprinted. After that the arresting officers wash their hands. This scene is a pre-figuration of style and content of the elements, which begin to appear in all Hitchcock films from this point onward. The terseness of this sequence reflects, in nuclear form, Hitchcock's consistent inclusion within the larger narrative an introductory or overture section which introduces the motifs of an extended symphonic structure.

Hitchcock observes this with an intimate mixture of affection and sadness.[30] The symmetries of musical structure applied to a particular set of narrative call in Hitchcock's invocation of the Wagnerian technique of an epic plot that is organized through the recurrent use of leitmotifs, and indicates a model of self-referential organization that Hitchcock considers appropriate to the organization of his own narrative material. Music is seeking out the thoughts inside the narrative construction.[31] The merger of elaborate plot and musical elements in the epic scope of Wagner merely points to a narrative tradition in which opera is a relatively late development. Certainly the Hitchcock narrative, in which repetitive detail and analogical situations are symmetrically organized in structure, which ultimately progresses from particularized detail to universal significance, returns to the origins of epic narratives in the earliest folk traditions.

This observation does not imply, however, that the narrative form of the epic, created for the listener, or the Hitchcock narrative, created for the viewer, subordinates formal complexity to the simplicity of storytelling; a trade-off of one for the other would diminish the grandeur of the ultimate effect. The materiality of guilt formally established in the shots of eyes and hands may appeal to the critics of Hitchcock's Jesuit upbringing as emblems of the pervasiveness of temptation and sin, but the evolution of hands and eyes as recurrent motifs in the Hitchcock canon is far more complex. As they are used in many films, hands assume a particular meaning. It is a visual analogue for the fragmented personality whose identity lies solely in reducing the capability, or lack of capability, for physical action. The

fingerprinting scene in *The Wrong Man*, works as an epito-
mizing image for Manny Balestrero's (Henry Fonda) pas-
sive acceptance of fate. Richard Hannay (Robert Donat) is
handcuffed in *The 39 Steps*, a film in which an arch-criminal
is identified by a disfigured hand. A criminal's (Norman
Lloyd) hands cling unsuccessfully to the Statue of Liberty
in *Saboteur* (1942) while Roger O. Thornhill's (Cary Grant)
hands cling successfully to Mount Rushmore in *North by
Northwest* (1959), and hands are clearly used as emblems of
frustration by sexually repressed psychopaths in a number
of the later films. In some cases, the spectator is aware of
the genuinely guilty party, so her attention focuses on the
behaviour of the guilty one. An interesting film in this case
is *I Confess* (1953), which deals with the institution related
to freeing oneself from the guilt, the confession. The nar-
rative concerns the moral conflict and the suspense arising
from it. The guilt in front of God, and in front of society,
will be handled equally. This features a certain double-co-
ding, in which the guilty person attempts to evade the con-
demnation of the people, whereas the priest (Montgomery
Clift), guarding the secrecy of the confessional at the price
of his life, attempts to fulfill God's will and the role he has
in the confession.[32] Hitchcock deploys his usual precision
in establishing intimations of crime and sin through purely
civic and ecclesiastical images.[33]

If, for example, hands are established in many Hit-
chcock's films as a subtext of leitmotifs signifying the sour-
ce of action, their parallel and closely related subtext is
that of eyes, which stand for both actual and moral vision.
Hitchcock creates an ongoing interplay between these two
motifs. The progress of a character toward visual acuity, of-

ten through attention given to the visual aspects of a mystery, allows for the potential reactivation of hands required in the restoration of order. Conversely, the presentation of distorted vision as a motif is accompanied by hands which act as the agents of disorder. Norman Bates in Psycho embodies distorted vision and action, and the complex subtexts of eyeglasses and hands and the predatory emblems of lobsters on Bruno Anthony's tie in *Strangers on a Train* exemplify these interrelated motifs. Methodical development of eyes and hands as a system of non-literal representation in Hitchcock's films provides the sort of formal linkage between parallel worlds of illusory order and actual disorder.

SETS OF CRIME AND GUILT

Hitchcock's general orientation on moral and, in some cases guilt, in his films is characterized by Catholic and other cultural influences. Also, as Durgnat has noted, Hitchcock's morality has the characteristics of Anglo-Saxon lower-class Protestantism in its capacity for rapid oscillation between a post-Wesleyan evangelical optimism, and a grimmer, more punitive view of human depravity.[34]

In many of Hitchcock's films, the guilty party is revealed for the spectator during the narrative. Hitchcock's solution points out how the guilty person faces his/her own guilt. This is a major change introduced by Hitchcock into the thriller canon. It also questions the idea of popular culture connected with these visions. One of Hitchcock's approaches deals with the original sin and its Christian af-

termaths. A person suffers from being guilty as a human, totally independent of how she or he has lived. This affects the characters already when they are relatively young, like Charlie (Teresa Wright) in the *Shadow of a Doubt*. In *Vertigo*, Scottie (James Stewart) is already guilty in the first frames of the narrative and has to punish himself for that. He cannot allow himself to be equally loved by Midge (Barbara Bel Geddes), so he chooses 'longing' and directs it towards Madeleine (Kim Novak) who has no prerequisite to be in this kind of situation. Moreover, there is Scottie's fear of heights, his vertigo, and the guilt embedded in it. He has "caused" two falls during the narrative, the policeman in the beginning and the fall of Madeleine because of his vertigo. In the end, he finds out about the double role of Madeleine, which frees him from one 'crime' and also from the vertigo. Now he is in a situation where he can continue to take care of his own guilt.[35]

While the worlds of crime and psychological aberration are obscured by the confusion of superficial material detail, the abstractions of eyes and hands function as economical emblems of this divided world. The use of this formal shorthand in the narrative organization also motivates a set of formal structures in which the camera plays a large part. Hands are typically shot in isolation or in close-ups, which emphasizes their larger significance. The motif of eyes and vision is similarly formally elaborated in the extensive inclusion of shots of directional glances intercut with point-of-view shots. In *Psycho*, the shower sequence set was built so that the walls could be removed, thus allowing the camera in close enough to film the elaborate montage sequence of 78 shots the director needed to cap-

ture. The sequence suggests not only that one sees a naked woman, but that one also sees the knife entering flesh. Close scrutiny of the sequence proves that this is not the case; one is simply fooled by the rapid cuts. In fact, the scene is bloodless until the end.

Hitchcock's abstractions of eyes and hands are one indication of the emphasis he places on details, which act as material and visible analogues for the holism of the human body and universal order. In light of this formulation, the mutilation or fetishization of the body is invariably associated with the violation of a social or cosmic symmetry. Norman Bates' mummification of his mother, an attempt to fetishize the body of one of his early victims, is a perversion of the creative impulses of a psychotic personality. The elaborate fetishization of Madeleine by Scottie in *Vertigo* is a similar impulse of a psychologically deranged character striving to restore the illusion of superficial continuity in an emotionally disjoined situation. In a way, *Vertigo* has similarities in its basic idea with *Rear Window* (1954). The spectator follows, like Ferguson, this mystical Madeleine and shares both the wandering and the later guilty feelings related to the death of Madeleine with him.[36] The guilty feeling stays, although the spectator gets to know the story earlier than Ferguson. In spite of this, the spectator starts to participate in all this and is also involved with complex moral issues, including the question of cause and effect in relation to responsibility, and so on.[37] Moral pressures are cleared out and intensified through the suspense structure, which goes on all the time. *Vertigo* was based on the book, *D'Entre les Morts*, by Pierre Boileau and Thomas Narcejac. Hitchcock took very little from the book apart

from the basic plot line. Hitchcock revealed the surprises to the spectator, unlike the original French writers, but in Hitchcock's film, the organization and the structure of cinematic expression, plot, characterization, and psychological dilemmas are all subordinated to the general thematic development.

In *Vertigo*, Scottie tries to recreate Madeleine in the figure of Judy (Novak again). All these moral pressures and issues are intensified in the film through the construction of suspense, which is cleverly built up on the themes of vertigo and falling. As so often in Hitchcock, the creation of suspense deals with moral, psychological, and erotic motifs. The suspense creates not only the spectator's interest towards future, but at the same time brings in an evaluation of the past. The essential thing is to decode the setting, which in Vertigo means a therapeutic treatment of the protagonist, and also of the spectator. This is due to the carefully structured identification process Hitchcock uses in the film.[38] *Vertigo* has a unique continuity of development, which contains a brief prologue and three main movements. In prologue we have the incident that precipitates Ferguson's vertigo. The first movement deals with his consent to follow Madeleine and the gradual deepening of his involvement. The second movement shows her attempted suicide, their meeting, and the development of their relationship until her death and his breakdown. The third movement begins with his meeting with Judy, and passes through the development of their relationship, his attempted re-creation of Madeleine, to Judy's death and the curing of Ferguson's vertigo. Robin Wood thought that of Hitchcock's films, *Vertigo* was closest to perfection, since

its profundity is inseparable from the perfection of form: it is a perfect organism with each character, each sequence and each image illuminating each other.[39]

Robin Wood's analysis of Hitchcock in the Shakespearean tradition lends insight to the antecedents to Hitchcock's view of human relationships as analogous to cosmic order or disorder. Although one may find elements of tragic sensibility in the violent struggles of Hitchcock's dramatic situations, it is ultimately the Shakespearean comedies that function as the prototypes of Hitchcock's treatment of courtship as a struggle, carried on in a milieu of social and emotional chaos and reconciled in the symmetry of marriage. Hitchcock's view of human relationships also produces comical approaches and consummation is the end result of an episodic series of extravagant events and trials. It is exemplified by films like *North by Northwest*, in which the murder of a diplomat at the United Nations is all but forgotten in the comic events of the narrative. A similar rejection of the tragic vision for the comedic is evident in the narrative emphasis of both versions of *The Man Who Knew Too Much*. The issue of marriage and family supercedes the ostensible social crisis connected to saving a diplomat's life. In the comic world of illusory doubles, the unity of marriage is the double structure which resolves all the others.

The reconciliation of illusion and reality comes to be recognizable as the moral torpor afflicting the Hitchcock character who is the victim of excessive innocence or moral blindness, like Joan Fontaine in *Rebecca* (1940) and *Suspicion* (1941) and Ingrid Bergman in *Notorious*. The unmasking of doubles is often the key to the resolution of

social chaos in the Hitchcock film. In *Shadow of a Doubt* and *Strangers on a Train*, these are literally doubles which represent some form of psychological and sexual split in the characters within the narrative. The centrality of the staircase motif in Hitchcock's films introduces the Hitchcock vertical on which the upper reaches are fraught with the terrors and anxieties traditionally associated with the lower depths. In the vertical as divided by Hitchcock, the upper half is the realm of dangerous confrontation and the lower half is generally some form of reintegration into ordinary life and order. Norman Bates and Uncle Charlie are associated with the psychological chaos at the top of the stairs; the mythical parody of Guy Haines' visit to Hades is shown as an ascent of Bruno Anthony's staircase in *Strangers on a Train*, and the space at the top of the stairs is the place where victims are sequestered or murdered in *The Man Who Knew Too Much*, *Notorious*, and *Frenzy* (1972). This view of the upper zone of the staircase as a locus of psychological disorientation is epitomized in the organization and emphasis on the dizzying point-of-view shots in *Vertigo*. When Scottie races up the bell tower and tries to stop Madeleine from committing suicide, Hitchcock uses shots combining a zoom out and a track in, reflecting Scottie's vertigo. It is also a sign of a sinister staircase motif in Hitchcock's films. The location of a corridor punctuated by doors – often bedroom doors – at the top of the stairs establishes a further connection between the erotic and deadly potential of this space.

Hitchcock's staircases frequently evoke fears: famous examples would be Melanie going up the staircase in the dark in the

Brenner house (The Birds), *and Lila going down into the cellar in the Bates house* (Psycho).[40]

We may think that the staircase merely signifies a single aspect of the larger vertical system, which provides a pathway between the world of psychological disorientation and the earth-bound lower zone of stability. In many cases, this division is reflected in the use of perilous heights to underscore in spatial terms the psychological distance between these two worlds, especially in the case of characters who are capable of psychological reintegration. However, the view from these heights is a critical moment followed by deeper insights. These characters are able to survive the hazards of the situation: the transformation of the sterile eroticism of Eva Marie Saint and Cary Grant in *North by Northwest* as it culminates in the Mount Rushmore sequence; the use of a breathtaking descending crane shot to the key in *Notorious*, a metaphorical use of camera movement to signal the power of vision to find a way out of the dilemma; the complex relationship between the overhead camera angle and the race between Mitch (Rod Taylor) and Melanie (Tippi Hedren) in *The Birds*, in which their unnatural sexual rivalry is literally viewed from the lofty realm of the agents who wish to punish them for it. In *Rear Window*, L. B. Jefferies's (James Stewart) refusal to move beyond the view of life below him turns his physical paralysis into the moral and psychological paralysis of voyeurism. In *The Birds*, Hitchcock showed a continuation of the bird idea familiar from *Psycho* where the birds were stuffed and placed in the walls of Norman Bates' motel. In *The Birds,* the spectator's role is connected with this from

early on, when the narrative offers constant comparisons between animal and human behavior. The plot-twists are also related to the spectator's position inside the narrative. The description of the spectator's actions in *The Birds* shows how the viewer is being provoked during the watching of the narrative to take in and try various alternatives for interpretation. Hitchcock plays with our expectations, building up suspense and fear through seemingly arbitrary choices.

The natural behavior comes true in Melanie's (Tippi Hedren) actions. Through Melanie's actions and her walks, we learn to see and feel the nature of the narration. We also meet all the curious people related to advancing the plot and listen to all their viewpoints. A good example is the gas station sequence in which the metaphysical alternative comes to the fore with a certain irony, since it is heard from the mouths of representatives of the ordinary. The learned ornithologist tells us a lot about birds, an Irish drunk speaks about the end of the world, and a man plays absent-mindedly with matches. This is also the case in the Bible, especially in the evangelic stories, where the 'truth' is often told by ordinary people, like fishers and a tax-collector.

The guilt in *Vertigo* comes and expands through the three falls in the narrative. Obsession is generated and the confusion of fantasy and real time is intermingled. The image of Carlotta haunts Scottie, expanding his vulnerability and creating an extended sense of inability to deal with human relationships. Scottie's tragic flow towards his Freudian unconscious is described with the nightmarish visions of his dream. Scottie's fixation with an image is shown in the art gallery sequence, where he sees the portrait of Carlotta,

looking at it like it was a representation of some holy image. This is essential from our point-of-view as Hitchcock viewers, since it deals with the way the characters in the narration can be specifically tuned in for something. In Hitchcock's films, ordinary people are there in the middle of happenings with full receptiveness in scenes concerning the turning points of their lives, and then something extraordinary happens to them.

Hitchcock was an artist struggling with all these contradictions. He was in the sense of Walter Benjamin, 'an Author as a Producer', concerned with the clarity and 'truth' of his ambitions. We as the itinerant observers of his work try to carry the questions and problems from one place to another, encountering the rich palette of options that make up a Hitchcock film. In this sense, the spectator is a traveler inside the web of a narrative, embodying the difference, and through the process of narrating her or his remarks and findings, becomes a certain mediator, and an instrument in the middle of all this. We have made a commitment to this process, and, in this sense, sacrificed ourselves to the task. Our purpose is to create an interdisciplinary space for our views, and besides this, approach the practices of narrative and aesthetic judgment, pay close attention to detail, the elaboration of historical and contextual issues, and the variety of interpretative techniques.

Is it possible to draw some philosophical conclusions? The characters in physical or emotional isolation, like those who reject experience and cling to the illusions of innocence, place themselves in a particular jeopardy in Hitchcock's world. To be guilty of any of these is to defy the completion of a symmetry, in which psychological stability

is the culmination and reward for enduring the trials of the material world. The experience of reality in a world of deception and potential menace may bring a character to the brink of annihilation, but it also provides the only possibility for redemptive epiphany and self-knowledge. To reject this experience is to invite certain death or madness. *Rope* and *Psycho* exemplify extremes of the latter, but in many of the films, the wilful blindness and self-imposed isolation of a character provokes a visible state somewhere between madness and death. The agony of Joan Fontaine in *Rebecca* and *Suspicion*, James Stewart's torment in *Vertigo*, Theresa Wright's painful repression of doubts about Uncle Charlie in *Shadow of a Doubt*, the violent intrusion of Raymond Burr into James Stewart's world in *Rear Window*, and the suffering and suicide attempt of Marnie (Tippi Hedren) in *Marnie* are all examples of this process.

DISCURSIVE AND OTHER PARALLELISMS

Phenomenological activities transpire within us, and this happens frequently so that we are not even aware of it. Some phenomenological and cognitive functions might be transparent to consciousness.[41]

The use of an actual journey to represent the metaphorical journey away from moral innocence and to the recognition of global corruption is a keynote in films such as *The 39 Steps* and *The Lady Vanishes*. These are precursors to such American films as *Saboteur*, *Strangers on a Train* and *North by Northwest*. In the films of this mode, the double structure

of a physical and psychological journey is the extension of Hitchcock's systematic use of physical details as psychological symbols.

> *Alongside the familiar category of symbol one may adduce that of symptom, and that of mask, whose function is not to express something but to conceal it while permitting a covert (and deviated) discharge of its energy.*[42]

In discussing with Truffaut the picaresque journey depicted in *The 39 Steps*, Hitchcock said that he constructed it episodically, as a series of short films.[43] The conventions of the picaresque narrative, with its emphasis on the initiation of a youthful character through the experience of life, are especially appropriate, considering Hitchcock's belief in the therapeutic value of lost innocence as a sign of psychological growth. The presence of mothers or their surrogates, for example, as they are used in Hitchcock's films, is clearly intended to signify a state of emotional infantilism and arrested sexual capacity. An extreme example of this condition occurs in the relationship of Bruno Anthony and his mother in *Strangers on a Train*: her gift of a tie clasp with his name on it is the emblem of his infantile dependence on her for his identity.

In *Frenzy*, the lurid shot of the murderer's mother from his point-of-view, framed high above in his bedroom window, is an example of Hitchcock's schematic treatment of this relationship, a major origin of more severe sexual perversity. Similarly, the picaresque adventures of Roger O. Thornhill in *North by Northwest* are, among other things, a flight from a mother who grudgingly identifies him at

the police station and humiliates him publicly by treating his explanations as the lies of a naughty child. The explicit presentation of a character in a state of sexual paralysis in these situations allows one to speculate on the psychological condition of Richard Hannay in *The 39 Steps*, whose journey actually begins prior to the film's opening events with his flight from Canada to England. Like Thornhill, Hannay is drawn into a journey whose specific details suggest that expatriation and isolation are an intense form of his psychological break with the debilitating security of childhood.

Characters can also act like surrogate victims through masks, staging and misconceptions. They get punished in surreal, unusual and cruel ways. What is the meaning of this suffering? In *Suspicion*, *Spellbound* and *Marnie*, the important road to liberation goes through remembrance, but it is possible to get rid of suspicion only in an immanent and social way. The characters are involved in a situation, in which the key to a deeper, existentialist guilt becomes more and more important. Birds are caging persons like Melanie, who is trapped in a phone booth and experiences moments of utmost fear and terror. The birds might be a metaphor of evil things in peoples' minds, a dark area from where all hope is gone and we are left with our basic and partly unconscious emotions. In *Psycho*, it was Norman's hatred that caused most of the destruction. In *The Birds*, the aggressive behavior of the birds causes a supernatural crisis among people and the community, and also affects the moral and ethical divisions among the characters. The birds are, more or less, agents of chaos and turbulence in the middle of this small place. A Hitchcock film progres-

sively uses its fictional situations to provide what may he described as a reflexive commentary on the opposition of traditional narrative modes and those of film form, using its potential to present a reality the authorship of which can be located within the work itself, rather than in the dogmatic authority of an external narrator. Each film is polarized by, and poised between, contesting authorities who make claims and counterclaims. It is the ideological basis that identifies them as authorial surrogates, in that each proposes a function of narrative art. In this sense, the agony or contest of each film is between these two potential surrogates or factions, each attempting to assert its own authority by assigning meaning to the subjects of the narrative (i.e., what one is meant to comprehend as the meaning and, by extension, the necessity or destiny of the film's narrative.

NARRATIVE DESTINY

> *There is a growing awareness, from a number of areas within philosophy, of the role of narratives in our lives, in such disparate areas as theories of action and emotion, practical reasoning, personal identity, and ethics.*[44]

Characters in Hitchcock's films have many specific and interesting dimensions. They confront themselves or others, glimpsing the potential to reassume the moral or ethical freedom as if to define and create a synthesis of objective vision, which is based on the personal reconciliation of objective-subjective antinomies of their own consciousness of

reality.[45] By heightening the form of the films, Hitchcock emphasizes the temporality of consciousness in which characters ignore the implications of freedom and moral responsibility. "These complex socio-moral statements are represented through images and sounds relying on Hitchcock's grasp of pure form."[46] By the time Hitchcock devised the episodic form of *The 39 Steps*, the contest for the domination of narrative destiny was clearly inscribed as a major issue in both the fictional narrative and the formal intensifiers by which Hitchcock structures the narrative material. This contest is one of authorship, which determines whose position in relation to the mystery or secret plot will subordinate or subsume all others. This has to do with the process of creating a credible narrative illusion and the power of the spoken word in the mystery thrillers. Examples feature Richard Hannay's amusing 'double-talk' in *The 39 Steps* as he uses the political platform to continue his flight, taking on darker implications in the stammer, and another sort of double-talk afflicting Norman Bates' testimony in *Psycho* (his 'story'), as he is questioned by detective Arbogast (Martin Balsam), concerning the inscriptions on the motel register. This is a view that dictates the moral order and its formations by exposing the nature of fictional characterization in order to evoke larger philosophical arguments.

The contest for the authorship of reality accounts for the increasing stylization and formal complexity of Hitchcock's films by the end of the thirties, leading to the further stylization of this subject in the formal designs of the American period. Examples are the struggle to triumph over the legacy of the past in *Rebecca* and *Notorious*, and

the pure stylization of this contest in the use of opposing doubles in *Shadow of a Doubt* and *Strangers on a Train*. In the essay, 'Film Form: New Problems', Eisenstein defended the formal strategies of his own work against the charges of 'formalist excess', and they are similar, in many ways, to those levelled at Hitchcock's work of this period. In Eisenstein's essay, written after his return from Hollywood and Mexico, one senses that he has begun to see formal possibilities in the use of the medium that were evident in Hollywood productions, despite the studio system's primary emphasis on product marketability and the absolute power of its moguls, whose cultural and aesthetic obtuseness was a universally acknowledged commonplace, and the equally Byzantine moral regulations in the form of The Production Code.

> *Hitchcock in this regard is the closest thing the cinematic canon has to a core text that can be cited or commonly referenced. That status places it in a peculiar, and empowered position for the reader.*[47]

Beyond these restraints, Eisenstein recognizes a measure of formal and aesthetic freedom that the essay attempts to reconcile with the prevailing Soviet ideology of Socialist Realism. Hitchcock's own move to Hollywood was, in part, a response to the restrictions of similar ideologies propounded by British criticism. Among other considerations, Hitchcock came to realize that the cultural naiveté of Hollywood by the virtue of its sheer ideological diffuseness provided a greater measure of creative latitude than the realist proscriptions of British cinema of the period. Eisenstein's essay was poignant in its attempt to argue for

the aesthetic and moral possibilities of film form against the prevailing Soviet proscriptions. Eisenstein's views were similar in many ways to the tenets in Hitchcock's praxis and are valuable in formulating an analysis of the aesthetic and epistemological concerns of the two filmmakers. Hitchcock had a particular belief in the extended parameters of narrative form in using a pattern as a part of a referential design, which contains the evidence of its own historical development, denying the patently illogical dogmatism of modernist political and aesthetic pronouncements that certain art may be structurally unrelated to historical evolution and its ongoing cultural shifts and changes. The subject of history in the Hitchcock narrative becomes another of the axes by which the narrative is polarized between moral and immoral characters. These two potential sources of authority in the making of a particular narrative are, in fact, paradigmatic of the structurally related macrocosm of history itself. This is a potential source of freedom and enlightenment when the process of it's making is visible and freely known, and a weapon of totalitarianism (*Notorious*, *Sabotage*, *North by Northwest*) when, like the mystery that is shrouded and guarded by criminals in many Hitchcock films, its structural evolution is falsified or withheld.

EMPHATIC AND HISTORICAL PATTERNS

The network of traces and effects that we call 'Hitchcock' emerges in through proliferating signature systems, what might be called cameonomies.[48]

The fictional narratives may lead us to take complex emotional attitudes toward the characters. The various and sometimes surprising parallels of form and fictional situation mark steps in Hitchcock's development of a narrative paradigm of reality that is different from the earlier oral and literary paradigms but which, nonetheless, bears an important relationship to them. The fictional narrative can be a literary unfolding of the events that compose the film's story and contains a context between the characters who attempt, in differing ways, to define their values in the narrated world. There are micro and macro levels in the narrative ascribing alternative meanings to reality. The macrocosmic sense of narration can create a psychological uncertainty that has traditionally tended to emphasize the authority and power of the narrator as well as the willing passivity of the spectator. Where reality in the novel is brought into being by the ever-present voice of the narrator, the act of unfolding these reality-aspirations can sometimes define the contest of authority between the characters or fictions who can be also, in some cases, potential authorial surrogates within the Hitchcockian world of narrative complexity.

According to an idea here, the viewer follows the moral and ethical development of a character. Through a progressive sense of self-consciousness on part of the characters, the responsibility for their own identities and for the interpretation of the world is no longer viewed as a simple matter of destiny or aesthetic necessity. The spectator can have challenging and ambivalent attitudes toward the characters. As the characters withdraw or are forced by what they see to retreat from blind faith in traditional authority, they

begin to recognize that it is, in fact, the very willingness to accept a reality presented by these authorities that has created the isolation and stasis they feel. In each film, the characters whose isolation is the result of this disillusionment are made to re-experience a condition of self-consciousness, discomfort, and fear in which the historically obscured choice and personal responsibility for determining reality can once again occur. Hitchcock's narratives invite us to create attitudes toward the characters. Vertiginously poised between their objective isolation and repatriation in a world in which the unity of false patterns and symmetries is clearly a subjective illusion, Hitchcock's characters are forced to re-experience and live the conditions which potentially bring illusion into being. We believe that cinema addresses characters as moral beings, and this brings in the evaluative aspect of the viewer.

At this point, the fictional crises in the Hitchcock narrative invariably raise questions which, in large part, account for the philosophical unity of the work as a whole. We can think that the narrative poses challenges, creates moral dimensions and aspirations of credible truths beyond the surface of the narrative, and fabricates human actions to have moral consequences regardless of whether they occur in a fictional narrative or in real life. The crucial answers are connected to the choices and actions of essential elements in the basic philosophical problems and dilemmas of Hitchcock's films.

Hitchcock as a sort of Hegel of the cinematic, in excess of any aesthetic category or what one calls 'film,' maybe circled as an event within the histories of teletechnics and the advent of the

cinematic.[49]

The similarities and differences in the ways Hitchcock's characters are formed and challenged by the spectatorship and the morally salient frameworks between the real world and the film world create an important perspective. Hitchcock addresses these questions by means of the consciousness of characters within the narrative, revealing that the form of the narrative is the visible result of acts and choices in which they demonstrate their willingness to accept or reject the freedom of consciousness to which the form of the medium bears a paradigmatic relationship. As Durgnat has stated: "These complex socio-moral statements depend on Hitchcock's grasp of pure form."[50] It is possible, for example, to read an individual Hitchcock film as a formally microcosmic treatment of the larger process of historical evolution, a relationship that is born by the allusive, meaningfully orchestrated parallels, which punctuate the narrative thereby enlarging the range of its implications – details of the unique fiction establishing their relationship to the macrocosm of cultural history. The individual film, beyond the unique details of its fiction, is a section of reality whose form, recapitulating the genesis of cultural history, is determined by the reconciliation of subjective and objective impulses by those who exist within it. The function of the film form is to reveal, through an aggregation of objective and subjective views where characters are seen objectively in relation to the details of their physical setting, to the world as the characters see it, objectively, subjectively, and in the limitless permutations of the two.

When Marnie 'sees red' and the screen is suffused with that colour, Hitchcock doesn't merely tinge the emulsion. the red seems to be sprayed down, its liquid pulsation recalls the bloodstains; and the colour seems to burst, against pressure, just as an emotion does.[51]

It resembles the dialectical, synthetic process through which reality is created.

Finally, what we read from the images depends on our ability to recognize things that have reflections into our storage of images in our minds.[52]

Hitchcock's fictional narratives are constructed in such a way that we as the viewers can take certain evaluative perspectives towards them. The genesis of fictional propositions, their history, is an essential part of the contesting possibilities which polarize the fictional situations of *Vertigo*, *Psycho* and *Marnie*.

The three films form a group, moving from bleakness to a positive faith in a humiliated moral decency. As the animal symbols recurring in all three suggest, they are not so much moral, as philosophical, enquiries into man.[53]

In each, the opposing factions have a more or less subjective or objective interpretation of past events, effectively reiterating similar ideas of history, alternate possibilities for being viewed as a source of authority in defining what one comes to accept as true or meaningful.

> Marnie *constitutes an explicit integration of problems which remained implicit in The Birds: morality, animal energy, spiritual judgment.*[54]

This polarization of contesting urges is embodied in the single, paralyzed figure of James Stewart in Rear Window: lofty, morally detached and, consequently, incapable of distinguishing the aesthetic function of narration from the moral. In the café scene in The Birds, as the townspeople propose alternative explanations for what has come to pass, Hitchcock again suggests the contesting narratives from that of the religiously superstitious to the objectively scientific, each of which attempts to impose some authoritative reading on historical events and their implications. Hitchcock's cultural context includes elements that his stylization turns into national and transnational emblems of social communication and narrative interaction. The director's cinematic strategy is to investigate and mould his narrative choices. Perception of images or sounds, and their connections, requires knowledge, comparison and deduction. The perception of a representative sign is always a perception of something. Admittedly, perception of images and sounds as a representation requires more cognitive processes than the perception of physical objects. One creates expectations as soon as one sees an image or hears a sound. All this brings in philosophical and theoretical claims about the world.

Tuomo Lahdelma is the Professor of Writing Studies in Jyväskylä University. He is also the Professor of Hungarian Studies and the President of the International Association of Hungarian Studies since 2006.

Jarmo Valkola is Professor of Film History and Theory at Tallinn University. He is also Docent at Aalto University, at the University of Jyväskylä, and at the University of Lapland. His latest monographies are Landscapes of the Mind: Emotion and Style in Aki Kaurismäki's Films *(2012), and* Thoughts on Images: A Philosophical Evaluation *(2012). His forthcoming book is entitled* Pictorialism in Cinema.

NOTES

1 Elsaesser, Thomas & Buckland, Warren (2002), Studying Contemporary American Film: A Guide to Movie Analysis. London: Arnold, 31

2 Truffaut, Francois (1967) Hitchcock. New York: Simon and Schuster, 12.

3 Thompson & Bordwell (2003) , Film Art: An Introduction. Boston: McGraw Hill, 242.

4 Durgnat, Raymond (1974), The Strange Case of Alfred Hitchcock. Cambridge. Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 38.

5 Valkola, Jarmo (2012), Thoughts on Images: A Philosophical Evaluation. Bucharest: Zeta Books, 107.

6 Durgnat (1974), 31.

7 Valkola, Jarmo (2012), Landscapes of the Mind: Emotion and Style in Aki Kaurismäki's Films. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing, 12.

8 Lahdelma, Tuomo (2010), Lecture at the Orivesi College of Writing, 12.2.2010.

9 Orr, John (1993), Cinema and Modernity. London: Polity Press, 43.

10 Durgnat (1974), 44.

11 Valkola, Jarmo (2004), Cognition and Visuality. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Faculty of Humanities, 71.

12 Skerry (2013), 65.

13 Durgnat (1974), 45.

14 Lahdelma, Tuomo (2011), Lecture at the University of Jyväskylä, 9.3.2011.

15 Chabrol, Claude (1966), 'Hitchcock Confronts Evil, ' Cahiers du Cinema in English, no. 2.

16 Bazin, André (1966) "Hitchcock Versus Hitchcock,' Cahiers du Cinema in English, no. 2.

17 Ibidem.

18 Truffaut, Francois (1966), "Skeleton Keys," Cahiers du Cinema in English, no. 2.

19 Ibidem.

20 Sarris, Andrew (1972), Focus on Hitchcock, ed. Albert J. LaValley. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 88.

21 Ibidem.

22 Cohen (2005,I), 8.

23 Wood, Robin (1989), Hitchcock's Films Revisited. New York, Oxford: Columbia University Press, 152.

24 Yanal, Robert, J. (2005), Hitchcock as Philosopher. London: MacFarland & Company, 188-189.

25 Ibidem., 189.

26 Wood (1989), 164, 172.

27 Cavell, Stanley (1971), The World Viewed: Reflections On The Ontology of Film. New York: The Viking Press.

28 Jones, Ward E. and Samantha Vice (eds.) (2011), Ethics at the Cinema. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 11.

29 Durgnat (1974), 71-72.

30 Ibidem., 104.

31 Cook, Nicholas (2000), Analysing Musical Multimedia. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 66.

32 Lahdelma (2011).

33 Durgnat (1974), 233.

34 Ibidem., 45.

35 An idea created by Tuomo Lahdelma.

36 von Bagh, Peter (1979), Hitchcock. Merkintöjä Alfred Hitchcockin elokuvasta Vertigo. Helsinki: Suomen Elokuvasäätiö.

37 Ibidem.

38 Ibidem.

39 Wood (1989).

40 Walker, Michael (2005), Hitchcock's Motifs. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 351.

41 Valkola (2012), 67.

42 Durgnat (1974), 363.

43 Truffaut (1966), 66.

44 Ward & Vice (2011), 17.

45 Valkola (2012), 74.

46 Durgnat (1974), 186.

47 Cohen, Tom (2005), Hitchcock's Cryptonymies, Volume II: War Machines. Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis Press, xiii.

48 Cohen (2005, II), 261).

49 Ibidem., 263.

50 Durgnat (1974), 186.

51 Ibidem., 364.

52 Valkola (2012), 255.

53 Durgnat, (1974), 368.

54 Ibidem., 359.

55 Valkola (2012), Thoughts on Images, 355.

Anne Mari Rautiainen

KOHTAAMISIA KIRJOITTAJIEN
JA KIRJOITTAMISEN OPETTAJIEN KANSSA

Kirjallisuuskatsaus:
Emilia Karjula (ed.) Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito
(Atena 2014)

"Miksi jakaisin ideani tai visioni kenenkään kanssa?", miettii blogiartikkelissaan kirjoittamisen opintojaan käynnistävä opiskelija.

"Miksi kirjoittaa, jos ei halua jakaa ajatuksiaan muiden kanssa?" vastaa toinen.

Emilia Karjulan toimittama artikkelikokoelma Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito tarjoaa näkökulmia muun muassa tähän kirjoittajan yksinäisen työn ja vuorovaikutuksen välttämättömyyden paradoksiin.

Luin teoksen artikkeleita samaan aikaan, kun kirjoittamisen perusopiskelijamme työskentelivät Kirjoittajan yhteisöt -nimisellä johdantojaksolla. Työpaikkani on kirjoittamisen opinnoissa Jyväskylän yliopiston avoimessa yliopistossa. Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito alkoi keskustella kiinnostavasti sekä opiskelijoidemme että omien ajatusteni kanssa. Jotkut artikkelit hiljaisemmin hymisten, jotkut terävämmin – alkoi tehdä mieli jutella ja osin väitelläkin tekstien kanssa.

Erilaiset kirjoittajakoulutukset ovat yksi mahdollisuus

löytää omaa kirjoittamista kehittävä yhteisö. Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito esittelee yhden tällaisen yhteisön tuotoksia, kyseessä on Turun yliopiston luovan kirjoittamisen oppiaineen ensimmäinen oma julkaisu. Artikkeleissaan opiskelijat, opettajat, tutkijat ja kirjailijat lähestyvät kirjoittamista enemmän käytännön kuin teorian suunnasta. Teos tekee siten tietoista eroa kirjoittamisen tutkimuksen suuntauksia esitelleeseen, Juri Joensuu ym. toimittamaan Luovaan lajiin (Atena 2008), jonka kirjoittajat ovat Jyväskylän yliopiston kirjoittamisen tutkijoita. Hyvä niin: kirjoittaminen ansaitsee monenlaisia tarkastelukulmia.

Kirjoittajan työn näkökulmasta huolimatta teoksessa on nähtävissä kirjallisuustieteen pohjavire. Kirjallisuusanalyysit eivät käännä tekstiä aidosti kirjoittamisen suuntaan, vaan katse kohdistuu prosessin tai kirjoittajuuden sijaan valmiiseen teokseen. Vahvimmin tätä perinnettä teoksessa jatkaa Katja Keisalan diskursiivista vallankäyttöä tutkiva artikkeli. Kirjallisuustieteen rinnalle teoksessa nostetaan oleellisiksi tieteiksi historia- ja kulttuuritieteet sekä psykologia. Vaikka kyse on kirjoittamisen opetuksesta, ei kasvatustiede tässä teoksessa näyttäydy. Toinen kapeus löytyy lajikirjosta. Turussa kirjoittamisen opetussuunnitelma rakentuu neljän peruslajin varaan, mutta artikkeleissa läsnä ovat vain proosa ja runous.

Teoksessa on oman oppiaineen suunnasta katsottuna paljon tuttua, mutta myös omasta ajattelusta poikkeavia näkökulmia. Sen koin virkistäväksi, on hyvä toisinaan peilata omia kirjoittamiseen ja kirjoittamisen opetukseen liittyviä käsityksiä. Hyvä sekin, ettemme kaikissa opinahjoissa ajattele kirjoittamisesta välttämättä samoin. Ihmeen sitkeästi näyttää silti elävän ajatus kirjoittamisen opettami-

sen kaavamaisuudesta. Tässä teoksessa Liisa Steinby väittää, että kirjoittamisen opettajilla olisi sekä Suomessa että muualla käytössään yhtäläinen muotti, johon opiskelijat pakotettaisiin. Steinbyn mukaan tuon muotin tuotoksena syntyy tusinakirjallisuutta, jossa teksti ei saa olla kuvailevaa ja jossa henkilöiden tunteet ja ajatukset näytetään ainoastaan toimintana. Jyväskylän opetuksesta en tuollaista muottia tunnista enkä edes ymmärrä, missä ja miten tällainen proosan opettamisen koulukunta olisi voinut syntyä. Ainakin meillä opiskelijat saavat kokeilla jo nyt Steinbyn ratkaisuksi esittämiä monenlaisia kerrontakeinoja ja hakevat samalla kosketuksia kirjalliseen traditioon.

Kirjoittamiseen liittyy paljon yksin tehtävää ajattelutyötä, ongelmien ratkaisuja, valintoja ja päätöksiä. Tähän kirjoittajan yksinäiseen työhön Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito tarjoaa kolme opastekstiä, jotka kaikki liittyvät romaanin rakentamiseen. Jenni Linturi jäsentää aineiston käyttämistä, Iida Rauma puolestaan romaanin rakennetta ja toisessa artikkelissa yhdessä Timo Harjun kanssa kertojaratkaisuja. Tällainen kirjoittamisen "järkiperäistäminen", kuten Rauma asian ilmaisee, auttaa kirjoittajan kirjallisen tietoisuuden rakentamista. Neljännessä opasmaisessa artikkelissa Niina Repo antaa kirjailijan elämää tavoitteleville käytännön neuvoja aina rahasta ja julkaisemisesta kritiikin vastaanottamiseen ja motivaation ylläpitämiseen. Nämä artikkelit selkeine jäsennyksineen ja esimerkkeineen löytävät varmasti lukijansa.

Itseäni tässä teoksessa puhuttelivat taidon harjoittamista enemmän kirjoittamisen lajien poikki kulkevat ajatuskulut, ennen kaikkea jakamiseen ja kohtaamiseen, kirjoittamisen yhteisöllisyyteen liittyvät aihelmat. Mausteita tähän kes-

kusteluun löytyi monesta artikkelista.

Selkeimmin jakamisen näkökulma näyttäytyi Taina Kuuskorven artikkelissa "Yhdessä luovuksissa". Siinä hän jäsentelee kymmenen kirjailijan käsityksiä yhdessä kirjoittamisen mahdollisuuksista ja haasteista. Teksti tuo hyvän lisän aiempiin yhdessä kirjoittamista tai kollaboraatiota käsitteleviin kirjoituksiin.

Ensireaktio monitekijäisyyteen on usein kielteinen. Juuri siksi tämä artikkeli on tarpeellinen: yhdessä kirjoittaminen näyttäytyy siinä enemmän myönteisenä ja houkuttelevana kuin hankalana ja rajoittavana. Ehkä kiinnostavimpia ovat kirjoittajuuden kasvuun liittyneet ajatukset. Peilipinta kirjoittajapartneriin kasvattaa tietoisuutta omista vahvuuksista ja heikkouksista.

Yksi tärkeä peili kirjoittajalle on opinnoista saatava palaute, jota käsitellään tai ainakin sivutaan useammassa artikkelissa. Kalle Vainio kirjoittaa palauteprosessin tärkeästä vaiheesta, palautteen vastaanottamisesta. Hän on kehitellyt prosessikammioksi nimittämänsä työvaiheen, jossa opiskelija käsittelee tietoisesti saamaansa palautetta ja tekee vasta sitten ratkaisunsa tekstin suhteen. Tietoinen työskentely vahvistaa myös kirjoittajaidentiteettiä.

Vainio esittelee palautteen työstämistä sen saamisen jälkeen, ei siis itse palautetilanteen pohjustamista tai suuntaamista. Ehkä eniten tässä teoksessa minua jäi mietityttämään juuri tämä palautekäsitys, johon liittyi myös varsin vahvana näyttäytyvä ohjaajan palautteen auktoriteettiasema. Vainio tuo kyllä näkyviin vertaisryhmän hyvät ja huonot puolet, muttei sitä, miten vertaispalautetta voisi kehittää. Niinpä hänen mukaansa "vastuuta palautteensa laadukkuudesta kantaa ainoastaan ammattimainen kirjoit-

tajaohjaaja". Samansuuntaisesti näyttää ajattelevan Kari Levola. Hänen mielestään toisilta opiskelijoilta voi kyllä saada vertaistukea ja heidän teksteistään voi oppia, mutta "yksityiskohtaisen palautteen" opiskelija saa nimenomaan koulutuksen ohjaajalta.

Kirjoittamisen opinnoissa on tavoitteellisesti kirjoittamiseen suuntautuneita opiskelijoita. Eikö tavoitteellisuuteen voi liittää myös oppimisprosessin, joka liittyy lukemiseen, palautteen antamiseen ja vastaanottamiseen? Miksi vastuu laadukkaasta tai yksityiskohtaisesta palautteesta olisi vain ohjaajalla tai opettajalla?

Opettajana olen oppinut arvostamaan vertaispalautetta, ja luottamusta siihen yritän valaa myös opiskelijoihimme johdantojaksosta alkaen. Palautetilanteet lähiopetuksessa tai verkossa tarjoavat yleisön, lukijajoukon, joka jo sinällään on usein kirjoittajalle arvokas kokemus. Kun tilanne pohjustetaan yhdessä, tietää jokainen sen lähtökohdat ja tavoitteet. Tätä yhteistä ymmärrystä korostaa myös Leena Gottelier omassa artikkelissaan, vaikka hänenkin tarkastelunsa perustuu pelkästään kirjailija-opettajalta saatuun palautteeseen. Vuorovaikutteisessa pienryhmässä kirjoittaja ei ole vain passiivinen satunnaisen palautteen ylöskirjaaja. Päinvastoin, hän voi oppia ryhmänsä teksteistä ja palautekeskustelusta paljon enemmän kuin opettajalta saamastaan yhdestä palautteesta – olipa se kuinka yksityiskohtainen tahansa.

En näe kirjoittajakoulutuksen vertaispalautteita irrallisiksi enkä varsinkaan sattumanvaraisiksi yksittäisiin teksteihin kohdistuviksi teoiksi, vaan oppimisprosessiksi, joka syvenee kerta kerralta koko opintojen ajan ja koulii lopulta kirjoittajaa myös itsearviointiin. Siten niiden merkitys kirjoittajana kasvamiseen voi olla opettajalta saatuja palautteita

tärkeämpi.

Koen, että palautteen antaminen on tekstin ja lukijan kohtaamista. Yksi minua puhutelleista teksteistä olikin Timo Harjun pohdinta lukijan ja runon kohtaamisesta. Harju ponnistaa älyllisestä kohtaamisesta yksilöllisen kokemisen suuntaan ja antaa runolle tilaa koskettaa. Hänen henkilökohtainen lähestymistapansa kohtasi myös minut paremmin kuin saman artikkelin objektiivista kirjoittamista tavoitteleva osuus proosan kertojaratkaisuista.

Yksi tärkeä kohtaamisen taso kirjoittamisen opinnoissa on itsensä kohtaaminen. Päivi Kosonen taustoittaa omaelämäkerrallisen kirjoittamisen historiaa ja painottaa omaelämäkerrallisuuden mahdollisuuksia itsetuntemuksen lisääjänä. Hän esittelee brittiläisen Celia Huntin kirjoittamisen opetusohjelmaa, jonka mukaan kirjoittamisen taidon ohella opetuksen tulisi keskittyä oman äänen löytämiseen. Huntin ajattelussa olennaista ei ole yhden äänen tavoittelu, vaan nimenomaan moniäänisyys. Kosonen korostaa vahvasti omaelämäkerrallisuuden merkitystä kirjoittamisen opinnoissa. Olisikin ollut mielenkiintoista kuulla, miten Turun opinnoissa tähän on vastattu. Jyväskylässä omaelämäkerralliselle kirjoittamiselle on oma opintojaksonsa, lisäksi itsensä moniääninen kohtaamispaikka voi olla jokaiseen jaksoon liittyvä oppimispäiväkirja.

Kohtaamisten jännittävin taso tässä teoksessa on Emilia Karjulan kohtaaminen muusien kanssa, yritys paikantaa taiteellisen ja tieteellisen lähestymistavan kohtauspiste. Hänelle "teorian ja käytännön muusa", "harhailun muusa" ja "keräilyn muusa" voivat toimia työn innoittajina ja rikastuttajina. Lisäksi hän näkee muusat keinoksi tavoitella luontevaa luovan työn ja tutkimuksen leikkausta. Kirjoit-

tamisen prosessiin liittyvissä kokeiluissaan hän pyrkii lä-
hestymään todellisuuden, kielen ja kirjoittavan minän koh-
taamista uusista suunnista. Artikkeli vasta keräilee ajatuksia
tutkimusmatkan alkutaipaleella, mutta suuntautuu kesken-
eräisenäkin kiinnostavasti paitsi taiteelliseen tutkimukseen,
myös kirjoittamisen alkujuurille.

Kirjoittamisen taide ja taito kuljettaa lukijansa ennen
kaikkea kirjoittamisen taitoon, taidetta ja teoriaa sivuten.
Kirjoittamisesta, sen oppimisesta ja opetuksesta kiinnostu-
neille se tarjoaa sekä tuttuja että tuoreita ajatuksia. Teoksen
artikkeleihin kannattaa kurkistaa oman kirjoittajuutensa
kautta ja siten löytää heijastuspintoja sekä kirjoittamiseen
että kirjoittamisen opettamiseen.

*Anne Mari Rautiainen on kirjoittamisen opintojen yliopis-
tonopettaja Jyväskylän Avoimessa yliopistossa. Hän tekee väitös-
kirjaa kirjoittamisen opiskelijoiden oppimispäiväkirjoista.*

SCRIPTUM Publications of Writing Research is a refereed, open access publisher of scholarly articles in Creative Writing Studies. Articles or monographs will be published in Finnish or in English. The Publisher is Jyväskylä University Department of Arts and Culture Studies.