

Bo Carpelan's richly textured novel, *Urwind*, and Mikhail Bakhtin's subtle theories of discourse are brought together in this stimulating and sophisticated collection of essays. The contributors approach Carpelan's work using all the ideas Bakhtin has placed at their disposal – dialogism, chronotope, carnival, polyphony, the unfinishedness of novels – but in an inquiring and open, rather than merely deferential, spirit. The result is one of the most interesting and subtle discussions of Bakhtin's relationship to modernist prose we have seen, a book that sheds light on Bakhtin's work as well Carpelan's.

Ken Hirschkop, Professor of English, University of Waterloo, author of *Mikhail Bakhtin: An Aesthetic for Democracy* and *The Cambridge Introduction to Bakhtin*

Finnish writer Bo Carpelan (1926-2011) gained unparalleled recognition amongst Finland-Swedish readers at home and others worldwide for his work as a poet and novelist. Yet despite a good deal of his literary output having been translated into English, surprisingly little critical commentary exists for the English reader. This study seeks to fill that gap, discovering as it does the dialogic possibilities inherent in Carpelan's work.

Eight scholars separately embarked on a common challenge: to use the critical methodology of Mikhail Bakhtin to read Carpelan's novel *Urwind*, which won the Finlandia Prize in 1993. The resulting discussions take on topics from art and music to time, to the borders between genres, as well as humanistic geography and the thematic of mid-life, many times stretching past *Urwind* to touch on other of Carpelan's texts.

ISBN 978-951-39-7929-4



9 789513 979294 >



Voicing Bo Carpelan: Urwind's Dialogic Possibilities

Edited by Brian Kennedy

VOICING BO CARPELAN

Copyright © Authors and the Research Centre for Contemporary Culture

Editor-in-Chief

Urpo Kovala (University of Jyväskylä, Finland)

Managing Editors

Pekka Hassinen (University of Jyväskylä, Finland)

Laura Piippo (University of Jyväskylä, Finland)

Editorial Board

Eoin Devereux (University of Limerick, Ireland); Irma Hirsjärvi (University of Jyväskylä, Finland); Sanna Karkulehto (University of Jyväskylä, Finland); Raine Koskimaa (University of Jyväskylä, Finland); Hanna Kuusela (Tampere University, Finland); Katariina Kyrölä (Åbo Akademi University, Finland); Maaria Linko (University of Helsinki, Finland); Olli Löytty (University of Turku, Finland); Jim McGuigan (Loughborough University, United Kingdom); Jussi Ojajarvi (University of Oulu, Finland); Tarja Pääjoki (University of Jyväskylä, Finland); Leena-Maija Rossi (University of Helsinki, Finland); Tuija Saresma (University of Jyväskylä, Finland); Piia Varis (Universiteit Tilburg, Netherlands); Juhana Venäläinen (University of Eastern Finland)

The Research Centre for Contemporary Culture is part of the Department of Music, Art and Culture studies at the University of Jyväskylä. The publication series was started in 1986. The series is multi and interdisciplinary, and it publishes studies on contemporary culture and cultural theory. This does not exclude a historical point of view; works on cultural and social history are acceptable in so far as they relate to the birth or phases of modern culture.

Manuscripts are considered for publication on the basis of expert review. The publication series uses a double-blind peer review system. The manuscripts may be in Finnish, Swedish, or English. The volumes are published in print (additionally online after 6 months of initial publication) or online.

Print editions are available for order at the website of the publication series at <https://www.jyu.fi/hytk/fi/laitokset/mutku/tutkimus/nykykulttuurintutkimuskeskus/nykykulttuuri-julkaisusarja> or from the Managing Editor. All correspondence, including subscriptions, should be sent to Laura Piippo, Research Centre for Contemporary Culture, P.O. Box 35, FIN-40014 University of Jyväskylä, Finland. Email: laura.h.piippo@jyu.fi, Tel. + 358 40 548 64 44. The publications are also sold in well-equipped bookshops and [University of Jyväskylä Web Store](#).

Layout: Pekka Hassinen

Layout design: Sami Saresma

Cover: Sami Saresma

Printed at Jyväskylän yliopistopaino
Jyväskylä 2020

ISBN 978-951-39-7930-0

ISSN 1457-6899



VERTAISARVIOITU
KOLLEGIALT GRANSKAD
PEER-REVIEWED
www.tsv.fi/tunnus

*Voicing Bo Carpelan:
Urwind's Dialogic Possibilities*

Edited by Brian Kennedy

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Brian Kennedy

INTRODUCTION: “A HIDDEN, MAGIC MEANING”—
VOICING BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND* 7

Stephen Souris

“A CONFUSING AND WONDERFUL MOSAIC”:
DIALOGIC ASPECTS OF BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND* 29

Roger Holmström

BO CARPELAN AND MULTIVOICEDNESS: *URWIND* IN
LIGHT OF BAKHTIN’S THOUGHTS ON METHODOLOGY
FOR THE STUDY OF THE NOVEL 63

Erkki Vainikkala

URWIND: A NOVEL IN POETIC PROSE AS
A BAKHTINIAN LIMIT CASE 77

Brian Kennedy

“ANOTHER, MORE DISSATISFIED AND TRUTHFUL
PERSON”: DANIEL URWIND ON THE THRESHOLD OF
MID-LIFE IN BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND* 113

Pauli Tapani Karjalainen

PLACE IN *URWIND*: A HUMANISTIC GEOGRAPHICAL
VIEW 139

Nanny Jolma

BETWEEN NOW AND THEN: THE EXPERIENCE OF TIME
IN BO CARPELAN’S NOVELS *URWIND* AND *BERG* 157

Catherine Maloney

SELF AND OTHER: “CREATIVE UNDERSTANDING” IN
BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND* 177

Peter Hitchcock

AFTERWORD: CARPELAN VOICING 195

AUTHOR NOTES 203

Brian Kennedy

**INTRODUCTION: “A HIDDEN, MAGIC MEANING”—
VOICING BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND***

What’s the harm in coming to the work of a gifted writer more or less by accident? If confessions were being taken, several of the authors in this volume did just that with Bo Carpelan (1926–2011). The idea for the book was conceived, as so many projects in academia are, as a conference panel, the goal being for four scholars to study the novel *Urwind* (1993) independent of each other but with the theories of Mikhail Bakhtin as their lens. The panel presentation, then, was hoped to celebrate both the synchronicity and the juxtapositions of ideas which would result. The conference in question would take place in Finland, which is why Carpelan’s text was chosen. In particular, it was the Twelfth International Bakhtin Conference, held in the summer of 2005. The result was both what was hoped for, and more. Core Bakhtinian ideas coalesced on the panel: the dialogic aspects of the novel were primary. Its presentation of a chronotope—identified as modernist, but not slavishly so—was remarked upon. The poetic aspects of the text, its flights of language, the thematic core of family breakdown—all of these were cross-referenced from paper to paper. But as conference papers can be, these were alive with possibilities not fully explored.

It was hoped that the four papers would form the dynamic core of a larger study, and that is what has happened in this book—albeit with only three of the essays having ultimately been put into full-length form. Alongside these come several more pieces which expand the scope of interpretation as they range across *Urwind* and other of Carpelan’s fictional works to discover his many possibilities, but with the core methodology owing itself, mostly explicitly but in a couple of cases more implicitly, to Bakhtin. As such, this collection gives voice to a set of theories, and they to a set of interpretations, which are dynamic in relationship to each other, and certainly one of the concerns of the editor is to make a meaningful

contribution in an area which has been underserved to this point—to the body of scholarship on Carpelan in English.

As any such study would, this book seeks to create a dialogue, in the fullest sense of the word. It is dialogic in that it invites the reader to participate in its meaning-making. As such, it is unfinished, or to use the term Bakhtin would have preferred, “unfinalized”. It will be a success in the moment that readers find themselves thinking past the Carpelan texts treated to other ones, and thinking past all of Carpelan’s work to that of others in his Finland-Swedish tradition and to other contemporary writers. Language will be, of necessity, a limiting factor in this endeavor, since only selections of Carpelan’s work, and very little criticism on his oeuvre, are translated into English, or exist in English in the first place, a point to which I will return presently.

For the novel itself, dialogism is a primary Bakhtinian concept, indeed axiomatic in defining the genre. Yet, as Peter Hitchcock presents in the afterword to this volume, dialogism is not just a characteristic of the genre, or even its defining principle, but rather a practice which finds itself alive within any text which can be claimed as “novelistic” and also a result of any two people’s encounters with such a text. As such, this book is a discourse with all the push-pull characteristics that dialogism presents. It uses *Urwind* as a model text, in that sense, to demonstrate that any novel could be read as an event—its eventness performed by readers alone but also represented, in the present context, by the critical volume which it inspires—noting here that most of the essays in this book treat Carpelan’s *Urwind* as their primary text.

Those who were part of the original conference panel (Vainikkala, Kennedy, and Souris) thought that their interpretations of *Urwind* might converge. That would have proved narrowing, and in fact, the readings diverged, pointing in multiple directions, two of which I would like to note at present: to Carpelan’s dialogic possibilities, and to a catalogue of the fullness of Bakhtin’s ideas available for critics. The essays added to the collection have further done this, with yet more Bakhtinian possibilities. Perhaps the reader, par-

ticularly one familiar with Bakhtin's critical canon, could come up with further interpretations still. That, in turn, would point to the complexity and beauty of Carpelan's novel, and indeed past that to the richness of his work as a whole. But it would also indicate the continued richness of Bakhtinian interpretations, and the continued relevance of dialogism as a practice.

Bakhtin himself describes this process in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (written in 1929):

Dialogic relationships are reducible neither to logical relationships nor to relationships oriented semantically toward their referential object, relationships *in and of themselves* devoid of any dialogic elements. They must clothe themselves in discourse, become utterances, become the positions of various subjects expressed in discourse, in order that dialogic relationships might arise among them. (183, emphasis original)

He gives an example of how two utterances can lack a dialogic relationship but goes on to say that dialogism arises when two statements are “separated into two different utterances by two different subjects” (183). Two people speaking, or two texts placed into context with one another—these represent the possibility for dialogic interaction. Bakhtin reinforces the need for this to be a human (he calls it “embodied”) act: “logical and semantically referential relationships, in order to become dialogic, must be embodied, that is [...] they must become *discourse*, that is, an utterance, and receive an *author*, that is, a creator of the given utterance whose position it expresses” (1929, 184, emphasis original).

By now, Bakhtin's concepts have become familiar in the way Freud's range of ideas are, and he is, in many ways, a figure like Freud—always lurking around the margins and footnotes of academic essays, if not so often pushed into new territory any more. In part, this is due to the careerist nature of the literary academy nowadays, where being newest to the party with ideas is the mode of production often privileged. Literary study has become like factory work: the product is the key, and yearly model updates are essential to keep consumers buying. In the mode of capitalist production of

goods, “newer,” “better,” and “more” have become synonyms for one another in the marketplace of ideas. In literary criticism, this means that each successive generation learns to honor the “fathers” while moving beyond them to new ground. But that misses the continued richness and relevance of the hallmark figures in interpretation, and thus this book asks the reader to once again revel in Bakhtin and Bakhtinian thought as a methodology.

This volume presumes Bakhtin’s relevance, because while its interpretations of Carpelan are new, and while they do, in places, push Bakhtin into new territory (see my discussion of the chronotopic threshold in Chapter Four, for instance), these essays also privilege Bakhtin’s ability to provide a foundation for interpretation. But that does not make the essays less exciting, because in treating Carpelan, they reveal the “hidden, magic meaning” that I have used in the title of this introduction. In a sentence, that is the multiple, rich, ever-expanding dialogism of *Urwind* and the other works treated herein. Maybe this too is only myth-making. Maybe there is no hidden, magic meaning to Carpelan, but there are multiple possibilities of meaning, and in revealing these, we remark upon the multiple frames and modes of dialogue which we as readers and scholars enter into. To further this point, an extended discussion of Bakhtin and his renewed possibilities as an interpretive lens is developed in Peter Hitchcock’s afterword, “Carpelan Voicing,” to which I again refer the reader for further discussion of Bakhtin and the notion of dialogue.

Of course, as is well known (and as is perhaps ironic in the present context), Bo Carpelan was a poet—perhaps primarily so, especially in the formative early stages of his career. Thus this study, from the start, exists somewhat in the tension between genres that allowed Bakhtin to dismiss verse, given his preference for fiction as dialogic, something he thought that poetry could never be. Amongst Carpelan’s oeuvre are about twenty volumes of poetry, as well as drama, young adult fiction, and criticism. All of this aside from novels, two of which won the Finlandia Prize, *Urwind* in 1993 and *Berg* in 2005.

At the time this book was conceived, Bo Carpelan was still alive. At one point, there were plans to ask him for a poem to be used as an epigraph. Sadly, he died in 2011, before we could approach him with the request. Had the poem been written, it would have created a further frame in which to view him, his novel *Urwind*, and his larger body of work. Without it, the dialogue on *Urwind* takes on different dimensions, because while the contemporary academy does not of necessity ask recourse to the writer in interpreting his or her work, there is always the possibility of the voice of that person entering the dialog/ic surrounding a text, as indeed the poem would have done as a frontispiece of this book. For Carpelan as it applies to this project, that possibility is now silenced. However, this is the more reason to publish this book, because it keeps alive the discourse on Carpelan, and offers it, as few other studies have done, into the English-speaking academy.

As a contribution to the criticism of Carpelan, this volume marks the only full-length study in English. For any Finnish (or Finland-Swedish) fan of literature or Finnish literary critic, the dearth of coverage on Carpelan in English would likely be more than surprising. For a writer whose published work includes around forty volumes of poetry, fiction, children's works, and other things (for instance, a Libretto—*Det sjungande trädet*, 1988), the attention he has received in the English-speaking world, whether scholarly in focus or popular, is slight, though approximately a dozen or so of his works of poetry and fiction, and the aforementioned opera, are translated into English.

Yet little exists in terms of scholarly treatment of Carpelan in English even by way of article-length publications. Most of what is available are book reviews. Furthermore, a search of the most extensive research databases turns up, as was just said, not only no English-language book exclusively devoted to studying his work, but only a handful of volumes where he is treated at all, mostly thematic studies or overviews of Scandinavian, or more narrowly, Finnish or Finland-Swedish, literature. What of the latter is available is often written by Finland-Swedish critics, as evidenced by the

multiple (often untranslated) quotations in the language used alongside their English prose argument.

Is the lack of critical attention in English surprising for a writer who has made the impact and won the awards that Carpelan has? Even a quick review of his winnings shows that he took nearly twenty major awards, including, as said above, the Finlandia Prize, twice (1993, 2005). Other honors included Le Prix Européen de Littérature in 2007, the Svenska Akademiens nordiska pris (Swedish Academy's Nordic Prize) in 1997, Svenska kulturfondens stora kulturpris (Swedish Cultural Foundation, Grand Prize) in 1991, the Nordic Council's Prize for Literature (for the poetry collection *I de mörka rummen, i de ljusa—In the Dark Room, In the Bright Light*) in 1977, the Finnish State Award for young people's writing in 1969 and 1989, and the Finnish State Prize for Literature in 1951, 1967, 1972, 1987, and 1989. Truly, Carpelan was amongst the most prolific and well-recognized writers of the 20th century, though not in the English-speaking academy. But perhaps it is less profitable to try to account for the dearth of treatment a writer receives than to congratulate those who seek to remedy the lack of attention, including those scholars represented here.

Of further note: a search of a popular US-based bookselling website indicates that many of Carpelan's titles are available, but only from resellers, which means that few Carpelan novels or collections of poems are being held by English-language publishers as part of their current in-print list. But if nobody had any interest in Carpelan, why would his work be as extensively listed as it is in the used book market? The simple answer is, it would not.

So who is reading Carpelan in the English-speaking world? There's no reason for a Swedish-speaking Finn to make the effort to read him in translation. Thus it must be native English speakers. Yet the books, speaking primarily of the fiction, are not particularly easy to read, which points to a clue as to their intrigue. Many may be read by those who have come to Carpelan compelled by an interest in modernism, which his work is often figured to fall into. To cite just one source in this regard, Thomas DuBois says in his re-

view of the English appearance of *Urwind*, “*Urwind*, like others of Carpelan’s novels and poems, shows the influence of modernist literature from Sweden as well as a familiarity with the themes and style of Finnish-language modernists, including Paavo Haavikko” (1994, 382). He adds, “Carpelan continues a tradition and voice created by figures such as Edith Södergran and Rabbe Enckell and representing one of the most valuable contributions of Finnish literature (in Finnish or Swedish) to European literary life” (382). Thus Carpelan is figured as important for his place in advancing a particular literary tradition. I will return to this in a moment.

But if those literary-historical contexts are not a starting point, then what is? Perhaps it is Carpelan’s technique. To take the primary novel considered here, one could answer this question by pointing out that *Urwind* is resplendent with complexities. Take, for example, descriptions such as this one of the wind:

[N]o wind that tastes so bitter exists anywhere else, it is blown through and through, and both destitute and lively, it continually rages on the beating-balconies like a desperate ruffian in combat with an invisible enemy [...]. The gale, it has been washed, mended, beaten, bleached, so that everything, both outside and in, smells of departure, unease and sea. (UW 44)

It might be that a novel which melds character, scene, and memory together so seamlessly and with such grace (here the temptation to invoke the word “poetic” is close to irresistible, but too easy, since Carpelan’s considerable fame is due largely in the first instance to his work as a poet, as was mentioned) is always going to be worth reading, yet even in saying so, I wind right back to privileging the novel’s technique, and any reader who finds herself or himself engaged with such compelling technique can’t help but ask what impulse it responds to, where its forebears (if indeed there are any) can be found. *Urwind*, by this reckoning, always already points back to Carpelan’s Modernist predecessors and his taking up of their mantle, continuing a tradition with a number of complex and somewhat fragmented histories that bring us down to the present, or long after European modernism had been concluded.

Given that many readers of the present volume (those in the English-speaking academy) may not be aware of the richness of Finland-Swedish modernism, and owing to the fact that much of what critical material there is on Carpelan in English takes modernism as a departure point, it is perhaps worth a quick review as a way to situate Carpelan.

H. K. Riikonen (2007) explains that there have been six, perhaps more, movements and periods which have been called modernist in Finland, going back to the 1890s. Jyrki Nummi (2012) names it as seven “separate islands” of modernism in what is called a “splinter theory” of modernisms, “a series of separate schools or movements that differ from each other in relation to place, language, and poetic programme” (364). Unlike in, for example, British letters, which most would agree had moved on to other things at least by the Second World War, in Finland, modernism extends into the 1950s in both poetry and prose (Riikonen 2007, 847), though Riikonen admits that his method of seeing things differs from what appears in most Finnish literary histories. However, Riikonen also makes a claim worthwhile in the context of Carpelan: “Finnish modernism *in stricto sensu* is situated in the 1950s and as such was a very late phenomenon” (2007, 847).¹ And Nummi says that there is “a clear asymmetry of Finnish modernisms in relation to the established periodization of modernism in the central literary traditions” (2012, 366).

Edith Södergran, according to Johan Wrede (1976), was looked at as early as the 1930s as being the first exemplar of modernism in Finland-Swedish literature, with her volume *Dikter* (1916) being “the first complete collection of poetry to show that the literary revolution had reached Finland” (73). Wrede points out, however, that the publication of this one volume did not necessarily indicate a large-scale revolution in literature in the country (1976, 73–74) and that, further, Södergran “did not see herself as a destroyer of traditions”—a way of saying, in the inverse, that she did not see herself as the harbinger of a new movement (1976, 74). He later adds

by way of summary, “Finland-Swedish Modernism came relatively late from the international point of view” (1976, 82).

Kjell Espmark (1976), in discussing Södergran, invokes the school of Finland-Swedish expressionism from the 1920s while also labeling her work part of the school of “Finland-Swedish Modernism” (5), but he does so not to limit Södergran or her school but rather to suggest that the mental landscapes her poetry creates were not part of a limited tradition but rather a rich one which extends into the present (6). “In many of Edith Södergran’s, [Elmer] Diktonius’s, and [Rabbe] Enckell’s poems the whole text forms one coherent visual metaphor for a mental state [...]. [M]odernist imagery is a sensuous sign language for feelings and conceptions” (1976, 6). The latter point Espmark picked up from an article written by Enckell, but it might as well have been written about Carpelan, and not Carpelan the poet so much as Carpelan the author of *Urwind*.

As the reader of that novel, drawn in by the metaphor of the wind, loses herself in the text, it is not only Daniel’s anxiety about the uncertainty of his life (a thematic point) which is the defining feature of the narrative but also the way that the narration becomes a seamless web which compels the reader to give attention, somewhere between present and past, anxiety and joy, and it is done very much through the visual. Just one example from the text will suffice: “Was it now, as I tried to capture the silences in my memory, that for the first time I was seized by the thought of writing, forming, noting down, seeking the right words that could give me at least a fraction of the image of myself I was looking for?” Daniel *Urwind* continues, “My thoughts strayed, as when I listen to music, they did not gather into a centre, they were hurled out into a space of their own where chance texts acquired a hidden, magic meaning” (UW 91). This perfectly blends (hybridizes?) Joyce’s interior monologue with Woolf’s stream-of-consciousness and hurls them towards the collective unconscious. In the process, the reader is drawn in as co-creator.

To borrow once more from Espmark, who is himself explaining the gloss on Södergran’s poetry given by Gunnar Tideström, “ma-

terial things are freed from all concretion while mental elements are experienced with the senses” (1976, 7). If this is at all descriptive of *Urwind*, then the line from Carpelan back to the modernism of the 1920s in Finland is clearly drawn.²

Modernism as a literary practice continued a long while as measured against the life of European literary modernism, partly due to a bit of a late start owing to the lack of models. “Until the beginning of the Second World War, there were in fact not many Finnish translations of modern or avant-garde literature that might have given new impetuses to Finnish writers,” according to Riikonen (2007, 851). The translation of Joyce and Eliot, in fact, took place very late, after WW2, though Eliot had been translated into Swedish much earlier (851). What surprises, though, are statements which begin like this: “The modernists of the 1950s were accused [...]”; “The modernist prose writing of the 1950s [...]” (2007, 853) because, indeed, nobody who studies British literature would make this formulation. The English Modernists were not necessarily dead by then (though some were—notably Virginia Woolf and Irish James Joyce), but certainly not working in the same vein as they had in the modernist heyday. In fact, the British Modernists by this time were far enough past current that they could even be re-contextualized into the new vein of psychological literature of the 1950s-60s. Witness on this note American Edward Albee’s play *Who’s Afraid of Virginia Woolf?* (1962), even the title of which says that modernism has become a shorthand for something other than itself in the postwar period.

Putting a fairly exact timeline on the matter, Ritva Poom (1995) offers that, “the process of development of modernism in the poetry of Finland [...] spanned forty years and the two major languages of the country, Finnish and Swedish, each with its distinct, autonomous literary tradition” (69). The flowering of Finnish modernism came in 1956, with the publication of Eeva-Liisa Manner’s *Tämä Matka* (“This Journey”), which is “considered to be the first mature work of Finnish language modernism” (1995, 69). Note that by this time, all of the following—Yeats, Proust, Lawrence, Woolf—were

dead, though significant British Modernists remained—Eliot, David Jones, Dorothy Richardson, as well as expatriot Ezra Pound. This does not mean that the latter were publishing in the same vein as they had when younger, of course, because largely speaking, they were not.

Nor should the foregoing be taken to indicate that the 1950s were the heyday of modernism in Finland, only that the energy which began in the 1920s with the publication of Södergran's work as well as that of Diktonius, R. R. Eklund, and others, along with the formation of a journal, *Ultra*, was sustained into that later decade.

Part of the reason that Finnish writers have always remained separate from the European literary tradition is language. But additionally, there was criticism from the cultural establishment. Take, for instance, Wrede's argument that modernism was read to be mocking stable poetic principles which themselves were seen as a guarantor of the "'moral beauty'" in poetry (1976, 84). "The Modernists' liberties in aesthetics and form appeared from the viewpoint of the guardians of tradition as irresponsible or even treasonable," Wrede summarizes (1976, 84). Ellen Rees (2001) echoes this idea when she says, "Unconventional elements such as nonlinear narrative structures, unreliable narrators, or a merging of genres were often considered as evidence of a lack of mastery on the part of the author by Scandinavia's more conservative critics," and writers who "deviated too far from realist conventions [...] were in some cases simply shut out of the literary canon by critics and literary historians" (237). Her context in particular is "literary modernism in Scandinavia from the years between the two world wars" (237). Meanwhile, as Wrede explains it, "Finland-Swedish Modernism endured whilst Finland-Finnish Modernism quickly disintegrated and was assimilated by nationalistic radicalism" (1976, 99) because as a precondition, the "dramatic political developments in Finland made the public particularly sensitive and intolerant towards deviations from what they considered to be common spiritual goals," a threat that they believed modernism represented (1976, 98).

Finland-Swedish modernism, the tradition that Carpelan would later inherit, was by contrast characterized by the broader Scandinavian attitude which saw modernism as more a surface manifestation of literary practice (“fashion” is the word Wrede uses) (1976, 99) than a threat in the form of “deviations from [...] common spiritual goals,” as cited above (Wrede 1976, 98). To invoke time again, as a way of suggesting Carpelan’s later connection, consider Wrede’s summary: “Finland-Swedish Modernism did not suffer—as did Modernism in Finnish Finland and in Sweden—a decline at the end of the 1930s. Instead Modernism developed, as a lyrical stylistic trend, a hegemony which lasted right up to the 1960s” (1976, 99). And, it might be added to satisfy the present context, beyond, for some, such as Carpelan.

Carpelan worked all through the period of the (late) flourishing of modernist tendencies, starting in 1946, but like many writers, he resisted being categorized at all. In an interview done in the late 1990s, he said, “[O]ne must have at least the shadow of one’s own voice from the very outset, otherwise what one writes turns out to be merely plagiarism” (Fagerholm 1998, 272). He adds, “That was also true of me, but in my own view I didn’t continue—as has often been asserted—in the wake of Finland-Swedish modernism,” yet he then relents: “It is of course quite possible that later on I returned to it” (1978, 272). He speaks here in response to a question about his technique, but the question is directed more pointedly at his work as a poet than as a novelist.

Whatever Carpelan’s opinion, and whatever admissions he makes, critics such as Ritva Poom talk about Carpelan as a Finland-Swedish Modernist. Poom elaborates to say that his work and that of his contemporaries “continued the Finland-Swedish prewar modernist tradition” (1995, 77), which points both to what the artists were doing and to the length of the tradition. But for our purposes, it should also point to the complex psychological portrayals in his fiction, with *Urwind* the key example. Call this Modernist, which it certainly appears to be, or don’t—plenty remains to be discussed and dialogued about.

Carpelan is not timeless, but neither is it just that critical inquiry in English into *Urwind* in particular often finds itself stuck on the modernist question. In fact, his being a Modernist out of time does not make Carpelan's work the less profound or beautiful. It just makes it somewhat hard to place, and thus, perhaps, easy to pass over.

Modernist technique is obviously not the totality of what the novel *Urwind* means or the breadth of its openness to critical inquiry. Hence the volume you now hold in your hands. To accomplish its aim, this book must make Carpelan a more familiar yet at the same time more intriguing figure for the English-speaking academy, capitalizing on the complexities and uncertainties in his work to point away from technique as an end in itself and towards a reading which sees the continuity between Carpelan's language, narrative style, and thematics.

Stephen Souris's contribution, "'A Confusing and Wonderful Mosaic': Dialogic Aspects of Bo Carpelan's *Urwind*," suggests that a Bakhtinian reading of Bo Carpelan's *Urwind* does not find the novel disjointed, self-indulgent, tiring, and impossible to read, as is the case with some reviewers; such an approach does not find the protagonist suffering from near-paralyzing alienation and listlessness, wallowing in hindsight, lacking connection to others, and unable to use his own words to express himself. Instead, by approaching *Urwind* with the Bakhtinian concepts of heteroglossia, dialogism, chronotope, and carnival, we can appreciate the "strange depth" the critic Karjalainen finds in this novel of an "alien man" (Carpelan, UW 175) struggling to come to terms with his mid-life identity crisis. What results from a Bakhtinian approach is an appreciation of the sincerity and depth of the protagonist's effort to lift himself by his own bootstraps to arrive at an affirmation of joy in the face of the existential fact of death. As such, the "furious joy" (99) with which Ludvig creates art in the hospital surrounded by old age and death becomes representative of what *Urwind* aspires towards, even if living on a "low flame" (185) is more characteristic of *Urwind*. Ultimately, what we eventually realize when approach-

ing the novel from a Bakhtinian perspective is that the novel we are reading represents the end of his struggle. *Urwind* is a Künstlerroman in the Proustian tradition because in the very telling of the story of the protagonist's struggle there is an implied achievement of his quest. We should assume that Daniel Urwind has finally managed to get his name in the library's card catalogue.

Late scholar Roger Holmström puts the Bakhtinian interpretations of Carpelan's *Urwind* into perspective, beginning by using "Epic and the Novel" (1941) to read what he sees as the "inconclusive present" (picking up Bakhtin's language) in the novel. He also highlights that the structure of the novel corresponds to Bakhtin's description of texts and their construction, showing that the density of the novel might be understood if its multiplicity of voices and dimensions are taken into account in a Bakhtinian-style analysis. He also briefly accounts for the use of Bakhtin in the Swedish literary academy over the past few decades, and then offers five readings from his Swedish language book of interpretation of *Urwind*, published under the title *Vindfartsvägar (Ways of the Wind, 1998)*, to illustrate the point that Carpelan's text exhibits Bakhtinian multi-voicedness.

Erkki Vainikkala, in "*Urwind*—A Novel in Poetic Prose as a Bakhtinian Limit Case," considers Bo Carpelan's novel as a "limit case" for a Bakhtinian analysis because of the tensions between the novel's Modernist poetics and Mikhail Bakhtin's theoretical outlook and critical concepts. This issue raises the further question of "which Bakhtin" with respect to the considerable changes that Bakhtin's theories and critical tools have undergone during his career. Thus *Urwind* in this essay is not considered in terms of a single thematic or formal issue of the novel with certain Bakhtinian tools applicable to such a task. Instead, key issues in *Urwind* arising from its characteristics as a fictional diary with larger "autobiographical" extensions and as a Modernist work in poetic prose are examined through a spectrum of Bakhtin's critical approaches over time.

My own contribution, "Another, More Dissatisfied and Truthful Person: Daniel Urwind on the Threshold of Mid-Life in Bo Car-

pelan's *Urwind*," sets *Urwind* into its modernist context while attempting to rescue it from the bind that critics seem to have gotten into when they limit interpretation to technique. Seeing the novel's technical elements as primary has led critics to a dead end as they try to understand and account for the book's complexities (some would say oddities) in narration. Readers either simply categorize the novel as modernist and then move on, or they attempt to unravel its complicated narrative strands, reducing them to simpler, and hence less satisfying, versions of themselves. I argue that *Urwind* should be read not as a textual experiment but a precise rendering of the profound disturbance which its namesake character undergoes as he faces a year alone.

Paralleling the novel with Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925), which is remarkably technically similar, and the film *American Beauty* (1999), which does not experiment with technique but contributes to understanding the thematic of mid-life, I argue that each text has at its core the notion of crossing a margin, which I interpret using Bakhtin's notion of chronotope, and in particular the chronotopic threshold which defines experience. While the problems which prompt the main characters' breaks from reality are outwardly not the same, they share the experience of being forced to confront a crisis which moves them outside their culture's conventional mode of living and thinking. The trauma of doing so means that each man's experience of the world in space and time takes on fantastic qualities, but what matters to someone trying to understand their narratives might not be the form in which their experiences are presented so much as the experiences of the characters themselves, contextualized and historicized similarly as male mid-life crisis.

Pauli Tapani Karjalainen picks up a point which Carpelan himself might have found quite fitting for his work. Talking about his novel *Axel*, Carpelan says, "[I]f one writes a work of prose one must in most cases have some kind of map and compass to hand before one gets going" (Fagerholm 1998, 275). For Karjalainen, the question of place cuts across the disciplines and the arts. Humanistic geography defines place as a centre of meaning constructed by

experience, internally connected with time and self. Place, time, and self make up a “triple helix” that spirals out from the individual’s personal meeting with the world. In depicting the helix in literature and art, spatial and temporal markers of human life are fused into a concrete whole.

Karjalainen argues that Bakhtin must be invoked as soon as time and space are mentioned together. The helix named above could be taken as what Bakhtin (1981) calls a chronotope: “Time [...] thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope” (84). In the chronotope, Bakhtin says, real life is linked to the real earth (1981, 206), and human life is always about the linkage between place and time: *topos* and *chronos* are inseparable. It is the writer’s duty to reveal this connection artistically.

Bo Carpelan’s novel *Urwind* may be read to indicate how the triplet, or chronotope, works out. Karjalainen reads the novel from three perspectives: mimetic, hermeneutic, and textual to argue that the “maps” thus produced reflect different spatial realms ranging from the realistic depiction of a territory via the interpretation of experiences to the inter-textual nets of meaning. The notion of place has thus both the most concrete and the most metaphoric content.

Nanny Jolma’s essay focuses on the narrative and thematic structures through which the representation of time is formed in Bo Carpelan’s novels *Urwind* and *Berg*. The questions of experientiality are in the centre of the analysis. The essay compares Dorrit Cohn’s classical and Monika Fludernik’s postclassical and cognitive narratology, while also referring to some critical approaches to these two theories. Jolma demonstrates that narrating and experiencing are not always two separate aspects of narration, and that in Carpelan’s novels they merge with each other in many different ways. Through the narrative approach to theme, Jolma’s essay shows how the theme of time is constructed by different motifs in the text. Each motif adds its own nuance to the idea of time which

is gradually developed through the narration and is also one of the structures that instead of linearity forms coherence in these novels.

One important theoretical frame in the article is also Bo Carpelan's poetics of openness from his non-fictional texts. Openness is defined, among other features, by time as something that collects and gathers, in the contrast to the idea of a linear time that constantly moves forward. The essay makes clear how the changes in the narrative modes and the motifs of the theme of time interact and merge with each other and that experience is the core around which the idea of time is constructed.

Catherine Maloney bases her argument in "Self and Other: 'Creative Understanding' in Bo Carpelan's *Urwind*" on the notion of *creative understanding*, a transformative mode of understanding which requires the knower to remain both rooted in her epistemic position and to gain *outsideness*, or an outside view, of herself. This seemingly paradoxical approach to understanding, as Mikhail Bakhtin develops it, allows for both a deeper understanding of self and the possibility of understanding across difference. It occurs through a dialogic engagement with an "other" in which the interlocutors do not attempt to adopt each other's viewpoint, but rather acknowledge their own locations and are willing to have their meanings transformed. The dialogic encounter exposes the particularity of each position and opens up new avenues of thought. An outside view is achieved through the collision of meaning.

In *Urwind*, the recent breakdown of Daniel Urwind's marriage is the destabilizing event which primes him to engage in transformative dialogue. The interpretive lens through which he habitually makes sense of the world has been shattered, Maloney argues, showing that Urwind the character has been thrown outside of himself and has an opportunity to understand himself in a new light. The weekly letters he writes—ostensibly a diary for his estranged wife—amount to a dialogue with various others: long-dead relatives, absent friends, his younger self, literary characters, and works of art. This essay argues that the literary and memory-based engagements in Daniel's journal constitute an intercultural dialogue

through which Daniel comes to understand himself and his world in a new and deeper way. It is a time of creative understanding which leaves Daniel perched on a threshold, ready to venture through.

And finally, Peter Hitchcock puts the effort of applying criticism to a lesser-studied writer into perspective with his afterword: “Carpelan Voicing.” Hitchcock rounds out the volume by taking up the question of reputation, using Bakhtin as an analogue for Carpelan. He makes his point well as he says, “Bakhtin’s mistimed and sometimes misplaced position in twentieth century letters reminds us that reputation is thoroughly overdetermined, by intellectual movements, by theoretical particularity, by power and knowledge, and crucially, by translation.” The point, clearly, could be spoken of Carpelan as well, and as Hitchcock brings this book to a close, he asks readers to form a dialogic critique in attempting to puzzle out the question of Carpelan’s position in the field of letters and most especially vis-à-vis modernism, which Hitchcock spells with a decidedly lower-case “m.” How might the map of modernism be redrawn, Hitchcock wonders, to account for contributions from other than the typical metropolitan centers (Paris, London, New York) from which (and from where) it has to this point been constructed? He broadens this inquiry to ask about dialogic approaches themselves and what they might contribute to a still very much open discussion of Carpelan, M/modernism, and the larger questions concerning both authorship and genre which lurk behind them.

This brings us back, then, to the original question: why read Carpelan? The answer, though hardly uncomplicated, might be posed by playing with the grammar a little bit, and asking, “What does it mean *to have read* Carpelan?” Hopefully this collection exists both as a response and an encouragement to pick up *Urwind* or another of his texts for the first time, or once again.

This volume is not intended to duplicate the efforts of Finnish and Finnish-speaking, or Finland-Swedish scholars who have spent so much time before us working on Carpelan in the original language(s). In fact, in most cases, we have not consulted that literature, because we are divided from it by language. Thus if a bilin-

gual reader finds some correspondence between these expositions and those of the critics who have worked in this field before us, we hope that this will be remarked upon as a coincidence and as evidence that the primary texts we study have a way of reaching readers no matter whether in the original language or in translation.

NOTES

¹ Note that his argument references the commonly accepted distinction between Finnish literary traditions and Finland-Swedish literature, though he says that it is now common for the two to be discussed together.

² Note that Espmark is not trying to fix Södergran, but rather he is anxious to prove that in her poetry immediately following the early work, Södergran departed from this style of Symbolist-Expressionist influenced work (7+). She lived only until 1923 and so did not participate in the longer history of the modernist form of expression.

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- DuBois, Thomas (1994) "Urwind [book review]." *World Literature Today* 68.2 (Spring 1994): 382.
- Espmark, Kjell (1976) "The Translation of the Soul: A Principle Feature in Finland-Swedish Modernism." *Scandinavica* [Special edition] 15.1. Ed. Johan Wrede. London: Academic Press, 5–27.
- Fagerholm, Monica, ed (1998) "Bo Carpelan: Fruits of Reading [interview]." *Books from Finland*
<http://www.booksfromfinland.fi/1998/12/fruits-of-reading/#more-7047>
- Hird, Gladys (1978) "Edith Södergran: A Pioneer of Finland-Swedish Modernism." *Books from Finland* 12.1: 4–11.
- Nummi, Jyrki (2012) "Modernist Asymmetries: Centre, Periphery and Juhani Aho's *Yksin*." *Ouest-Est: Dynamiques Centre-Périphérie entre les Deux Moitiés du Continent*. Ed. Traian Sandu et al. Paris: L'Harmattan: 363–380.
- Poom, Ritva (1995) "Parallels in Finnish and Finland-Swedish Modernism: Eeva-Liisa Manner and Edith Södergran." In George C Schoofield and Laurie Thompson, eds. *Two Women Writers from Finland*. Edinburgh, Lockharton: 69–80.
- Rees, Ellen (2001) "Problems of Prose Modernism and Frigidity in Stina Aronson's 'The Fever Book' and Edith Øberg's 'Man in Darkness'." *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 20.2 (Autumn 2001): 237–52.
- Riikonen, H. K. (2007) "Modernism in Finnish Literature." In Astradur Eysteinnsson and Vivian Lisk, eds. *Modernism*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia, J Benjamins: 847–854.

Wrede, Johan (1976) "The Birth of Finland-Swedish Modernism: A Study in the Social Dynamics of Ideas." *Scandinavica* [Special edition] 15.1. Ed. Johan Wrede. London: Academic Press: 73–103.

Stephen Souris

**“A CONFUSING AND WONDERFUL MOSAIC”:
DIALOGIC ASPECTS OF BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND***

Thus do days, weeks and years pass into my double-entry ledger. (UW 75)

* * *

I must go forward, dragging with me all the rooms I have visited, like an old bargeman. (111)

* * *

[Bernt] mixes up past and present, the way time itself does, everything affects everything else and forms a confusing and wonderful mosaic that resembles the logic of dreams, indeed, surpasses it. (32)

* * *

The challenges facing the reader of Bo Carpelan’s *Urwind* (1993) are many and are suggested by the criticisms that appear in the few pieces that have been published in English on the novel. Even the Secretary General of The Finnish Book Foundation, which bestowed the Finlandia Prize upon *Urwind*, writes that “[t]he prize-winning novel wasn’t necessarily a book that would appeal to a wide audience, rather it was quite intellectual” (Sonninen 2004). Roger Holmström observes that “[t]here are several [readers] who, after having read the first four or five chapters, put the book aside, convinced that it is a story one can’t get into” (qtd. in Schoolfield 2000, 120). Michel Ekman complains that the novel is “disjointed and self-indulgent,” that “[t]here are many clichés in [Urwind’s] fantasy life,” that the novel becomes “mechanical and tiring,” and that “the missing structure is very noticeable” (qtd. in Schoolfield 120). The most scathing criticism is found in Edward McBride’s (1996) review in the *Times Literary Supplement*. McBride sees the

book as a “vivid portrayal of near-paralysing alienation,” and as such, he declares that “the hero’s dislocation and listlessness infect the book so strongly that it is almost impossible to read.” He refers to the protagonist’s “wallowing in hindsight.” He asserts that “Urwind’s life-story reads more as a mood piece than a narrative; the events described are emotional rather than biographical landmarks [...]” McBride declares that “Urwind’s psychological stock-taking represents a self-conscious effort to explain how he has gradually lost all sense of connection with everyone save [his wife].” Finally, McBride suggests that “Urwind does not even try to express himself through his own words or images; he borrows from all the authors and artists he has encountered during his lifelong career as a book-lover” (1996, 23). Clearly, this prize-winning novel requires a certain kind of reader to appreciate it. What kind of reader would that be? I suggest that a reader approaching the novel from a Bakhtinian standpoint is uniquely situated to understand its richness.

However, given Bakhtin’s stubbornly judgmental dismissal of poetry as a monologic genre in favor of the novel as a superior, dialogic genre, the insistently poetic texture of Carpelan’s prose may make questionable from the outset the value of a Bakhtinian approach to *Urwind*.¹ We might wonder after reading a few pages of *Urwind* if the novel is going to be a monologically self-indulgent narrative whose primary purpose is to revel in the poetic sensibility of a single, insular consciousness the agenda of which is to cultivate an insistently private vision.

As it turns out, though, it is precisely the first-person narrator’s self-preoccupation and his particular predicament that gives rise to dialogic dynamics of various sorts—within the obvious limits of the restriction to a single consciousness.² If we take the key concepts of heteroglossia, dialogism, chronotope, and carnival (the terms and concepts are to be defined over the course of this essay) as our investigatory rubrics to assess *Urwind* from a Bakhtinian perspective, what seems at first glance like another tediously solipsistic modernist first person narrative reveals itself to be criss-crossed with dia-

logic strands with the chronotopic and carnivalesque aspects contributing to the narrator's dialogic agenda. A Bakhtinian approach to *Urwind*, then, offers more than an academic exercise in Bakhtinian methodology: it is uniquely well-suited to make sense of this unusually complicated and dense narrative. A Bakhtinian approach to the novel helps establish the profoundly affirmative and dialogic nature of what might seem like a tediously self-indulgent, monologic wallowing in existential despair. By approaching the novel from the key Bakhtinian concepts, we can better appreciate the narrator's sustained agenda of lifting himself by his own bootstraps³ to overcome his mid-life malaise. His imaginative dialogic engagement with various people who have been a part of his life, as well as with various works of art that have been important to him, demonstrates that there can indeed be a vigorous and productive kind of dialogism even when everything is subsumed under a single consciousness. As such, this essay attempts to demonstrate by drawing from Bakhtin that the harshest critics, such as McBride, are missing the subtleties and complexities of *Urwind*. Moreover, by using Bakhtin to articulate the dialogic richness of a novel that emanates from the mind of a single protagonist, we can perhaps appreciate the ways in which such a novel lends itself to a Bakhtinian analysis even though what Bakhtin celebrates most are heteroglot and dialogic environments that are not subsumed under a single consciousness.

Heteroglossia and Dialogism

The first issue in any novel that one might investigate from a Bakhtinian perspective is the novel's heteroglossia, that is, the degree to which the novel consists of a radical diversity of very different points of view representing a wide spectrum of society. The kind of novel Bakhtin celebrates possesses such radical diversity. His entire model of novelistic discourse is based upon the presence of conspicuous heteroglossia as a starting point, followed by an ex-

ploration of the implications of that diversity. Urwind's many references to other works of art and his almost obsessive presentation of others' views of him may seem tedious to some readers, but from a Bakhtinian standpoint, this relentless cultivation of diverse viewpoints is understandable and even necessary on philosophical grounds.⁴

Sheer heteroglossia, however—even insistent heteroglossia—is not in and of itself sufficient for a novel to be truly dialogic. A Bakhtinian analysis would examine the “event potential” (Bakhtin 1984, 81) between perspectives and not simply the presence of multiple points of view. Reading the novel this way is enormously helpful in making sense of the narrative. Urwind's need to come to terms with himself now that he has reached middle-age requires that he survey his life, looking backwards even as he moves inexorably forward in time (“Thus do days, weeks and years pass into my double-entry ledger” [UW 75]), engaging with the various voices of people whom he has known and with the various works of art he has encountered. For Bakhtin, dialogism is a special sort of engagement between two voices. It requires an intense commitment to understanding the other voice or position, incorporating it into one's own consciousness and interacting with it, perhaps even arguing with it, perhaps even being haunted by it, but ultimately being in some way changed by it. Dialogism is a very special kind of dialogue; it is not a casual back-and-forth between speakers. Nor is dialogism to be understood as dialectics: dialectics involves abstract positions, whereas dialogics involves embodied, highly particularized positions. The consciousness of a Bakhtinian protagonist is highly permeable: voices from others readily enter and engage with that consciousness. Indeed, Bakhtinian protagonists seek out other positions as a way of being; they define themselves through an intense engagement with other viewpoints and are changed by that engagement. Urwind is the quintessentially Bakhtinian protagonist, as I will demonstrate by examining selected examples of intertextuality and engagement with other people who have been part of his life; I will, in addition, show how Bakhtin's concepts of carnival

and chronotope help us understand the dialogic nature of the narrator's quest.

Intertextuality

To assess the event potential across viewpoints in *Urwind*, we might first examine the way in which the protagonist makes use of intertextuality to come to terms with his mid-life crisis. With constant references to classic authors, composers, and artists, the linear, "horizontal," syntagmatic progression of *Urwind*'s narrative has many digressive, "vertical," paradigmatic offshoots that allow for a rich interaction between *Urwind*'s own situation and similar or opposite situations represented by the authors, composers, and artists invoked. My examples will be limited to a few that contribute to the mid-life crisis theme.

Of the many literary references throughout *Urwind* that provide intertextual dialogic dynamics, the ones to the poets William Carlos Williams, Theodore Roethke, and John Keats are representative. *Urwind* quotes the famous declaration by Williams—"no ideas but in things" (35). Williams' emphasis on the phenomenological richness of things in the present moment, as seen in his famous poem, "The Red Wheelbarrow," adds dialogic depth to *Urwind*'s own narrative, the upshot of which is to appreciate life more.⁵ The quoted lines in Chapter 38 ("Granny Is Dead") from another modern American poet, Theodore Roethke, also suggest the kind of fulfillment and joy the protagonist might find in life by turning his attention to the present moment (143–144). The narrator's father is here trying to come to terms with the death of his mother. He is with the narrator and reads from Roethke's (1958) *Words for the Wind*. Although this is not mentioned in the text, the poem the father is sharing with his son is titled "The Shape of the Fire" (included in *Words for the Wind*). It is full of depressing images up to the section Fredrik quotes. Here are some examples: "Wake me, witch, we'll do the dance of rotten sticks"; "In the hour of ripeness, the tree is bar-

ren”; “Have you come to unhinge my shadow?”; and “The wind sharpened itself on a rock.” Then, in the fifth section of the poem, from which Fredrik quotes, the tone abruptly changes. The images are now resolutely affirmative, directing one’s attention to highly particularized examples of the beauty of the present moment in nature to those who are properly attuned to it. The following lines typify the entire section: “To stare into the afterlight, the glitter left on the lake’s surface, / When the sun has fallen behind a wooded island; / To follow the drops sliding from a lifted oar, / Held up, while the rower breathes, and the small boat drifts quietly shoreward [...]” (UW 96). Just as Roethke in “The Shape of the Fire” works his way from depression to affirmation, and Fredrik counters the sadness of his mother’s passing with the final section of the poem, so, too, must our narrator work his way out of his own depression, self-doubt, and existential anguish. Urwind draws upon the remembered moment with his father to remind himself of the lesson his father tried to share with him back then because it is even more relevant to him now that he is experiencing a mid-life crisis. Urwind’s use of Keats’ “O Thou Whose Face Hath Felt the Winter’s Wind” in Chapter 43 (“The Skating Rink”) is an interesting attempt to cheer himself up, just as Keats penned the lines, according to Urwind, to lift his own spirits. Urwind quotes the second half of Keats’s poem:

*O fret not after knowledge. I have none,
 And yet my song comes native with the warmth.
 O fret not after knowledge! I have none.
 And yet the evening listens. He who saddens
 At thought of idleness cannot be idle,
 And he’s awake who thinks himself asleep.* (159)

These lines speak to the protagonist’s predicament because they embody the same tension between dejection and hard-won affirmation that he himself is experiencing at mid-life.

As a way of making the entire set of references to world authors resound dialogically, Carpelan has Urwind ask himself in Chapter 48 (“The Book That Writes You”): “Will I also one day take from my shrunken inner self my laboriously dreamed-togeth-

er life's work and set it beside these tales of brilliant achievements and bitter defeats?" (174). Although Urwind does not bring the numerous works of literature mentioned throughout the novel into dialogic contact with each other, the noteworthy achievements of authors around the world taken as one conglomerate gestalt serve as a dialogizing background to the protagonist's own efforts.

Even more significant than the literary allusions to Williams, Roethke, and Keats are the allusions to the biblical *Book of Daniel*, including the references to Daniel in the lions' den and the angel Gabriel.

Urwind's use of the name Gabriel sets up a dialogic dynamic through similarity. As summarized by the *Oxford Companion to the Bible*,

Gabriel is one of the most prominent angels in postexilic Jewish literature and in Christian texts [...]. [H]e is one of the four angels close to God's throne [...]. [H]e explains mysteries about future political events [as we see in the *Book of Daniel*] [...] and he delivers special revelations from God to individuals [...]. Gabriel [...] [also] functions as an intermediary or an interpreter of dreams. (238)

The Gabriel of *Urwind* plays an important role by encouraging the protagonist to pursue joy in life and to endure the contradictions inherent in the human condition. "Listen to my prophecies," he declares. "[M]ore you will never get. One is forced to live in contradictions, if they were erased life would collapse." Quoting an Inuit writer, he recites the following passage: "The great sea moves me, the great sea takes me away, it bows me like the grass on a stone in the river. The height of the heavens moves me, the strong wind blows through me, takes me with it so that I tremble with joy" (135). If only Urwind could embrace contradiction and be joyful! What better way for Carpelan to communicate that central message to his protagonist than to have it delivered by a character whose name invokes a biblical messenger of ultimate authority. The only irony—and it is a powerful one—is that our protagonist is not noticeably religious. The fact that Urwind manifests no religious beliefs at all is highlighted by the following assertion by his grand-

mother in Chapter 25 (“Midsummer”): “God created the birds and set the mountains in their places. He also decided to create man, but then abandoned us, and we must seek him, as the children seek the one who has hidden” (96). Carpelan’s Urwind does not seek God; he is an “alien man” (175) in search of himself. He internalizes Gabriel’s message, though, recognizing Gabriel’s authority, as we see in the dream he has near the end of the novel. In his dream, he is present at a gathering where Gabriel declares:

Of airy nothing are we made, to airy nothing do we return. See, above us opens the sky, cold and clear, strewn with stars, but we are here, earthbound for a moment in eternity, evil and good in bitter blending, and it is our task to tell them apart, evil and good, false and genuine, play and seriousness, dream and reality. Courage exists, I know it, mercy exists, and sharp perception. Feel with the eye, see [with] the heart! (182–83)

If the use of the name Gabriel establishes a dialogic dynamic of similarity, the use of the name Daniel functions by way of dissimilarity. The biblical Daniel is a man of great wisdom and fame. He is especially known for his extraordinary insight into dreams and is thus kept by various Babylonian kings, such as Nebuchadnezzar and Belthazar, so that they can know the divine significance of certain dreams. For example, Daniel correctly interprets the handwriting on the wall. When the biblical Daniel is thrown into the lions’ den for praying to his god in violation of the king’s order, his god does save him from certain mutilation. The rich biblical material is invoked in all its particularity and significance throughout *Urwind* with the simplest of references. Here are some examples: Granny in Chapter 7 (“Granny in Bed”) asks, “Ah, Daniel, Daniel, come over here so I can touch you. Have you struggled your way up from the lions’ den [...]?” (26). Granny Stilen, in her praise of God, mentions at one point, “He who rescued little Daniel from the lions’ den” (49). And Dani, himself, while in the apartment house’s bomb shelter, thinks of his biblical namesake (53).⁶ What makes these allusions to the *Book of Daniel* so productive from a dialogic standpoint is that they work by way of ironic inversion. Our Daniel is

not like his biblical namesake; in fact, he is essentially the opposite. Instead of being famous, he is unknown; instead of being universally regarded as a wise man, he is pathetically unsure of himself; instead of having a gift for dream interpretation, he merely presents his own dreams and, by implication, invites the reader to figure them out for him. The repeated allusions to the biblical Daniel function to enhance the impression of Urwind's passivity and ineffectuality through the constant reminder of his biblical namesake.

In addition to literary allusions, Urwind gets good dialogic mileage out of references to musical compositions. A few salient examples of this kind of intertextuality will suffice. Daniel mentions Frank Sinatra in the scene where Dani has to prove his worthiness to the father of the girl he's pursuing, Fanny. Dani is extremely uncomfortable under the scrutiny of Fanny's father. "Every subject of conversation became a series of student essays," Urwind recollects (79). Suddenly, Sinatra's album *Songs for Swinging Lovers* starts playing. This is a deliciously ironic moment because Dani and Fanny are not exactly swinging lovers—yet. And although Dani manages to get beyond his "interview" with Fanny's father into her bedroom where the two consummate their relationship, the father is standing outside the door about to knock (82). As with Urwind's references to the biblical Daniel, the dialogicity here works by way of ironic inversion.

Another example of dialogic intertextuality involving musical allusions is Urwind's use of Mozart's "Haffner" Symphony. In Chapter 9 ("The Haffner"), he remembers when his mother took him to a performance of the famous Mozart symphony because she knew that he loved it. He fantasized during the performance that the conductor fell ill all of a sudden and he, Dani, was asked to take over because of his intimate familiarity with the piece. Here is Urwind's recreation of that fantasy, writing as the middle-aged adult:

It begins. It has begun. The orchestra sees me, for a moment I hear the music before the *allegro moderato*, before the preparations for triumph. I alone am responsible, alone have the power to move the stars about the sky and make stones dance. The silence is so taut that it im-

mediately answers. I am no one. Three blows against the rock, a clear, proud stream of water flows out. Joy! The inexplicable reveals itself, formed to a single body, a hovering building, an innermost room. I attain it, I have no age, I am primordially ancient, I am time condensed and wiped away, the wordless, I am the power and the metamorphoses. I cannot read the text of the score, it is the song of a bird, I know it. I know the allegro, I walk its steps in a sun-bright park with heavenly clouds, in its expectancy, I live in the andante's melancholy and move in its dance. I raise romantic hands, I walk on classical feet, the purest sorrow falls like snow and covers my face, it is inexplicable. (35)

One must know the “Haffner” to fully appreciate the exhilaration Dani experiences. The symphony is in the best classical tradition of majestic and sublime nobility. The intertextual reference to the “Haffner” invokes an entire mood and outlook on life, as does Dani’s fantasy of conducting it and having thereby a peak experience. It is crucially important for the older Urwind to remember this triumphant fantasy by his younger self as he struggles to come to terms with his mid-life crisis. Recreating the childhood fantasy of conducting Mozart’s “Haffner Symphony” is an important “bootstrap” moment for Urwind in that he uses his memory of Dani’s fantasy to lift himself out of his mid-life blues. Especially significant in this passage is the affirmation of joy. As we will see shortly, in passages where he uses other characters to provide the encouragement he needs to move beyond his mid-life impasse, the word joy also appears. It is significant that Urwind as a youngster knew how to find “joy.” His project in the present is to bring joy back into his life.

In the area of visual arts, Urwind makes especially good use of paintings by Klee, Cézanne, and Van Eyck. The protagonist’s dialogic engagement with them helps him think through and articulate his various middle-age preoccupations.

The Klee painting in question is “The Messenger of Autumn” (sometimes translated as “The Herald of Autumn”). Chapter 42 is devoted to this painting and opens with a lengthy meditation upon its meanings for Urwind. The painting speaks to him at mid-life because it represents the calm maturity he himself is striving after:

There is a state of mind there, as at parting, but without sorrow. There is no longer any striving for greenness; what we have lost in words like ‘fate’ and ‘completion,’ ‘stillness’ and ‘consolation’ are found recreated here [...]. [T]he great trees [in parks and cities] burn so silently, as though they had nothing else to tell us but that beauty is a gift, full of secrets, as existence is for a child. (154)

The fact that Urwind has a reproduction of this painting “pinned to the wall in front of the writing desk” (154) suggests its importance to him as a reminder of the middle-aged maturity he should strive to embrace.

In contrast to his use of Klee to represent what he yearns for, Urwind uses Cézanne to represent what he does not seek. He describes how his mother had a fondness for Cézanne’s Mont Sainte-Victoire series. In his recollections of her, she imitates the paintings, or uses them for inspiration, it seems, because she finds a certain comfort in the sense of eternal stability that emanates from Cézanne’s geometrical vision of nature. As she paints in one of Urwind’s recollections, his father reads from Cézanne’s letters: “‘Nature is to us human beings more depth than surface [...]’” (UW 67). The father then reads from a critic, who observes that the paintings of Cézanne’s late period suggest “‘a distance from life, from human beings—as if all his landscapes were depicted in a complete absence of wind’” (68). It is not clear just which one of Cézanne’s many paintings of Mount Sainte-Victoire the mother is working from, but a familiarity with the series is sufficient for the dialogic dynamic to result from the incorporation of the reference to Cézanne. The simple reference adds depth to Urwind’s characterization of the mother, who seemed to take refuge from her responsibilities in the comforting abstractions of Cézanne’s paintings. This intertextual use of Cézanne contributes to the narrator’s agenda by providing a contrast to his pursuit of a self-accepting and life-embracing philosophy in the sense that he must learn to sign his name in the wind—as he does at the end of the novel—instead of seeking a realm beyond the wind. The use of Cézanne is another example of how the protagonist uses references to other works of art to establish ironic inversion.

The reference to Van Eyck's famous painting in Chapter 10 ("The Arnolfini Couple") is another important intertextual moment in *Urwind* based on works of pictorial art. The protagonist's meditation upon the painting reveals that he is not without some self-awareness regarding the reasons Maria might have for wanting to leave him. Urwind offers an extensive analysis of the painting, "The Arnolfini Portrait" (one of several ways the title is translated into English), writing ostensibly to his Maria. He observes,

I have held your hand the way he is holding hers, he is not touching it, protecting it only, close against the back of his hand with its warmth, they are not looking at each other. He keeps his other hand raised, as though he were reproaching her for something, or pointing out rules of life to her. But she has her own life, she keeps it hidden, in the folds of her magnificent green gown. (37)

It seems Urwind is acknowledging indirectly to Maria that he may have been guilty of a similar failure to demonstrate warmth, and guilty of a similar show of condescending superiority. At the end of his meditation on the painting, he writes, "Don't you think he looks a bit nasty, Giovanni, and she, submissive?" (38). One must have the painting in mind and the conventional interpretations of it, which do not suggest criticism of the male figure, to fully appreciate the dialogic implications of this scene. The painting allows the protagonist to communicate something to his wife without coming right out and saying it. There is a reason why she has decided to spend a year in the States doing research, and there is a reason why she falls in love with another man. Urwind slowly comes to realize over the course of the narrative that she is drifting away from him and that he may be partly responsible. His engagement with the Van Eyck painting is a good example of how Carpelan has the narrator's dialogic engagement with other works of art result in a deeper understanding of himself.

Urwind's dialogic engagement with Van Eyck's "The Arnolfini Couple," Cézanne's Mont Saint Victoire series, and Klee's "The Messenger of Autumn" allows him to become clearer about what

he is striving for. They serve as visual representations of his preoccupations.

Dialogic Engagement with Other Characters

In addition to the obvious sort of dialogism unleashed by overt references to other literary, musical, and pictorial works of art, we can find dialogic potential in Urwind's orientation to his wife and various other characters. Bakhtin writes in *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* that the Dostoevskian protagonist's discourse "must find itself, reveal itself among other words, within an intense field of interorientations" (1984, 239). These "other words" are the words of other characters, actual or imagined. Carpelan's protagonist likewise strives to understand himself within an "intense field of interorientations" as he looks back upon his life and conjures up the various people who made an impression on him.

In many cases, the effectiveness of the conjuring up is enhanced by a richly particularized setting. For Bakhtin, a point of view needs to be particularized and not abstract; dialogic dynamics requires rich particularization. For Urwind's life review to be effective, he needs to ground the remembered voices of his past in the details of the individuals' circumstances. In Bakhtinian terms, when a character is located within a matrix of time and space coordinates, that character can be said to occupy a unique chronotope. In *Urwind*, the many passages of poetic prose are in the service of establishing chronotopic particularity which then enhances the dialogic potential of the position being represented because the represented positions are no longer abstract. When the positions of different points of view defined by different chronotopes engage with each other, we have a dialogism of chronotopes.⁷ Some of the passages where Urwind remembers people from his past demonstrate the enhanced dialogism that obtains from locating points of view in unique time-space coordinates. Bakhtin ends "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" by declaring, "[E]very en-

try into the sphere of meanings is accomplished only through the gates of the chronotope” (1981, 258). For Bakhtin, any particular chronotope involves a unique relationship between time and space. A chronotope can involve a specific time and place or a non-specific time and place, or one of the terms can be specific and the other can be non-specific. In *Urwind*, the character-based chronotopes tend to be richer in details about place than they are about time. In this vein, Pauli Tapani Karjalainen’s (1988) observation that in *Urwind*, “[p]lace is a story we tell” is provocatively apt.⁸

It would seem that the protagonist’s orientation to Maria would be a rich source of dialogicity. After all, he writes on the first page, “I am writing a diary for you, you will receive it as a part of me when you come back” (1). One might expect his entire narrative to be structured around a deep engagement with her, anticipating her reactions, answering them in advance—speaking throughout, as Bakhtin puts it, with a “sideward glance” (e.g., Bakhtin 1984, 203). Indeed, there is one passage early in the novel that is curiously similar to the passage Bakhtin focuses on in Dostoevsky’s *Poor Folk* where Makar describes to Varenka his modest quarters near the kitchen, anticipating her reactions (Bakhtin 1984, 204ff.). *Urwind* writes, “I know that you think I spend too much time here, in the room facing the rear courtyard. I have a kitchenette, I have had a simple shower room put in, I have my CD player, I have left the TV in our living room, even if you can scarcely watch it” (5). But the fact of the matter is that he does not have the cringing sideward glance that Bakhtin ascribes to Makar in *Poor Folk*. In fact, while ostensibly intending to show Maria his entire journal upon her return and while addressing her directly in numerous places throughout the novel, ironically *Urwind*’s narrative is not structured around a dialogic engagement with the woman who needed to get away from her husband for a year. The references to Maria seem perfunctory and do not lead to any real engagement with her. Her presence as a potential reader does not seem to exert much influence on *Urwind*’s writing at all, even though he claims he misses her dearly. Instead, he uses the agreement that he’ll share the journal with her

when she returns to embark upon an extended meditation on his own life for his own purposes. On the second page, he notes that he is “writing to you [Maria], at long range. Or is it to myself that I write, this unfamiliar I that dodges off round each window corner [...]?” (2). It turns out that that is indeed his primary purpose for writing; however, to a remarkable degree this writing to himself, which may seem tedious and solipsistic at first glance, involves dialogic interorientations to the words of others.

More important by far than his orientation towards Maria is his orientation in the journal towards his Aunt Viktoria. She functions as an alter ego or *Doppelgänger*. In contrast to the usual role of the Double in fiction written in the third person, where the author places a secondary character in the plot to represent a side of the protagonist that the protagonist lacks or that has been repressed, here the protagonist himself intentionally cultivates memories of this secondary character out of a deliberate agenda to supplement his own shortcomings. He desperately needs to work himself out of his mid-life crisis. He suffers from depression, low self-esteem, passivity, and crippling self-doubt. He is the typical modern anti-hero whose stature is lower than, not higher than, the average person’s.⁹ Viktoria is the exact opposite of Urwind. She is self-sufficient, bold, courageous—and joyful. He deliberately incorporates her into his narrative to remind himself of the qualities she represents. He gives her a conspicuously important place in his narrative. She is less a Bakhtinian “penetrative word,” intersecting with an internal dialogue within himself and setting off an intensified version of that pre-existing internal debate, than she is a deliberately chosen external voice representing what he knows he needs as a supplement to his own dominant voice. The compelling dialogicity that arises from her place in the narrative is due to his deliberate wooing of her strengths by giving her a prominent place in his journal and having her speak to his shortcomings—directly and indirectly.

There are several important moments when Urwind engages dialogically with Viktoria as he tries to work his way out of his unproductive state. One such moment occurs in Chapter 4 (“In Vik-

toria's Room"), where he imagines her giving him advice both as a youngster and as a middle-aged man. She declares, "To live one's life, what else is there to do here?" (15). There are three chronotopes in this chapter: that of Urwind in the present, Dani in the past, and Viktoria as she existed in the past. The specificity of detail about Viktoria and her environment provided by the protagonist in his journal enhances the power of her words because the richness of setting gives the necessary ground for her point of view to resonate with authenticity. Interestingly, Urwind remarks that his memory of the color of her eyes functions like a catalyst to bring back the past: "It is all happening here and now, the past is waiting for me, it has the blue color of her eyes" (16). Viktoria and her philosophy of life are not remembered in abstract terms but through concrete details, the specificity of which makes her philosophy of life more meaningful. Another example of Urwind's dialogic engagement with Viktoria occurs in Chapter 37 ("Viktoria's Blue Cathedral"). She has built out of wood and glue a model cathedral which seems to somehow sum up her entire life and also to represent an existentialist assertion of personal value upon the void of existence. "When one grows old, one must become one's own heaven and church," she declares (137). Urwind writes: "From Viktoria's cathedral emanates a faint but clear music. It speaks of a great calm, beyond childhood, beyond death. It smells of wood and glue, but also of something unknown, more obscure, more bitter. It contains so much completed longing. And what does your cathedral look like, Daniel?" (138). The richly detailed nature of Urwind's vision of Viktoria in this chapter gives resonance to her prodding. Chapter 49 ("Viktoria Speaks") is another example of how his dialogic engagement with Viktoria contributes to his quest. He imagines her in old age here—she's eighty and close to death—speaking to him at age forty-nine. She's lonely and resigned to die. Her wisdom for him is tempered by her advanced age. She talks about grace. And she confronts him with the ultimate question: "What does your Book of Daniel look like?" (178). He imagines she calls him an "old hack" (177); he thinks of himself as a "blockhead"

(179). Given that all the passages involving Viktoria are imagined by Urwind—she is, after all, dead in the present moment of the narrative—the dialogic potential of her life philosophy and challenges to him is significant. Her significance is enhanced by positioning her shortly after the beginning of the narrative (Chapter 4, “In Viktoria’s Room”) and shortly before the end (Chapter 49, “Viktoria Speaks”). Viktoria was important to young Dani, but she is equally important—perhaps even more important—to the middle-aged protagonist. He uses his journal to remember her but also to resurrect her in such a way that she can help him overcome his crippling passivity and self-doubt.

Urwind also enlists the support of his mother in an attempt to lift himself up by his bootstraps through the journal exercise. In Chapter 39 (“The Farthest Place”) he imagines a conversation with her from the other side of the grave in which she offers advice to him as a thirty-nine-year-old man. He has her say to him: “I tried to praise life, that ought to be our task, don’t you think, Daniel?” (146). The final page of this chapter is poignant in its depiction of the mother and her sympathy for her struggling son (“[Y]ou are still seeking, groping your way through open rooms, have no permanent place, only a labyrinth, echo chamber [...]” [147]). While she is not the same independent spirit that Viktoria was, Urwind was very close to his mother and mourned her loss. She has a place in the line-up he has established to help him work his way out of his unproductive solipsism in spite of her preference for seeking refuge from the wind of life by taking Cézanne as her artistic inspiration.

Very different from the dialogic dynamic resulting from the inclusion of his mother’s and his aunt’s voices is the inclusion of criticism from the librarian, Emerentia Busch, and his neighbor, Herman Stilen. Urwind incorporates the voices of his mother and his aunt to provide moral support; in contrast, he demonstrates in the passages on Herman Stilen and Emerentia Busch that he can leave behind his own position and acknowledge the unsympathetic criticism of others. By including voices of criticism, Urwind expands and enriches the heteroglossia of his narrative and the dia-

logic event potential. A protagonist with a dialogized consciousness hears voices—a great many of them, representing a wide range of possible perspectives—and he finds an identity for himself through that process.

Urwind demonstrates that he can understand why the librarian, Emerentia Busch, was unfriendly towards children who came to the library. Surely Dani was not this understanding. To him, she must have been a “witch.” But the older Daniel can understand why Emerentia resented the kids creating a mess in her library. The long passage on her in Chapter 11 (“The Library”) is impressive for the way it establishes the oppressive strictness and rigidity of the head librarian while at the same time suggesting the validity of her criticism as well as an appreciation of her values. Urwind describes one day when his mother got into a massive argument with Emerentia Busch when she, his mother, came to the defense of Dani and children in general. The librarian rose to the challenge, distinguishing between the way adults and children behave in her library:

[T]hey [the adults] do not leave ham sandwiches between the leaves of *The Lion, the Witch and the Wardrobe*, they do not live like savages or cannibals, drones or dreamers inside the covers that have been purchased with precious municipal resources! [...]. And what does Mrs. Urwind think we do here day in and day out? Every day we clear up books that the children have spread out on the floor [...]. There are texts that they swallowed, that are lost forever! And what do you think we find among the cards in the catalogue? [...]. You should see the picture books! Children eat everything, poke their fingers into everything, take a great interest in everything, run up and down behind the book stacks, this [is] how they do it, this is how they spread out their arms, they bring everything toppling down, hurl themselves to the floor, clamber about like monkeys [...]. (41)

Nevertheless, Urwind writes near the end of his long recollection these favorable words: “Emerentia is burning with indignation and delight. She is a big red cloud, she shakes our dust off us, blows our noses, opens our eyes, what is life in the street compared to life here [...].” (41).¹⁰

In the passage I am thinking of involving Herman Stilen, Urwind shows that he is aware of Mr. Stilen's contempt. He feels in Herman's presence "a mild contempt [...]. I am the bookworm's boy and books are something one can do without except when it's a matter of struggling grimly forward" (23). There is considerable free indirect discourse in this lengthy passage through which Urwind conveys both Herman's disdain of Dani's bookishness and his worthlessness in practical matters as well as Urwind's own satiric treatment of Herman's sense of superiority. The tone of satiric undercutting comes across in phrases like these: "No, no one can lead Herman Stilen up the garden path. He laughs, shortly. Something dark and pompous permeates everything here, the wedding bouquet that stands like a mummy on the top shelf of the cupboard [...]. It has all been accumulated with dry passion" (24). The bi-directional criticism (Herman of Dani, Urwind of Herman) is intertwined in this passage and is nearly simultaneous; the lack of quotation marks enhances the complex intertwining of viewpoints by not separating them out formally. This passage is therefore a good example of what Bakhtin calls "double-voiced discourse," and it is similar to what in narratological terms is called free indirect discourse: two viewpoints are meshed together in a passage that appears at first glance to be monologic (singular and unified in viewpoint).¹¹ What I want to stress is Urwind's willingness to allow for Stilen's criticism, even though he has his own criticism of Stilen. It is unclear how aware young Dani was of Stilen's disdain; what is clear is that the protagonist, in remembering Stilen, gives full expression to his neighbor's criticism of him at this critical time in his life when everything is in shambles.

My point in directing attention to these moments in the narrative where Urwind imagines people criticizing him is to suggest that his ability to see and acknowledge the criticism of Herman Stilen and Emerentia Busch from their perspective at least to a certain degree (albeit with some satiric undercutting as well) suggests something other than a monologically firm consciousness—and monologic firmness is the antithesis of Bakhtinian openness to other

voices. His ability to see from their eyes at least to some degree is an indication of a dialogized consciousness or a consciousness that is prepared to reach beyond itself.¹² Approaching the protagonist from a Bakhtinian perspective makes it easier to appreciate the richness and complexity of this notoriously difficult novel. The scenes involving Emerentia Busch and Herman Stilen are not gratuitous memories; they are strategic exercises as part of Urwind's life review.

Carnival

Bakhtin's concept of carnival is noticeably different from his theory of dialogism in that the carnivalesque dynamic consists of a dialectical opposition between points of view instead of the deeper, more intense "interorientation" between viewpoints characterized by dialogic dynamics.¹³ Bakhtin's concept of carnival stresses the aggressive challenging and overturning of established rules and values. Carnival time allows for the overturning or transvaluation of established order.¹⁴ There are several passages in the novel in which Urwind describes fantasies or dreams of a bizarre and entirely improbable nature, characterized by fantastic, surrealistic happenings.¹⁵ From a Bakhtinian perspective, these moments, which may make a reader uncomfortable who prefers traditional realism, are carnivalesque moments that contribute to the protagonist's overall dialogic agenda through the abrupt challenge to the status quo of his life and personality. Urwind is rather conservative and passive; he is cautious and hesitant. The carnival moments, which usually come unexpectedly and are departures from his everyday experience, are assaults upon that rigidity. The challenge is dialectical during the carnival moment, but the protagonist is affected by each of those challenges; although there is no dialogic engagement during the carnival moment, a seed is planted that eventually bears dialogic fruit. *Urwind* is an interesting example of how carnivalesque assaults upon a rigid consciousness can, along with other, deeper

dialogic dynamics, contribute to an opening up of that consciousness. The fantastic and sometimes phantasmagoric scenarios imagined by Urwind in these carnival moments open up new possibilities for him as he strives at the age of fifty-three to come to terms with and move beyond his limitations.¹⁶

The novel's epigraph is relevant to the carnivalesque strain in *Urwind*. The lines from Gunnar Björling's *Sungreen* (*Solgrönt*, 1933) speak to the carnivalesque impulse to turn things upside-down and inside-out to challenge the status quo while still maintaining a hold on life. The persona of the poem declares, "I want [...] houses to stand on their roofs and the ground to hover in the air / all the lines, the forms be hurled up in the air / like a topsy-turviness [...] and all be as it is, / from the [inside] out."¹⁷ That we stand in balance / on opened street's abyss's walls / and hold house and eyes together." These lines from *Sungreen* speak to the protagonist's desperate attempt to move beyond his limitations while still maintaining some sense of control.

Some of the carnival moments are affirmative, enlightening, or ennobling in their extravagant departures from verisimilitude. One example is Chapter 30 ("The Lift Journey"). Here Daniel fantasizes that the elevator he's taking with others to Viktoria's apartment keeps going up through the roof and high into the sky. The experience provides new perspective on himself and life. "I must go forward, dragging with me all the rooms I have visited, like an old bargeman [...]" (111), he realizes. He also reports that "we were seized by a wild joy [...]" (114). Upon their return, he experiences compassion (the word is repeated five times in one sentence) for numerous people in his life—including himself (115). The fantastic experience enlarges his perspective, and yet he can still maintain his grip on life. Invoking the novel's epigraph, he reports, "[E]verything gives us new, wild perspectives and the sense of balancing at the hour of danger on the walls of the abyss of an opened street [...]" (114).

Another example of an affirmative carnivalesque moment comes at the beginning of Chapter 34 ("The Way to the Library"):

While the inhabitants are asleep, the heavy demolition lorries arrive, the excavators and the battering rams, gliding airily through the dawn, and begin their work. Façades, roofs and interior walls are removed with dreamlike swiftness. When we wake up, we can see a long way. Everywhere people sit up in bed and find themselves hovering in space without limits. We see our house stretching like airy planes towards the pigeon-blue sky. The entire neighborhood forms a world of observations [...]. And then the everyday is there, and outer walls, inner walls and roofs stand in their places, apparently immovable. They tremble without our noticing it, in the wind [...]. (126)

As with the elevator excursion, there is a breaking free of conventional constraints and an enlargement of perspective. The fact that Urwind launches into this fantasy without warning, as he does with other fantasies constituting the carnivalesque strain in this novel, reinforces the importance of the carnivalesque strain because he moves so freely back and forth from the mundane to the fantastic.

Whereas some carnival moments are affirmative and uplifting for Urwind, others allow for the expression of anxieties and fears—also through departures from verisimilitude. In Chapter 19 (“The Local Pub-Restaurant”), for example, he sees Viktoria and his father together without understanding why, and Sten’s mother blames him for her son’s death. Imagining Viktoria and his father together comes from a deeper awareness that they had an affair, but he is apparently not yet ready to fully acknowledge it. And the accusation of Sten’s mother seems to come from a fear that perhaps he was responsible. This chapter allows subconscious knowledge to come to the fore without Urwind’s having to consciously acknowledge and embrace the significance.

Another example of the darker carnivalesque moment is Chapter 27 (“At the Funfair”). This is apparently a dream in which he sees Maria at an amusement park. He had received a letter from her that disturbed him. “[S]ome tone there makes me wonder, feel a vague doubt, an unease,” he writes (101). Then, at the amusement park, he sees her but she doesn’t acknowledge him and her face is terrifying: “I did not know where I was going, where I was [...] there was a woman who looked like you, I followed her, when she

turned round her face had disappeared, all that was left were black shadows, a grotesquely smiling mouth” (102). His subconscious knows she is about to leave him and it tries to communicate that knowledge to him, but he is not yet ready to accept the fact. Later in the chapter, he stumbles upon a hall of mirrors: “The hall lay outside the amusement park proper, as though it had been built only for me,” he reports. Then he describes in poetic detail the various distortions of himself he experienced inside—“where one’s body assumed grotesque forms [...]” (103). This carnival moment represents a need on his part to turn himself inside-out and topsy-turvy—not so much literally, as with the hall of mirrors, but figuratively, to force himself to come to terms with his mid-life malaise.

Another darker carnival moment occurs in Chapter 47 (“In the Old Classroom”). In this surrealistic scene, the protagonist imagines his elementary school teacher quizzing him on Protagoras’ second fallacy. Apparently, Urwind has wandered into his old elementary school classroom while everyone is outside playing. As he looks around the empty classroom, he experiences many memories. Then he imagines his teacher quizzing him. He does not know the answer to the question. He stands at the blackboard, “transfixed by cold light” (172). He then imagines that his punishment is detention: “Daniel can go to his place. Daniel has grasped nothing of today’s lesson, and nothing of previous lessons either. Daniel must stay behind in life and sort it out” (173). The richly detailed chronotope of the classroom helps make the imagined rebuke all the more painful for its relevance to the protagonist’s present circumstances. This chapter is thus another example of dialogized chronotopes in *Urwind*: the chronotope of the middle-aged man struggling with his mid-life crisis of identity engages dialogically with the chronotope of the elementary school classroom and its authoritarian teacher who publicly humiliates students for their shortcomings. In this surrealistic scene, the school teacher is apparently chastising the middle-aged Urwind in front of the class of children. This chapter is a remarkable exercise on Urwind’s part in self-criticism, undertaken as part of his life review. He diversifies the range of self-rebuke by

imagining his elementary school teacher taking him to task for failing to accomplish more.

Yet another disturbing carnival moment occurs in Chapter Thirty-Four (“The Way to the Library”). Here he dreams that he’s told by a librarian that there are no books by him in the collection:

He leafs through his card index, the back of his head is quite shiny, like [...] that of a deathshad. When he turns round I see that his features have been carved with a knife, the dark eye-sockets, the high cheekbones, the bared teeth, the jawbones’ clutching-tongs. He says, in his soft, clear voice: You are not here. Here are only those who are able to express themselves, who have a language, who are at once dead and alive. I can only find you in the telephone directory. That is your book. Look in it. Dial the number. Perhaps someone will answer. (128)

This dream, with its improbable and grotesque elements, represents his fears that he will never publish anything noteworthy. It is a crucial moment in the narrative, representing an underlying angst. As such, it is another remarkable example of his ability to imagine criticism of others, even perverse criticism. Although the dream is disturbing, it nevertheless shakes him up and spurs him onward.

My final example of a carnival moment that throws Urwind into a strange situation to challenge his status quo occurs in Chapter 50 (“The December Festival”). As mentioned earlier, in this chapter Gabriel offers wise words to the protagonist, much as the biblical Gabriel functions to pass on words of wisdom to the biblical Daniel.¹⁸ In Chapter 50, Gabriel offers Urwind some of the best inspirational advice he has received over the course of the narrative: “Of airy nothing are we made, to airy nothing do we return [...]. Courage exists [...] mercy exists, and sharp perception. Feel with the eye, see [with] the heart!” (183). Instead of being inspired by Gabriel’s wise words, however, Urwind is immobilized. He cannot rise to the occasion and accept Gabriel’s invitation to accept the baton. Here, as in Chapter 19 (“The Local Pub-Restaurant”) and Chapter 27 (“The Funfair”), there is a conventional “carnival” atmosphere (things are topsy-turvy, there is a “festival procession” [180] and “carnival costumes” [181]), and yet the deeper significance is not festi-

val, procession, pageantry, or partying, but dialectical challenge to the status quo of the protagonist's way of life and habit of mind. Urwind needs this dream or fantasy to challenge himself, to shake himself out of his passivity, to accept the baton offered him by Gabriel. Taken together, the various examples I've given of the carnival strain in this novel—whether affirmative and uplifting, or critical and challenging—contribute to the protagonist's quest to lift himself up by his own bootstraps. They help him move beyond his mid-life malaise. While some readers may want to simply categorize these moments as interesting exercises in "magic realism" and leave it at that, I suggest that these carnivalesque moments be seen as crucial contributors to the protagonist's dialogic agenda through their dialectical challenge to the status quo of his life.

Dialogic Juxtaposition of Chapters

In addition to the dialogic dynamics obtaining from intertextuality, engagement with other characters through memory, and carnivalized moments, there can be an additional kind of dialogic glue that provides coherence and significance to *Urwind* by enhancing the struggle and the meaning of the protagonist's quest. There can be a dialogic cohesiveness resulting from contiguous juxtapositions of chapters on the narrative's syntagmatic axis through the active agency of an alert reader who can discern and activate the dialogic event potential inherent in the silent, unexplained, transitionless pairings of chapters. Many examples could be found of meaningful pairings, and the examples would undoubtedly vary from reader to reader, which introduces another chronotope to the chronotope-crowded novel—the unique time-space positionality of the reader. I will offer just a few examples of meaningful pairings to illustrate the point. Given the resistance to this novel among many readers who cannot make overall sense of its assemblage of narrative excursions, considering for a moment the syntagmatic and temporal axis of reading is important.

In Chapter 9 (“The Haffner”), we find Urwind engaged in a fantasy of self-transcendent joy as he imagines himself pressed into service to conduct Mozart’s sublime symphony. In Chapter 10 (“The Arnolfini Couple”), we find him reflecting upon possible personal shortcomings that might be interfering with his marriage. The contrast between the peak experience imagined in Chapter 9 and the mundane matter of marital conflict hinted at in Chapter 10 points up the struggle in life between the desired ideal and the mundane reality. “Sooner or later you sit on the edge of your bed and see that your sock has a hole,” he states at the outset of Chapter 10. That banal statement begins the transition from the glory of the “Haffner” to the troubling conflict between Urwind and Maria. The opposite moods brought into juxtaposition by the pairing of these two chapters is typical of the back-and-forth between affirmative and depressed moods throughout the novel.

Another effective and thematically significant juxtaposition occurs with the pairing of Chapters 29 and 30. In Chapter 29 (“On the Way Yonder”), Urwind describes the death of his mother, a loss that was obviously hard on him. In Chapter 30 (“The Lift Journey”), he describes an expansive experience as the elevator soars up into the sky where the occupants are “seized by a wild joy” (114) and he experiences compassion for others as well as himself. Wild joy and compassion are effective antidotes to the loss of a beloved parent. The juxtaposition of opposite moods without conventional transition or commentary enhances the novel’s realism and universality because it is true to life. As Gabriel states, “One is forced to live in contradictions, if they were erased life would collapse” (135).

Another contiguous pairing with dialogic event potential is the juxtaposition of Chapters 36 (“Gabriel’s Heavenly Geography”) and 37 (“Viktoria’s Blue Cathedral”). In Chapter 36 Urwind presents Gabriel handing down a philosophy of joy. Quoting Uvav-nuk, an Inuit shaman, Gabriel offers these lines (as previously mentioned): “The great sea moves me, the great sea takes me away, it bows me like the grass on a stone in the river. The height of the heavens moves me, the strong wind blows through me, takes me

with it so that I tremble with joy” (135). In Chapter 37 we learn about Viktoria’s Blue Cathedral, a model of sorts that she built in her apartment representing her healthy philosophy of self-acceptance and self-reliance. Viktoria’s Blue Cathedral is an example of what Gabriel would like to encourage Urwind to engage in. Chapter 36 offers Urwind the inspiration of shamanistic joy; Chapter 37 presents him with a more down-to-earth existential self-affirmation.

With each pairing, we can assume that the protagonist is aware of the connections between the chapters. However, the absence of transitions and overtly stated relationships requires a more active kind of reading, which then draws readers into Urwind’s quest and makes them more active, allowing them to grow along with the protagonist through the discovery of the unarticulated logic. Readers who approach *Urwind* with a Bakhtinian sensitivity to the dialogic event potential between chapters can better appreciate the coherence of this seemingly chaotic, fragmented narrative.

Conclusion

A Bakhtinian reading of Bo Carpelan’s *Urwind* does not find the novel disjointed, self-indulgent, tiring, and impossible to read; such an approach does not find the protagonist suffering from near-paralyzing alienation and listlessness, wallowing in hindsight, lacking connection to others, and unable to use his own words to express himself. Instead, by approaching the novel with the Bakhtinian concepts of heteroglossia, dialogism, chronotope, and carnival, we can appreciate the “strange depth” Karjalainen finds in this novel of an “alien man” (1998, 175) struggling to come to terms with his mid-life identity crisis. What results from a Bakhtinian approach is an appreciation of the sincerity and depth of the protagonist’s effort to lift himself by his own bootstraps to arrive at an affirmation of joy in the face of the existential fact of death. As such, the “furious joy” (99) with which Ludvig creates art in the hospital surrounded

by old age and death becomes representative of what Urwind aspires towards, even if living on a “low flame” (185) is more characteristic of him. Ultimately, what we eventually realize when approaching the novel from a Bakhtinian perspective is that the novel we are reading represents the end of his struggle. *Urwind* is a Künstlerroman in the Proustian tradition because in the very telling of the story of the protagonist’s struggle there is an implied achievement of his quest. We should assume that Daniel Urwind has finally managed to get his name in the library’s card catalogue.

NOTES

¹ Here is the highly poetic beginning of Chapter 2:

The cold strikes, forcing the house's inhabitants into bundles of clothes and snowy silence. Sounds reverberate like gashes in the bright air. The silence expands towards evening and the darkness arches with black starry heavens. Life's pattern seems hammered into my consciousness with steel nails. Houses interpenetrate, and the dreams that are dreamt behind closed doors are secret or obliterated by ice-floes. They drift into black floatways along the quays, where in the mornings the smoke rises towards a sky fragile as glass. Sparkling snowploughs churn up their black tracks in my sleep at night. Everything that happens happens slowly at this furtive time. People walk in their own blackness, it is only the children who roll like motley-coloured spools of thread in and out of the snow of the parks. (6)

² Bakhtin's preference for heteroglossic and dialogic environments that are not subsumed under a single consciousness is seen in the following statements: "[Dostoevsky's novels] are constructed not as the whole of a single consciousness, absorbing other consciousnesses as objects into itself, but as a whole formed by the interaction of several consciousnesses, none of which entirely becomes an object for the other." And: "It is quite possible to imagine and postulate a unified truth that requires a plurality of consciousnesses, one that cannot in principle be fitted into the bounds of a single consciousness [...]" (Bakhtin 1984, 18, 81).

³ The Oxford English Dictionary's definition for "bootstrap" will help explain my use of the metaphor: "To make use of existing resources or capabilities to raise (oneself) to a new situation or state; to modify or improve by making use of what is already present."

⁴ It should be acknowledged that there are some limitations to the heteroglossia in *Urwind*. Assessing a novel from a Bakhtinian perspective yields useful insights not only when the novel is found to conform precisely to Bakhtin's ideal novelistic universe but also when a novel is found to fall short of the Bakhtinian ideal. The diversity of the protagonist's childhood environment is limited by the restriction to the actu-

al residents of his particular apartment complex. Few if any perspectives from “above” or “below” the socio-economic level of his apartment complex are provided. As for the countless authors mentioned in chapter after chapter, we might note that they are mostly white, male, Western writers. The same could be said of the composers and artists he mentions throughout. Notwithstanding those qualifications, however, it is clear that this novel is richer than most in the range of diverse perspectives forced upon and sought by the protagonist.

⁵ “so much depends / upon / a red wheel / barrow / glazed with rain / water / beside the white / chickens.”

⁶ I use “Dani” throughout this essay to refer to the young Daniel Urwind.

⁷ On the dialogic relations between chronotopes, see Bakhtin (1981), “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel” (252).

⁸ In an interview given to the CBC, Carpelan has this to say about the importance of place in *Urwind*:

Urwind makes a journey through [the protagonist’s] life and through all the rooms he has been living in. I’m very interested in rooms—people don’t tend to remember the rooms they’ve experienced life in but I think they are important. Rooms are more interesting than time. Time is not interesting for me at all [...]. Time is a very peculiar thing; I can’t really understand it. It has very little to do with the clock.

⁹ Carpelan has this to say about Daniel in the interview he gave to the CBC: “I’m interested in persons who are not especially interesting when you look at the surface. Small people who are rather big. People who, when you look closer at them—they have capacities and have dignity, too.”

¹⁰ Carpelan undoubtedly had reasons to show some sympathy towards Emerentia Busch: he worked for some years as assistant director of the Helsinki City Library.

¹¹ See Chapter 5 of Bakhtin’s *Problems of Dostoevsky’s Poetics* (1984) for analyses of various forms of double-voiced discourse.

¹² An analytical framework from Bakhtin's early years for analyzing and articulating the continuum of self-other relations is applicable to Urwind's openness to viewpoints and even criticism from others: "I-for-myself" (how I see myself independent of others' viewpoints of me), "I-for-another" (how another person sees me, profiting from his/her "surplus of vision"), and "The-other-for-me" (how I see another person, profiting from my "surplus of vision"). Carpelan's protagonist moves back and forth along this self-other continuum. (See Bakhtin [1990], "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity," for his discussion of these terms.)

¹³ This distinction between the dynamics of dialogism and the dynamics of carnival is made forcefully and lucidly by Morson and Emerson in *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics* (1990).

¹⁴ Although the carnival dynamic can occur during some sort of festival or party-like event, Bakhtinian carnival is not about "partying." Partying may give free reign to the kind of dynamic found in Bakhtinian carnival but partying is not a prerequisite for Bakhtinian carnival.

¹⁵ A write-up on the novel on the culture page of the UNESCO website makes this observation, which is relevant to the bizarre carnivalesque moments in *Urwind*: "[Carpelan's] prose often issues from the uncontrollable subconscious, dreamlike and nightmarish realms whose surrealistic details are visually potent."

¹⁶ For Bakhtin's discussions of carnival, see Chapter 4 of *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984) as well as *Rabelais and His World* (1968). The following passage in the former is representative and pertinent to my analysis of *Urwind*:

[Carnivalization is] an extraordinarily flexible form of artistic visualization, a peculiar sort of heuristic principle making possible the discovery of new and as yet unseen things. By relativizing all that was externally stable, set and ready-made, carnivalization with its pathos of change and renewal permitted Dostoevsky to penetrate into the deepest layers of man and human relationships [...]. Everything in [*Crime and Punishment*]¹⁷—the fates of people, their experiences and ideas—is pus-

hed to its boundaries, everything is prepared, as it were, to pass over into its opposite (but not, of course, in the abstractly dialectical sense), everything is taken to the extreme, to its outermost limit. (166–67)

¹⁷ I've changed "from the inside's out" to "from the inside out." My edition of *Urwind* has the former in the novel's epigraph from Björling; I've changed it for the sake of clarity. For helpful comments on the relative strangeness of Björling's poetry, see Hertzberg.

¹⁸ One difference would be that the wisdom of Carpelan's Gabriel is this-worldly whereas the wisdom of the biblical Gabriel is other-worldly.

Acknowledgements: I am indebted to Russ Greer and Brian Kennedy for their insightful suggestions for revision, as well as the recommendations of the press's readers.

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1990) "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity." *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. Vadim Liapunov. Austin: U of Texas P, 4–256.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981) "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel." Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 84–258.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1968) *Rabelais and His World*. Trans. Helene Iswolsky. Cambridge: Massachusetts Institute of Technology P.
- "bootstrap, v." (2019) *OED Online*. Oxford UP. Web. www.oed.com/view/Entry/21553
- Carpelan, Bo (1995) "Interview with Bo Carpelan." *Writers & Company*. CBC, Toronto, Canada (December 17).
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- "Culture: Urwind." UNESCO. <http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/> (accessed 12 June 2008).
- Hertzberg, Fredrik (2002) "Gunnar Björling: An Introduction." *Boundary 2* 29:1, 17–24. http://writing.upenn.edu/library/Bjorling-Gunnar_poems.html
- Karjalainen, Pauli Tapani (1998) "Place and Intimate Sensing." *Nordisk Samhällsgeografisk Tidskrift* 27. <http://www.geo.ruc.dk/nst/karjalainen27.html>
- McBride, Edward (1996) "Cold on Cold." Rev. of *Urwind*, by Bo Carpelan. *Times Literary Supplement* (20 Dec.), 23.
- Morson, Gary Saul and Caryl Emerson (1990) *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford UP.

- Oxford Companion to the Bible* (1993) Ed. Bruce M. Metzger and Michael D. Coogan. New York: Oxford UP.
- Roethke, Theodore (1958) "The Shape of the Fire." *Words for the Wind: The Collected Verse of Theodore Roethke*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 93–96.
- Schoolfield, George (2000) Rev. of *Vindfartsvägar: Strövtåg i Bo Carpelans Urwind*, by Roger Holmström. *Scandinavian Studies* 72:1 (Spring), 118–123.
- Sonninen, Veikko (2004) "Do Literary Prizes Really Promote Book Sales? Experiences from Finland." *European Booksellers Federation*. http://www.ebf-eu.org/doc_conf/Antwerp/Veikko%20Sonninen.doc
- Williams, William Carlos (2007) "The Red Wheelbarrow." In Nina Baym (ed.) *The Norton Anthology of American Literature*. 7th ed. Vol. D. New York: W.W. Norton, 1469.

Roger Holmström

**BO CARPELAN AND MULTIVOICEDNESS: URWIND
IN LIGHT OF BAKHTIN'S THOUGHTS ON
METHODOLOGY FOR THE STUDY OF THE NOVEL**

Bo Carpelan's *Urwind* (1993) has been translated—its title kept the same—into English by David McDuff (1998). A report in the Finnish literature researchers' journal *Avain* (3–4/2005) claims that four speakers at the Twelfth International Bakhtin conference in Jyväskylä in the summer of 2005 had all prepared comments on the novel independently of each other, and at times it even seemed as if they were not even talking about the same book. During a subsequent panel discussion on the interpretation of *Urwind*, the panel's chairperson Brian Kennedy noted that Bakhtin, paradoxically, can be said to be both everywhere and yet nowhere, given that several of his central concepts have gained universal currency.

It is easy to agree with Dr. Kennedy. Looked at from the other side, it is also fair to say that certain novels are particularly well suited to exemplify Bakhtin's theories. One such novel is Carpelan's *Urwind*. In what follows, I would like to support this argument by identifying some central characteristics, which, according to Bakhtin, stand out in the novel, and to highlight their relevance to *Urwind*. With respect to space constraints, I am limiting myself to Bakhtin's article "Epic and Novel: Toward a Methodology for the Study of the Novel" (1941), part of *The Dialogic Imagination* (translated into English and edited by Michael Holquist; the article was originally published in 1981 and refers to a lecture given by Bakhtin in Moscow in 1941.) These summarized reflections on *Urwind* in light of Bakhtin will additionally be followed by five chapters from my monograph on Carpelan's novel, published under the title *Vindfartsvägar* (*Ways of the Wind*, 1998).

My interest in *Urwind* was first awakened the very same fall the book came out and was honored with the prestigious Finlandia prize. I was primarily intrigued by the book's composition and

structure and decided to follow the author's advice to the letter and read the book's 53 chapters a week at a time during the course of a whole year. Reading it in this way expanded my appreciation of it in several directions, and my technique is reflected in my choice of subheading for my book: *Strövtåg i Bo Carpelans Urwind* (Wanderings through Bo Carpelan's *Urwind*). Repeated readings—chapter by chapter—became a kind of journey through the whole of Carpelan's authorship, sampling the fruits which he sows both astutely and generously throughout his pages. The index in my book (listing almost 200 names), combined with Carpelan's abundant literary output, paints a picture of the educational tradition that the novel can be said to represent. *Urwind* is a veritable cornucopia! Each rereading reveals new aspects, and the parallels with various representatives of the worlds of poetry, art, and music are so numerous that the index in my book about *Urwind* could be extended much further.

Which aspects of *Urwind* can Bakhtin's description of the novel as a genre best be applied to? A natural point of departure for answering this question is provided by Bakhtin's earlier-referenced 1941 statement on how "the generic skeleton of the novel is still far from being hardened" and that we as readers are unable to foresee the novel's "elastic possibilities." In the published form of this address, Bakhtin also states that the novel is "the sole genre that continues to develop" (1981, 3, 196). This point of view corresponds both with the dynamic and the unconcluded aspects of Carpelan's novel. Not for nothing is one of the chapters of *Urwind* entitled "The Book That Writes You." Or as Bakhtin puts it: "The novel comes into contact with the spontaneity of the inconclusive present; this is what keeps the genre from congealing" (1981a, 27). This "inconclusive present" is especially notable in Daniel Urwind's constant musing over the past.

Another characteristic feature of the novel, according to Bakhtin, is the ever-present inclusion of parody and travesty (6 ff.). On this point, *Urwind* is riddled with examples, ranging from the Bible

to classics such as Shakespeare and Goethe, and so on to Carpelan's own works within various genres.

With overarching insight, Bakhtin identifies three characteristics specific to the novel, these being as follows:

1. Its stylistic three-dimensionality, which is linked with the multi-languaged consciousness realized in the novel.
2. The radical change it effects in the temporal coordinates of the literary image.
3. The new zone opened by the novel for structuring literary images, namely, the zone of maximal contact with the present (with contemporary reality) in all its openedness. (11)

All three of these appear in Carpelan's novel. And though I, for my part, conducted my wanderings through *Urwind* without a specific novel theorist to hand, the following passages from my book *Vindfartsvägar* illustrate that the manifestation of various characters' consciousnesses in combination with various indicators of how time and space play a central role.

The universal currency of several of Bakhtin's concepts can also be scrutinized in light of how Bakhtin's theories have been gaining a foothold in Swedish-language literary research during the past few decades. Some pioneering research into Swedish academic literature teaching between 1890 and 1995, carried out at the University of Uppsala and led by Bengt Landgren, has allowed us to examine which of the main theories are cited in doctoral theses within the domain of literature studies. Michael Gustavsson maps out the expansion of literary theory between 1976 and 1995 and is able to show among other things that, in his thesis entitled *Humor, grotesk och pikaresk. Studier i Lars Ahlins realism* (1975), Hans-Göran Ekman introduces Bakhtin's ideas about folk humor and "carnival" as early as 1975 (Landgren 2005, 549). It is then not until the end of the 1980s that Bakhtin makes a real breakthrough into Swedish literary research. In his study, Gustavsson notes that Bakhtin is often cited as the most significant reference for intertextuality (Landgren 2005, 535). One researcher who has paid special attention to the di-

alogical is Elisabeth Hästbacka with a thesis on Hjalmar Bergman's novels between 1913 and 1918. The book has the Bahktinesque title *Det mångstämmiga rummet* (*The Multivoiced Room*, 1990) and also includes two chapters of theory, partly about Bakhtin's theory of the novel, partly about the dialogical novel.

The title of Hästbacka's thesis corresponds in every significant way to my interpretation of Bo Carpelan's *Urwind*. The novel is a multivoiced room, and the challenge is to try to find out which words are 'inhabited'. The following five passages from my chapter-by-chapter analysis in *Vindfartsvägar* will hopefully provide an understanding of how Carpelan's multivoicedness is orchestrated.

Weather and Wind

In the opening moments of his novel *Urwind*, Bo Carpelan travesties a familiar reference to small-talk, the subject of weather and wind. This could easily have ended up sounding banal, but a wordsmith is able to expand upon the everyday in the most surprising of ways, in this case forming row upon row of pearls of travesty, presenting to the reader both familiar situations and moments of striking unpredictability. In the same breath as the author describes how weather and wind define the two interlocutors, the beer cellar is blended in with the element that predominates outside Danzig: the sea.

The image in which "the sea swells with beer foam" (UW 3) illustrates Carpelan's method of combining elements. This expression, suggestive of sound, manages to flesh out the scene and transverse into something greater. As the narrator hears the sound, he begins to play with the multiple interpretations available in Swedish of the name *Urwind*. Like the trade wind in Harry Martinson's symbol-rich world of poetry, Carpelan harnesses a host of associations ranging from the archetypal image of a wind from the dawn of time that hurls people forward through their lives, to a wind that makes sails billow and fields of crops bow low.

Thus far, the reader of the novel might feel that the author has indeed managed to bedeck the world around him with elaborate descriptions, but might ask themselves how original he is being. In this regard, I believe his prose to represent an art form of high caliber, by virtue of the string of pearls technique he develops. Image is joined to image. He does not stop at depicting the wind as an existential weather phenomenon, but goes on to interpret the word *vind* further. In his depiction the *vind* blows open the door to the *vind* (attic) of childhood memory, whereupon the readers suddenly find themselves entering a new room, one filled with a wealth of artifacts steeped in associations.

Carpelan is uncommonly conscious of rooms and space in his work. The room defines the environment, lending it a distinct palpability. One of his collections of poems, *I de mörka rummen, i de ljusa* (*In Dark Rooms, In Light Rooms*, 1976) contains a poem that begins with the following lines:

<i>Jag förnimmer dig</i>	<i>I become aware of you</i>
<i>som att stiga över en tröskel</i>	<i>as if I had stepped</i>
<i>från ett mörkt rum till ett ljust</i>	<i>from a dark room to a light one</i>

The title of the collection is expressly alluded to, and the theme reaches out to touch many other works by Carpelan. In these lines, Carpelan outlines the spatial perspective at the same time as he defines the relationship between the first and second person.

The introductory passage to the novel leaves the reader in a state of curious uncertainty concerning this relationship between *I* and *you*. The initial dynamic seems clear enough: a narrator—antique bookshop keeper Daniel Urwind, 53 years of age—says goodbye to his beloved upon her departure to the United States. The couple is to live apart for a year, and Daniel begins to keep a diary so that his wife, upon her return, will gain an insight into his life. But in this respect Daniel is not entirely sure of himself. As he reflects:

Or is it to myself that I write, this unfamiliar I that dodges off round each windy corner, letting the wet snow lash me in the face? Fire, water and wind, and that heavy smell from the sea. But I protect myself, I surround myself with books, their silence does not demand anything,

they exist, they are alive, they are for anyone to open, unlike us human beings. (UW 2)

Both in his being far away from his beloved and in his penchant for prioritizing the world of art before the real world, Daniel Urwind has a kindred spirit in the character of Sven Ingelet in Mikael Lybeck's novel *Breven till Cecilia* (*The Letters to Cecilia*, 1920). The two leading antagonists are seekers and skeptics who must write in order to reinforce their own existence. In Daniel's words: "I sit and write, to whom? The man who burned, the child who disappeared, they are all vague signs, and I try to capture the intangible in words as though I were looking for something, someone, to remember" (UW 5). The reference to the man and the child allude to Daniel's imaginary world in the opening chapter. He himself—to say nothing of us, his readers—does not always know if the images are reality or fantasy. In his capacity to fantasize, the hero of Carpelan's novel is so much more complex than Lybeck's protagonist.

Time and space become one. The line between dreams and waking hours is indiscernible. Daniel Urwind ploughs through the mires of his world, reaching out with all of his senses. Let us, week by week, follow in his steps!

Backwards and Forwards

Stepping over the threshold to Aunt Viktoria's is like stepping into a time machine. The various planes of time meld effortlessly together and all events combine to form a single, condensed microcosm of life, a distillation of the human condition. The Viktoria of Carpelan's novel is reminiscent of the Mima of Harry Martinson's space odyssey *Aniara* (1956). Both have second sight, but with the crucial distinction that Viktoria is not a technical creation but a living person. She is a person who has been hardened and processed by life's ebb and flow. Her experiences lend her the ability to distinguish between the real and the unreal. Like some Oriental mandarin, she generously imparts her life wisdom, as summarized by the

wonderful maxim “all brilliance comes from within” (UW 13). At what cost such victory has been bought is more hinted at than fully described, but such as she appears to us in the novel she does fair justice to her name.

The bond between Viktoria and Daniel is expressed through the fact that she too takes great pleasure in playing with language. During their intimate conversation, she mentions that she has long been waiting for Daniel and goes straight on to recite: “From the wind [*Ur vinden*] he’ll come, like a snowflake, and here you are now, name and all” (UW 14). Viktoria’s statement can be taken as no more than playful banter, an interpretation that suits the context. On the other hand, though, the first words—“From the wind he’ll come”—carry a heavily biblical tone, alerting the reader to the idea that Viktoria is aware of the great divide that is opening within Daniel.

In spite of their blood relation and the similarity of their life philosophy, there is a striking difference between Viktoria and Daniel. She keeps a sharp eye on the future, while he buries himself in the past. Both regard humanity as a riddle, and their shared effort to try and understand their surroundings unites them in a no-strings-attached intimacy.

Within the confines of the novel nothing is impossible. The long-since-dead Viktoria becomes one in Daniel’s (dream?) consciousness with Daniel as a child. Unexpected, the lad in the black leather jacket—the persecutor from Chapter 2—rings at the door. Daniel, who has climbed up on a chair, stares at him through the spy-hole, sees his gaping mouth, but doesn’t let him in. Aunt Viktoria is told who it is and says: “He thinks he’s my son. Perhaps he is?” (UW 16). The question is by no means out of place. Aunt Viktoria’s entire bearing depicts her as a modern, universal mother figure, one who is constantly trying to understand herself and others.

Outside, the world grinds ever onwards in all its brutal reality, but at Aunt Viktoria’s, just as in Daniel’s consciousness, the focus is on the here and now. The future and the past are treated as one. By juxtaposing Aunt Viktoria with the young Daniel, Carpelan

demonstrates how everything is dependent on everything else. Human beings are inescapably conscious of their past, present, and future. Piece is added to piece in life's ever-growing mosaic of troublesome riddles. Both a look back at the past and a glance ahead at the future afford one a better chance of understanding the present.

Memory and the Future

At the point where January and February meet, Daniel Urwind continues his philosophical dialogue with Aunt Viktoria. Through a hazy and foggy winter landscape they wander, in lofty defiance of all objective conceptions of time and space. Their introspection transforms the yard and the building where they live into a gigantic labyrinth where every staircase and every door are symbolic representations of life's important crossroads.

Carpelan's *Dagen vänder* (*The Day is Turning*, 1983) contains a poem entitled "Minnet" (Memory), which concludes with the following lines:

*Minnet är det i nuet
som gör framtiden synlig*

*The memory is that part of the present
which exposes the future*

[transl. by Anne Born]

These words could stand as a conclusion of the fifth chapter of Carpelan's novel. I refer in particular to the passage where the narrator hears his aunt say this:

Daniel! Listen! Pay attention! One day all the confusion will be over, all the torment and the unexplained, you will learn to live in the great absent-mindedness that opens all doors and windows, so that the light can flow in and lead you away. Where? Do not ask where. Live your life, that is the answer. Don't forget to remember, it leads you forward. (UW 20)

Memory and the future. These are the two main ingredients of Aunt Viktoria's elixir of life. But does this work just as well for Daniel? I believe not. Is he not more readily predisposed towards shy-

ing away and sinking into the past? Neither does he appear to have such an easy time of simply shrugging off all his questions and getting on with living his life.

Viktoria's and Daniel's polarized approaches to life clarify the bases for our existence. Additionally worthy of note is that we can never be too attentive in a world of constant change and upheaval.

A Rhapsody of Rooms

Just as with every face, every authorship, too, has its own characteristic profile and unique identifying features. Sometimes an entire authorship can be summarized by a single particular symbol, such as 'the house' and 'the bird' in the poetry of Tarjei Vesaas. Sometimes a striking characteristic can be a recurring detail, such as in Rabbe Enckell's 'matchstick poems'. In Bo Carpelan's author profile, the room is a notable call mark.

Any reader of Carpelan will quickly note that the rooms in which the characters of his poetry live and breathe have a function that goes beyond that of the outer frame. The title of the poetry collection *I de mörka rummen, i de ljusa* (*In Dark Rooms, In Light Rooms*, 1976) thematizes rooms in the same heavily symbolic way as throughout Bo Carpelan's literary universe. The room is a state in symbiosis with the persona of the poem, a persona who is intensely observant, especially in the visual sense. In changing state—moving from room to room—the door becomes a crucial channeler. It does by no means open exclusively into a room in the strictly physical sense of the word. The concept of space may equally stretch to views over cities or districts, landscapes, dreams, or tableaux of the imagination. A change of room is normally signified by the opening of a door, or by one of the characters of Carpelan's fictional world becoming curious as to what lies behind a closed door. In the aforementioned collection of poems, one of the poems begins with the words: "Dörren slås upp" ("The door is opened"). One of Carpelan's works of prose is entitled *Din gestalt bakom dörren*

(“Your Figure Behind the Door,” 1975). At every turn, readers are confronted with doors, and their attention is drawn further and further from one room to the next. I am of the opinion that the room is a core concept of Carpelan’s creations to the extent that each individual work can be read as a separate element of what I am wont to call a “rhapsody of rooms”. Each room is a part of what has come before and is incorporated in that which follows as part of something greater and unending.

These thematics are available for closer inspection in the twenty-third chapter of the novel, entitled “In Rooms Dreamt and Real.” Its first sentence reads: “The intractable door refuses to open” (UW 87). And when the same door four lines later deigns to open, there is a switch from light to dark. The analogy with the aforementioned collection of poems is clear, but at the same time the dream/reality coin is introduced, thus broadening the reader’s spectrum of associations. Depth is, as always in *Urwind*, added by the ever-shifting perspective of time. Then and now. Standing on the threshold to summer, Daniel Urwind recalls his childhood Sundays, with ringing church bells, just like in Hjalmar Söderberg’s *Martin Bircks ungdom* (*Martin Birck’s Youth*, 1901). Pondering over the passage of time and generations, Urwind sees fit to call to question Söderberg’s claim that one’s golden years are in middle age, ““when the children have just grown up and the old are not yet really old”” (89). Urwind’s dynamic and fantasizing way of traveling in his world of thoughts along the axis of time is not in concord with Söderberg’s static manner of regarding ageing in terms of rises and falls.

For Urwind, both time and space are extremely relative concepts that change with the weather and the mood of the beholder. Change and complexity are further highlighted by the shift between the dreamt and the real, both of which are of striking importance in Carpelan’s novels. In his fictive characters’ perception of the room, it is not merely the eye that is at work. Smells, too, play an important part in conjuring up associations. The chapter “In Rooms Dreamt and Real” provides extensive evidence of how smell, more specifically the smell of wood followed by the

smell of freshly chopped birch wood, guides Daniel Urwind's steps through his world of daydreams from one room to another. The various planes of consciousness are simultaneously outlined by having a room able to suddenly open downwards, or sway before his gaze "like the reflection of light in the water jug" (UW 88). The room oscillates. It reshapes itself in tune with the slightest shift in the character's psyche.

This correlation between room and character explains the hegemony of the room in Bo Carpelan's poetry. The room is more than it appears to be. It represents a widening, a lengthening, and a deepening of the poem's narrator's world of gathered experiences. It is in this respect that the expression "rhapsody of rooms" encapsulates my way of reading and appreciating Carpelan's work.

The Manifested City

The structure of novels can be very complicated. Many, having read the first four or five chapters of *Urwind*, put the book aside, adamant that the book is impossible to get into. But those who persevere see the novel's main threads come to light.

Chapter 34 is called "The Way to the Library," and exists in symbiosis with chapter 11, "The Library." Taken together they form a tribute to the library as a bastion of learning, a cornucopia for bookworms of all ages.

The way to the library leads through the newly manifested city. The chapter opens with a dream vision in which all walls and barriers are torn down, "the day of total openness has come," and people awaken to "find themselves hovering in space without limits" (UW 126). Among Carpelan's readers the scene will call to mind the passage "Staden drömd" ("The Dreamed-Up City") in *Jag minns att jag drömde* (*I Remember That I Dreamed*, 1979), with its paradoxical cry of "the whole city dreamed up and thus alive!"

Carpelan's works provide extensive evidence of what the way to the library can mean. *Paradiset* (*Dolphins in the City*, 1973) speaks

of Johan's and Marvin's visit to a library, wherein it is noted that "all the soil and sustenance of dreams and curiosity was there" (60). In *Julius Blom ett huvud för sig* (*Julius Blom, A Mind of His Own*, 1982), Julius sits in the library reading about the Inca civilization, which made the birches where he lived look like they were made of gold (118). And in *Anders i stan* (*Anders in the City*, 1962), Karlotta and Anders trudge off to the library, where it is noted that "here you could sit looking at pictures for years and just forget everything around you!" (118). Each of these examples stands as a variation on the theme of the library representing the manifested city.

With this in mind, it is no surprise that Bo Carpelan certifies just how much the library has meant and still means for him both personally and professionally. He reinforces this in an interview with Eva Johansson in *Biblioteksbladet*, in which he also points out the significance of rooms and space in all his writing. In this regard, *Urwind* can be seen as a trek from room to room. And from the same perspective, the way to the library is synonymous with the way to the manifested city.

By contrast to the depiction of the library in chapter 11, the tone here is much darker and more sinister. The portrayal becomes a dream vision, which becomes a nightmare. Daniel Urwind is on the run, and finds sanctuary in a large library. From among the stands of bookshelves he can hear "ever more heated voices from the books unwritten" (UW 127), and the scene is not lacking in absurd detail such as can be found in the "Reference Literature" chapter of *Trösklar* (*Doorsteps*, 1982). But behind the situation comedy lies a palpable seriousness.

The enormous library has but one exit, and there, in a scene highly reminiscent of Kafka, Daniel Urwind meets "a sombre man behind a table," who dryly remarks: "Did you think that you could go out of the library unaltered? Did you think it was a question of text, printer's ink on paper? Do you think that you can read without coming into contact with bleeding life?" (UW 128).

These demanding questions receive no direct answer. Against this backdrop, the library is no mere place of refuge offering a mo-

ment's repose. The library is the manifested city; the place where all humanity comes together. Life and death. The way there is a learning experience in itself.

Translated from Swedish by Stuart Shelley

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Carpelan, Bo *Dolphins in the City* (1976) Delacarte Press. Trans. Shiela La Farge.
- Carpelan, Bo (1987) *Room Without Walls. Selected Poems* Forest Books. Trans. Anne Born. Illustrated by Hannu Taina.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Schildts.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- Childs, Peter and Fowler, Roger (2006) *The Routledge Dictionary of Literary Terms* New York: Routledge.
- Holmström, Roger (1998) *Vindfartsvägar. Strövtåg i Bo Carpelans Urwind* Schildts.
- Hästbacka, Elisabeth (1990) *Det mångstämmiga rummet. Hjalmar Bergmans romankonst 1913–1918* Hjalmar Bergman Samfundet [diss].
- Johansson, Eva (1995:80): “Jag älskade jobbet som bibliotekarie, det var som klippt och skuret för mig.” Intervju med Bo Carpelan. Biblioteksbladet.
- Landgren, Bengt (ed.) (2005) *Universitetsämne i brytningstider. Studier i svensk akademisk litteraturundervisning 1947–1995* Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Parente-Čapková, Viola (et al.) (2005) “Bahtinista on moneksi” *Avain* 2–3/2005: 110–116.
- Schoolfield, George C. (ed.) (1998) *A History of Finland's Literature* Lincoln: U of Nebraska P.

Erkki Vainikkala

**URWIND: A NOVEL IN POETIC PROSE
AS A BAKHTINIAN LIMIT CASE**

A writerly novel

Bo Carpelan's novel *Urwind* is a text which its narrator-protagonist Daniel Urwind is writing as a diary over the course of one year. Consequently, there is no worked-out plot in it. The chronotope of a diary, however, does not rule out the possibility of arranging the entries so that a communicative and relatively consistent narrative emerges by extrapolation. Building on this tension, the diary form is put to a special use in *Urwind*, as it combines its episodic make-up with the overarching narrative purpose of producing a written portrait of the diarist. In this fictional world, the whole diary is to be presented in due time to Daniel's intended reader, his wife, who has left on a scholarship for the U.S., and will return in a year's time. Her absence is also marked by a marital crisis. The writing is out to evoke Daniel's "innermost self" in episodic memories of his past and in descriptions of his experiences and thoughts during the time of waiting and writing. The self-portrait arising from it functions as enhanced self-knowledge at the same time as it is intended as an appeal to his wife.

The "entries" of Daniel's writing constitute the chapters of the book. They are set down regularly on a weekly basis over the one-year period of his wife's absence, as can also be inferred from the number of chapters, fifty-three, which is one more than the number of weeks in a year. The chapters follow each other in loose sequence without a developing narrative structure; they consist of, and add up to, episodes, scenes, and conjectures about the future. On occasion, they have a chronological fit, for example as the return of Daniel's wife approaches, but structurally they are independent small narratives and descriptions held together by recurrent motifs,

thematic patterns, partly overlapping environments, and obviously the narrator-protagonist himself. Almost all chapters deal with experiences in different rooms and parts of the big apartment house where Daniel has grown up and where also his second-hand bookshop, the place where he writes his entries, is located. As a corresponding large temporal dimension, the passing of a year creates a cyclic symbolic pattern with suggestions of the passing of Daniel's whole life. The latter is reinforced by the fact that fifty-three is also Daniel's age at the time of writing, when he takes stock of his life. These architectural structures, however, are not obtrusively delineated, but rather intimated and symbolically suggested as possible orientations for reading the text. Both the spatiality and the suggestive openness are features of Carpelan's modernist poetics.¹ The passing of time itself is rendered in terms of perceptions and emotional stances, on which the significance of the descriptions and the small-scale narrative sequences also depends.

Daniel's—and why not Carpelan's—writing in *Urwind* is memory work, which leads to different places and spaces in an often dream-like evocation. This is indeed not the kind of memory that one might expect to find in diary entries. Daniel brings memories emerging from the whole span of his past life into the present moments of his writing—or, as we could also put it, brings himself into the present moments of his past in writing. Not only are the entries exceptional for the span of memories they incorporate, they are also characterized by a markedly poetic language—*Urwind* can be characterized as a poet's work in prose (cf. Hellgren 2009, 136). A realistic motivation for this on the story level is provided by the fact that Daniel is a person with high literary ambitions, aspiring to give his memories and daily experiences another life in language, including references to pictorial art, artists, and the problems of creativity. As the owner of a second-hand bookstore, he authors this account of his life literally among books.

The inner and the outer in this self-writing appear as alternating faces or correspondences of the same phenomenal reality. Daniel's wife takes on varying positions in this layout. She figures as a

character in his writing and as part of his personal life experience, thus situated on the boundary, partly inside, partly as his “constituting other.” She is a figure of intimacy and uncertainty, returning and then departing again in a gesture of an even more uncertain future, left open but tinged with symbolically closing overtones. Her presence and absence are the motivating factor for the act of writing, and as a concrete figure she hovers over the beginning and the end of the story. On a more abstract level, her figure becomes an instance of the workings of Daniel’s mind and writing—as part of the correspondences and as the absent center of his hopes and fears. In Bakhtinian terms, there can be no strictly polyphonic or dialogic representation of this relationship because, apart from a few emotionally charged but descriptively distanced scenes, she appears only as a point of reference in Daniel’s mind. She does not properly have a “voice,” although she takes independent action. Even more generally, Daniel’s consciousness tends to absorb the dialogical edge of encounters in the Bakhtinian senses of person-centered polyphony or dialogically rendered language diversity.

This is not to say that there is no social diversity conjured up in the memory spaces or other descriptions, but it is all filtered through Daniel’s central consciousness. As suggested above, however, this centrality has the paradoxical quality that its boundaries often merge in dreamlike condensation with the surroundings and the voices sounding, remembered, and overheard. The ensuing attenuation of the contours of his individuality only increases the existential urgency of the writing. Such features, combined with the poetic elements of the prose, play down the story-like elements and underpin the “writerly” movement of Daniel’s mind.

A View from Bakhtin

As described above, *Urwind* is characterized by a loosely conceived diary form extending towards larger patterns of fictional autobiography and its questions of the meaning of life. Perceptions,

incidents, and encounters are recounted as elements of the narrator-protagonist's present life, as memories and anticipations. Writing presents an interface for a continuous exchange between the responses of Daniel's "inner self," including his hallucinations, and the environment with its different spaces. On this surface, everything seems mutable, the description often being a matter of quickly changing images, scenes, and time levels (for an account of this feature, see Hollsten 2004, 52–54). There are also strong intertextual elements in the ekphrastic descriptions and generally in the presence of visual art, music, and literature in *Urwind* (see Hollsten 2007, 48–58). Thus, although everything is rendered from the perspective and in the language of the protagonist, the term "monologic" would seem out of place in the narrow evaluative sense of the term, and it is not surprising to find the term "dialogic" used in some critical accounts of the novel. There are many voices and images at work in Daniel's mind, coming from different places and times as his writing has it.

The two Bakhtinesque terms above suggest the line of inquiry of this essay; Carpelan's novel will be discussed in Bakhtinian terms. This raises some initial questions. *Urwind* is by all accounts a modernist novel. In his theoretical and critical work, Bakhtin did not deal with the issues of literary modernism explicitly or in any depth. Indirectly, however, there are interesting connections, some of which take the form of prefigurations, while some others suggest themselves as implicit criticisms by targeting phenomena characteristic of modernist aesthetics. Bakhtin's theory of polyphony as a feature of "Dostoevsky's poetics" is a case in point. As an early example of the crisis of the unified subject and solid authorship, Dostoevsky has been regarded as prefiguring the mode of writing of the high modernists, and polyphony as Bakhtin's theoretical grasp of this phenomenon has been considered in similar terms (cf. Erdinast-Vulcan 2013, 91–92, 94). *Urwind* as a later modernist work shares this property of "a plurality of voices." The open-ended course, or spatiality, of its narrative fits into the same pattern, and so does the use of a few mythical figures as quilting points.

But on a closer look, Bakhtin's account of polyphony has attributes which some modernist works may share and some others not, but which primarily is about a mode of artistic creativity that lets competing worldviews and ideological standpoints face each other on an equal footing. This emphasis on plurality as a struggle of worldviews is for Bakhtin the historical achievement of the novel, and it is not necessarily shared by modernist mind-writing.² In many respects, Bakhtin's best-known texts on the genre of the novel are anti-modernist, especially when it comes to the occurrence of poetic elements in the novel.

Although there are considerable changes in Bakhtin's theoretical outlook over time, his approaches to the novel, leaning on his theories of polyphony and dialogism, tend to have a normative and occasionally even polemical edge due to the emphasis on this specific generic achievement that he wants to describe and even praise. Bakhtin, of course, provides historical accounts of the novel, but especially when focusing on the issues of "dialogue," he approaches and judges novels from the perspective of a particular model of the genre. Consequently, it is not always possible to apply Bakhtin's critical concepts with just the customary twist on the empirical object. One may have to decide whether to go along with all the leverage of those concepts or stay back somewhat by acknowledging the resistances and counter-leverage of the text to be analyzed. This is the case, perhaps not surprisingly, with *Urwind*: a view from Bakhtin also turns out to be a view on Bakhtin.

There is also a question of which Bakhtin, unless one theoretical standpoint serves one's purposes. There is a difference even between polyphony as contending horizons of meaning, and dialogism as heteroglossia or social language diversity. The former is concerned with a theory of creation, especially as it applies to the structure of novels; it was developed in his treatise *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics* (1984), written in 1929 and published in a rewritten form in 1963. The concept of dialogue as heteroglossia was elaborated in the treatises of his "middle" period in the 1930s, collected in English translation in *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981).

Compared to polyphony, it had wider cultural and social implications, and it was also essential to the development of Bakhtin's theory of the novel in that period. Bakhtin's book on carnival, *Rabelais and His World*, is not important for my purposes here. Bakhtin's early, "architectonic" period, however, opens interesting perspectives on *Urwind*. It has a more subjective orientation with an emphasis on the makings of an integrated and ethically answerable self and the function of aesthetics and art in that context. Finally, I have made some use of one of the last essays of Bakhtin, where he to some extent reverts to his early ideas.

I have not opted for any single theoretical standpoint or key concept of Bakhtin's for my approach to *Urwind*. Rather, I have chosen to see how *Urwind* responds to a spectrum of Bakhtin's theories and concepts at the different stages delineated above. These concepts are related but with different theoretical groundings and reverberations. Thus, *Urwind* will be examined from various Bakhtinian angles, and at the same time the reach of these critical concepts will be highlighted.

Not all Bakhtin's concepts are equally "problematic" in their leverage. In the section "Variation of Time-spaces and the Quest for Meaning," *Urwind* is considered in terms of varying time-space extensions and the way meanings are articulated in such changing perspectives. It builds on Bakhtin's theory of chronotopes, although no specific references to Bakhtin are made. The concept comes from his "middle" period, but it is not polemically conceived and contains a wide range of chronotopic patterns that readily apply to different kinds of novels. Specific instantiations of chronotopy, such as encounters on "stairs," also come up in other connections in this essay. In the subsequent section, "The Self and the Other, or Polyphony Finalized and Unfinalized," Bakhtin's early architectonic ideas will be drawn on along with the concept of polyphony in the Dostoevsky book; their relations and applicability to *Urwind* is gauged with the notions of finalization and unfinalization. The following section, "Inner Dialogue and the Fantastic Limits of the Self," also draws largely on Bakhtin's architectonic ideas of

the self and its limits, with a focus on dreamlike and fantastic elements in *Urwind's* writing and their haunting effects on images of the self and description of environments. In the section "Metonymic Figuration Between the Prosaic and the Poetic Word," the poetic figuration of *Urwind* is considered in contradistinction to Bakhtin's theory of heteroglossia and his partly normative conception of the novel based on such premises. *Urwind's* metonymic troping as perception-oriented figurality is analysed as characteristic of its (in the Bakhtinian view) "unnovelistic" procedure. In the section "Voices of Lexical Shadings," my reading continues partly against the Bakhtinian grain by the reminder that the crossing of voices in a word always also brings in different semantic fields and thus the potentiality of troping (which Bakhtin of course would admit but in his best-known texts wants to constrain). I also draw attention to certain ambivalences in Bakhtin's own formulations with a quote from a late essay of his on voices arising from "lexical shadings" as a kind of "voice-troping," which is then considered as a feature in *Urwind*. The last section, "A Retroactive Complement," gives a short recount of the procedure.

Variation of time-spaces and the quest for meaning

Diary as form involves a special chronotopic pattern. The diary novel as a genre shares with this form, but it is blurred on the edges, as the entries in such novels are not always as convincing as real diary writing, and even the line between first-person and third-person intrusive narration does not always hold (Martens 1985, 6–8). In *Urwind*, this feature is enhanced; despite their personal nature, the chapters representing the entries have little to do with ordinary diary writing. As memory speaks, the entries are extended in associative transitions and connections in a way that cuts them loose from the daily grounding that usually constrains diary writing in its informative, musing, and even rambling forms. Even so, there are

also descriptions of daily occurrences that could have been taken from any diary.

This affinity to, and deflection from, the diary form contributes to the constellation of generic and local chronotopes of the novel. Put in narratological terms, the distance between enunciation and what is enounced as events and action tends to be short in ordinary diaries; it is only within such spatial-temporal bounds that short-term memories, aspirations, and anticipations can be grounded. This is at odds with the digressive and far-reaching memory work in *Urwind*, where the distance between enunciation and enounced continually contracts and stretches out, articulating in this way specific chronotopes of places and situations. Daniel Urwind is out to produce an account of the essence of his whole life, and the digressions serve this purpose, while the weekly diary form in turn gives his writing an unobtrusive presence of continuity rooted in the place where he writes. The physical place of Daniel's writing is fixed, and there are "architectural" fixations in the mode of the writing itself (see Hellgren 2009, 134–190). The existential moment of his writing, however, is situated in *medias res*, in a crisis of his life, and not in any quasi-autobiographical vantage point of a life lived or an education process traversed.

Daniel's age is secondary to the existential urgency of the moment of crisis, but at the same time, it significantly coincides with the quasi-mythical moment of mid-life—"When half way through the journey of our life / I found that I was in a gloomy wood, / because the path which led aright was lost." At fifty-three, having already started on the downward slope of his life, Daniel takes stock. In this context, the cycle of the year suggests symbolically a movement from birth to death, overlapping with the leaving and expected return of Daniel's wife, possibly a rebirth but with premonitions of a final separation and images of death. The cycle as such connotes both death and a new beginning, but the latter is suggested only in a resigned and halting manner at the end of the novel.

All these different dimensions of time and their spatial attachments link up to produce the chronotopic constellation of *Urwind*.

The main axes in this constellation are, on the level of narration, the above-mentioned contracting and extending distance between the enunciation and the enounced, and on the overarching hermeneutic level the presence of the cyclical form of a year symbolically expanded to a life cycle. There is a suggestive tension between this symbolic dimension and the episodic and scenic form of the narrative with tentative openings and loose ends. The cycle remains only one temporal structure among others, and thus its chronotopic status becomes a special kind of potentiality with touchdowns in certain places, the force of which comes from the fusion of the concrete and the symbolic. In such connections, even the verbal poetic elements of the novel play an important part, to be discussed in the last section of this essay.

Even a formal analysis of such patterns necessarily involves thematic questions of interpretation. Key passages of this kind, with extensive thematic effects, appear at the beginning and the end of the novel. The first five sentences of the first chapter, “The Name Urwind,” are about Daniel’s ordinary perceptions as he is riding a bus on the way back home after seeing his wife off at the airport. In this movement through the urban landscape, time and place are tightly knit as elements of perception. Then he is visited by an apparition after noticing a lonely man standing in a deserted parking lot: “Suddenly the man flared, a torch, stretched up his arms, burned inside my eyes like choked scream [...]” (UW 1). This image may give rise to various associations related to the violence of the outside world, and also, suggested by later elaborations, to the legendary phoenix burning to ashes and being reborn from the remains. This resonates with Daniel’s fears and aspirations, although in a temporally confused manner; it is often suggested, both explicitly and through the melancholy mood of the writing, that the end is already in the beginning, that the essence of fire is in the ashes, and that being reborn is as dubious as it is desired. This is reinforced by other images brought up on reflection after the apparition. Daniel thinks of “a violent wind” blowing outside his bus and the airplane carrying his wife, and he continues the rumination: “Each weekday

contains its hidden vertigo, it breaks out like a sudden fire, a text that must be interpreted. Perhaps it will illuminate my own face, so I will manage to interpret it before it returns to its darkness?" He then addresses his absent wife by telling her that he is writing a diary as an account and interpretation of his "days" and the vertigos of his mind (UW 1).

There are other image clusters to similar effects in the opening chapter. A semiotic play of meanings, or more properly in this context, their mind-dependence, is brought to the foreground when Daniel "plays with" the meanings of his last name, Urwind: "It is the primordial wind from the universe, the one that blows out of nothing into nothing, hurling stars into that storm-centre that is called the soul" (UW 3). Beyond the cyclical symbolism of the year, this is a timelessly mythical level of meaning contributing to the chronotopic constellation in its metaphysical way. The metaphor of the primordial wind has different temperatures. It is presented as the principle of poetic creation: "[...] it is the invisible symbol of metamorphosis, it exists in bowed trees and the snowy twilight out there" (UW 3). Metamorphosis as a poetic principle also suggests eternal change on an inhuman scale, the wind blowing "cold from an outer space." There is, however, even a more genial twist to this: it also blows as "a warm, steady wind" existing in dreams, "in our happily straying thoughts, in the grass, [...] in the eye of the child" (UW 3). It is "the blue colour of space," and not the empty sky; we could speak here of a necessary illusion. But then again—and the first chapter can be read as a miniature of the whole novel—it ends on a melancholy note, as Daniel has another apparition, a *déjà-vu* experience, waking up in the middle of the night. He sees a young boy sitting in his grandfather's chair. As the boy slides away, Daniel has a fearful and sorrowful feeling of his whole life having passed through him without leaving a trace. He looks on these apparitions as "vague signs" that he tries to interpret in his writing. He thinks of himself as a void to be filled; and after probing his name Urwind in its associative expansion, he now wonders if he has any name at all. He imagines himself peeping in

through the window from the courtyard where the boy had disappeared. He sees the furniture, the table, and the lamp, and “at the table no one.” The life cycle is here reduced to a loop where the starting point, on return, is empty (UW 5).

The cyclic dimension of time is heightened by the fact that such images are emphatically repeated at the end of the novel. By that time, the expectation of a rebirth of the relationship with his wife has expired in a new departure. This concrete turn of a cycle in his life has been metaphorically prefigured in the imaginary and associative images in the first chapter; or, as could also be said, the first chapter already presents the existential import of the fate of this relationship. A concrete link between the beginning and the end is presented by the “genial” wind blowing through the childhood summers and evoking the attic “with its forgotten treasures” where, along with objects, “all the clockwork of human life” appears in a dreamlike, tumultuous disarray of time and transformation. In this collection of things, Daniel writes about children playing in the attic and turning into birds “hurtling out, their arms spread like clockhands,” and a bit further on he imagines himself flying on his “fantastic wings,” perhaps reborn for the reunion (UW 4).

In the last chapter of the novel, “In a Cold Gateway,” having seen his wife again off to the airport, Daniel ponders over the course of the year and his efforts to gather and remake himself: “I have gone through myself, the unknown in myself, and come out into a cold gateway.” No more treasures. He describes climbing to the attic, visited in the beginning in a dream: “There lay a few pathetic remnants of my wings, the bamboo ribs, the whole spectacle. When I lifted my gaze I saw a young lad there, on a ledge, ready to go plunging down and dare the impossible. For a moment our gazes met.” The scenes from the first chapter resonate in this last description, including a repeated apparition of the boy, and again their meeting gazes suggest the cycle of life, in principle always repeated but here with a note of resignation at the sight of the “spectacle” of the remnants of the Icarus wings he had constructed as a child.

Even so, the novel ends in mid-air: “Perhaps, when we lie broken, a wind will carry us?” (UW 3–5, 189).

These dense passages, and the way they draw a loop between the beginning and the end of the novel, bring out a chronotopic arrangement where the generic diary chronotope is transformed through the quite different workings of memory and poetic analogies. Part of the latter are the quasi-mythical cycle of the year and of life, as well as the poetically refracted image of the timeless primordial wind suggested “literally” even by his name. These elements make up a constellation with varying and often ephemeral combinations of time and place. Even the generic chronotope of diary, much transformed, becomes only one refracted element in the whole. All this ties in with a particular *mode* of writing, of literary modernism with a poetic bent.

The self and the other, or polyphony finalized and unfinalized

Urwind raises questions about the conjunction of the inner and the outer, or the way that Daniel’s mental reality and the human and physical environment reflect each other in the writing. The relationship is porous both in terms of perception and the performative force of the poetic images, but also regarding “voice” and the dialogic elements, which do not have the status of strong contending subjectivities and languages as theorized in Bakhtin’s best-known writings on the subject. Daniel’s voice in the novel emerges from the poetic and often dreamlike quality of the writing, and the same applies to the voices of others which appear as indices of other life-worlds entering Daniel’s consciousness in his memories and observations.

However, the notions of “voice” and dialogue even in Bakhtin take somewhat different forms in different parts of his work. Even the apparently stark distinction between finalized and unfinalized procedures becomes “unfinalized” in this larger framework. (For

a comprehensive account of Bakhtin's intellectual trajectory, see Morson and Emerson 1990, 64–68 ff.)

Bakhtin's earliest published articles, written before 1924, are focused on ethical, cognitive, and aesthetic issues with Kantian and neo-Kantian leanings, with a polemical edge on the "material aesthetics" of the Russian Formalists. In this early phase, known as his "architectonic" approach, Bakhtin stressed "finalization" and "outsideness" as the precondition for achieving an image or conception of oneself; without another's look, a view from the outside, one's selfhood cannot not take shape. In the creative act, the author of a literary work finalizes the "hero," the protagonist, and by extension all characters, by setting up such necessary horizons. There is a strong ethical aspect to this as one's singular relationship of answerability to the "other," to what is outside oneself (Morson and Emerson 1990, 78–80, 83; see also Roberts 1989, 120–21). Several early works of Bakhtin's along such lines, characterized as his "architectonic" approach, are included in the book *Art and Answerability* (1990).

While one's relation to the "other" is crucial already in Bakhtin's architectonic phase in regard to the integration of the self and ethical responsibility, the notion of the double-voiced prose word and the overarching idea of polyphony or multi-voicedness were properly developed during—in this scheme—his second period, in the early version of his study of Dostoevsky (1929), of which a rewritten and expanded version was published as late as 1963. These ideas still harken back to Bakhtin's early philosophical positions due to their continued emphasis on consciousness and worldviews, of ideological positions taking the measure of each other. In a further development, this undergoes a change in the essays of Bakhtin's "middle" period, collected in English in the volume *The Dialogic Imagination* (1981), where the idea of polyphony is transformed into "dialogue" with a strong emphasis on "dialogized heteroglossia" or diversity of languages in social encounters.³ Thus although the notion of "prose word" as the privileged vehicle of contending voices already appears in the book on Dostoevsky, a "pro-

saic” conception of language as social discourse comes into its own in these essays (Morson and Emerson 10, 15–38, 67).

Bakhtin himself describes the difference between the views of the Dostoevsky book and the later modification of the conception of voice and dialogue like this:

In Dostoevsky’s multi-voiced novels, for example, there is significantly less language differentiation, that is, fewer language styles, territorial and social dialects, professional jargons and so forth, than in the work of many writer-monologists [...]. It might even seem that the heroes of Dostoevsky’s novels all speak one and the same language, namely the language of their author. (Bakhtin 1984, 182)

Thus, while this is a note on the specificity of Dostoevsky’s novels, it also specifies a moment in Bakhtin’s thought and his theory of the novel. The point is that although there is no focus yet on the forms of language or discourse as diversified, the contending worldviews are nevertheless considered in terms of their diversification. No different “territorial and social dialects” make an appearance, but even so, the development of different ideological positions is not constrained by any unified outlook of the author, and consequently the treatment of the “other” in the author–hero relationship rests now on the principle of *unfinalized* creation. This marks a departure from the philosophical ideas of the early, “pre-Dostoevsky” Bakhtin, where finalization as the production of “outsideness” was considered to be the precondition of the development of integral selfhood and the possibility of fixing the contours of the others (see e.g. Bakhtin 1990, 28–29). As a general directive, the new principle of unfinalization extends to the phase where dialogism takes the form of language diversity.

Still, despite the harsh critique of finalization this change entails, the distinction between finalized and unfinalized remains aspectual and ambivalent; openness in one respect needs horizons to relate to in another. In the Dostoevsky book this shows in the reservation of necessary information to be provided (1984, 73), and more specially as the provision of “extralocality” and a “surplus of vision” on the part of the author, characterized by such meaningful

structures of feeling as love, forgiveness, or simply “willingness to listen” (1984, 299; Morson and Emerson, 91–92). Although even these orientations cannot but be considered as general aspects of worldviews, they are not considered to rule out polyphony, provided that they don’t curtail other orientations on the “hero” or character level.

The point of this account for tackling a novel such as *Urwind* is that even in Bakhtin’s key concepts there are historical variation and certain ambivalences which hold out different viewpoints and possibilities, some of them more amenable and some clarifying through their recalcitrance. The theory of chronotope has a broad applicability, also to this novel, whereas Bakhtin’s philosophical and critical accounts of the self–other relation and the contentious relations between worldviews or discourses offer not only a different conceptual framework but also a very different task of application. More than a matter of tools of description, they are a matter of prying into the properties of the novel with more or less uncertainty and difficulty. This falls out differently depending on the provenance of Bakhtin’s critical terms in theories of architectonics, polyphony, or heteroglossia.

Despite their differences, Bakhtin’s architectonic position and his conception of polyphony in the Dostoevsky book more readily provide conceptual tools for the analysis of *Urwind* than the essays from the 1930s as far as their orientation to heteroglossia is concerned—or to put it differently, the former are more coextensive with the literary procedures of the novel, while an approach through the latter provides a sharper edge of difference. Nevertheless, even the conception of polyphony in the Dostoevsky book with its emphasis on competing worldviews jars with the characteristics of *Urwind*. The differing values and social experiences voiced in the locales of the apartment house and elsewhere do not share the strong sense of polyphony as mutually challenging ideological forces. Daniel himself as the narrator-protagonist of the novel is not an ideological contender; his relations to other characters are rendered in terms of personal, existential significance and

not in terms of assertive ideological positions contending on a par. As prior examples and descriptions in this essay already show, the others' voices appear much more as echoes in his consciousness.

In *Urwind*, the writing is throughout couched in the vision and the language of Daniel the narrator-protagonist, and moreover there is a strong correspondence of style, values, and the overall emotional stance and sensibility of this narrative instance to the image we have of Carpelan as a writer. These quasi-autobiographical connecting effects need not be hastily considered as a feature of closure precluding the appearance of otherness. In its own terms, this closeness to each other of the different narrative instances, the resulting coherent voice, and the pervasive meditative and poetic style enable a free movement of recollection and projection, including the contingent appearance of characters in situations evoked by the movement of Daniel's associative mind.

This difference that remains from efforts to apply the "Dostoevskyan" notion of polyphony to a novel such as *Urwind* brings out, in addition to immediately suggesting something about the characteristics of the novel, the above-mentioned theoretical ambivalence of Bakhtin's distinction between the notions of "unfinalized" and "finalized." When the others' voices appear in Daniel's mind as elements of his subjective experience, they do retain their strangeness and the haunting outsidership of their origin, and there is no evaluative or intrusive containment imposed on them; in this sense they are not co-opted or finalized. But as they appear on the inner-outer conjunction, their outsidership is qualified by a certain evanescence; they share this quality with all the other signs which Daniel endeavors to interpret to make sense of his life. In this way, the other characters are like visitations to grapple with, insistent and even fateful, and much less subjects to be reckoned or contended with on an equal footing. In this respect, *Urwind's* falling short of, or fitting only partially into, Bakhtin's concept of polyphony suggests a more aspectual application of the finalized/unfinalized distinction, and a less strict and more complementary approach to the conception of polyphony itself.

Interestingly in view of *Urwind's* practice of fictional self-writing and its metonymic chain of author–narrator–protagonist, Bakhtin also draws attention to the “internally dialogized” dimension in encounters with others, when a character’s external exchanges are intertwined with “his internal dialogue with himself and in his internally polemical interrelations with others” (Bakhtin 1984, 279). In such internal contention, a character’s inner discourse may alternate between, for example, religious belief and disbelief as varying responses to pressing circumstances (on such wavering, see also La Capra 1987, 37). For Bakhtin, even such internal dialogue is a response to dialogic situations with others.

Inner dialogue and the fantastic limits of the self

Inner dialogue or responding to voices in one’s own mind, again in consideration of what finalization and openness in their differential pull might mean in this connection, raises the question of the *dreamlike* elements in the novel. As I observed in the first section of this essay, writing in *Urwind* often proceeds “in dreamlike condensation,” and there are interesting passages in Bakhtin’s works where he brings up the issue of dreams and fantasy as something of a testing ground for his views of dialogism and the novel. In the treatise “Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity” (1990), dating from his architectonic period, Bakhtin discusses this in numerous passages. The emphasis at this stage, as suggested, is on finalization as the result of both recognition and distance (“outsideness”) vis-à-vis others; without this, no integral and ethical self can come about. But there are complications to this even there. In one’s dreams and fantasies, Bakhtin writes, one may perceive the other participants and objects with the same clarity as in ordinary waking perception—“in its plastic and pictorial aspects, the world of fantasy is quite similar to that of actual perception” (Bakhtin 1990, 28). The point is that while the others are expressed “outwardly,” the self in both waking and dreaming can be experienced and expressed only

“from within.” This is a direct experience, but it necessarily lacks the contours that others have; such contours are not needed for the “center” of inner experience, which remains outwardly indistinct. It is only when starting to recount such fantasies to other persons that I transpose myself onto the same plane with other participants, which means that I start drawing the contours of myself. Crucially, this is the case even in first-person narration, narratologically pinpointed by the distinction between I–me and the “narrating” and “narrated” selves. In this, for Bakhtin, lies the difference between “the world of artistic creation and the world of dreaming as well as that of actual life” (Bakhtin 1990, 28–29, 59–60, ff.). Thus, in artistic creation the inner experience of oneself is transformed into an outward, perceivable image of oneself.

In a narratological sense this division can be dealt with in purely structural terms. In the early treatise where Bakhtin deals with this issue, however, the structural duality is considered as a larger ethical and aesthetic question, and more particularly in terms of a certain difficulty; in this creative act, where externalization does not happen easily because one cannot externalize one’s own outward image (project “myself” into it) in the same way as one can perceive external characters in real life or in writing and reading fiction. As he puts it, the effort to visualize oneself as another requires a forced breach with one’s “inner self-sensation,” which produces a “peculiar *emptiness*, *ghostliness*, and an eerie, frightening *solitariness* of this outward image of ourselves” (Bakhtin 1990, 30). There is an interesting twist in Bakhtin’s argument, because he first describes the “difficulty” as one of formal perception, as simply the difficulty of seeing oneself, and then as a forced objectifying act turning out an alienated likeness without enlivening “self-sensation.”

Through this twist, the description acquires quite different attributes which usher it towards a Freudian register—a direction that Bakhtin himself disowned. This externalized other self invites the Freudian conception of “uncanny” (*unheimlich*), as the doubling of the self remains haunted by the “inner sensation” and fantasy of the

self. In other words, this doubling as a miscarried act of “finalization” remains a split, fantastic, and thus ghostly or “haunted” self.

Given the early Bakhtin’s theoretical outlook and Carpelan’s literary orientation, it may not be surprising that Bakhtin’s account of the haunted and solitary self cogently applies to Carpelan’s novel. In *Urwind*, there is a pervasive sense of this kind of solitariness and uncanny fusion of the familiar and unfamiliar. An impressive image of the haunting nature of such splitting is the scene, already described from a different angle in this essay, where Daniel wakes up in the night (from his “dreams”) and has an apparition of himself as a young boy sitting in his grandfather’s chair, then sliding away from the room, and subsequently imagining himself as looking in from the window beyond which the boy had disappeared—inside, through the boy’s eyes, there is no one inside (UW 5). This connects with Daniel’s feeling of himself as a void to be filled. Bakhtin’s architectonic account of phenomena of this kind addresses conceptually the same issue. From this point of view, *Urwind*’s writing concretizes and gives new meanings to the idea of the solitariness of the circular fantasy of the self, or as I have modified it here, of its haunted nature. This solitariness (be it in view of author–protagonist or the protagonist’s externalizing of himself even as a double) can be accounted for as an effect of a failing connection to “others,” which corresponds to the circle of turning oneself inside out.

The ghostliness of the image thus turned out can always be considered as a product of imagination, whether the “inner experience” to be externalized lies in one’s everyday consciousness or day-dreaming fantasy. The term “fantasy” in this usage, however, suggests something extra, extravagant, which is needed to compensate for and charge a lack. The differences from Bakhtin’s views here are twofold. First, even if we accept the idea of the solitary circle as such, the ghostliness of the outward image is not due only to the emptiness or lack as such, but also an effect of the workings of the “inner self” which is by no means simply left behind – from this comes the haunted nature of the externalized image. Second, the “others” (or theoretically, the “other”) may also be eclipsed in a

way similar to one's inner self, which then does not redeem the self from its fantasy but rather adds to its complication. It follows from both considerations that the inner–outer and self–other problematic loses some of its Bakhtinian contours, with a modifying effect on Bakhtin's views of such relations from his early thinking right through to his ideas of polyphony and dialogism. This of course is not to be taken as a critique of the premises of Bakhtin's thought, which remain what they are, but rather as a deviation called for by *Urwind's* literary practice.

A shortcut to this practice are, as suggested, the dreamlike qualities in *Urwind's* poetic prose, engendered by its associative procedure that often moves between different time-levels with spatializing effects. The image of the boy as his doubled self, for one, becomes meaningful only as a product of Daniel's "dream" of himself; it is not just an outward visualized image brought up by memory, solitary due to the formal lack of "others," but a haunted and haunting dream-like image of Daniel's existential predicament. Regarding the "others," in Bakhtin's architectonic as well as polyphonic view "the other's possible emotional-volitional reaction to my outward manifestation" is needed to vivify the otherwise empty objectification of the self and make it answerable. The experience of the other, however, is often quite different in *Urwind*: although acting characters, the others often have dreamlike and fantastic qualities in Daniel's child's-eye perception of them, and as such, they appear as memories on the interface of his writing. Being subjected to the other's response in this way is not only a matter of being redeemed into unalienated social existence, although recognition is a crucial element in individual and social life. Such recognition can be affected and haunted—vaguely perceived—by the *other's* eclipsed and enigmatic "inner self," in addition to the usual complications resulting from different perceptions and points of view. The following example comes from the chapter "In Viktoria's Room":

In the hallway there is a smell of warmth, and Viktoria squints at me and asks how old I am now, I have grown since last time, I am a big ras-

cal, soon we will be able to stand before the altar together, she laughs hoarsely, and the birthmarks in her face darken. [...] And she looks at me with her large, pale eyes. They were dark as Andalusian nights once, says Viktoria, they saw so much of what is foreign, then one goes dark, but perhaps you won't understand that, even though you say you are fifty. (UW 13)

How do Aunt Viktoria's presence and words in this passage vivify and give contours to Daniel's solitary and ghostly image, or more precisely, how does it come through in the writing which is all about Daniel's own perception and memory? There is something enigmatic about Viktoria herself, and there is something about the whole interaction that remains eclipsed. The obvious refraction concerns the age difference; much of what Viktoria says must remain odd for the young boy, and the end of the passage, "even though you say you are fifty," mixes the memory with the act of memorizing. But there is more to it. Viktoria's joke about their soon getting married, which must be alluring and embarrassing to Daniel, is a suggestion full of duplicity and indirection. The young Daniel takes it in as an indication and anticipation of his growing up. In the text, this is shown in the first-person descriptions which come from Viktoria's mock-imitation but immediately become Daniel's self-experience in a loop initiated or mediated by the other: "I have grown since last time, I am a big rascal" (UW 13). On the face of it, these can be considered in Bakhtinian terms as "emotional-volitional" external attributions, but in Daniel's mind they sound as if giving voice to his innermost "inexpressible" self. Indirection in such memories strongly suggests what is known as dreamwork, a rhetoric of dreams, with its haunting effects on this scene of Daniel's acknowledgement by his aunt. On the story level, this comes through as the dual workings of the experiencing and remembering Daniel's mind, Aunt Viktoria's opaque way of addressing him being part of it; on the level of writing itself ("Carpelan"), this is part of its haunted mode, discernible throughout the novel.

The dreamlike and fantasy-driven elements of *Urwind's* writing mold the affirmations of the self through glidings and transfor-

mations as if on a fluctuating interface. The resulting un/familiarity of things often spawns haunted images and haunting effects on the self as well as on whole scenes. However, this is not limited to the author–protagonist–character relations but can also affect descriptions of the physical environment, which always involves the use of poetic and rhetorical means of expression. The following excerpt from the chapter “In Rooms Dreamt and Real” gives a sense of the fluctuation and the strangeness of the familiar:

The intractable door refuses to open. The light on the other side is too strong. On the whitewashed wall hang a steel lantern, a rusty barometer, an old icon. The odour of metal is as acrid as the brown water on the stone floor. From the stairs comes a cold wind of wood and damp. A cane chair lies knocked over on the floor. When the door opens the winds blow out the light in the room, it is immediately dark. [...]

Further away in the wood-fragrant room one can see a finely latticed window that divides a forest landscape into clearly separate parts: trees, roads, field, all enclosed by a house-wall. The wall grows and sets before me the familiar rubbish-bins, the grey sky and time, the war, the rats, the night. Here the silence has been scraped together in a hurry, it rests by the legs of the table, hangs from the ceiling, smooths out the tablecloth but cannot manage to do anything about the bread-crumbs. Do I hear singing, like a floating in the air, a many-voiced voice? As a child I heard muffled churchbells, they rang in Sunday and its boredom, my dreams [...]. (UW 87)

There is no divided self here, and no character entering an action-oriented relation to the world of people and the environment. The person entering the room is reduced to an instance of lucid perception—a moving eye, a nose that smells, an ear and tactile sense that feels the wind blowing in. In this kind of description, the metaphoric interface between inner and outer tends to fade out. It does, however, retain its function here when perceptions are rendered as memory (“the familiar rubbish-bins”; “As a child I heard”), or when imagination engenders quasi-causal connections (the door refuses to open “because” the light on the other side is too strong) and expands the perception of things into memories and lists of very different objects and scenes (“rubbish-bins, the grey sky and time,

the war, the rats, the night”)—and also in the metaphoric description of the silence as hurriedly scraped together and fixed on tangible objects. An imaginary “many-voiced voice” connects the room with Daniel’s childhood.

Most of the description, despite the variation of the means, could equally well be accounted for as contents of Daniel’s (or anyone’s) mind or as things in the world that just “need” a mind in order to become accessible to other minds. Still, with a focus on Daniel’s figure, especially in a larger context, the significance of the room for him as a memory space is evident, and the description itself brings out his peculiar sensibility intertwined with the power of language. In the scheme of the whole novel, however, Daniel as an experiencing person is by no means thinned out. His life and predicament have clear contours and situate him in the framework of answerability within the author-protagonist-character framework, his wife as a character and addressee. With reference to Bakhtin’s early, architectonic thought and his theory of polyphony in the Dostoevsky book, we could say that *Urwind* deals with the same problematic with a strong modernist bent. Given the mode of writing of the novel, the notion of polyphony becomes applicable with a “sideways glance,” as infected from the novel’s poetic language which in the story world Daniel writes, but which in its rhetorical force also takes him over as its vehicle. The remaining two sections will focus precisely on the poetic and rhetorical means and force of *Urwind*’s language, and the way it relates to Bakhtin’s discussion of such elements in a novel.

Metonymic figuration between the prosaic and the poetic word

As a shortening of larger units and contexts, “word” in Bakhtin’s usage has metonymic implications and dialogic significance. The “double-voiced” or multi-voiced word is in this sense a meeting place for different speakers and discourses, be it in terms of ordi-

nary conversation or ideological struggle. Along with these voices and discourses come meanings in their linguistic-semiotic and referential dimensions and rhetorical and poetic articulations. A consideration of their relative status in the whole pattern takes us to the point where Bakhtin's dialogical approach becomes a matter of critical discrimination. With his "translinguistic" approach, he supersedes Saussurian linguistic approaches (Todorov 1984, 24–25, 54–56), and his emphasis on responsiveness and dialogue takes precedence over referentiality and representation. More particularly, and most significantly in this case, "lyrical self-expression" and poetic diction (troping) are problematized as alien elements in the context of his prosaic and dialogical theory of the novel; to the extent that such features assume a formative impact beyond some local functions, they are seen to compromise the historical achievement of the novel.

This critique of "poetic novels" is a consequence of Bakhtin's theory of dialogism and the dialogic theory of the novel. It is fully developed in the writings of his "middle period," accessible in English in *The Dialogic Imagination*, of which I shall be drawing here mostly on the treatise "Discourse in the Novel" (DiN). As the focus of my discussion in the remaining two sections is on the poetic and rhetorical means of *Urwind's* prose, my references to Bakhtin will be predominantly to these core ideas of his middle period where his critique of "poetic prose" is most intense.

This non-coincidence brings such features in the novel to their characteristic edge. And even here, Bakhtin himself occasionally touches on the limits of his critique.

Reservations about such "unnovelistic" features already exist in Bakhtin's discussion of polyphony in his book on Dostoevsky's poetics, although there almost exclusively in relation to "lyrical expressivity" and not to troping. In DiN, this critical stance has become much more emphatic, and explicitly leveled at troping. In this critical—and censoring—definition, the "word image" as image-as-trope is "completely exhausted by the play between the word [...] and the object [...]," and all the richness of meaning and its

“contradictory multiplicity” resides in the aspects of the object itself, in language in its “virginal” or as yet “unuttered” nature. Thus “word” in its limited understanding as an image or trope “forgets that its object has its own history of contradictory acts of verbal recognition, as well as that heteroglossia that is always present in such acts of recognition”. The “novelistic image” or prose word, by contrast, is born “in a dialogue as a living rejoinder within it; the word is shaped in dialogic interaction with an alien word that is already in the object” (DiN, 277–279). Apart from failing in this respect, novels may also fail by staging themselves in the manner of classical drama; such novels, written in “pure single-voiced language,” remain “closet dramas” considered “unnovelistic” (327, 327n25) by Bakhtin. These are different kinds of failure, but with equally un-novelistic consequences. What matters for my purposes here are the strictures on poetic elements in novelistic prose.⁴

In his sweeping critique of troping, Bakhtin does not much distinguish between the different effects of different kinds of figure (although he discusses the prosaic specificity of irony at length), not even between metaphor and metonymy. This distinction, however, is important when discussing *Urwind's* poetic prose, a salient characteristic of which is its propensity for metonymy and, as part of it, synecdoche. As figures, they readily tap into contiguous, perceivable everyday realities and thus also into the dialogic potentiality of the lifeworld. This special characteristic of *Urwind's* figurative language partly refracts Bakhtin's sharp and general critique of the status of poetic figuration in novels.

The penchant for metonymy has been observed to be a general characteristic in Carpelan's writing, especially in his poetry, but also in his prose (Hollsten 2004, 44–62). Metonymic and metaphoric troping may intertwine, which is the case in *Urwind* as well. Pivoted on similarity, metaphors are dependent on metonymic elements, but the degree of explicitness may vary greatly, and in longer texts metonymic relations may give rise to comprehensive metaphoric meanings in the end (e.g. Lodge 1977, 73–111). Along such lines, it is possible to discern extended textual metonymies.

As an example of such two-way movement, Hollsten notes (60–61) how in *Urwind* long mimetic listings of different objects are often suddenly framed in a way that endows them with an extended metaphoric meaning. Somewhat differently, objects and places—including the whole apartment house where much of the action and the writing itself take place—may stand in a metonymic relation to those who have used them or lived there.

In the following excerpt, taken from the chapter “Snow Letter,” it is through such metonymic figures and their metaphoric condensation that the experiences and voices of others present themselves to Daniel’s consciousness:

How heavy it feels to struggle up this cold and vertiginous stairwell while the snowstorm quietly rages out there. It is as if I had been making my way up here for decades and had slowly grown, become heavier, acquired eyes ever more hesitant, ever more difficult to find the way with. But Viktoria is surely waiting for me, why, we shall get married this autumn, she says. I sniff the air. At the Bengtssons’ they are frying herring, where did they get it? Out under the door it streams, bones, spines, dead heads, dead eyes. At the Pietinens’ they are listening to the news, there is the sound of Sibelius, a woman is screaming: ‘If you touch me, I’ll leave!’ Hot lava penetrates across the thresholds, here everyone at all may give up the ghost without anyone hearing, snow whirls in through the windows and covers all those who are asleep, they lie in rows as along wintry roads near the front. Each window is a darkness, each stair a year of my life—how many years do I have left? (UW 11)

This passage is full of indices of the war years. It is both mimetically forceful and stridently subjective. The different voices and suggested discourses (Sibelius-cum-patriotism) along with the affective and emotional qualities (fear, envy, aggression, melancholy) merge to produce connotations of threat, death, and shortage. The passage is metonymically mimetic, arising from concrete sensations, with a metaphoric pull through the image of “lava.” Carpelan’s tendency in his poetry to eschew metaphors and symbols without concrete attachments is no less the case with the figurality of his novelistic prose. But as suggested, this verbal characteris-

tic can be combined with larger imaginative, even turbulently figural and fantastic elements, such as the semi-mythical cycle of the year and suggestions of mythological figures and apparitions. For Daniel, such apparitions function as “vague signs” whose meanings he is out to interpret. But although they are detached from ordinary perception, as phantasmatic messages they are embedded in his lifeworld.

The metonymic procedure comes through with exceptional clarity in the sentence “Out under the door it streams, bones, spines, dead heads, dead eyes.” All this belongs to fried herrings. This is the sensation has it, they can even be sniffed. At the same time, surrealistically or as in a dream, these parts of the fish are described as materially and separately streaming through the door crack. They become concretely visible in fantasy—be it in the child’s fantasy or the adult Daniel’s fantasy in writing. Formally these body parts are just “parts for the whole,” but the way they are presented connotes cutting into pieces, and as such they lead to, and partake in, the images of wartime violence and violence in the families. The parts of the fish suggest what kind of food is being prepared in the rooms, and at the same time their severed quality suggests bodies cut into pieces on the front. The same image is symbolically split in two directions. These different orientations are joined in the same act of evocation, but both their metonymic connections and symbolic meanings remain largely separate, as their weight lies in the concrete situations. The common element of violence in Daniel’s recollected experience provides a rhetorically vague but emotionally strong link, starting in his experience in the apartment house and widening out to the front.

The different scenes and elements of violence are suggested by the juxtaposition of lava and snow. If “lava” connotes death by heat (aggression of any kind), in the same passage “snow” connotes death by the cold; both images overdetermine the image of cutting. Death by the cold as an inner and outer experience is suggested by the “cold and vertiginous stairwell” inside the house and the snowstorm outside, these images of vertigo arising in Daniel’s

mind as he makes his way up the stairs. This leads to the description of “snow whirls” covering all sleeping people and, in another move, soldiers lying in rows “along wintry roads near the front.” The image of lava, too, relates to Daniel’s perceptions in the stairwell: “Hot lava penetrates across the thresholds,” as do the parts of fish, both functioning as images of hatred and rage in the rooms behind the thresholds, and more extensively of destruction in the image of death by heat and then petrification. In a series of displacements, personal rage leads to an index of war, concretely the Finno-Russian Winter War. “Lava” and “snow” as vehicles give this passage a metaphoric twist, but even so the text retains a strong metonymic basis, because the different realities thus suggested are brought together only by common connotations, without losing any of their lifewordly and physical differences.

The passage also has chronotopic significance. Daniel’s climbing the stairs is presented as lasting for decades, the climb becoming heavier and heavier. When the boy struggles up the stairs, every step is at once movement in place and time, from the young boy of the war years to the middle-aged man writing about it. The common chronotope of stairs as a place of moving up and down and meeting others (Bakhtin 1981, 248) is turned into a poetic image by transforming it into a suggestive space with an opening towards one’s whole life. The stairway functions as the scene of concrete time-space contiguities and metonymic displacements, with the special edge of being the scene of the workings of memory and recollection.

What transpires from the above reading of Carpelan’s metonymically leaning figurality is that, although poetic prose is by no means the privileged means for furthering polyphony or dialogism in Bakhtin’s definition, neither are the effects of this kind of troping limited to narrowly linguistic substitutions or self-expression. Bakhtin does not pay much attention to what can be achieved through such means in the genre of the novel; such considerations are soon cropped by his polemical genre criticism. As shown above, however, troping in its metonymically oriented variations may very

well have large textual and social reverberations and as such serve to interrelate different domains of individual, social, and historical experience. This is the case even in a novel such as *Urwind*, where everything is filtered through the narrator-protagonist's sensibility.

"Voices of lexical shadings"

Bakhtin's emphasis on "voice" as a carrier or performer of world views and language diversity is at the core of his theory of polyphony and dialogism. "Word" as a vehicle of voices is in this sense not understood in terms of a single voice, but dialogically as the site where several different—responsive, anticipating, and contending—voices may appear. Along with these translinguistic and performative functions foregrounded by Bakhtin, words retain their representative and—in this case more importantly—rhetorical functions. These latter features, too, embedded in overlapping semantic fields and tensions between the axes of selection and combination have a force of their own, with the consequence that a simultaneity of voices in "words" may also involve figurative transformations of meaning.

The preceding section ended in a note on how Bakhtin's sharp critique of the effects of troping in novels disregards the novelistic achievement of even the kind of metonymically bent poetic prose practiced in *Urwind*. Positively put, *Urwind's* figurative practice could be seen to effect a tentative convergence between Bakhtin's privileged prose word and its generically undermining "other," the poetic word. Below, I shall approach the issue from Bakhtin's direction by suggesting that even in some parts of his own theory of the multi-voiced word there are implications towards a similar partial convergence. These implications, at variance with Bakhtin's polemical strictures, point to the possibility of constructions where the "word" as the site of crossing voices may work on different semantic potentials to the point where something of *voicetroping* be-

gins to emerge. The following quotation from the fragmentary late essay “The Problem of the Text” (2004) brings home the point:

Each large and creative verbal whole is a very complex and multifaceted system of relations. With a creative attitude toward language, there are no voiceless words that belong to no one. Each word contains voices that are sometimes infinitely distant, unnamed, almost impersonal (voices of lexical shadings, of styles, and so forth), almost undetectable, and voices sounding nearby and simultaneously. (123–124)

In DiN, when discussing the difference between poetic and prosaic use of tropes, Bakhtin is ready to “save” the poetic figure or trope when it is taken over for dialogic purposes and given a prosaic accent, for example through an ironic twist:

To understand the difference between ambiguity in poetry and double-voicedness in prose, it is sufficient to take any symbol and give it an ironic accent (in a correspondingly appropriate context, of course), that is, to introduce into it one’s own voice, to refract within it one’s own fresh intention.” (328–329)

The above excerpt gives this earlier allowance a different extension, as “distant” and lexically suggestive features are now discussed on a par with contextually identified dialogic relations. Voices are described as emerging from “lexical shadings” and stylistic values, and not exclusively from socially identifiable forms and subjects of discourse; thus, the notion of voice becomes interwoven with the characteristics of words as bundles of associative semantic fields and rhetorical transformations. Even the workings of metonymy, apparent in any realistically oriented dialogic text, become different in the kind of more distant voicing that Bakhtin discusses in the excerpt above. In such cases, the metonymic potential of the “word” becomes loosened from its contextually identifiable groundings, and this kind of voice-troping⁵ may also have more pronounced condensing and thus metaphorizing effects. Theoretically speaking, we are now probing into the boundaries between linguistic signification and Bakhtinian translinguistics.

In this convergence between word-as-voice and word-as-trope, the distinction between the prosaic and the poetic word becomes

ambivalent. In *Urwind*, words as carriers of voices (“If you touch me, I’ll leave!”) are often interwoven with words as tropes (“Hot lava penetrates”). The cry from behind the door, a concrete voicing of quarrel, hatred, and despair, is also part of a whole life, while “hot lava” is a directly metaphoric rendering of a similar destructive and ultimately petrifying quality of life. They relate differently to the idea of “voice,” the former connecting with concrete speakers in the lifeworld of the protagonist-narrator, the latter being part of “writing” that draws on the rhetorical and poetic resources of language and, at the same time, on the inner experience of the narrator-protagonist, engendering a more fluid kind of subjectivity.

Even for Bakhtin, the dialogic and “lyrical” (self-expressive) orientations are not unconditionally inimical to each other, but they lean on “voice” in divergent ways, and an overdose of the latter—which would be the case in *Urwind*—undermines the historical dialogic achievement of the novel as Bakhtin has it. The difference is critically significant, and thus it has been instructive to gauge these leanings also against the grain, both in fiction and in theory.

Concluding remarks

As I have been reading *Urwind*, a novel with salient poetic elements, against the foil of Bakhtin’s overlapping but changing views of the self and the other, inner and outer, polyphony and dialogue, and the status of troping and the “lyrical,” the applicability of these concepts and notions has been variable. In this two-way reading connecting to different moments of Bakhtin’s thought, even the limits and ambivalences have, I hope, been significant in both directions.

The emphasis in this essay has been on Bo Carpelan’s novel, and consequently the discussion of Bakhtin’s changing views over time has been limited to the essentials, although I have tried to give it enough space to make the cross-lighting meaningful. There is a certain increase of friction when I move from the discussion

of chronotopes to self–other relations and polyphony, and further to the poetic elements and the status of troping in the novel. The view from chronotopy and from Bakhtin’s early architectonic ideas proved to be more directly amenable to account for *Urwind’s* specificity than the view from Bakhtin’s “middle term” theory of the novel exemplified here by the treatise “Discourse in the Novel.” Bakhtin’s critique of “unnovelistic” novels provided a foil against which *Urwind’s* poetic prose most clearly stood out.

In looking at this most thorny part of the relationship, it has obviously not been my purpose to polemically roll back what Bakhtin has stated about the difference between the novel and the poetic genres, or the difference between the prose word and the poetic word. Nevertheless, the quotation from Bakhtin’s posthumous essay in the last section is symptomatic in the sense that it draws, once again, attention to the modifications of Bakhtin’s views of the novel and the varieties of novelistic prose. Considered as a complement with retroactive effects, the passage from the late essay together with other similar passages has a relativizing impact on the sharp distinctions made elsewhere in Bakhtin’s work.

As part of the same gesture, I have regarded Carpelan’s novel as in its own way triggering off similar, complementary effects vis-à-vis Bakhtin. *Urwind* itself with its own “voices of lexical shadings” can be viewed as a fictional complement affecting Bakhtin’s strictures on self-expression, troping, and lyricism. Theoretically speaking, it questions the cleanliness of Bakhtin’s distinction between “pure language” (language as a formal system of differences) and language as a translangual and dialogic phenomenon. There is no pure language, although formal abstractions exist, and so do specific formal operations known as rhetoric. The latter, however, only exist to produce particular meanings, the status of which in different contexts and dialogical relations may vary greatly. Most clearly, perhaps, this transpired from the way *Urwind’s* metonymically bent figuration functioned as mediation between the narrator-protagonist’s subjective experience and the social world, thus bringing about a dialogic relationship of its own kind.

NOTES

¹ For a discussion of Carpelan's relation to modernism in a literary and historical context, see e.g. Hollsten 2004, 33–36, 89–91, 288–289, and Hellgren 2009, 70–73.

² Dentith (1995, 43) somewhat relativizes Bakhtin's unreserved characterization of Dostoevsky's works as decisively polyphonic, i.e., lacking any hierarchical structures of meaning. On a scale between hierarchy (consistent narrative omniscience) and polyphony, he situates Dostoevsky close to the latter, but considers Joyce and even Dickens to be the closest. However, Dentith reduces polyphony to the idea of "freedom of the word" or an open process of signification, thus playing down Bakhtin's view of the centrality of struggles over meaning on the level of worldviews and discourses.

³ Graham Pechey describes the position of the Dostoevsky book as the point of transition between "the sociologizing imperative of his friends' polemical texts and the historicizing imperative of his own work on carnival and the novel," which makes it "the locus classicus" of an "existentializing imperative" affecting all of Bakhtin's thinking. Regarding another pair of competing paradigms, the subject-oriented stance of the Dostoevsky book—its "*textualizing* of the subject"—is considered as setting itself apart from both Saussurean objectivism and the "premature" cancellation of both subjectivity and sociality in Russian Formalism (Pechey 2007, 20–21).

⁴ For a Bakhtinian discussion of poetry, see Wesling (2003); for a discussion of poetry and polyphony, see the chapter "Polyphony and the Poetic Text" in Steinby and Klapuri (2013).

⁵ It is not possible to deal here in any detail with Paul de Man's (1989, 105–114) idea of the radical otherness or exotopy as a way of attending deconstructively to Bakhtin's idea of dialogism, or to the effects of the distinction between the epistemic (intentional) and the linguistic conception of trope. Clearly, however, my own analysis comes close to de

Man's critique of the opposition that Bakhtin sets up between "trope as object-directed and dialogism as social-oriented discourse". Such a division for de Man is "tropological in the worst possible sense, namely as reification." On the face of it, of course, Bakhtin's approach is the opposite of reification, but his efforts to oppose it by defining troping or the "poetic word" in terms of "pure language" land him facing the problem he had been striving to overcome. On these issues, see also Roberts (1989) 115–134.

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, M. M. (1990) "Author and Hero in Aesthetic Activity". In M. M. Bakhtin, *Art and Answerability: Early Philosophical Essays by M. M. Bakhtin*. Ed. Michael Holquist and Vadim Liapunov. Trans. and notes by Vadim Liapunov. Austin: U of Texas P, 4–256.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P. – I have drawn on two treatises in this collection, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel" (84–258), and "Discourse in the Novel" (259–422).
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (2004) "The Problem of the Text in Linguistics, Philology, and the Human Sciences: An Experiment in Philosophical Analysis". In M.M. Bakhtin, *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P, 103–131.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- De Man, Paul (1989) "Dialogue and Dialogism". *Rethinking Bakhtin: Extensions and Challenges*. Ed. Gary Saul Morson and Caryl Emerson. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 105–114.
- Dentith, Simon (1995) *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. Routledge.
- Erdinast-Vulcan, Daphna (2013) *Between Philosophy and Literature: Bakhtin and the Question of Literature*. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Hellgren, Jan (2009) *Det osynligas arkitektur: Om rumsligheten i Bo Carpelans författarskap*. Ph.D. thesis. <http://bibbild.abo.fi/ediss/2009/HellgrenJan.pdf>, digital edition ISBN 978-952-12-2268-9. Åbo Akademi, Litteraturvetenskap. – My references are to this dissertation only, not to its modified book version *Bo Carpelan: rummets diktare* (Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 2014).

- Hollsten, Anna (2004) *Ei kattoa, ei seiiniä. Näkökulmia Bo Carpelanin kirjallisuuskäsitteeseen*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Hollsten, Anna (2007) "Ekphrastic Encounters in Bo Carpelan's *Urwind* and 'Den skadskjutna ängeln'". *AVAIN – The Finnish Review of Literary Studies*, 4, 2007, 48–58.
- La Capra, Dominick (1987) *History, Politics, and the Novel*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Lodge, David (1977) *The Modes of Modern Writing. Metaphor, Metonymy, and the Typology of Modern Literature*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Martens, Lorna (1985) *The Diary Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Morson, Gary Saul & Caryl Emerson (1990) *Mikhail Bakhtin: Creation of a Prosaics*. Stanford: Stanford UP.
- Pechey, Graham (2007) *Mikhail Bakhtin: The Word in the World*. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Roberts, Matthew (1989) "Poetics Hermeneutics Dialogics: Bakhtin and Paul de Man". In Gary Saul Morson & Caryl Emerson (eds) *Rethinking Bakhtin. Extensions and Challenges*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern UP, 115–134.
- Steinby, Liisa & Tintti Klapuri (2013) (editors) *Bakhtin and His Others. (Inter)subjectivity, Chronotope, Dialogism*. London & New York: Anthem.
- Wesling, Donald (2003) *Bakhtin and the Social Moorings of Poetry*. Lewisburg & London: Bucknell UP/Associated UP.

Brian Kennedy

**“ANOTHER, MORE DISSATISFIED AND
TRUTHFUL PERSON”: DANIEL URWIND
ON THE THRESHOLD OF MID-LIFE IN
BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND***

As Bo Carpelan’s *Urwind* (1993) opens, protagonist Daniel Urwind stands on the brink of a new life, one bereft of the comforts of domestic partnership, at least for a year. We find him riding on a bus, coming home from having dropped his wife at the airport for her trip to a US research university. Looking out the coach’s window, he sees a man suddenly seem to burst into flames, burning before him. So intense is the experience that Daniel must shut his eyes. When he opens them, the man is gone. Nobody else on the bus has seen anything (UW 1). Thus begins a novel which has baffled even some professional critics with its series of time shifts and its protagonist’s fantastic interior narrative. Their answer for *Urwind’s* complexities, in many cases, has been to do one of two things: to account for the book’s difficulties by characterizing it as modernist, or to focus interpretive efforts on rendering the novel’s complicated chronology simple. However, interpretive readings often then go no further, and thus either approach may leave much of the rich texture of the novel, including the vivid detail of its narrative events, unremarked upon. The novel may quite readily be read as modernist, but to leave the matter there misses the thematic locus centered on the experience of standing on the margin between two possible lives, waiting to see which one will be one’s own.

Mikhail Bakhtin’s notion of the chronotope allows for a two-part investigation into *Urwind*. On the one hand, it makes possible an understanding of the space-time of the novel, which codes the book as modernist, a point usefully made in the context of Carpelan’s oeuvre. A further, yet little remarked upon, dimension of the chronotopic—the notion of *threshold*—allows for a reading which opens Carpelan’s novel thematically. In what follows, I would like

to develop the possibilities for chronotope as it applies to this novel. In discussing *Urwind* as modernist, I will make comparisons to Virginia Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway* (1925) and Charlotte Perkins Gilman's "The Yellow Wallpaper" (1892). Doing so will validate Carpelan's modernism but also expose the class-bound (and therefore time-bound) limits of the threshold experience, and thus necessitate comparison with a contemporary text which is thematically tied to *Urwind*.¹ For this point, I will use the film *American Beauty* (1999) because its protagonist is, like Carpelan's Daniel Urwind, a middle-aged male living in contemporary space-time.

Like Septimus Warren Smith, Perkins Gilman's narrator (possibly named Jane), and Lester Burnham, Daniel Urwind stands near a threshold which will define his experience from this point in his life forward. This is the year of absence which he will presently endure, and, as it turns out, the life he will have thereafter. For Septimus, his threshold has passed, the Great War taking him from everything which he knew, including his job and his sense that English culture could provide order to life, leaving him disoriented and alone despite the presence of his wife, an Italian woman who has returned with him to England as he attempts to resume his pre-war life. For Jane, the threshold comes as the reader observes her struggling with what is probably post-partum depression. For Burnham, the threshold is that invisible line which men (at least, in contemporary Western cultures) seem to approach somewhere around their fortieth birthday. He appears to have crossed it in some near past, but spends the several weeks covering the film's action trying to live in reverse by fighting off the physical and psychological effects of aging. Each, then, shares the experience of being forced to confront a crisis which moves them outside their culture's conventional mode of living and thinking. The trauma of doing so means that each one's experience of the world in space and time takes on fantastic qualities.

Before delving into the chronotopic threshold experience, I would like to account for the chronotope of Carpelan's form, which has, as was indicated above, been a source of both interest and trou-

ble to readers. In terms of technique, *Urwind* bears remarkable similarity to great works of European modernist literature as well as fitting into the late strain of modernism which flourished in Finland.² So, for example, Carpelan's text might be read alongside *Mrs. Dalloway*, each focusing on the internal, the characters' points of view, while seeming to ignore conventional notions of time and time markers in narration.

Witness, for instance, what happens when Septimus Warren Smith is out for a curative rest in the park on the June day in 1923 when the story takes place. Despite this being several years after the Great War, he is afflicted by it still. Suddenly, the branches of a nearby tree part, and out walks his trench buddy, Evans (70). Evans, it must be noted, has been dead since being killed in action in Italy just before Armistice. As Septimus begins to rise from his chair, his wife, Rezia, tries to calm him. No one else sees Evans, though in fact, Peter Walsh is walking towards the couple, and Mrs. Rezia Smith is embarrassed for both herself and Septimus. What has happened to Septimus here is not terribly different from what befell Daniel Urwind on his way home from the airport as detailed above. Such incidents, multiplied throughout each novel, point to the stream-of-consciousness narrative which signals modernism. Still, critics have come to *Urwind* with a measure of hesitation oftentimes prompted by the unconventional time scheme of the novel as well as the unrealistic flights which take the protagonist-narrator on a mental journey which spans decades and transcends the normal spatial limits of the human body. The result is that critical approaches often take two diametrically opposed tacks: either to read the book as modernist by embracing its lack of cohesion, or to reduce it, and the reading of it, to an exercise in creating a chronology which "makes sense" in the conventional way. A third strategy is to cite the novel's debt to Carpelan's considerable talents as a poet to provide a viable way into the admittedly dense narrative.

So, for instance, Thomas DuBois (1994) describes the technique of the book with a degree of enthusiasm: "Carpelan's powerful use of imagery and language, [are] characteristics which tie him inte-

grally to the Fenno-Swedish modernist school (of which he is undoubtedly one of the best-known and most widely acclaimed exemplars in the postwar period)” (382).³ He then goes on to explain, in his brief review, the connections of Carpelan’s work with other important texts in both Finnish and Finland-Swedish literature, not limiting his references to *Urwind*, but making the claim for other of Carpelan’s novels as well as the poems (1994, 382).

DuBois notwithstanding, it is not uncommon to see *Urwind* questioned, if not derided, as not particularly accessible in its language. For instance, in reviewing Roger Holmström’s book on the novel, George C. Schoolfield (2000) says that readers are not universally enamored of the Carpelan text, citing several examples. However, as is well known, the novel won the Finlandia Prize, something which another critic says vaulted the book to prominence, but the description offered seems to be not without reservation: “[Not] necessarily a book that would appeal to a wide audience, rather it was quite intellectual. Nevertheless [because of the prize] sales took off” to total 33,000. “Without the prize, its sales would probably have remained at around 3,000 copies” (Sonninen 2004). It is a point Schoolfield picks up when he cites Holmström to say that the reader may “abandon [...] his efforts, despite the extraordinary amount of praise (and the Finlandia Prize) it [*Urwind*] received upon its appearance. ‘There are several who, after having read the first four or five chapters, put the book aside, convinced that it is a story one can’t get into’” (qtd. in Schoolfield 2000, 120). In the face of this, the strategy which Holmström’s book takes is to form an apology for the novel showing how its chronology works (Schoolfield 2000, 120–121).

This interpretive strategy might be glossed as being the same as the approach which readers of Western European modernist texts used in the first phase of the movement. Stacy Burton (2000) claims that early criticism “promoted readings that demonstrated that modernist texts were more carefully calibrated than they appeared to be and emphasized their centripetal rather than centrifugal tendencies [...]. [R]eaders were at least assured that [the mod-

ernist novel] really was art: principles of order and narrative purpose, they were told, shaped its apparent chaos” (534). The problem, and here she could be talking about Carpelan as much as James Joyce (whom she is discussing), is that “such formalist approaches [...] do not explain the unruly multiplicity of modernist narratives as anything more than a problem to be solved. Critics assume that monologic intent underlies polyphony and read ambiguous conflicts with an eye toward making them unambiguous” (Burton 2000, 535). In fact, according to Burton, it was oftentimes the artists themselves who created these interpretations in the early days of modernism, over-writing their own texts in reaction to confused critical response.⁴

Put another way, this could result in the following question: what would it take to rescue *Urwind* from this modernist/technicalist bind? Doing so might necessitate reading the chronotope of the novel in context with selected modernist texts while simultaneously wrestling with *Urwind*'s contemporary cultural contexts. Such an interpretation would avoid the traps of either exoticizing or domesticating the novel, and instead explore the historically and culturally situated reasons for what appears to be an endless loop of memory lost and regained. This method has been prefigured by a critic seeking to render into meaning Peer Hultberg's 1992 novel *Byen og Verden* (*The City and the World*), and I cite it briefly here as a transition to my argument on Carpelan's novel.

Henk van der Liet (1999) admits that *The City* is “characterized by a fragmentary, plotless construction which lacks narrative progression [...]” (211). He says that it is a collection of one hundred disparate units which might best be described as “a series of relatively independent and unrelated textual fragments [...]” (212), but he then goes on to claim that there is a way of making sense of the text, if one reads the scattered fragments as being united by the chronotope of the city: “In Bakhtinian terms, Viborg functions as a chronotope,” he claims (1999, 213). In making his argument, van der Liet has bypassed the attempt to untangle the chronology of Hultberg's novel, instead reading the book as portraying “the ten-

sion between two chronotopic levels—the gap between public and private existence—collective and the individual time and space” (1999, 215). A similar approach might be used to understand *Urwind*.

For Bakhtin, at least as he studies ancient literature in his essay “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope of the Novel” (originally published 1937-38, now appearing in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, 1981), the chronotope is a matter of relationship in space-time, wherein one term cannot exist, nor change, without the other also changing. Take for instance his statement that “[t]ime, as it were, thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot and history” (84).⁵

Bakhtin indicates that the significance of the multiple chronotopes he describes is that “(t)hey are organizing centers for the fundamental narrative events of the novel. The chronotope is the place where the knots of narrative are tied and untied” which leads to “the meaning that shapes narrative” (1981, 1937–1938, 250). He says that “the chronotope, functioning as the primary means for materializing time in space, emerges as a center for concretizing representation, as a force giving body to the entire novel” (250). Stacy Burton (1996) suggests the flexibility of the concept when she claims that Bakhtin’s “chronotope and discourse theories propose not another typology of texts, but rather creative ways to understand heterogeneous experiences of temporality and their re-creation in narrative” (44). Speaking in the context of the discussion of *Urwind*, it might matter less whether the text is modernist per se than that it can be read as dramatizing the particular temporality which grows out of Daniel Urwind’s experience.

Burton uses the notion of “heterochrony,” or the mixing of chronotopes within a single text, to read *The Sound and The Fury* (1929) against the much later *Moon Tiger* (1987), a method obviously suggestive of my comparison of *Urwind* with *Mrs. Dalloway*, “The Yellow Wallpaper,” and *American Beauty*. Such readings, at least to some degree, ignore the historically determined nature of

their respective protagonists in order to focus on the similarity of their experiences. In the case of these latter four texts, the result is a recognition that despite their differences, the characters share threshold moments which trigger similar psychological reactions.

The idea of threshold is of course also predicated on Bakhtin, who describes what he calls “the chronotope of *threshold*” as “the chronotope of *crisis* and *break* in a life” (1981, 1937–1938, 248, italics original). The break that he speaks about, he elaborates as “the decision that changes a life (or the indecisiveness that fails to change a life, the fear to step over the threshold)” (248). In terms of the time element of this chronotope, Bakhtin says that “time is essentially instantaneous; it as if it has no duration and falls out of the normal course of biographical time,” and this seems to describe *Urwind* well (248).

In the case of Daniel *Urwind*, the break is actually induced by the twin crises of his wife’s absence and the indications of his body that his life is entering its late stages. The experience and expression of this character might thus be seen to represent a *particular type* of threshold experience, which I will describe presently as male mid-life crisis.

Thus my argument might demand one further qualification: we must understand that, while the idea of chronotope may be useful in comparing motifs between texts, chronotopes are not universal, or without historical context. It is a point which Michael Holquist (1990) made a number of years ago, and one which has more recently been repeated by Bart Keunen (2000) in his attempt to rethink chronotopes as what he calls “memory schemata.” First Holquist: “[L]iterary chronotopes are highly sensitive to historical change: different societies and periods result in different chronotopes both inside and outside literary texts” (1990, 112). Taking an example, he says that “even the most elementary form of the chronotope, abstract adventure, is subject to intertextual and historical conditions that make any appropriation of its repeatable features an *utterance*, that is, a text with a particular meaning in a specific situation” (1990, 118).

Keunen could be seen as agreeing when he argues that chronotopes work not just to organize texts, but as triggers within readers, who have pre-existing space-time constructs, “memory schemata,” culturally formed, within their minds. “[A] chronotopic structure determines the way in which a text will be constructed (by the writer) or reconstructed (by the reader)” he claims (2000, para. 12). Chronotopes become schematic structures which “enable the reader to concretize and even to reproduce the genological (sic) language he associates with a specific motif” (2000, para. 15). The idea seems to be that one’s historical context largely informs the structure which one’s mind builds when confronted with a given chronotope. In seeking to prove that “texts activate memory schemata by referring to everyday situations,” Keunen cites researcher Elena Semino, who theorizes that action schemata—the prompts which get a reader to understand a text, to try to put in plainly—work by “enabl[ing] understanders to form expectations about what is likely to happen next, either in the real world, or the world of the text” (qtd. in Keunen 2000, para. 16). These memory schemata are formed in the first place by one’s prior (historically contextualized) experience.

To apply the notion of chronotope as an interpretive tool, then, might demand that one trace a book’s chronotopic form in not one, but two, directions: to similarities with other texts which share its generic qualities (while not giving too much credence to the matter of genre per se), and to similarities with other texts which share its historical contexts. Chronotope itself, then, would take on two lives—as form, though not to restrict the text’s possibilities for meaning to that alone, and as message, historically and contextually understood.

In what follows, I will pursue this two-pronged approach by exploring how *Urwind* deploys the schemata of the threshold in a way resonant of its generic cousins *Mrs. Dalloway* and “The Yellow Wallpaper,” with the result being a similar expression of space-time, and by showing that Carpelan’s protagonist might also be read as portraying a specific experiential chronotope as seen also

in a contemporary parallel, *American Beauty*. This is the masculine mid-life crisis most familiar in the present-day middle-class West and which, most often, afflicts males facing the break point in life brought on by aging.⁶

Daniel Urwind, protagonist and narrator of the eponymous novel, writes what he claims to be a diary, to be delivered to his absent wife upon her return from her year's journey to the US, where she is working on a research project. Almost at the book's inception, he declares his intention, saying, "I am writing a diary for you, you will receive it as a part of me when you come back" (UW 1). He further describes his method by indicating, "You will be gone for a year, and I will write reports to you, one for each week" (UW 2). This is not, perhaps, an uncommon strategy, except for two things: first, there are not fifty-two chapters, one for each week of his wife's absence, but fifty-three. And the form of memory in them is not focused solely on the here-and-now, but moves back and forth, the narrative style doing contradictory things with time. The narration follows the slow progression of the protagonists' life, each chapter corresponding to one year of his chronological age. But it portrays what happened during that year through an often-bizarre and unrealistic narrative which stretches the chronology well past the limits of convention.

This is forecast early in the first chapter when, after promising his wife a record of the year, he declares his age: "I am fifty-three years heavy" (UW 2). But this does not indicate the adventure to come, wherein Daniel turns realism on its head with visions from that of a floating school to an elevator which breaks through the ceiling and hovers above the city, flights of fancy which suggest the stream-of-consciousness characteristic of modernism. Of that we get a clue when, after declaring his age, he says, "My memory hurls me forward, grows ever more mysterious and contains so many dead people," something he hints is tied to his physical being as he describes himself as "the stranger who sits here with his hands threaded in mine. Blue veins, red knuckles, two sprawling fingers, a text stained by patches of snow" (UW 2). In a much lat-

er chapter, when speaking of himself as a younger man, he says, “I will soon be twenty, somewhere I remain there, I drag everything with me and forget, but it is my life’s luggage, it settles in my face, weighs down my hands, forms my movements, my voice hesitates” (UW 77), indicating the connection between the physical results of his having aged and his ability to erase the conventional usage of time as he writes this year-long diary.

A similar paradox occurs with space. Whereas Daniel rarely moves in space, confining most of his activities, at least as they are presented to the reader, to either his bookshop or his apartment, his fantasy life suggests movement in space which defies all laws of physical restriction which normally apply to humans (see, for instance, the chapter where Daniel is in the pub, UW 71–74). Thus while never in a literal sense anything other than a 53-year-old bookseller, Urwind is living a mental chronotope which allows him to break from the space-time which constrains him and to review all of his life over the course of a year. At one stage, he indicates that he comes home and sits on the bed “as though neither past nor present existed, and all the years that have passed since then [teenagehood] are like a white cloud that sails across the sky and is gone” (UW 60).

This sense of chronotopic erasure allows him, through the novel, to move between times and spaces through a distortion of his body into a form of the grotesque (to reach out for another familiar Bakhtinian concept)—not a physical one, but a mental one. The character’s grotesque mental image of his body, an image distorted from what might be considered to be a normative sense of one’s body in the world, departs from the physical frame, which can no longer contain it, and inhabits a new space-time. Urwind indicates as much when he says at the start of the twentieth chapter, “Spring Days,” that “[i]t is not only forty years that separate what I was from what I am, but the distance now, in the moment” (UW 75).

His need to reconfigure the world by breaking out of what we might think of as normal space-time might be further understood through comparison with three other literary characters, each of

whom has a vision of the world something approximating Daniel's. As was mentioned above, Septimus Warren Smith, the returned WWI veteran who wanders about London on the same June day as Mrs. Dalloway in Virginia Woolf's novel of the same name, has a series of visions remarkably like those of Urwind. He sees a dead friend, he remembers past scenes, and he hears trees talking to him. All of these are integrated into the novel as part of the ongoing stream-of-consciousness which constructs Woolf's modernist paradigm. So, for example, his inner narrative sounds like this at one point: "The earth thrilled beneath him. Red flowers grew through his flesh; their stiff leaves rustled by his head" (68). "I leant over the edge of the boat and fell down, he thought. I went under the sea. I have been dead, and yet am now alive [...]" (69). At the time, he is merely sitting in Regent's Park. Suffering Shell Shock has made this shift in his thinking happen, but his doctors can't understand him, rooted as they are in their nineteenth-century practices. Septimus recognizes this while being interviewed by Dr. Bradshaw, who suggests a course of rest and porridge with heavy cream. Septimus's response is to mock the idea that he would be sent to the country. "One of Holmes's homes?" he sneers, and the doctor responds, "one of *my* homes, Mr. Warren Smith" (97, emphasis original).

Woolf's narrative as it describes Septimus, at times, toggles between conventionality and stream-of-consciousness. There is a long paragraph on Septimus, for instance, which begins, "To look at, he might have been a clerk, but of the better sort; for he wore brown boots; his hands were educated; so, too, his profile—his angular, big-nosed, intelligent, sensitive profile [...]" (84). The paragraph ends describing him as "one of those half-educated, self-educated men whose education is all learnt from books borrowed from public libraries, read in the evening after the day's work, on the advice of well-known authors consulted by letter" (84). Here, he becomes Thomas Hardy's Jude Fawley. But when Septimus's own point of view is represented in the narration, we again are back in the stream-of-consciousness style: "In the tea-shop among the ta-

bles and the clattering waiters the appalling fear came over him—he could not feel” (88), we learn. At another point, again with Bradshaw, he filters Rezia’s conversation with the doctor and we get this: “So they returned to the most exalted of mankind; the criminal who faced his judges; the fugitive; the drowned sailor; the poet of the immortal ode; the Lord who had gone from life to death,” and so on (97).

Jane, the narrator in Charlotte Perkins Gilman’s short story, “The Yellow Wallpaper,” is similarly portrayed, a woman with a mind that cannot be reined in to the conventional realities of her space and time. Like *Urwind*, this story features diary form, which the narrator claims she writes in secret when her caretaker is not attending her (766). As the story/diary goes on, she gradually loses herself in her fantasy that there is a woman behind the wallpaper of her bedroom, seeking to be released from confinement. Like *Urwind* on his quest for his past, Jane places great pride in the personal quest to find the truth about this woman who lives inside the paper, and she pulls and pulls, hoping to help the woman gain her release (775). In the end, it appears that she has gone quite mad.

What unites these two characters with *Urwind* is that each has come to a brink something like the one which has forced Daniel to indulge in his year of fanciful remembrances. For Septimus it has been the War, for Jane, the birth of her child. For Daniel, the loss of his wife and the confronting of his own aging body create the fulcrum between the past and the future which is manifest in his fanciful chronotopic adventures. For each character, then, a threshold experience is followed by a disconnection from the world signaled through a distortion of the mind’s image of the body and its place in the world, and the story is told in the shifting and difficult narrative style characteristic of modernism. Of course, the trouble with using these examples as parallels is that in the former two cases, the protagonist endures a final and total break from reality, as evidenced by Septimus casting himself out a window to be impaled on the railing below and by Jane coming to see herself *as* the woman in the wallpaper. *Urwind*, by contrast, simply ends up alone in his room and

his life. Unlike the other two, he has not succumbed to his condition. This leads one to inquire as to the difference of his experience to theirs. The answer is not in the form of the respective stories, as is evident by the earlier-cited tendency by critics to become lost in the complexities of *Urwind's* narration. So why is it that despite his sense of his grotesque (mental) body in his perceptions of himself in the world, Daniel Urwind stops short of madness?

One way to think of this is to return to the point, above, concerning historical context. While all three of these characters may be facing a type of threshold, the former two are removed from Daniel Urwind in important ways. Jane, obviously, being female in an age (late 19th century) when women were often subjected to their husbands' demands of them, is unable to make choices for herself. Early on, for instance, she reports that her doctor-husband has made a mockery of her wish to think for herself, saying, "I sometimes fancy that in my condition, if I had less opposition and more society and stimulus—but John says the very worst thing I can do is to think about my condition, and I confess it always makes me feel bad" (766). For his part, Septimus has come from humble roots, and had just worked his way into the clerical class, albeit with the promise of greater things, before the War interrupted. He enlisted and "went to France to save an England which consisted almost entirely of Shakespeare's plays" and the vision of his Shakespeare teacher in a green dress (86). The trenches took all of that away, leaving him broken. Daniel, by contrast with these two, is middle-classed, a bookshop owner, and a man in a world where men have much of the power.⁷ Thus while each stands at a threshold—to return to Bakhtin, each has undergone a "*crisis and break in life*" (1981, 1937–1938, 248, emphasis original)—and thus Daniel's trauma of losing his wife may resemble the pains of the other two in some aspects, it veers from theirs because, in the final analysis, it does not unmoor him the way post-partum depression or Shell Shock do their victims, and this may partly be due to the insulation from problems that his class, gender, and historical conditions afford him.

Yet if his break does not lead him from sanity to madness, it is still traumatizing for him, and this might best be understood by recognizing that his social situation has labeled what has happened to him as the primary problem a man of his age and class can undergo. This moment in his life marks a shifting in his understanding of himself caused by his realization that he is in the middle of his life, “a threshold away from the beginning and toward the end,” as one psychologist describes the period in a line highly resonant of Bakhtin (Lachman 2004, 310). This period, often marked by the very issues Daniel is facing—“parenting growing children and dealing with the aging and death of one’s parents” (321) as well as rethinking the value of one’s work (323)—leads to upheaval, if not “crisis” for many people. As a result, “the decade of the fifties is an important turning point in personality, with increased introspection and reflection” (320), something which could explain Urwind’s impulse to take this year to look inside, and externalize his thoughts in the form of his diary. “In midlife, the central theme is generativity versus stagnation,” and people are often led as a result to focus on “transmitting values” through, for instance, “contributing to the world through art or literature” (316), all of which might be read as a gloss on Daniel Urwind’s life in his fifty-third year.

The reader finds out as the novel moves forward that Maria and Daniel had twins, and that the children, now in their early twenties, have left home to pursue their careers. Daniel, who has been surrounded by family and its responsibilities for over two decades, thus suddenly finds himself alone, his thoughts his only companion. This, added to what seems to be his preoccupation with his failing body, thrusts him into a mode of reflection which causes him to wonder, for instance, “[W]hat am I doing here, in what room of memory do I find myself now, what time is being slowly torn open, like a ripped web?” early in the narrative (UW 19), and it is this which renders the unique form of the novel and, as I will continue to argue in what follows, one of its key meanings.

Daniel Urwind’s being betrayed by his body is something which he mentions repeatedly in the text, often referring to the image he

sees when he looks in mirrors as for instance when he returns from a funhouse. There, he has observed a variety of versions of himself in distorting glasses, “where one’s body assumed grotesque forms,” an experience which he describes as “filling me with loneliness and darkness” (UW 103). His bathroom mirror offers no remedy. Instead, when “the light struck me in the face, I raised my eyes, I was there, had grown older [...] alien and confused” (UW 104). Perhaps this would not be a bother for some, but Daniel experiences it as such. Once again sitting on his bed, he despairs: “I sit, a stone, unthrown, on my bed and see the emptiness and uncertainty behind maturity’s surface” (UW 106) after having relived the summer when he was twenty-eight. Later, he again says that “the bathroom mirror [...] reproduces a heavy, stupidly staring face [...]. Work and time leave their marks [...].” (UW 127). One final mirror-gazing experience, at his class reunion when he is forty-eight, has him commenting on his “fiery red, heavy face [...] this stooping, stocky, round, alien man with his watery eyes and his lank hair that is starting to get grey streaks in it” (UW 175). He wonders in this moment, “What have I become?” and he concludes, “You see: I am alive. Only just, but alive” (UW 175).

Urwind clearly has on his mind the passing of time and the effects on him. Aside from the physical reminders of aging already mentioned, there are other indications of what he is thinking. He figures the gap from his younger self by saying that life will be “never again as then, in one’s teens, when one’s contact with things was things themselves” (UW 59), and he betrays his realization that his children will soon “lead us into a new childhood, quieter, more colourless, more bitter”—that of old age, one presumes (UW 70). This is a time which he dreads. Even in creating the memories which form his diary, he says that “[w]hat I hate in the passage of time is all the sentimentalities it gives rise to, they become more and more difficult to avoid the older one gets” (UW 121). This, as I argued above, reflects his concern with his age, his panic perhaps at having awakened to the mid-life crisis.

So what is he to do if he is to return to the world and continue to live in it? He does not, like Septimus or Jane, abandon sense, or life. At some point, then, his distorted mental image must be forced to again reconcile with the physical, because by neither dying nor going completely mad, he must go back to life as it has always been, working in the bookshop until death or retirement. One recalls in this regard his attempt to change careers, his having asked Maria, “if you might have a job at the institute for me as a caretaker. You’re too old, Daniel, you replied, couldn’t you start to write or paint instead?” (UW 158). At the time, he was just forty-three. But having had this year of revelry now at fifty-three, how is it that he might reintegrate the distorted mental image of himself with the physical reality of his body, assuming that the body is not itself suffering too much from the physical distortion of aging? A contemporary parallel text might help provide insight.

In *American Beauty*, protagonist Lester Burnham (Kevin Spacey) is bored and, in his early forties (he is forty-two), ready for a change from the suburban routine he has lived for the prior decade and a half. Like both Septimus and Urwind, he experiences visions, but his come in the form of fantasies about his teenaged daughter’s friend, Angela Hayes (Mena Suvari), who, to take one notable instance in the film, seems to open her sweater during a cheerleading performance, allowing dozens of rose petals to flow out. No one but Lester sees this. Lester admits in voice-over as the film begins that “both my wife and daughter think of me as this giant loser, and they’re right. I have lost something. I’m not exactly sure what it is, but I didn’t always feel this [pause] sedated. But you know what? It’s never too late to get it back.” He then goes on to detail that *something* through the action, eventually revealing the loss of his sexuality, his lack of mastery over his job, even his unhappiness with the car he drives. Perhaps more important to him than these is the physical change which he realizes one night standing in his garage. Having gone to his daughter’s cheerleading exhibition and fallen instantly in love/lust with her teenaged friend, Lester goes home, strips off his clothes, and looks at himself in the

reflection of the garage window. His belly rounds itself even as he gazes at it, and he looks down on it with disbelief, as if it had appeared there all of a sudden. In fact, in a way, it had, since he had never seen it before. His image of his body has not kept pace with the physical changes that age has worked on him. Now, he is able to see his body for what it has become, and similar to Urwind, his mind is unable or unwilling to accept this new image as his reality, this physically grotesque person he has changed into. To remedy the problem, Lester adopts a precisely inverse strategy to Daniel, who attempts to reconcile his familiar mental image of the body with a new, and disappointing, physical frame.⁸ Lester by contrast decides to bend the physical body back into the shape (space) he had always thought it to occupy. In so doing, one might say, he attempts to turn back time. He has just declared in voice-over narration, “I feel like I’ve been in a coma for about twenty years, and I’m just now waking up.”

His remedies for the condition involve starting to smoke marijuana, exercise, and listen to the music he used to enjoy as a teenager. His experience might be described as nostalgia in the way figured by Svetlana Boym and described by Nanny Jolma (2018): “nostalgia is, besides a longing for a lost home or a general sense of belonging, also a yearning for a different time” (2018, 7). Jolma further cites Niklas Salmose as saying that “the moment of narration in nostalgic narratives is often a time of decay and the physical absence of childhood dreams” (8). If one could move the adjective “physical” to before the word “decay,” the formulation would exactly suit Lester Burnham. He longs to be his former self, the one who spent the entire summer after high school flipping burgers to buy an 8-track tape player. “It was great,” he tells Ricky Fitz, his daughter’s eventual boyfriend. “All I did was party and get laid.”

Burnham’s thoughts concerning his physical, bodily self are mostly not revealed, but the action shows his inner wishes: when his daughter is with him in the kitchen, Lester drinks a (healthy, post-exercise) smoothie, flexing his biceps as he lifts the blender jar to drink. Later, Angela Hayes, his daughter’s friend, notices his bi-

ceps in a t-shirt and says, “Wow, look at you. Have you been working out?” Lester responds, “Some,” and Angela’s response in turn is, “You can really tell. Look at those arms.” His reaction is a smile that tells the viewer what is in his mind: “It’s working. I’m becoming my younger self once more.”

His wish to turn back time becomes, at one point, quite childish. He loses his job and replaces it with one at a fast-food restaurant. While being interviewed by the teenaged manager, he points out, “I have fast food experience,” to which the young man laughs, “Yeah, like twenty years ago.” Burnham’s response is, “Surely you must have some sort of training program. It seems unfair to presume I won’t be able to learn” this job which he says he wants because, “I’m looking for the least possible amount of responsibility.” This is also the way he has begun to live his life.

One afternoon, he is home, playing with a remote-control toy monster truck. His wife, Caroline, arrives, asking, “Whose car is that out front?” to which Lester replies, “Mine. 1970 Pontiac Firebird. The car I’ve always wanted and now I have it. I rule.” Perhaps this suggests a regression to teenage-hood which is troubling and thematically one-dimensional, or perhaps it suggests that stripping one’s self of the trappings of middle age also takes away what one has learned getting there. In any case, Lester Burnham’s experience of nostalgia is not the one Jolma describes, “a complex experience that includes a wide range of feelings, such as happiness, sadness, and bitterness, or even melancholy” (2018, 3). That might be better saved for Daniel Urwind, to whom I now return.

Urwind, too, is at a threshold. He can’t retain the image of his physical body as he has always experienced it, and this has produced a crisis like Burnham’s. Nor does he seem to have the sort of resources Lester has to do anything about it.⁹ But if Daniel cannot take the Burnham cure, he does, at certain points, indicate a renewed sense of self which might allow him to go on, his body retaining its newly aged shape, but his mind shifting shape to fit it. And it is because of this that his story takes on its peculiar form, as a diary which freezes and extends the space-time of his past in a

variety of ways and allows him time to heal, or at least, to come to grips with, the new self which his aging has created of him. Recall Bakhtin's explanation of the time element of the chronotope of the threshold: "[T]ime is essentially instantaneous; it is as if it has no duration and falls out of the course of biographical time" (Bakhtin, 1981, 1937–1938, 248).

Urwind gives away the purpose of writing his diary when talking about having stayed at his grandmother's place, asking, "Was it now, as I tried to capture the silences in my memory, that for the first time I was seized by the thought of writing, forming, noting down, seeking the right words that could give me at least a fraction of the image of myself I was looking for?" (UW 91). When sorting books for his shop, he reflects that "[i]n every book a life is hidden. The book that writes you and is one day put away, never to be read again" (UW 175). This is taken up also when he discusses the end of July and a journey that is going to take an elevator straight through the roof of his apartment: "I who thought I would be able to go back without disturbing time, find that I must go forward, dragging with me all the rooms I have visited [...]" (UW 111). Perhaps unable to deal with his aging any other way, he visits these rooms, and we with him, in a chronotopic revelry which has a spatial dimension which transcends normal physical boundaries and a temporal dimension which ranges across the years of his life. And the effect is to heal the problem which he began with, to allow a strategy by which he might cross the threshold before him. It is a kind of inverse of Lester Burnham's strategy, which might be read as crossing the threshold in reverse, or attempting to, by recapturing the body which middle age had seen him lose.

A few years before the beginning of the narrative, Urwind had turned fifty, something he describes saying, "I walked into a new decade with no ideas" (UW 180). He was now living an age which his Aunt Viktoria described as being "when one no longer returns, can no longer return to anything, is merely driven onwards, tries to find an anchorage [...]" (UW 177). Now fifty-three and alone, Daniel has come to an understanding that might help him through this

middle-aged time. He expresses it by asking, “What is the meaning of [life]?” and answering his own question with “[t]hat it must be lived, lived through. I feel as though in a single year I had gone from being a child via the life of an adult back to the utterly simple, grateful eye and what it sees” (UW 186). It’s like he said in an earlier context, speaking of a moment when he was visiting Fanny Dahlgren’s family: “It suddenly seemed to me as though in each of us another, more dissatisfied and truthful person were about to break through” (UW 79). Perhaps having crossed the threshold to age, he has the possibility for renewal.

He had better hope the strategy works, for at the end of the fifty-second week, his wife, who has returned to Finland for Christmas, announces that she has found another man (UW 187). Confronted with yet another threshold, Daniel indicates that life “cannot be explained, only built. I have nothing more to say” (UW 189). The diary ends, and the reader wonders what kind of experience this new one will be for Urwind. Bakhtin gives a number of choices, naming “falls, resurrections, renewals, epiphanies.” He sums up by saying that the threshold forces “decisions that determine the whole life of a man” (1981, 1937–1938, 248). Or, we might say in Daniel Urwind’s case, if not the whole life, whatever life he has left after fifty-three. Maybe if he is lucky, he will inherit Burnham’s idea. The latter declares, “It’s a great thing when you discover you still have the ability to surprise yourself. Makes you wonder what else you can do that you’ve forgotten about.”

However, Lester Burnham himself doesn’t have a chance to work out his new-found life. His neighbor shoots him in his kitchen, angry over his own repressed homosexuality and under the impression that Lester has had a sexual relationship with his son.¹⁰ As the film heads toward its denouement, an overhead shot of the neighborhood the Burnhams live in, which is used as a recurring motif, appears on the screen. Lester’s voice-over narration goes like this: “Remember those posters that said today is the first day of the rest of your life? Well, that’s true of every day except one. The day you die.” Lester is then seen coming out of his house and jogging

quickly down the street. That same day, one presumes, is when he discovers his wife's affair, when he is kissed by Frank Fitz, when he has the chance to sleep with Angela Hayes but does not, and then when he is shot. In portraying these moments, the chronotope of the film speeds up as all of this action rushes past to get to Lester's final proclamations about the meaning of life, which he now understands precisely because he has crossed from life to death. His summation: "I guess I could be pretty pissed off about what happened to me, but it's hard to stay mad when there's so much beauty in the world." He later adds, "I can't feel anything but gratitude for every single moment of my stupid, little, life." He has crossed a different threshold, perhaps, in his violent death, and he seems to think that this gives him a privileged position from which to comment. He says as the film ends, "You have no idea what I'm talking about, I'm sure. But don't worry—you will someday."

Should his point of view be privileged in these matters? While he looks beguilingly like someone who seized and triumphed over the threshold moment in his life, in the end, his death renders him silent, no more capable of extracting meaning from experience than Jane, Septimus Warren Smith, or even Daniel Urwind.

Is he/are they truthful? Perhaps. Dissatisfied? Certainly every one of them would have the right to be.

NOTES

¹ As a side note, van der Liet (1999) makes the point that “the chronotope offers a valuable analytic perspective with respect to modernist literature, particularly given that the representation of time and space in modern art [...] is one of the central areas of aesthetic critical interest” (210).

² Finno-Swedish modernism, it must be noted, is a phenomenon which both existed contemporaneously with European modernism and also had a heyday after WW2. See for example Lehtonen and Hawkins (2001), a piece which explains this late modernism and also mentions Carpelan as one exemplar.

³ This despite the time, not to say chronotopic, lag between the end of literary modernism in, for instance, Britain, and the publication of the book in Finland-Swedish in 1993. Obviously, this late flourishing of modernism came in the aftermath of the decline of European modernism, which Stanley Sultan (1987) has argued cannot be read as other than a product of the late 19th century (95–101) and which, if it can be defined at all, surely has to be viewed as having ended by 1960, if not earlier (115), but the point here is not the existence of the movement, nor its lingering presence in Scandinavia. Nor would it appear to be satisfying to confine interpretation of the book to its successful placement in literary history. See this chapter’s first note, above.

⁴ See for example her discussion on pages 536–538, which details how Eliot, Joyce, and Mann all “instigated readings that closed off the multiplicity and ‘weirdness’ of their texts” (2000, 536).

⁵ His version of literary history from ancient to nineteenth-century traces out this interrelationship, yet as has been noted in many places, he did not extend his investigations of literature into his own century. (One such discussion, which summarizes what others have said as well, is Stacy Burton’s, found in “Paradoxical Relations: Bakhtin and Modernism” 2000, 519–524. I have already made reference to an-

other section of this chapter.) Thus it is difficult to say what he might have made of the chronotope of modernist literature. And in any event, Bakhtin seems to have been less interested in interrogating the generally accepted categories of literature than in quantifying what the chronotopes were within them. But see also the discussion of chronotope in Workman (2016), esp. 138.

⁶ For another Modernist example, see Rendall (2010) on Joyce's "The Dead" and mid-life.

⁷ Perhaps a discussion which could reference as a larger frame is Peter Hitchcock's (2017) treatment of John Berger's depiction of work in his fiction. See Chapter 4 of *Labor in Culture, Or, Worker in the World(s)*.

⁸ Lachman indicates that physical change is a large part of dealing with mid-life, suggesting following OG Brim's lead that "a central task is to identify the alternative pathways to health and well-being" (2004, 306).

⁹ I am making the argument here that these two texts have remarkable similarities, as indeed they do. But here we might be glimpsing the cultural difference between Finland and the US—the American is free to troop out to the garage, get out the dusty weight set, and start to reinvent his body, where the Finn retreats to the apartment to think about the past. Or perhaps the difference in the two men's approaches could be read as a mode of critique of the American preoccupation with the physical, a large part of which is fed by commercial capitalism's desire to sell its adherents the goods which will aid the middle-aged in the process of physical restoration.

¹⁰ Since the voice-over at the first of the film, the viewer has been aware that Burnham will end up dead.

WORKS CITED

- American Beauty* (1999) Dir. Sam Mendes. Perf. Kevin Spacey and Annette Bening. Dreamworks SKG.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981, 1937–1938) “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel.” Bakhtin, *The Dialogic Imagination*, 84–258.
- Burton, Stacy (1996) “Bakhtin, Temporality, and Modern Narrative: Writing ‘The Whole Triumphant Murderous Unstoppable Chute.’” *Comparative Literature* 48.1 Winter: 39–64.
- Burton, Stacy (2000) “Paradoxical Relations: Bakhtin and Modernism.” *MLQ: Modern Language Quarterly* 61.3: 519–543.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- DuBois, Thomas (1994) “Urwind [book review].” *World Literature Today*, 68.2 Spring: 382.
- Emerson, Caryl (1997) *The First Hundred Years of Mikhail Bakhtin*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Fagerholm, Monika, ed. (1998) “Fruits of Reading: An Interview with Bo Carpelan.” *Books from Finland 4*. <http://dbgw.finlit.fi/fili/bff/498/carpelan.htm>.
- Gilman, Charlotte Perkins (1892) “The Yellow Wallpaper” *The American Tradition in Literature*, 9e. Ed. George Perkins and Barbara Perkins. Boston: McGraw-Hill College, 1999: 766–776.
- Hitchcock, Peter (2017) *Labor in Culture, Or, Worker in the World(s)* New York: Palgrave-MacMillan.
- Holquist, Michael (1990) *Dialogism: Bakhtin and His World* London: Routledge.
- Jolma, Nanny (2018) “‘As If There Was No Fear’: Exploring Nostalgic Narrative in Bo Carpelan’s Novel *Berg*.” *Humanities* 7.106 Oct: 1–12.

- Karjalainen, Pauli Tapani (2004) "On Geobiography." *Koht ja Paik: Place and Location: Studies in Environmental Aesthetics and Semiotics III*. Proc. of the Estonian Academy of Arts 14, 23–26 Sept., Tallinn-Tartu: The Research Group of Cultural and Literary Theory, Estonian Literary Museum Institute of Art History, Estonian Academy of Arts, Estonian Semiotics Association, 87–92.
- Karjalainen, Pauli Tapani (1999) "Place and Intimate Sensing." *The Thing-mont Working Paper Series on The Philosophy of Conservation*. Department of Philosophy, University of Lancaster, UK 1–17.
- Keunen, Bart (2000) "Bakhtin, Genre Theory and the Cognitive Turn: Chronotopes as Memory Schemata." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture: A WWWeb Journal* 2.2 June: para 1–25 <http://clcwebjournal.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb00-2/keunen00.html>.
- Lachman, Margie E. (2004) "Development in Midlife." *Annual Review of Psychology* 55: 305–331.
- Lang, Susan S. (2001) "Midlife Crisis Less Common than Many Believe." *Human Ecology* 29.2 Spring: 23.
- Lehtonen, Soila and Hildi Hawkins (2001) "Global Literature?" Editorial. *Books from Finland 1*. <http://dbgw.finlit.fi/fili/bff/101/editorial.htm>.
- Liet, Henk van der (1999) "'Haven't You Heard . . .': Speech and Chronotope in Peer Hultberg's Novel *Byen og Vergen*." *Scandinavian Studies* 71.2 Summer: 207–220.
- Paton, Fiona (2000) "Beyond Bakhtin: Towards A Cultural Stylistics." *College English* 63.2 Nov: 166–193.
- Rendall, Thomas (2010) "Joyce's 'The Dead' and the Mid-life Crisis." *Joyce Studies Annual*: 262–271.
- Schoolfield, George C. (2000) "Vindfartsvagar: Strovtag I Bo Carpelans *Urwind*." *Scandinavian Studies* 72.1 Spring: 118–123.
- Sonninen, Veikko (2004) "Do Literary Prizes Really Promote Book Sales?: Experiences from Finland" Get Caught Reading Conference Antwerp 7–8 Nov. http://www.ebf-eu.org/doc_conf/Antwerp/Veikko_Sonninen.doc.

Sultan, Stanley (1987) *Eliot, Joyce and Company*. New York: Oxford UP.

Woolf, Virginia (1925) *Mrs. Dalloway*. San Diego: Harvest-HBJ, 1990.

Workman, Travis (2016) *Imperial Genus: The Formation and Limits of the Human in Modern Korea and Japan*. Oakland, CA U of California P.

Pauli Tapani Karjalainen

**PLACE IN *URWIND*: A HUMANISTIC
GEOGRAPHICAL VIEW**

*There are inside the gateway
disconnected images—a memory
like a relic,
a dark negative, finally developed
that day I take my leave—
Memory is what in the present
makes the future visible.*

(Carpelan, 'Homecoming,' 60)

The question of place cuts across the disciplines and the arts. Humanistic geography defines place as a center of meaning constructed by experience. In existential terms, place becomes realized as a bunch of environmental relations created in the process of human dwelling. In this sense place is internally connected with time and self. Place, time, and self make up a 'triple helix' that spirals out from the individual's personal meeting with the world. In depicting the helix, in literature and art, spatial and temporal markers of human life are fused into a concrete whole.

Even though I will here use a humanistic geographical toolbox, a reference to Bakhtin is at stake as soon as time and space are mentioned together. The helix named above could be taken as what Bakhtin (1981) calls a "chronotope": "Time [...] thickens, takes on flesh, becomes artistically visible; likewise, space becomes charged and responsive to the movements of time, plot, and history. This intersection of axes and fusion of indicators characterizes the artistic chronotope" (1981, 84). In the chronotope, Bakhtin says, real life is linked to the real earth (206), and human life is always about the

linkage between place and time: *topos* and *chronos* are inseparable. It is the writer's duty to reveal this connection artistically.

Examples of how the triplet, or chronotope, works out can be drawn from creative literature. Bo Carpelan's novel *Urwind* offers a roomy world in which to wander. I will read the novel from three perspectives which I broadly call mimetic, hermeneutic, and textual. The 'maps' thus produced reflect different spatial realms ranging from the realistic depiction of a territory via the interpretation of experiences to the inter-textual nets of meaning. The notion of place, in the way used in this chapter, has thus both the most concrete and the most metaphoric content.

Place in humanistic geography

In his article "Place: An Experiential Perspective," Yi-Fu Tuan (1975) writes as follows:

Place is known not only through the eyes and mind but also through the more passive and direct modes of experience, which resist objectification. To know a place fully means both to understand it in an abstract way and to know it as one person knows another. At a high theoretical level, places are points in a spatial system. At the opposite extreme, they are strong visceral feelings. (1975, 152)

In my discussion, most notably, place is an experiential phenomenon, something that at the very start is a vital part of one's life. Place is incorporated into the ontological anatomy of all human experience. As Walter (1980–1981) says, "We call locations of experience 'places.' Experience means perceiving, doing, thinking, and feeling. Every event happens some *where*, but we don't often locate an experience by its latitude and longitude" (1980–1981, 162). Here, as also in Tuan, there is a stretch from the quantified neutral locations to intimately lived-in places. The quality of place, Walter also states, depends on "a human context shaped by memories and expectations, by stories of real and imagined events, that is, by his-

torical experience located there” (141). His invoking history, thus, calls time into the equation to complement space.

In this way, places are not (only) objective segments of the terrestrial reality but sites of concrete human involvement, which is acted out in chronotopic fashion. The notion of place thus provides an organising principle for what we may term a person’s immersion in the world around him/herself, which happens in time. In phenomenological terms, places are those parts of spatial reality that have been claimed by human intentions. As Cresswell (2004) points out, the humanistic geographical project is to “define the essence of human existence as one that is necessarily and importantly ‘in-place’”(51).

A further step in the existential ontology of place can be taken by discussing what I call “intimate sensing.” I have borrowed the term from Porteous (1986), who sees it as a necessary counterpart to remote sensing. The latter means “the examination of, the obtaining of information about, an object or phenomenon at a distance from it, without physical contact with it” (Porteous 1986, 250). Intimate sensing, “the appraisal of land and life at ground level” involves “not only visual sense but also sound, smell, taste and touch, body and soul as well as mind” (250). Remote sensing is clean, cold, and detached, whereas intimate sensing is rich, warm, and involved.

In my usage, intimate sensing widens towards existential questions forming the basic grounds for humans to find their way. The body and the senses are a necessary part in one’s personal encountering with the world. In the encounter, the human memory, a key existential factor, plays a vital role. Memory relates to the human sense of time. We have our present perceptions, memories of the past, and anticipations of the future. This triplet—perceptions, memories, anticipation—has very much to do with our personal identity. Lowenthal (1975, 9) writes, “Life is more than separate events; it incorporates the quality of duration, of passage through time. Buffeted by change, we retain traces of our past to be sure of our enduring identity”. To put it strongly, intimate sensing is our ba-

sic way of being in the world, and it very much resembles the interaction of space-time which Bakhtin labels a key tool in the critical apparatus. In Krohn's (1993, 213) words:

As much as my body, I am my memories. Place is another attribute of my very self. As much as my body, I am its environment. How could it be possible for anything to exist without its time and place? Environment gives us our body, the earth our feet, the light our eyes. Time allows us to remember. I am the one who is here; I am the one who is now. (transl. PTK)

Lived time and lived place make up the texture of chronotope, and no strand of it can be released without the totality losing its cohesive power and tending towards disintegration. Finally, because nobody else but I—my particular self—can have precisely these memories, each one of us has his/her own intimate textures, our own rich chronotope, and, by extension and to again invoke Bakhtin's methodology, literary characters both share this characteristic and may yield to critical interpretation which takes the chronotope as an axiom of their construction.

In places real, dreamt, and written

To illustrate the points made above, I will now discuss a specific way of articulating the complexities of place. I will introduce a few features from Bo Carpelan's novel *Urwind* (1993), in which the techniques of narrative writing are brought together in a prolific and imaginative way. *Urwind* is a poetic text of strange depth and self-revelatory intensity. On the surface, the story is a very simple one. It tells of a 53-year-old antiquarian bookseller, Daniel Urwind, whose wife leaves him for a year in order to do research work in Boston, USA. There is a complex criss-crossing of experience, past and present, which makes the diary form of narrative, as McDuff (1993) says, a matter more of inner than outer experience (272). The novel has 53 chapters, one chapter for each week of the year plus one more, the first of the next year. "I am writing a diary for

you, you will receive it as a part of me when you come back [...]. Or is it to myself that I write, this unfamiliar I that dodges off round each windy corner, letting the wet snow lash me in the face?" the protagonist/narrator asks (UW 1, 2). In the modernist sense of literature, *Urwind* can be read as a description of the process of identity shifts, the medium of which is writing. "I sit and write, to whom? [...] I try to capture the intangible in words as though I were looking for something, someone, to remember" (UW 5).

"Urwind" itself is a versatile word. It means, most notably, both the primordial wind and primordial attic. "Urwind" is irrational and unpredictable, as the narrator points out:

I play with the interpretations of Urwind. It is the original primordial wind from the universe, the one that blows out of nothing into nothing, hurling stars into that storm-centre that is called the soul [...]. It has no pattern, it has the blue colour of space. If you capture it, it alters form, becomes [...] the primordial attic, with its forgotten treasures, its yellowed bundles of newspapers, its tattered prams, its dark cupboards of rumbling voices! (UW 3)

In the novel, place becomes a text of what it means to be a writing self in the rooms of fading identities, in a world continually shifting from one image to another. *Urwind* is very much about memory and place, and in this sense it is about intimate sensing, in the existential sense of the term. The concrete scene of the novel is an old apartment house, its inside (stairways, flats and rooms, cellar and attic) and outside (courtyard and streets). The old house, which from the few hints given in the novel can be perceived to be in Helsinki, is the stages of life, an arena of the total range of human circumspection. In the house, Daniel writes, "every stairway [...] is a stepladder from hell to heaven, or at least to the primordial attic full of remnants, boxes, trunks, worn-out bicycles, skis and sticks and the faint but clear smell of overripe apples" (UW 60). Living in the old house is like a retrospect (memories coming alive in and of time) put together with extremely spiritual constituents, showing domains of deep sensuality, perception, and thinking, all connected with the place of dwelling.

Like every novel, *Urwind* is open to various interpretations. I will read it from three specific angles, each revealing a different aspect of Daniel Urwind's desire to find his way. I call these readings mimetic, hermeneutic, and textual. Their means and ends can be characterised by listing the relevant key words:

MIMETIC

Transcribing reality

Objective/physical

Map of territory

HERMENEUTIC

Interpreting experience

Subjective/sensuous

Map of mind

TEXTUAL

Producing/deferring meaning

Intertextual

Dance of meaning

The mimetic reading seeks for the correspondence between the actual and described (written) territories. The question is to what degree the author possibly reproduces the essential features of the landscape and by so doing makes the work a source of documentary value. We can assume that because of the fictional (artistic) nature of the world he/she is describing, the author may have modified reality, the real situations and sites. However, after noticing the mechanism of the modification, we can see the connection between the fictional and the real, and thereby are ready to make the map. Sometimes the author him/herself may even create a minutely mapped region for the purposes of the story (Muehrcke & Muehrcke 1974). Whatever the case, in this sense the artwork has instrumental value

for geographers. In regional geography, in particular, regional novels have been used for the purposes of obtaining geographical information.

In the hermeneutic reading the interest is not so much in the “real” landscape as in the ways in which the place is experienced, interpreted, and valued in one’s life. This, then, is a tool more akin to Bakhtin’s idea of chronotope, since it depends upon both space and time in its deployment. The presupposition here is that an author has a special ability to capture experience; that literature is a transcription of experience grounded in the life-world. What takes place here is a transition from the objective landscape to a subjective one, or rather, to a dialogue between the outer and inner realities. Ultimately, of course, the hermeneutic reading also includes a mimetic view of literature. What is at stake now is not the objectively referential territory but the subjective images (or the experiential field as a whole) that the life in one’s place arouses.

In both the mimetic and the hermeneutic readings, a kind of *a priori* geographical scheme is, at least implicitly, projected upon the literary work. In other words, when the work is analysed geographically, its possible worlds are reflected in a meta-linguistic context, the essential content of which, in this particular case, is composed of place intimations which the geographer has theorised beforehand. This has to do with the instrumental view of literature. As Brosseau (1994) writes, “most geographers’ accounts consider poetic language and forms in strictly transitive terms that rest on an instrumental conception of literature whose relevance, therefore, is to be found outside itself” (347). Geographers just throw their conceptual nets into the waters of literature and take whatever catch they are prepared to accept. This sort of instrumentalism, in the final analysis, always serves one’s own cause.

In the textual mode of reading the text and the reader live in a symbiosis. When I read the text, I am reading at the same time about my own self, in that my self is constituted in the very process of reading. So ultimately what is important is not the work as a more or less stable source of reference, but the text as a semiotic

field of associative complexes of signification in which the meaning is continuously taking on new shapes. The interplay between the reader and the text is essential: meaning is not contained in the text itself but is created by this confrontation, this space-time of the reading situation. Berman (1988) says that “meaning is not discovered *in* the text, but is effectuated by reading it” (176). The reader is wandering about the text, and also in the context, because there is no text without a context of other texts. Inter-textual connections, or the motion of creative associations between the texts, are here an essential feature of the artwork. In *Urwind*, as Hollsten (2004) shows, there are an innumerable amount of inter-textual connections ranging, for example, from the Bible via Bach and Mozart to Musil and Klee (78–83).

Three kinds of mappings

It is now possible to apply the three modes of reading discussed above to Bo Carpelan’s *Urwind*. Where the map of the territory refers to the natural and cultural features of the environment, the map of the mind encloses the various ties that connect a person with the elements of his/her living surroundings. So far everything is all right: the first two maps are relatively easy to produce. The third one, the mapping of the dance of textual meaning, is much more challenging. This is because the limits of representation will be faced. How, in fact, can we write—or think, paint, or film, for that matter—in a way that allows the endless dance of meaning free space for movement without obstacles, without limiting boundaries and predisposed conceptualizations? First of all, writing must be anti-canonical: the protection of any conceptual structure should be discarded. In the end, however, even though we try to go beyond the categories to describe that which is indescribable, we are forced to categorise and to refer to something not capable of being described. In some way or another we need to make the invisible visible, and hence describe it after all.

In the field of modern art, Paul Klee, much present in *Urwind*, comes readily to mind. Klee understood the function of art as being to make the world visible (to show the world), not to imitate it (to represent the world) (Klee 1987, 57). *Urwind* is a splendid example of the possibilities for artistic expression to take hold of the myriad aspects of life freely running outside the categorical limitations of the scientific world. The latter, as Daniel explains to his beloved Aunt Viktoria, are no more than “the dying texts, the gravel of accumulated facts, the compulsion in one’s brain, the way in which the lyric and epic categories commit spiritual murder of living, bleeding words, the turning of imagination into hay, the turning of theories into cement” (UW 92). Daniel’s own effort is to catch in words a picture of his life, to make it understandable in a text. In this there is no need for fixing categories but for words that are capable of echoing his innermost feelings.

Map of the territory

To make a traditional map on the basis of *Urwind* would be a somewhat futile task, as the novel contains very little realistic material for the purposes of chorographic description. The location of the apartment house Daniel lives in, for example, can be deduced only with the help of a few references, always interwoven with the landscapes of the mind in an almost surrealist manner. The following excerpt with proper names is an example of the “realistic” depiction of the environment:

Suburbs grow up, you can see them stretching north with television towers and rollercoasters if you stretch out of the skylight and hear the roof-plates rattling in the gale: the summer storm here! It arrives, it passes over Kronberg Bay, sweeps across rocks and shores, tears the roofs from the stalls on the square, a huge whirlpool of Baltic herring glitters in roaming sunlight, is swept up towards the dome of St Sofia’s, people creep around like ants in their carapaces, Satan himself stands on Sofiegatan raising a bottle of spirits to his mouth, June is full of cries of gulls, the smell of mash, white clouds and cranes that reach the

sky. I run downstairs and outside. The gateway on the light opens with a boom. The city rattles past like a railway yard, and the heart skips like playing ducks and drakes along June's waves and suddenly sinks, seven steps towards the unknown. (UW 89; transl. changed by PTK)

The scarcity of natural or cultural determinants of the physical environment does not really mean that the city is not concretely present. Its presence is not so much in the objective (detached) physicality of the environment but rather in the coming together of the landscape and mindscape, creating a chronotope in which the city manifests itself in the signification of the lived environment. The process of signification, the meeting ground of the exterior objectivity and the interior subjectivity, is what I refer to as a map of the mind.

Map of the mind

Seen from a hermeneutic point of view, the question in *Urwind* concerns the ways in which the writer of the weekly reports tries to collect and recollect his thoughts and thereby create a shape of identity, tries to understand his world as constituting an entity that holds fast and has more or less distinguishable boundaries. It is a question of how the writer—the writing self within his words—makes sense of his existence as a finite self, a person who acknowledges his own image (and eventually himself as an image), although in no way definitely, as enclosed in an inflexible framework.

Urwind can be read through various oppositions and their unity. Interesting points for a geographer are the spatial oppositions, inside/outside, up/down and here/there, and the temporal oppositions closely connected with them, present/past and beginning/end. Relevant temporal organisers include the four seasons and the distinctions between the present and recollected images. The spatial and temporal dimensions, or chronotopic determinants, in *Urwind* are anything but linear; on the contrary, they are stratified and complicated.

The spatial scales of experience are forcefully depicted in references to the cellar (underground world) and attic (heaven). Here, of course, many metaphors and archetypes are at work. The cellar is a remembrance of the war years, when the underground part of the house served as a bomb shelter. These memories put an oppressive stamp on this part of the house. Years after the war, Daniel visits the cellar to fetch a pot of jam for his mother. The abyss underneath the house becomes a horrible space, in part because of the temporal relations of the space in the present to what has happened in the past (retrospect):

I open the door to the cellar, it is made of iron, I tug and pull, inside a vapour of darkness hits me, the lighting goes on above aisles and compartments, and I remember dimly how the house held its breath, how black people gathered, how they sat or lay, and the bodies go into one another as with the man with the black beard, with the white woman, I am enveloped, cannot move, am only astonishment and fear, eagerness and horror, the cellar supported by fragile wooden beams, long benches of silent people. Here the world is compressed to mere listening: there are the gun-blasts, the faint quiverings, the whistling that makes us bend, the dust that whirls down from the ceiling with its retaining boards. Life goes on in the underworld, in its dark caves and passages, away in the darkness a loving couple entwined in each other's arms, the soldier on leave, the pilot who has a fit, starts screaming, springs to his feet and outside, people who try to hold him back, all of it distant and silent, and filled with the smell of rotting potatoes. (UW 51–52)

Contrary to the cellar, the oppressing labyrinth of the underground world, the attic inspires emotions of hope and freedom. The way from the cellar to the attic is a passage “from hell to heaven, or at any rate to the primordial attic” (UW 60). A great silence prevails in the attic, the act of listening to which is one of the important themes in the novel. Flying to freedom is Daniel's big dream: “Why, really, should I be eternally bound to the earth?” (UW 84). From the heights of the attic he can throw out his wings:

Pine and basswood, cane and strongest silk fabric is my body, I am Leonardo's ornithopter. I hesitate. The city out there, the wind whistling beneath the roof, it is all a mighty power made of silence. [...]

Everything glides swiftly through me, spring air, fear, joy, I throw myself out, I fall through my life, I sink in the darkness, I bump against a crossbeam, I fall into an immense heap of dry hay, I am light as a child and happy as a summer memory. (UW 84)

For Daniel, the everyday objects are tangibly present: “You wake up, you see that the green lamp is burning quietly, that the simple things have formed up around you: the coffee cup, the pad, the pen, the table, the sofa-bed” (UW 4). Objects are not indifferent or insignificant. The sad thing is, Daniel thinks, that we tend to forget them; the objects close to us need our care: “Each object needs special attention, they turn away when they know that we do not see them, when we walk past them or thoughtlessly use them, as though they were a matter of course” (UW 106). It is in forgetting that things have both spatial and temporal dimension that tragedy resides.

The environment in *Urwind*, to a high degree, is a sensuous one. The house, the rooms, and the city obtain not only visual but also auditory, olfactory, and tactile meaning. In the stairwell: “I sniff the air. At the Bengtssons’ they are frying herring, where did they get it? Out under the door it streams, bones, spines, dead heads, dead eyes. At the Pietinens’ they are listening to the news, there is the sound of Sibelius, a woman is screaming: ‘If you touch me, I’ll leave’” (UW 11). Many a time it is the sensuous embodiment that gives an impetus to the images of the place. The dark footsteps in the white snow of the yard or the smells in the staircase open up the bolts of memory and call forth the stream of recollections. Perceptions of objects—experienced as space, in one sense—are closely linked with memories of various events—space-time. With Aunt Viktoria once again:

We sat again in the familiar silence that was our common estate. We listened and heard the city. There were the metro, the harbour, the trams, the wind from the sea, the odour of fish, the smell of mash, the snow’s immense water-scent, the howling of the ambulance, the tango from the radio, the creaking of the dying trees, the voices from city districts like ice floes colliding in the circulation of my blood, voices from long ago, in summer rooms [...]. (UW 179)

The dance of meaning

Text is a field of the (endless?) chain of meanings opened up through every sign. In the textual field, no one element of meaning is simply present or absent, but each is already produced by the traces of all the others. The same holds true with regard to the reading self: even the subject is an outcome of the interplay of difference and trace. The perspective is that of deconstruction: an authentic, fully self-reflective and fully self-conscious subject is impossible (Norris 1998, 10). Identity is wavering: when the self is here, it is nonetheless already elsewhere; when the self has these characters, it already has other characters. Identity does not hold; identity is an interplay of sameness and difference, themselves complex manifestations of both space and time, or better, space-time or time-space, in which no meaning is fixed, in which no meaning always remains the same, but in which everything is continuously changing, now this, but instantly becoming another. As Daniel comes to know, “I contain many ‘I’s’ at once, can see them, they go past me like strangers” (UW 53).

If we now think of the process of writing (bringing out the self by means of writing), there cannot be any point of saturation in this process. It will always be unfinished, never at a definite end. This is because the context is unbounded: there is always something to be added, always something else to be said. In the trace of the meaning and after the association, there are always other meanings and associations hiding. The regression is infinite, and the progression is infinite, too.

If the meaning in any one text is not fixed, arrested, and finite, the same is the case with the context: the context is not bounded. For us as searchers for meaning there are no possibilities here other than our own discourses, our own wandering paths, despite the fact that we are faced with *aporia* (Steiner 1989, 123), a loss of the signposts, the vagueness and dimness of the map, the non-passable way to go, the dead end in which the text (life?) gets into trouble, becomes conflicting, the meaning unanticipated, without a formu-

la. This is to go astray, to see the boundaries and fixed points vanish, the identity fade away. Daniel knows the feeling:

I wipe my tears with the arm of my pullover, Viktoria sits on a stool watching me, I am a grown man after all, an experienced secondhand bookshop owner, a heavy and stubborn bookworm, what am I doing here, in what room of memory do I find myself now, what time is being slowly torn open, like a ripped web? It is all turning into rags and tatters. I want back to the origin, the starting point. (UW 19)

Now there is no meta-language to rise above, but only the writing. There is only the text, and only a wanderer in the text. What does the wanderer look for? He, Daniel Urwind, only tries to preserve the directions, to be on a readable map! But the process of language will never sit still, and the wanderer will never find the ultimate place, the ultimately true map: there is always something waiting around the corners, and that is because it is not just the spatial dimension which determines life, but the interaction of space with time, both ever-unfolding and also past, in the form of memory of retrospective. Reflections in the storm-centre called life, in the 53rd week:

The snow stopped falling when I came back from the airport, it brightened up. The wind is stronger, streets open in various directions. I have gone through myself, the unknown in myself, and come out into a cold gateway. [...] This incomprehensible life, it cannot be explained, only built. I have nothing more to say. [...] Each day is a little lighter than the last. In the air, in the wind I sign my name. (UW 189)

The wor(1)d is written [...] the life is not the word [...] there is no last word. What about the self? Is the self a trace of all that happens? How to know it, how to capture it? The images show all around, like shadows sometimes hiding the whole scene, while at other times flashing it wonderfully:

Am I the mirror of what happens? [...] Perhaps I am not a dream at all, perhaps I am the living reality and have attained my final place, while you are still seeking, groping your way through open rooms, have no permanent place, only a labyrinth, echo chamber, the great wind that blows away names and actions, so that only a symphony, a book, a watercolour, a thing of beauty recalls the love that was. [...] The full

moon slowly rises above the roofs of the houses, gets caught for a moment on the tower pennant of the corner house, tears itself dreamily free and pours its light over the communal yard. [...] That is Klee and you see his full moon, you see four trees, our wonderful hovering house, divided, but not splintered, into a dark, warm geometry, into an architecture reflected in the eye of a child. If you look there, our window, our curtain, the garden with its fruits, the mountain and paths of memory, all beneath the magnetic silence of the full moon. Klee sits bowed over his memory, the moon is the centre, but there are three smaller, red moons, like echoes, dispersed above the angular houses, the building blocks, the cross gleaming narrow and white in the darkness, Higher, higher the moon rises, and the sky is free from clouds. (UW 143, 147, 129)

Concluding remarks

Olsson (1981) writes most tellingly about longing: “To yearn for home is to experience a double bind. It is to be torn between irreconcilable identities, sometimes enjoying the freedom of swinging with the wind, sometimes missing the subjugation of being fettered to the ground” (126). Daniel Urwind wanted back to the origin, the starting point, the ultimate place. He wanted, in other words, to erase the characteristically chronotopic mode in which life is lived, but privileging space and erasing time. He wanted to fly, but he found himself to be bound to the earth. He wanted to know himself, and he wanted to make others know him. He lived in writing only to come to sign his name in the wind. Daniel came to understand that in one’s life there are no final explanations. He must just go on living, have his place and time as they are given to him.

In this essay, I have let the setting change: the object of description (mimetic place) is turned into a description of the experience of life in place (hermeneutic place). Finally, the journey has taken us to the halls of mirrors and the chambers of echoes in which the images tell about other images (textual place). In *Urwind*, Bo Carpelan writes about the human condition. In Bakhtinian terms, the real life chronotopes are shown as imaginative artistic chronotopes.

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, M.M. (1981) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Ed. Michael Holquist. Trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Berman, Art (1988) *From the New Criticism to Deconstruction: The Reception of Structuralism and Post-Structuralism*. Urbana and Chicago: U of Illinois P.
- Brosseau, Marc (1994) "Geography's literature." *Progress in Human Geography* 18.3: 333–353.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Homecoming*. Trans. David McDuff. Manchester: Carcanet.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- Cresswell, Tim (2004) *Place: A Short Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Hollsten, Anna (2004) *Ei kattoa, ei seiniä. Näkökulmia Bo Carpelanin kirjallisuuskäsitukseen. (Summary: No ceiling, no walls. Perspectives on Bo Carpelan's concept of literature.)* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Klee, Paul (1987) *Modernista taiteesta*. (German original: Über die moderne Kunst.) Helsinki: Suomen Taiteilijaseura.
- Krohn, Leena (1993) *Tribar: huomioita inhimillisestä ja ei-inhimillisestä. [Tribar: Notes On the Human and the Non-Human.]* Porvoo: Werner Söderström.
- Lowenthal, David (1975) "Past Time, Present Place: Landscape and Memory." *The Geographical Review* 65.1: 1–36.
- McDuff, David (1993) "Eye of the Storm." *Books from Finland 4/1993*: 272–273.
- Muehrcke, Phillip C. & Juliana O. Muehrcke (1974) "Maps in Literature." *The Geographical Review* 64.3: 317–338.

- Norris, Christoffer (1988) "Deconstruction, Post-modernism and the Visual Arts." In Christoffer Norris & Andrew Benjamin: *What is Deconstruction?* London & New York: Academy Editions & St. Martin's Press: 7–32.
- Olsson, Gunnar (1981) "On Yearning for Home: An Epistemological View of Ontological Transformations." In Douglas C. D. Pocock, ed.: *Humanistic Geography and Literature*. London: Croom Helm: 121–129.
- Porteous, J. Douglas (1986) "Intimate sensing." *Area 18*: 250–251.
- Steiner, George (1989) *Real Presences: Is There Anything in What We Say?* London: Faber & Faber.
- Tuan, Yi-Fu (1975) "Place: An Experiential Perspective." *The Geographical Review* 65.2: 151–165.
- Walter, E.W (1980–1981) "The Place of Experience." *The Philosophical Forum* 12: 159–181.

Nanny Jolma

**BETWEEN NOW AND THEN:
THE EXPERIENCE OF TIME IN BO CARPELAN'S
NOVELS *URWIND* AND *BERG***

Memory, time, and space are key themes that are closely connected and intertwined in Bo Carpelan's work.¹ Here, I focus on the experience of time in two novels: *Urwind* (1993) and *Berg* (2005). Through this perspective, my analysis also refers to the two other corners of this thematic triangle—memory and space—and makes comparisons to other texts by Carpelan.

Carpelan's late novels—*Urwind*, *Benjamins bok* (1997), *Berg*, *Barndom* (2008), and *Blad ur höstens arkiv* (2011)—share many features in terms of style, imagery, and narrative form.² All of them except *Barndom* feature an elderly male first-person narrator who is reflecting on and writing about his past and everyday life.³ As is typical for modernist novels, time is not linear or chronological in Carpelan's late works. The narrative moves between time layers, following the narrator's flow of thought, fragments of memory, dreams, and fantasies. A temporal frame that holds the fragments together in Carpelan's work in general is the cycle of a day or year (Hollsten 2004, 228). Carpelan often utilizes a perspective that depicts how a child experiences and understands the world (Hollsten 2004, 179). Sometimes the childhood memories are a nostalgic shelter, but even more often, they are colored by a melancholic tone.⁴

In *Urwind* and *Berg*, the narrative is built around one specific house. This emphasizes space and spatiality, including in terms of the experience of time, which reflects the poetics Carpelan (e.g., 1960; 1991) formulates in his essays. As time follows a spatial structure and the cyclic time of nature rather than a temporal linearity, subjective experience and achronological movement are highlighted. In both of the aforementioned novels, the movement be-

tween time layers is a repetitive motif that is emphasized alongside the problematics of narrating and experiencing.⁵

In the following sections, I will explore time and temporality in the target novels with the following research question: how is the experience of time represented through narrative form and repeating imagery? Thus, the purpose is not to explain the time structure of the novels as narrative wholes, but to analyze how the subjective experience of time is represented with a focus on the relationship between the present and the past. I will apply both classical and postclassical narratology as tools for my analysis. To demonstrate how narrating and experiencing interact and intertwine in my target texts, I will go to the roots of these two approaches and compare the perspectives that Dorrit Cohn's (1978) and Monika Fludernik's (2003) theories offer on Carpelan's novels. To conclude the analysis, I will explore motifs that construct the theme of time and reflect on Carpelan's (1960; 1991) poetics.

A Voice from the Past: Changes in the Narrative Mode

As noted elsewhere in the present volume, the first-person narrator of *Urwind* is writing a diary to give to his wife when she returns from her one-year stay in Boston. At the beginning of the novel, Daniel Urwind comes home after escorting his wife to the airport. He describes his feelings of loneliness and estrangement, and he tries to find comfort in the silent walls of books in his antiquarian shop. By listening to the silence around him, his memory comes to the fore:

I listen. Papa is talking there in the room that faces the street, he has been dead for many years, of course, but I can hear him, the customer leaves, the doorbell tinkles, it is silent. I used to sit here looking out through the fanlight at a pale narrow strip of rear courtyard, it was there in my eye even when I was a child. The room was much bigger then, the table higher, but the light was the same. What bound us together then? The name? (UW 2)⁶

In this excerpt, the present and the past intertwine with each other in an interesting way. The passage represents both the old narrator and his earlier self, but the distance and relationship between them seems to vary. The narration of the old Daniel indicates an uncertainty of his connection to the past and the people there.

According to Cohn (1978), the relationship between the narrating and experiencing self can to some extent be compared to the connection between the narrator and his protagonist in a third-person novel (143). The narrating self is aware of his past and is on a higher cognitive level than the experiencing self. The experiencing self, in turn, is the earlier self who lives through the events that the teller narrates. The way the experiencing self is viewed by the later self can vary in several ways, as the narrating self can utilize different attitudes and “is free to slide up and down the time axis that connects the two selves” (Cohn 1978, 145). It is, however, important to note that the functionality of the relationship of a third-person narrator and his protagonist is not fully adaptable to first-person narration. The two selves are obviously connected to each other by the first-person pronoun and an existential relationship (Cohn 1978, 144).

The excerpt from *Urwind* starts in the present tense. The use of the verb “listen” connotes expectations of experientiality. This first short sentence could be connected to the time of the narration because before this scene, the narrator described his age by stating that he is “fifty years heavy” (UW 2). The second sentence continues in the present tense: “Papa is talking there in the room that faces the street.” It can be seen as the discourse of the experiencing self. The narrating self has slid close to his childhood self when immersing himself in memories and identifying with the experiencing self for a short moment (Cohn 1978, 145). This creates the illusion of a direct access to the mind of the younger Daniel. It can also be interpreted as an example of consonant self-narration, where the narrator does not show his greater knowledge but rather identifies with his earlier self (Cohn 1978, 143). From this point of view, the first sentence, “I listen,” could also be interpreted as a consonant im-

mersion into the past and thus also express the discourse of Daniel as a child.

In the next part, the moment of listening and experiencing is interrupted by a comment from the narrator: "He has been dead for many years, of course." Here, the narrating self acts very differently from the way he did in the previous part. He draws attention to himself and to his position of greater knowledge. This serves as an example of a dissonant self-narration that emphasizes the temporal cognitive gap to the earlier self (Cohn 1978, 143; 151). The fact that the changes between the consonant and dissonant modes are so quick can be interpreted as a questioning of the possibility and meaning of differentiating the two selves. In addition, the narrating self notes that he is able to hear the voice despite the father being long dead.

An observation about the present surroundings, "the customer leaves, the doorbell tinkles," ties the narrative to the present again, and the comment "it is silent" marks the ending of the meaningful moment where the past and the present overlap. The narrating self then continues telling about his past in a more traditional retrospective form, using the past tense: "I used to sit here." Here we can clearly apply the idea of the narrating self who vividly tells about his past. There are notions of the surroundings that create an experiential atmosphere, but the presence of the narrator can be seen constantly from the past tense, and the adverbs highlight the now-then dichotomy.

This short excerpt from *Urwind* demonstrates multiple changes in the narrative form. It cannot be categorized as dissonant self-narration or consonant self-narration, as it consists of quick changes between these modes. This can be interpreted as communicating the narrator's confusion and challenges as he tries to execute the autobiographical process of writing. The tools Cohn's theory offers do not fully explain the relationship of the past and present selves of Daniel Urwind, but it is still illuminating that the narrative does not fall into clean categories.

My interpretation is that the aim or the nature of the narrative analyzed here is, in fact, not just to retrospectively mediate the experience of the earlier self. The experience that is at stake here is also that of old Daniel's confusion, which he summarizes in the reflective question at the end of the excerpt. The past is only one layer of the experiential substance in this novel, and it intertwines with the narrator's experiences of trying to define himself through his past and his present loneliness. Later in the novel, the narrator even states of himself that "I contain many 'I's at once," and that he sees them going past him "like strangers" (UW 53).

The following excerpt also illuminates the different layers of experience. It follows a section of childhood memories vividly represented in the present tense. Daniel, as a child, becomes lost in an apartment building before finally finding his way back to his aunt, Viktoria:

I wipe my tears with the arm of my pullover, Viktoria sits on a stool watching me, I am a grown man after all, an experienced second-hand bookshop owner, a heavy and stubborn bookworm, what am I doing here, in what room of memory do I find myself now, what time is being slowly torn open, like a ripped web? (UW 19)

The beginning of this excerpt is an example of the discourse of the experiencing self as mediated by a consonant narrator. The peculiarity of this part of the narrative is the gradual change to the experience of the "grown man," the later self. At first glance, the reader assumes that Aunt Viktoria is watching Daniel as a child, but as one reads further, it becomes unclear which Daniel is experiencing Viktoria's observing look. Does the childhood memory overlap with some later memory, as it often does in *Urwind*? Alternatively, is the memory of that look so strong that the old Daniel relives it later as he writes down his thoughts? After this, however, the narrator starts to define his present self with a list of adjectives and nouns. In the end, he expresses his confusion regarding his memory process and the time layers that merge with each other in his experience.

Based on my analysis, I suggest that Cohn's theory—despite its acknowledged benefits—leads to an understanding of this first-per-

son narrative that is too dual to explain the mediation of experience in a highly self-reflexive novel like *Urwind*. To enable another perspective of the experience of time in my target texts, I will put Fludernik's theory of experientiality to the test.

An Immersion in Memory: Overlapping Cognitive Frames

In the novel *Berg*, the first-person narrator Mattias is trying to confront his past by writing and visiting a house, named Berg, where he used to spend his childhood summers.⁷ The groundless guilt from a shooting episode in his childhood still follows Mattias as an aging man, and traumatic memories start to unravel as he observes the rooms, stairs, corridors, and closets in the house. Berg breathes and ages along with the characters: "We have all changed. The whole Berg has changed. We decay slowly, and the house with us" (B, 124).⁸

As in *Urwind*, the first-person narrator of *Berg* describes the voices that echo to him from his past. The novel starts in the traditional form of a retrospective narrative in the past tense: "In the war summer of 1944, when I was eight years old, we hiked—Mama, Papa, Jonas, and I—the winding road under friendly clouds" (B, 9). A little later, the narrator describes the voice of his mother calling him as a child. At this point, there is a change in the tenses and the narrative technique:

As if I still heard her voice, heard Papa's hawking and Jonas's wild cry, and saw all the smallest things that moved: the trail of the ants, the lizard that quickly disappears in the grass, the shadows of the clouds that move themselves, relaxed, over the field and over me. Where is the time that separates us? (B, 11)⁹

In this excerpt, the memory of the voices from the past is vivid. In the first excerpt from *Urwind*, hearing the voice of the father was an actual memory from the past, but here the sense of hearing leads to a more comprehensive experience of Mattias' childhood moments. In the above excerpt, the change from the past to the present tense

can be interpreted as marking the slide from retrospective dissonant self-narration to consonant re-experiencing. As it also ends with a question, indicating confusion over the flow of time, one can note that there are many similarities to *Urwind*. The experience mediated in the narrative cannot restrictively be located in the past. Instead, the experience cuts through different temporal levels.

According to Monika Fludernik (2003), experientiality is the subject and core of narrative (244). The text does not become a narrative before the reader interprets it as one—that is, narrativizes it. Fludernik distinguishes five cognitive frames for narrativizing human experience: Action, Telling, Experiencing, Viewing, and Reflecting.¹⁰ In the following analysis, I focus on the frames of Telling, Experiencing, and Reflecting. The frame of Telling covers the traditional storytelling situation that mediates the consciousness of the teller. Experiencing refers to a frame whereby the experiential core of the narrative is mediated directly from the consciousness of the protagonist; the focus is on the immersion in the protagonist's experience. The frame of Reflecting, in turn, points to the narrator's mental evaluation, to reflecting and commenting on the narrated experience (Fludernik 2003, 246–247).

At the beginning of the excerpt from *Berg*, the retrospective storytelling situation activates the frame of Telling, as the narrator vividly tells about his past. It is attached to the time of narration with the adverb “still,” which in this context refers to the present moment. The beginning draws attention to the time of narrating, but at the same time binds it together with the past, where the voice originally could be heard. The conditional form also emphasizes the frame of Telling as the primary way of representing consciousness, as it indicates that the narrator acknowledges the temporal distance. However, the narrator Mattias expresses his relationship with his past in a highly experiential manner. The past starts to come alive in his mind, and it is colored with details. The conditional form can also be interpreted as representing the incompleteness of the re-experience of the past. Although Telling can be seen as the primary cognitive frame here, the frame of Experiencing also starts to be-

come active behind it. After the list of voices, another sense comes along, “and saw all the smallest things that moved.” Not only can the first-person narrator hear voices from the past, he can also see all the details. This sets up expectations for a strong moment of remembering. When the movement of the lizard is described with the present tense, the frame of Experiencing bursts through and becomes the dominant way of narrativizing consciousness.

In both *Urwind* and *Berg*, the cognitive frames overlap and form dynamic and meaningful moments in the text. The narrative technique also thematizes the possibility of the different times merging with each other. The question “Where is the time that separates us?” from *Berg* is clearly a comment from the narrator, and it can be interpreted as mediating the experience of time through the frame of Reflecting. This is a very similar ending as in the excerpt from *Urwind*: “What bound us together then? The name?” Both are efforts by the narrators to find the connections to their past by reflecting on the temporal distance—both endings also indicate the experience of the later self. In *Urwind*, the old Daniel finds it difficult to find a connection to the past. In *Berg*, the old Mattias feels a connection to the past very strongly and rather questions the temporal gap between his current and his childhood experience. The frame of Experiencing can also be seen to be active in these reflective parts. It can be interpreted that the combinations of Telling and Experiencing are used to mediate the childhood experience of the past. The fusion of Reflecting and Experiencing, in turn, rather represents the self-reflexive mind and the experience of the narrating Daniel and Mattias.

As with Cohn’s concepts of dissonant and consonant narration, it also becomes clear with the cognitive frames that there is a lot of overlapping of different models of consciousness representation when it comes to first-person narratives such as *Urwind* and *Berg*.¹¹ In the context of recent narratology, this is no surprise, as these theories can be seen as different perspectives of the same phenomenon. Mari Hatavara (2013) argues that the difference between classical and cognitive narratology lies in the emphasis of either the textual

structure or the reader's process of interpreting the text (165). Both approaches have also received criticism. According to Alan Palmer (2004), it is not possible to see the complexity and diversity of fictional minds through Cohn's theory, because it focuses too greatly on the verbal aspects of fictional minds (53). Maria Mäkelä (2013) agrees with Palmer on this matter and notes that making sense of fictional characters and their minds is more complicated than just engaging in "meticulous linguistic analysis"(130). However, she also highlights Cohn's achievement in underlining the peculiar and unique nature of fictional minds. Naturalizing narration into different cognitive frames and seeing it as just a series of examples of the ways real minds work comes with its own disadvantages, as it flattens the dynamic of sliding between different narrative techniques and modes. Hatavara (2013) emphasizes the importance linguistic categories have as concrete tools for text analysis, even when they cannot be applied to all situations (166)¹².

My analysis shows that the changes between different narrative modes can be interpreted as representing the contradictory relationship to the past and the narrators' challenges in recognizing the present identity in the midst of the process of remembering. The intertwining of experiencing and narrating also thematizes the subjectivity of time and the reconstructive nature of memory. Both the classical theory and the cognitive theory illuminate these strategies of narrative form, but at the same time they are limited in their capacity to fully explain how these texts function and form their meaning.

The excerpts from *Urwind* and *Berg* represent the subjective experience of the connection to one's past. The reflective comments and questions analyzed also take the discussion of time to a philosophical level to express Carpelan's ideas of space and time (and hence Bakhtin's chronotope). It is typical of Carpelan's work to include explicit definitions of concepts that are central to his poetics. To conclude the analysis of the experience of time, I will examine metaphors and motifs of the theme of time in relation to Carpelan's poetics of openness.

Time Is A Snowflake: The Motifs of Temporality

In *Urwind*, the nature of time is summarized well in the third chapter, “Snow Letter,” with the following metaphor: “Each year is a snowflake, it blows around between now and the past” (UW 10). A year as a segment of time is depicted with a snowflake, something fine, unique, and temporary, that is easily blown around by the wind. This indicates that the movement of time is not straightforward or controlled by a predefined chronology. It can easily fly in one direction and then, with the next gust, in another. This metaphor describes a similar experience as was analyzed in the previous discussion. Time moves easily between the present and the past depending on the narrator’s associations.

The floating and blowing movement contributes to the wind imagery introduced in the first chapter of the novel, “The Name Urwind.” The “urwind, the primordial wind [...] throws the time this way and that” (UW 4). Wind is a central element in the imagery of Carpelan’s work (Hollsten 2004, 135). According to Hollsten (2004), the different characteristics of the wind in the first chapter of *Urwind* aptly demonstrate the essential features of Carpelan’s poetics: the dynamics between openness and collectiveness (137). The wind blows things apart but also gathers them together. Time is both moved by the primordial wind and also collected by the spatial variation of urwind, the primordial attic that “gathers in its dark corners childhood summers” and “all the clockwork of human life” (UW 3).¹³ Time, in the form of a grandfather snoozing in a hammock, is also imprisoned in the attic. Accordingly, time is not such an independent and forceful element as it is typically characterized in modern Western thinking. It is easily moved around and manipulated.

Openness is the central term of Carpelan’s poetics. It is a peculiar synthesis of romantic ideas around nature and free creation with the balance and clarity of classicist thinking (Hollsten 2004, 219; 287–294). In his essay “Om diktens öppenhet” (1960), Carpelan combines his poetics of openness with John Keats’s (1795–1821)

idea of negative capability—to rest in uncertainty without yearning for reasons or answers, a talent necessary for creative work. Carpelan implies that openness is not the antonym of collectivity. On the contrary, openness becomes the power that gathers different fragments together. The negative capability is to be able to reflect on the opposites of reality and existence open-mindedly. In this way, it is natural to question the strict lines drawn between different categories, like the divisions between the past, present, and future. Negative capability collects all of these experiences of time into the immediate blink of an eye (Carpelan 1960).

The idea of a brief moment expanding to include numerous different layers of time is also well known in the aesthetics of modernism (Hollsten 2004, 219). It has similarities with Bakhtin's (1981) chronotope, which "expresses the inseparability of space and time" (84). Time thickens, becomes spatial, and loses its linear form as space is also affected by temporal indicators (84–85). As with Carpelan's blink of an eye, it also refers to a special moment where the layers of time merge with each other and are bound to space. In *Berg*, Mattias experiences a moment of this kind. He looks at picture frames where the dead and the living stand side by side: "I view them like a book, open and filled with voices: a murmur from years that are gone and the years that are coming, everything is still in this quiet, warm blink of an eye" (B 42). Mattias experiences this moment with different senses; he senses the years as voices and a nostalgic warmth. On the one hand, time is like flowing water; on the other hand, everything stands still. The moment is deeply experiential and filled with contradictions as it gathers together mobility and immobility. This summarizes the ambivalent and holistic essence of time that is typical of Carpelan's work.

The connection of time and space is also evident in the following excerpt from *Berg*: "Time, motionless time turned into space and the people there: they have grown old and bleached, like wood is bleached and whetted by the wind and the waves" (B, 119). Here, time can take different forms, and it refers both to the space and the people belonging to that space. Both are gradually worn down by

the power of nature. This metaphor makes time into something that we can see. As with the previous example of the blink of an eye, it also comments on the movement of time: time can also stand still.

Returning to *Urwind*, Daniel also describes his experience of time with a space metaphor in “Snow Letter”: “[...] each stair [is] a year of my life” (UW 11). Thus, the staircase of the apartment building where Daniel lives resembles the chronology of his life. However, he can go up and down the stairs, as it is noted several times in the novel. Later, in the fourteenth chapter, “The Bomb Shelter,” the narrator describes time as a vehicle of some sort: “Creaking, the wheels of time move backwards, stop, move forwards again” (UW 52). Here time is pictured as something heavy, quite unlike a snowflake. The difficult and creaking movement of the wheel can also be interpreted as representing the unpleasantness of the war memories—moving back and forth is not equally easy for all memories.¹⁴ This is also emphasized by spatial features, as the chapter mainly takes place in the dark cellar of the building. However, the wheels of time are moving in different directions.

Both the staircase and the wheel are human-made and can be seen as symbols of modernity and progress. However, it is interesting to note how these motifs are used in *Urwind*. The metaphors build the impression of a temporal dimension where a back and forth movement is possible. On the other hand, the round shape of a wheel also indicates cyclical movement that repeats itself. In turn, the stairs become a very subjective and surreal space in the novel. They both indicate the existence of a chronology that is compromised by the changing direction of movement.

The representation of time as a constantly changing, shape-shifting structure can also be interpreted as a comment against the tradition of strictly coherent narrative. According to Matti Hyvärinen et al. (2010), coherence and continuity have been thought of as virtues of narrative, especially since the 1980s and 1990s (1–2). Experience, on the contrary, has been defined as unorganized and shapeless. However, this normative idea impoverishes narrative, as the diverse meanings of non-coherent material are ignored. Fludernik’s

(2003) vision of experientiality as the core of narrative is an example of the approaches that are breaking the coherence-oriented tradition in the defining of narrative. As I have shown in the previous sections, experientiality is woven tightly into the narrative. The aim in *Urwind* and *Berg* is quite clearly to narrativize experience, and therefore it is not possible to separate the narrating and experiencing from each other. From this point of view, Carpelan's modernist novels strongly speak against the coherence-oriented definition of narrative, just as they do against linear time.

Carpelan's critique of the idea of linear time is explicit in his essay "I poesins rum" (1991). He argues that we are surrounded by the idea of linear time already as children, for instance, in the form of several phrases and idioms that talk about time moving forward quickly. The time Carpelan finds important is the time of poetry, which creates space around us. This time can be delayed or stopped; it rises deep from the experience of the individual. At the end of his essay, Carpelan suggests the following:

Maybe time and space are not antonyms after all, but rather permeate each other? Maybe the room of poetry is the innermost room where my time can be measured, weighed, and found in reconciliation with myself? (Carpelan 1991)

The target texts of the present discussion can be interpreted as exploring this thought: space as a source of imagery allows one to move between layers of time as from one room to another. Moreover, different experiences through time can condense together in a specific space.

An important factor in the case of *Urwind* is that in this diverse collage, the fragments still create significance and meaning in the whole (Hollsten 2004, 238). The same applies to *Berg*. As the metaphors and definitions according temporality are repeated in *Urwind* and *Berg*, it is important to note that they can be interpreted as motifs of the theme of time. The theme, understood as a structure constructed by the repeating smaller thematic elements, helps the reader to understand the text and interpret the coherence of the fragments (see, e.g., Pyrhönen 2004, 33–34; Pettersson 2002, 238).

My analysis also points out that the motifs of temporality form a wider thematic structure that connect different works by Carpelan.¹⁵ The process of defining time can be considered to continue throughout Carpelan's novels. In *Benjamins bok*, for example, an old pocket watch functions as a modernist motif of time and temporality. Appearing at the beginning and the end of the novel in the encounters of different generations, it builds the idea of a cyclic time. In *Blad ur hörtens arkiv*, memory and time are pictured as being cyclic, organic, and constantly changing through the use of the autumn archive metaphor (see Jolma 2018c). To conclude, I argue that it is especially the representation of the experience of time that creates the coherence both within *Urwind* and *Berg* and between these works and Carpelan's other texts.

Conclusions

In *Urwind* and *Berg*, the narrator-characters experience themselves in, across, and between different times. This experience of time is embodied both in the narrative form and in the repeated imagery. With the tricks of the narrative form, the temporal distance to the past is both established and questioned. The repeated metaphors that function as motifs also express the subjective essence of time: the different forms and movements of time challenge the idea of linearity. Both the narrative and thematic features also create moments where different times overlap and condense.

In Carpelan's late novels, the form and content are strongly connected. Consequently, the narrative modes and thematic elements should not be detached in the analysis. First, my analysis shows that the thematic features are part of the narrative structure which build coherence in the collage-like narrative whole. Second, I suggest that the narrative strategies also build and emphasize the theme of subjective time without one single form.

Carpelan's poetics are certainly not about categories and opposites. Rather, they strongly emphasize openness, collectiveness,

and the ambivalence and dynamics that follow from their combination. *Urwind* and *Berg* also reflect and represent these ideas. It is not possible—or necessary—to always see a clear line between now and then, nor between experiencing and narrating.

NOTES

- ¹ See Hollsten 2004, Hellgren 2014, and Jolma 2018c.
- ² The style of Carpelan's late prose starts to form already in *Axel* (1986), as the novel partly uses diary narration. *Urwind*, however can be seen as a culmination of Carpelan's prose up until the 1990s; it marks the beginning of what I refer to here as Carpelan's late novels.
- ³ *Barndom* is an exception, as it is written in the third person. It follows David's development from a child to becoming a writer.
- ⁴ On the problematics of nostalgia in Carpelan's *Berg*, see Jolma 2018b.
- ⁵ *Benjamins bok* also shares these narrative features but rather than focusing on spatiality, it concentrates on trauma and the grotesque (see Jolma 2018a). *Blad ur höstens arkiv* represents memory with spatial metaphors but the problematics of narrating and experiencing are not central, as the novel focuses on the perspective of an ageing man.
- ⁶ Hollsten (2004) mentions this scene from *Urwind* as an example on how the memories of people and spaces tend to be strongly tied together in Carpelan's work (246).
- ⁷ *Berg* is the Swedish for mountain or rock.
- ⁸ All the excerpts from Carpelan's novels and essays, except *Urwind*, are translated from the original Swedish version by N. J.
- ⁹ In Jolma 2018a, this excerpt is analyzed by applying Cohn's concepts and different theories of nostalgia and nostalgic reaction.
- ¹⁰ These frames are originally defined in Fludernik's *Towards a 'Natural' Narratology* (1996). The article that I use as reference here is "a response to the questions raised by the original formulation [...] and it attempts an extended presentation of the cognitive framework" (2003, 244). I will follow Fludernik's formulation and use capital letters to emphasize the idea of cognitive frames as abstractions that are represented on the level of concrete speech or text.

¹¹ Mäkelä (2013) also notes that these theories give similar results regarding a self-reflexive and retrospective excerpt of first-person narration; she ends up interpreting her target text as both a “peculiar combination of dissonant and consonant first-person narration” and a “serious overlapping and ambivalence” between cognitive frames (134–135).

¹² For more on the benefits and achievements of Cohn’s classical theory, see e.g., McHale 2012.

¹³ The description of the primordial attic in *Urwind* can be seen as a model for later attic descriptions that appear in Carpelan’s late prose (see Jolma 2018c).

¹⁴ Hollsten (2004) also mentions this chapter as an example of the time structure of the novel; the cellar is described in three overlapping time layers (53–54).

¹⁵ Hollsten (2004) refers to this phenomenon as autotextuality, the intertextuality between the works of the same author (16).

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1981/1937–1938) “Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel.” In Michael Holquist (ed.): *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays by M.M. Bakhtin*. Austin: U of Texas P, 84–258.
- Carpelan, Bo (2008) *Barndom*. Helsinki: Schildts.
- Carpelan, Bo (1997) *Benjamins bok*. Helsinki: Schildts.
- Carpelan, Bo (2005) *Berg*. Helsinki: Schildts.
- Carpelan, Bo (2011) *Blad ur hastens arkiv*. Helsinki: Schildts.
- Carpelan, Bo (1991) “I poesins rum.” *Hufvudstadsbladet* 25.4.1991.
- Carpelan, Bo (1960) “Om diktens öppenhet.” *Hufvudstadsbladet* 27.3.1960.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- Cohn, Dorrit (1978) *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Fludernik, Monika (2003) “Natural Narratology and Cognitive Parameters.” In David Herman (ed.): *Narrative Theory and the Cognitive Sciences*. Stanford: CSLI Publications, 243–267.
- Hatavara, Mari (2013) “Making Sense in Autobiography.” In Matti Hyvärinen, Mari Hatavara, & Lars-Christer Hydén (eds): *The Travelling Concepts of Narrative*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 163–178.
- Hellgren, Jan (2014) *Bo Carpelan. Rummets diktare*. Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland.
- Hollsten, Anna (2004) *Ei kattoa, ei seiiniä. Näkökulmia Bo Carpelanin kirjallisuuskäsitykseen*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen kirjallisuuden seura.
- Hyvärinen, Matti et al (2010) “Beyond narrative coherence: An introduction.” In Matti Hyvärinen, Lar-Christen Hydén, Marja Saarenheimo, & Maria Tamboukou (eds): *Beyond Narrative Coherence*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 1–15.

- Jolma, Nanny (2018a) “‘As if there was no fear’: Exploring the nostalgic narrative in Bo Carpelan’s novel *Berg*.” *Humanities*, vol. 7. doi:10.3390/h7040106.
- Jolma, Nanny (2018b) “Det groteska och öppenhetens poetik i Bo Carpelans roman *Benjamins Bok*.” In Anna Biström & Maren Jonasson (eds): *Historiska och litteraturhistoriska studier 93*. Helsinki: Svenska litteratursällskapet i Finland, 205–228. doi: <https://hls.journal.fi/article/view/66711>.
- Jolma, Nanny (2018c) “Muistojen arkisto ja muistelun kertomus. Muuntuva arkistometafora Bo Carpelanin romaanissa *Blad ur höstens arkiv*.” In Hanne Juntunen, Kirsi Sandberg, & M. Kübra Kocabaş (eds): *In Search of Meaning: Literary, Linguistic, and Translational Approaches to Communication*. Tampere: University of Tampere, 80–100. <http://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-03-0919-0>.
- McHale, Brian (2012) “Transparent Minds Revisited.” *Narrative* 1/2012, vol. 20.
- Mäkelä, Maria (2013) “Cycles of Narrative Necessity: Suspect Tellers and the Textuality of Fictional Minds.” In Lars Bernaerts, Dirk de Geest, Luc Herman, & Bart Vervaeck (eds): *Stories and Minds: Cognitive Approaches to Literary Narrative*. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 129–151.
- Palmer, Alan (2004) *Fictional Minds*. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press.
- Pettersson, Bo (2002) “Seven trends in recent thematics and a case study.” In Max M. Louwerse & Willie van Peer (eds): *Thematics: Interdisciplinary Studies*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 237–252.
- Pyrhönen, Heta (2004) “Kaunokirjallisuuden temaattisesta tutkimuksesta.” *Synteesi* 1, 28–52.

Catherine Maloney

**SELF AND OTHER: “CREATIVE UNDERSTANDING”
IN BO CARPELAN’S *URWIND***

One approach to Bo Carpelan’s *Urwind* is to consider it as a philosophical text which locates Mikhail Bakhtin’s concept of creative understanding in a moment in the life of the novel’s eponymous character Daniel Urwind. Reading *Urwind* in this way is not to reduce it to a pre-digested set of ideas, but is rather to take seriously the Russian philosopher and literary critic’s insistence on the connection between form and content. Bakhtin writes that “Artistic form, correctly understood, does not shape already prepared and found content, but rather permits content to be found and seen for the first time” (1984, 43). In this sense, *Urwind* opens a window on a particular instance of creative understanding at work and as such makes its elements visible in new and unique ways. *Urwind* takes its reader through Daniel’s transformative journey of understanding. In the wake of the breakdown of his marriage, the interpretive lens through which Daniel has habitually made sense of the world has been shattered; this is both devastating for Daniel and an opportunity for growth and new understanding. The weekly letters, or journal, which Daniel writes to his estranged wife during their year apart amount to a conversation with various others: relatives and friends—some now dead or at least long gone from his life—his younger self, literary characters, and works of art. All of these constitute the interlocutors with whom he searches for new meaning and understanding. My argument claims that the literary and memory-based engagements in Daniel’s journal constitute an intercultural dialogue through which he comes to understand himself and his world in a new and deeper way. It is a time of *creative understanding* which leaves Daniel perched on a threshold, ready to venture through to a new life.

Intercultural Dialogue and Creative Understanding

In order to make the case that Daniel's journal constitutes an intercultural dialogue through which he engages in a transformative process of creative understanding, it will be useful to explore what each of these terms—intercultural dialogue and creative understanding—means and how they relate to each other. Culture itself, as the intercultural theorist Milton Bennet (2013) asserts, is not a thing but rather “the process whereby groups of people coordinate meaning and action, yielding both institutional artifacts and patterns of behavior.” Conceiving of culture in this active and participatory way broadens the concept and moves it away from the narrower definition of culture which refers solely to constructs of ethnic or national groups. Under this broad definition, any group that creates meaning through a particular frame of values, beliefs, norms, or practices has a culture. While a nation might be said to have a particular culture, so could a hobby or interest group if that group can be shown to have a coherent set of values from which the members create meaning.¹ Furthermore, it follows that individuals participate in more than one culture and therefore are located at an intersection of a variety of modes of meaning making. For example, Daniel Urwind is a member of many groups; he is Finnish, he is a WWII baby, he is a bookseller and a lover of Western literature. By contrast, his Aunt Viktoria, who is similarly Finnish and from the same family as Daniel's mother, is also a professional dancer, European traveler, and pre-WWII baby. The location from which Daniel and Viktoria respectively make meaning is the intersection of all of the cultural groups to which each belongs. While they have many points of cultural overlap, they also have significant points of divergence; that is, the cultural location from which each of them makes meaning is similar but not identical, and is in some ways radically different.

Building from this definition of culture, intercultural understanding is a mode of knowing across difference that is framed though a cultural lens. It is not equivalent to specific knowledge of

various cultures, but is rather an interrelated set of abilities, together with a sensitivity and disposition that allow individuals to engage across cultural difference where that engagement is a dynamic and relational process of meaning making rather than a treasure hunt to find the static jewels of cultural knowledge. Furthermore, it is useful to distinguish the term “intercultural” from the term “cross-cultural,” as this distinction highlights the relational aspect of an intercultural encounter. As Bennett (2012) uses them, cross-cultural is “a particular kind of *contact* among people, one in which the people are from two or more different cultures” (91); whereas intercultural “refers to a particular kind of *interaction* or communication among people, one in which differences in culture play a role in the creation of meaning” (91). Where a cross-cultural moment may (or may not) recognize or acknowledge difference, what makes it cross-cultural is the simple fact of the contact between two or more cultures. This could be as casual and everyday as an observation of another person on a bus or as intentional as a multicultural food fair, but it does not imply a corresponding shift in understanding. An intercultural moment on the other hand is an engagement of the cultures involved, yielding new meanings and ideally greater understanding. Speaking in terms of paradigms in international education, Bennett (2012) suggests that the move from a cross-cultural to an intercultural model marks the move into a constructivist paradigm. Whereas the earliest positivist model of international education worked on the basis of a neutral observer gathering facts, and the later relativist model recognized the role of framing and location, the constructivist model fully embraces the implications of the relational, participatory, and creative nature of meaning making. An intercultural dialogue then is a dialogue in which new meanings are created due to the particular contributions of the interlocutors and, importantly, the interactions of those meanings. An intercultural dialogue is likely to be transformative, leaving the participants with some degree of shift in perspective.

Creative understanding as Bakhtin elucidates it is given only a relatively brief explanation at the end of one of Bakhtin’s short

and later essays, “Response to a Question from the *Novy Mir* Editorial Staff” (1986b). In this essay, Bakhtin is asked to “evaluate the current state of literary scholarship” (1), and he shifts quickly into a discussion of the relationship between culture and literature. Bakhtin laments that “questions of the interconnection and interdependence of various areas of culture” (1986a, 2) are omitted in much of the Russian literary scholarship of his day. The best scholars, he suggests, consider literature within the complicated context of the culture(s) from which it arose and, importantly, also the current culture in which it is read. He espouses a relational or intersubjective approach to literary exegesis. This is the “creative” part of what becomes creative understanding; that is, the creation of meaning results from the interaction of speakers or texts. At the end of the *Novy Mir* essay, Bakhtin gives his most succinct account of the concept:

We must emphasize that we are speaking here about new *semantic* depths that lie embedded in the cultures of past epochs and not about the expansion of our factual, material knowledge of them [...]. Creative understanding does not renounce itself, its own place in time, its own culture; and it forgets nothing. In order to understand, it is immensely important for the person who understands to be located outside the object of his or her creative understanding—in time, in space, in culture. For one cannot really see one’s own exterior and comprehend it as a whole, and no mirrors or photographs can help; our real exterior can be seen and understood only by other people, because they are located outside us in space and because they are *other*. (6–7, emphasis original)

There are several important points to pull out of this passage: a distinction between understanding and knowledge, the implication that knowledge is situated, and the need for dialogic engagement with others in order to understand.

To take the first point, Bakhtin distinguishes between understanding a culture and knowledge of a culture. The semantic dimension encompasses understanding the “forms of thinking” (1986a, 5) and speaking which make up the way a cultural community makes meaning; whereas “factual” or “material” knowledge of an era is

more closely tied to the outward expressions of a culture, such as its artifacts or behaviors. These two realms are related, but not identical. Making a related point regarding knowing subjects versus knowing facts or propositions, the feminist epistemologist Lorraine Code writes,

Knowledge of other people develops, operates, and is open to interpretation at various levels; it admits of degree in ways that knowing that a book is red does not. Such knowledge is not primarily propositional [...] ‘Knowing how’ and ‘knowing that’ are implicated, but they do not begin to tell the whole story. (1993, 34)

Similarly, Bakhtin is suggesting that creative understanding is more akin to the “process of *kennenlernen*, or getting to know” (Marinucci 2010, 307) a person and less about learning facts about that same person. This same distinction is evident in Daniel’s relationship to his journal. His engagements draw on memory and already known works of literature or art; he is not gaining knowledge about these works or these people, but rather is coming to understand himself and his interlocutors differently. His perspective shifts, and new meanings are revealed to him in old stories.

Second, the person who creatively understands is located or situated in a particular context, set of values, or way of seeing; i.e., occupies an epistemic, or cultural, location. Very much in line with current feminist epistemology, Bakhtin implies that while a person can enlarge his or her perspective and learn to temporarily shift interpretive frames, it is not possible to completely escape the lens through which one makes meaning. Therefore, trying to escape that location and “walk in someone else’s shoes” or achieve a neutral, unsituated, “view from nowhere” is a deception. In an earlier part of the text Bakhtin makes this clear:

There exists a very strong, but one-sided and thus untrustworthy, idea that in order better to understand a foreign culture, one must enter into it, forgetting one’s own, and view the world through the eyes of this foreign culture. This idea, as I said, is one-sided. Of course, a certain entry as a living being into a foreign culture, the possibility of seeing the world through its eyes, is a necessary part of the process of under-

standing it; but if this were the only aspect of this understanding, it would merely be duplication and would not entail anything new or enriching. (1986a, 6–7)

Bakhtin is challenging the possibility of unsituated knowledge. He asserts that a person who believes that it is possible to achieve a view from nowhere has deceived themselves and in fact only replicates their own perspective under the guise of understanding an “other.” Duplication, as he uses it here, refers to duplicating one’s own point of view in the process of attempting to interpret another culture. In order to discover or admit unexpected or new meanings, a person must first recognize what they bring to the process of understanding. Bakhtin is gesturing at the necessity of reflexive thinking for understanding both oneself and others; that is, in order to understand others one must also understand oneself.

The third point is Bakhtin’s acknowledgment of the necessity of engaging dialogically with others in order to allow for the possibility of reflexive thought. Given that it is not possible to vacate one’s own vantage point, reflexivity only becomes possible in dialogue with others. Others can challenge or provoke our perspectival complacency in productive ways, allowing us to catch a glimpse of our own location. What Bakhtin refers to above as seeing one’s exterior with the help of others is what he refers to as “outsideness” in the passage below:

In the realm of culture, outsideness is a most powerful factor in understanding. It is only in the eyes of another culture that foreign culture reveals itself fully and profoundly [...]. A meaning only reveals its depths once it has encountered and come into contact with another, foreign meaning: they engage in a kind of dialogue, which surmounts the closedness and onesidedness of these particular meanings, these cultures. We raise new questions for a foreign culture, ones that it did not raise itself; we seek answers to our own questions in it; and the foreign culture responds to us by revealing to us its new aspects and new semantic depths. Without one’s own questions one cannot creatively understand anything other or foreign [...]. Such a dialogic encounter of two cultures does not result in merging or mixing. Each retains its own unity and open totality, but they are mutually enriched. (1986a, 7)

At first it might seem that claiming knowledge is situated is at odds with suggesting that “outsideness” is necessary for understanding; however, outsideness turns out to be a necessary concomitant of situated knowledge. Because it is not possible to achieve what Donna Haraway calls the “god-trick of seeing everything from nowhere” (1991, 189), it is necessary to have some mechanism of broadening one’s own understanding of both oneself and others. A conversational, or dialogic, mode of engaging with otherness in which an open questioning plays a central role is the only way to avoid duplication. Decentering one’s own epistemic position reflexively is possible only in community, where the other shows the knower things about herself that she would not have realized had she proceeded with a monological mode of knowing. And that very self-understanding, gained through dialogue with others, in turn leads to greater understanding of the other in a kind of virtuous circle.

Creative understanding and intercultural dialogue are closely related; in fact it is possible to say that creative understanding is a mode of relating to one’s own questions and the questions of others, which results in a successful intercultural dialogue. Where Bakhtin refers most explicitly to differences in cultures across time, Bennett’s approach gives access to a broad definition of culture that is complementary to Bakhtin’s and situates creative understanding in a larger discourse of difference. The language of intercultural dialogue gives a familiar framework in which to understand creative understanding, while the latter gives weight to the co-creative dimension of understanding and foregrounds other important aspects of understanding across difference, such as reflexivity and situatedness.

Reading *Urwind*

Turning now to *Urwind*, it is reasonable to ask how a novel written by a single author, and featuring the journal entries of a single protagonist, can constitute an intercultural dialogue? At the be-

ginning of the novel Daniel Urwind's wife Maria has suggested that a year apart may help them to "see each other more clearly" (UW 1) and he in turn has determined to "write a diary" (UW 1) for her, to "write reports [...] one for each week" (UW 2). Daniel is a bookseller, and so literary references figure heavily in his writing. The weekly letters he writes—ostensibly a diary for his estranged wife—amount to a dialogue with various others: long-dead relatives, absent friends, his younger self, literary characters, and works of art. Although these dialogues are focalized through Daniel's memory and imagination, they still constitute an "encounter with something that asserts itself as a truth," as Gadamer says in *Truth and Method* (2004, 489). In revisiting experiences from his past, Daniel is applying a new interpretive lens to those events based on his current epistemic vantage point which is so heavily filtered by his faltering marriage. Those events in turn push back on him, and he finds new meaning in the familiar. As Bakhtin writes: "Semantic phenomena can exist in concealed form, potentially, and be revealed only in semantic cultural contexts of subsequent epochs that are favorable for such disclosure" (1986a, 5). The location that Daniel occupies after his separation gives him a new semantic relationship to past events. He is not learning new facts, but his understanding is shifting; that is, his understanding of both himself and those around him. As a philosophical text, *Urwind* illustrates three essential aspects of creative understanding: the radical rupture that must occur for reflexivity or outsideness to be possible, the necessity of maintaining a situated or located approach to understanding, and the necessity of seeking out and engaging with different ways of knowing while recognizing the cultural aspect in that difference. All three aspects are present in *Urwind*, and the resulting shift in his understanding is what allows Daniel to continue to move and grow through a difficult time.

The recent breakdown of Daniel Urwind's marriage is the destabilizing event which leaves him "pulled up short by the text" (Gadamer 2004, 268) of his life and primes him to engage in a reflexive and transformative dialogue. The interpretive lens through which

he habitually makes sense of the world has been shattered. As difficult a period in his life as this is, it is also a moment of opportunity. As Deborah Kerdeman (2003) astutely notes, while we as knowers can cultivate a “proclivity for self-questioning” (294), it is not possible to achieve that element of outsidersness on our own or through conscious choice. There are many methods that educators espouse for making oneself visible to oneself, but in the end Kerdeman writes:

These views assume that challenging our prejudgements is a choice we govern or an activity we can monitor and direct. Sometimes, however, our beliefs are thrown into doubt without, and even despite, prior deliberation on our part. This particular experience of negation is what Gadamer means by being pulled up short. When we are pulled up short, events we neither want nor foresee and to which we may believe we are immune interrupt our lives and challenge our self-understanding in ways that are painful but transforming. (2003, 294)

Daniel’s situation certainly maps on to the type of experience Kerdeman describes. Despite himself, Daniel enters into a time of insight. At the beginning of the novel, the “fifty-three years heavy” (UW 2) Daniel returns home after leaving Maria at the airport. His expectations subverted, his everyday ways of being and thinking unsettled, Daniel is open, raw, and importantly, forcibly receptive to new meanings. The first chapters are laden with references to and symbols of sight and light. The opening image of the book is of “a lonely man in a deserted parking lot” (UW 1). Daniel sees this image from the bus that takes him home from the airport and further away from his wife. Almost immediately the reader comes to realize that this vision is particular to Daniel. The man flashes a torchlight which Daniel says, “burned inside my eyes like a choked scream” (UW 1); despite the strength of the light, his fellow passengers are impervious to it. This painful illumination foreshadows the time of insight that he is entering into. Daniel writes that “Each weekday contains its hidden vertigo, it breaks out like a sudden fire, a text that must be interpreted. Perhaps it will illumine my own face, so I will manage to interpret it before it returns to dark-

ness?” (UW 1). He references the disorientation of his current state together with its enhanced, but time limited, illumination and potential for understanding.

While it is certainly possible to make the argument that smaller moments of self-awareness and understanding of others are possible without the life-altering type of event that Daniel is experiencing, some element of having one’s expectations subverted is certainly necessary. Gadamer himself notes that “It is impossible to make ourselves aware of a prejudice while it is constantly operating unnoticed, but only when it is, so to speak, provoked” (2004, 299). Because all understanding is situated, or to use Gadamer’s terminology “historically affected,” prejudices form the very horizon in which each person operates. Self-understanding therefore is necessary in order to understand others, and it can be aimed at² only through the foregrounding of prejudices. Additionally, provocation by others is the key to foregrounding the self and its prejudices. This back and forth between self and other is the activity of what has been called the hermeneutic circle. As a historically affected, or situated, consciousness, the task of the interpreter—who is always, by virtue of being human, projecting fore-meanings (or prejudices) onto what is being understood (which is both the knower and the known)—is to work out her or his own fore-projections (2004, 267), so that the meaning that is presenting itself can be revealed. This is reminiscent of Bakhtin’s description of the necessity of having one’s own questions in order to understand creatively (1986a, 7). The task of working out one’s fore-projections is not achieved as “a single, ‘conscientious’ decision, but is ‘the first, last, and constant task’” of interpretation (2004, 267). The circle is then a circle of re-projection and re-interpretation which continues indefinitely; the knower is able to understand more fully, but never definitively and completely. Daniel’s situation has presented him with an opportunity; his reaction to Maria’s decision has forced a state of openness upon him. The subversion of his everyday expectations and habituated ways of being and knowing allows for a reflexive time of insight into himself and the world around him,

however painful that may be. He temporarily occupies the privileged “stranger’s vantage point” (Greene 1973, 93) in which he “notices details and patterns in [his] environment [he] never saw before [...] [He] has to think about local rituals and customs to make sense of them once more” (93). Daniel has achieved a measure of outsidership through the dialogic clash of meaning which has occurred between him and Maria.

While Daniel’s experience has left him destabilized and open to new understandings, he remains situated. Recall that Bakhtin rejects the possibility of “view[ing] the world through the eyes” (1986a, 6) of another, but also maintains the concomitant necessity of outsidership. The interpretive necessity of an outside view is also in play in *Urwind’s* opening chapter. The turmoil of Daniel’s situation has made him feel a stranger to himself, and he makes the relationship between himself and the lonely man from the parking lot explicit: “What cannot be said must be said, by the stranger who sits here with his hands threaded in mine. Blue veins, red knuckles, two sprawling fingers, a text stained by patches of snow. As though I were standing alone in a parking lot, being observed by someone” (UW 2). Even though he has in a sense been thrown outside of himself, the problematic and partial nature of reflexivity is not lost on Daniel. At the end of the first chapter, he wakes to see a child sitting waiting for him. Again, there is light imagery suggesting sight: the child himself radiates a “peculiar light” (UW 5) and then runs out into the “semi-twilight” (UW 5). Daniel follows the child outside, but finds only the boy’s footprints. Once outside Daniel muses: “If I knelt down there in the courtyard and peeped in through my window, what would I see? The unmade sofa-bed, the light falling from the shower room, the chair, the dark bookshelves. I would see the table and the lamp, at the table no one” (UW 5). Despite his epistemically privileged position, Daniel, like all other knowers, cannot escape his location. When he looks in to his apartment, he sees it unoccupied; a space without himself in it. In order to achieve the outside view Bakhtin is speaking of, he needs a dialogical partner(s) to maintain the measure of externality he has gained.

The third and final aspect of creative understanding that is present in *Urwind* is dialogue with difference. The weekly diary entries that Daniel writes amount to a dialogue with various others: long-dead relatives, absent friends, his younger self, literary characters, works of visual art, and novels. He moves back and forth in time and between interlocutors to which he has varying relationships. Despite the fact that all of the human interlocutors he engages are Finnish, and more than just that, they are also family members, neighbors, and friends, each of his interlocutors has his or her own particular cultural location(s) and corresponding imaginaries. His Aunt Viktoria is permeated through and through by her years in the elite European ballet dancing communities she was a part of. His mother focalized her life through painting, while his father was a bookseller taken up with stories. At the neighboring and working class Stiléns', Daniel was perceived as "the bookworm's boy," whereas at the Dahlgrens' (where the father was an Engineering researcher) Daniel was viewed as frivolous and suspicious. Daniel (re)engages these characters in dialogue (albeit through the haze and unreliability of memory) and through this process is able to affect some measure of outsidership towards himself. Coming to these encounters as his adult and destabilized self, Daniel discovers new layers of meaning and thereby allows himself the opportunity to see himself more clearly.

Daniel's journey over the course of the novel is certainly one that engages in creative understanding and intercultural dialogue. The dialogic aspect of *Urwind* is further supported by Bakhtin's work on genres as conduits of particular types of understanding. In his essay on speech genres, Bakhtin defines genres as the "relatively stable types" of utterances common to "each sphere in which language is used" (1986b, 60). The three aspects of content, style, and structure "are inseparably linked to the whole of the utterance" and to the sphere of use (1986b, 60). That is, content, style, and structure all bear on the meaning of an utterance. The semantic connection between form and content implies that some genres are better

than others for expressing certain types of meaning. Bakhtin writes that

not all genres are equally conducive to reflecting the individuality of the speaker in the language of the utterance [...]. The most conducive genres are those of artistic literature[...]. The least favorable conditions for reflecting individuality in language obtain in speech genres that require a standard form[...] (1986b, 63).

Attending to the connection between form and content can open new ways of thinking about and seeing the world. The idea that genres constitute ways of seeing runs parallel to Bennett's definition of culture as coordination of meaning among groups of people; the particular values, norms, and beliefs of cultural groups circumscribe meaning in much the same way as the conventions of a genre allow certain ideas to be highlighted and others obscured. Given this approach, it is important to note the genre in which Daniel is working. He is writing a diary, ostensibly for Maria. The diary form is of course a genre in its own right, but has been said to be "the most pliable and elastic of literary genres" (Merry 1979, 3). This pliability allows Daniel the openness to engage in a variety of types of dialogues. He moves back and forth in time and between interlocutors to which he has different relationships. Each of these changes in time and person constitute a shift in genre of sorts. Daniel's memories of discussions with his father are shaped differently than those with his aunt or his adolescent girlfriend; sometimes his entries are fantastical or dreamlike and other times a straight account of an event. Changes in temporal location, as well as his current temporal vantage point, all shape the meaning of each entry. In addition to his various interlocutors, the pliability of the genre he uses increases the intercultural impact of his dialogical experiences.

At the end of the novel, Daniel has gained a new sense of self. He writes in his second-to-last diary entry: "Is it when we are driven out of ourselves that we truly begin to see?" (UW 188). The destabilizing event with which the novel began has led Daniel through a year of intercultural dialogue which has transformed him and his understanding of himself. He returns home after bringing Maria to

the airport once again, this time with a very different vantage point: “[S]treets open in various directions. I have gone through myself, the unknown in myself, and come out into a cold gateway[...]. This incomprehensible life, it cannot be explained, only built[...]. Each day is a little lighter than the last. In the air, in the wind I sign my name” (UW 189). The breakdown of Daniel’s marriage “pulled him up short” and opened up the opportunity for him to engage in a journey of transformative dialogue. Gadamer writes that “in the last analysis, *all* understanding is self-understanding” (1986, 55) and further that “understanding involves a moment of ‘loss of self’” (1986, 51). Over the course of the novel Daniel journeyed through loss, via dialogue with others, to a renewed sense of self and purpose.

NOTES

¹ For example, it is possible to make the claim that canoe trippers value the ability to move around easily and so the resulting artifacts of that culture might be lightweight, functional objects. Similarly, elite athletes value performing at their best and so a corresponding behavior would be waking early to train on a regular basis.

² I say “aimed at” rather than “achieved” because this is an infinite process which is never complete.

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1986a) "Response to a Question from the *Novy Mir* Editorial Staff." *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1986b) "The Problem of Speech Genres." *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Trans. Vern W. McGee. Ed. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. Austin: U of Texas P.
- Bennett, Milton (2013) "Culture Is Not Like an Iceberg". IDR Institute Blog, May 6, 2013. www.idrinstitute.org/page.asp?menu1=14&post=1.
- Bennett, Milton (2012) "Paradigmatic Assumptions and a Developmental Approach to Intercultural Learning". *Student Learning Abroad: What Our Students are Learning, What They're Not, and What We Can Do about It*. Ed. Michael Vande Berg, R. Michael Paige, and Kris Hemming Lou. Sterling, Virginia: Stylus.
- Carpelan, Bo (1993) *Urwind*. Trans. David McDuff (1998) Evanston, IL: Hydra/Northwestern UP.
- Code, Lorraine (1993) "Taking Subjectivity into Account." *Feminist Epistemologies*. Ed. Linda Alcoff and Elizabeth Potter. New York: Routledge.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg (1986) "On the Problem of Self-Understanding". *Philosophical Hermeneutics*. Trans. and ed. David E. Linge. Berkeley: U of California P.
- Gadamer, Hans Georg (2004) *Truth and Method*, 2nd rev. ed. Trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall. New York: Continuum.
- Greene, Maxine (1973) "Teacher as Stranger." *Teacher as Stranger: Educational Philosophy for the Modern Age*. California: Wadsworth.
- Haraway, Donna (1991) *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge.

- Kerdeman, Deborah (2003) "Pulled Up Short: Challenging Self-Understanding as a Focus of Teaching and Learning." *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 37.2: 293–308.
- Marinucci, Mimi (2010) "Knowledge as Kennenlernen: Subjectivity, Pluralism, and Intimacy." *Social Epistemology*, vol. 24, no. 4, Oct.–Dec., pp. 301–311.
- Merry, Bruce (1979) "The Diary as Literary Genre". *The Maynooth Review / RevieúMháNuad* 5.1 (May): 3–19.

Peter Hitchcock

AFTERWORD: CARPELAN VOICING

Katerina Clark and Michael Holquist (1984) begin the preface to their intellectual biography of Mikhail Bakhtin by noting, “[T]he history of reputations is a chronicle of lesser or greater discrepancies. There is always a gap between what someone does and what the world perceives them to have done” (vii). Obviously, this is particularly apposite with Bakhtin, who lived most of his career in obscurity but then, once “perceived,” often became aligned with a figure he never was or only pretended to be. Here is not the place to revisit Bakhtin’s sometimes calculated multiplicity as if, over forty years after his death, we can now settle the difference between Bakhtin and “Bakhtin.” Yet the general point about reputations is well taken, and points to the “discrepant” necessity for this book on Bo Carpelan. Bakhtin’s mistimed and sometimes misplaced position in twentieth century letters reminds us that reputation is thoroughly overdetermined, by intellectual movements, by theoretical particularity, by power and knowledge, and crucially, by translation. As Brian Kennedy points out in his splendid introduction, Carpelan’s relative obscurity in world literature or modernism is as much a function of translation relations as it is his somewhat anachronistic proclivities. Perhaps, because Carpelan is best known as a poet, this study of his novel, *Urwind*, will only further his displacement, but I would like to think it would have us pay greater attention to the pervasive and formative persistence of discrepancies in literary/critical endeavor. The current volume does not exist as a remedy or necessary corrective (longtime aficionados of Carpelan will not breathe a sigh of relief with the appearance of this book) but shows that an openness, curiosity, and reflexive vigilance will seek out a Carpelan if only to underline how much more could be done to chronicle reputation across the ambivalence of perception. It is no coincidence that dialogical critique might help in this endeavor. How?

Rather than discuss the individual essays collected here in detail, I wish to comment further on some of the Bakhtinian finesse the contributors bring to an understanding of Carpelan and his difficult but rewarding novel, *Urwind*. As indicated, the problem of translation is not a background, as several of the critics arrayed make clear; but let us think of this specifically as a question for the dialogical modern. When Fredric Jameson (2013) writes of a “singular modernity” he does not mean that it is monolithic and prone to reveal an unencumbered checklist of defining features. Modernity is a site of contradiction, of demonstrable unevenness, of dialectical historicity. While such a matrix of relations does not limn unproblematically with modernism—art having its own relatively autonomous and material interventions and inconsistencies—the lessons of the former are not entirely lost on the aesthetic predilections of the latter. The production of Finland-Swedish and Finnish modernism from the perspective of influence and displacement is therefore less surprising than the fact that literary history still proceeds as if the relatively unaccounted instance does not disrupt tidy manifestations of what are deemed the central texts. If we maintain that dialogism includes the idea of utterance (words spoken or written) shaped by the context in which it takes place, then modernism at the margins can quite easily become marginal modernism when context is limited to strictly national or language group prerogatives. It is only relatively recently that the map of modernism has been expanded so that other coordinates appear, rather than an axis that links the conventional urban hotbeds like London, Paris, Berlin, and New York. If the singularity of modernity appears monologic, it is only because the hegemony of certain powers has forged a discursive rationale across its registers, including those that affirm corresponding and imbricated projects of capitalism, colonialism, and imperialism. This is not to say that peripheral modernisms, by extension, are necessarily counter-hegemonic (they may simply confirm the questionable aesthetic hierarchies manifest in cultural elites elsewhere), but their very inclusion always already implies something of an internal polemic by asking on what grounds has

previous exclusion been secured? Dialogism, then, is operative at several levels of critical practice.

First of all, of course, it provides an interpretive critique that is dynamic. While it may pay significant attention to philological genealogies, it slides across either historicism or aestheticism as if to leave each to its own reward (even at the time, I would argue, when Bakhtin is wrestling within the discourses of Marburg School-type Neo-Kantianism). It is true that you can distill single aspects of Bakhtin's methodology, say, the theorization of genre, without subjecting it to other elements of his corpus, like the elaboration of novelization. Yet the spirit of the dialogic, if not always its practice, is a perspicuous openness to transgressing the formal and the formalist. Some have read such openness to be opposed to perhaps more practiced systematicity, in dialectics for instance; and yet there is a tension between them that productively emerges at different places in Bakhtin's writing, in the historicity of the carnivalesque for example, or in the relationship of class and sign. Dialogism is not an epistemology of everything, but it does pay close attention to the constantly changing relations of art and life.

Second, if dialogism is an open event in theory, this does not mean it provides the seat for some form of critical free-for-all. It is true that Bakhtin's insistence on unfinishedness (*nezavershen*) has slid into more conventional discourses of multiplicity as its own reward, a kind of unreflexive liberalism deemed consonant with democratic ideals (Holquist, 1990, 165). Ken Hirschkop's (2000) work in this area has problematized the place of Bakhtin in democratic thought while usefully questioning the assumptions affixed to democracy in such endeavor. The dialogic does not mean that a dialogue is taking place, but it suggests that an utterance is mediated by more than self-consciousness, or the self-presence of an authorial "I." Dialogue, then, is, as Michael Holquist (1990) points out, at the center of Bakhtin's thinking, but the stress is on the determinants of language itself rather than on one or more speaking subjects. In elaborating the dialogic at the heart of epistemology, the

question becomes one of otherness rather than simply multiplicity: it is the other that challenges the unitary nature of the “I.”

Following on from this, dialogism does not refuse authorship but complicates its constituents. In effect, Bakhtin argues that if the nature of utterance is a clue to existence itself, then authoring is not just the ability of a writer, for instance, to narrate, but is a primary form of participation in making the world. Dialogism concerns world-making as a shared event; thus authoring is always participatory, even if an individual author believes him- or herself to be the sole source of their utterance. More than this, of course, Bakhtin suggests that the “I” authors him/herself from the outside in a movement that both displaces the “I” as itself and stresses co-authoring as fundamental. The aesthetic provenance of this idea is relatively clear. If the dialogic engages modes of world making, the artistic claims on this are yet specific. For Bakhtin, the brilliant artist is one who, like Dostoevsky, writes narrative polyphonically so that all of the others, those other than the author, are themselves fully fledged “I”s and not objects in making the story. When Bakhtin says it is about the other that all of the stories have been told, he is emphasizing a human necessity to see ourselves in others as themselves, and not simply as mirrors or caricatures of our sense of self.

A fourth point about dialogism (but hardly final given the extent of the concept as a whole) concerns its relationship to genre, and particularly the novel. For Bakhtin, the novel is an opening to the world of discreet discourses without seeming to speak for them. The novel shows a capacity to not only ingest discursive worlds but also to novelize other genres in representing them. Such novelization (or “novelness”) continues as a process of life, or consciousness of life, even if it may not seem primary in an individual novel. Clearly, Bakhtin is not the only thinker to make special claims for the novel regarding existence as such, but an emphasis on the dialogic novel combines a literary history with a philosophical one. Genres are historical, and so even the capacious novel cannot cheat expiration; yet the principle of novelization as a kind of generic capacity accentuates why the novel persists even when so much of

culture is mediated through a plethora of other modes. No novel, or sub-genre of it, defines existence, but in its dialogic openness it can engage it to an extraordinary degree. Given the aesthetic and philosophical weight Bakhtin accords dialogism and the novel, there are very few works that might meet their peculiar challenge. (There are other reasons Bakhtin did not write about more novelists and novels but this is certainly one of them.) Certainly, Bo Carpelan's *Urwind* is not being presented as some kind of Bakhtinian quintessence in matters dialogic or novelistic. Nevertheless, *Urwind* gets us to think about what is appropriate now in aspects of a Bakhtinian hermeneutic.

The central conceit of the novel, a series of weekly letters written by Daniel Urwind over the course of a year to his estranged wife while they are apart, is at once a challenge to Bakhtinian critique, not because of the quasi-epistolary form (and recall, Bakhtin himself was notorious for not writing letters, which makes him our contemporary but anachronistic in his own intellectual circles) but because the intensely personal style threatens to be hermetic rather than open, observational rather than inter-relational, even in the lively exchanges with Aunt Viktoria. Yet, as both Stephen Souris and Erkki Vainikkala point out in these pages, Carpelan often elaborates Urwind's reflections through free indirect or double-voiced discourse, a crucial aspect of that "concrete lived totality" Bakhtin finds in Dostoevsky, "an intense field of interorientations" (1984, 239) bringing life to discourse. Vainikkala's essay also stresses a kind of creative asymmetry between Carpelan and the dialogic that is a useful reminder that, even with the flexibility of the dialogic novel, its primary critical perspicacity comes through its constitutive edges, the places where the genre questions its own efficacy, as Daniel questions the nature of his own existence.

Diaries are fictions of the self, so on the face of it, the novel should have little difficulty pursuing its generic components (their literary histories are thoroughly entwined). Carpelan, of course, offers a diary that is not one, and this is in accord with a modernist penchant for fictions of fiction or meta-fictions of the self. Vainik-

kala reads this as an interplay of chronotopes whereby the time/space of the conventional diary is overwritten and recalibrated according to the structures of Urwind's thought. Similarly, the "clockwork of human life," as Daniel calls it, is displaced by subjective interactions and interpretations of it so that, whatever the essence that Daniel initially assures his wife he will reveal, the novel itself complicates through multiple voicing, where each voice, as both Souris and Holmström attest, is internally determined by relations to another. Within modernist modes of authorship, it is hardly surprising to read this splitting or fragmentation of the centered subject, but Carpelan seems less inclined to reduce such variegation to his god-like touch (to recall Joyce), preferring instead to wonder about the moving contradictions and self-delusions (including hallucinations) of the human mind. I think of this less in terms of difference and more around the problem of distinction. If the diary is a form of distinctive life, what is it about its modes of voicing that enables this distinction? Each of the contributors to this volume provides insight on this question, whether reading selves and others (Maloney), elaborating discrepant temporality (Jolma), or approaching the genre as a system of spatial referentiality (Karjalainen). This does not give us a holistic Daniel, still less an essential Carpelan, but such contributions accentuate the dilemmas of modernist consciousness, the ways in which utterance continually tries and often fails to overcome the modes of alienation unleashed by modernity itself (symbolized by the man in flames that begins the book).

How many thoughts make up a mental journey? Part of what dialogism permits is to consider both the narrative that becomes Daniel's diary entries (a year in the life about a life of many years) and the utterance context that makes such narrative possible. In Pierre Macherey's work (2006), this is something of the non-said of the text, what it is constrained not to say, and is an opening into its ideological compartment. Bakhtin, at least in the work ascribed to Volosinov, understands well the social logic written into any sign—the word as window into other conditions of self that cannot be adju-

licated by the self alone. Although *Urwind* is hardly an unalloyed class fiction, its journey into thought, as Brian Kennedy's chapter underlines, is class-inflected if not class intended, and also features major struggles that are obstinately cerebral rather than practical. Yet this reveals a common attraction of the novel as genre: that writing/voicing cheats our social checklists. Daniel continually sidesteps the category divisions of life even though the extent of his reflections tends to confirm so many (especially, as Kennedy points out, about ageing). I read this as also part of the dialogic struggle of the text, both in its stylistic relationship to modernism, but also, more profoundly, in its belief that living a life entails a responsibility to voice it. Just as Bakhtin's thoughts on chronotope are an invitation to invent more scales of time/space, so Carpelan's *Urwind* asks us to stretch the ways in which a life is measured, which is simultaneously a comment on the limits of the novel and now, in this collection, a critique of the grounds of comparison in such endeavor.

WORKS CITED

- Bakhtin, Mikhail (1984) *Problems of Dostoevsky's Poetics*. Ed. and trans. Caryl Emerson. Minneapolis: U of Minneapolis P.
- Clarke, Katerina and Michael Holquist (1984) *Mikhail Bakhtin*. Cambridge MA: Harvard UP.
- Hirshkop, Ken (2000) *Mikhail Bakhtin: An Aesthetic for Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Holquist, Michael (1990) *Dialogism*. London: Routledge, 1990.
- Jameson, Fredric (2013) *A Singular Modernity*. New York: Verso.
- Macherey, Pierre (2006) *A Theory of Literary Production*. Trans. Geoffrey Wall. London: Routledge.

AUTHOR NOTES

Peter Hitchcock, PhD

Peter Hitchcock is a Professor of English at Baruch College and the Graduate Center of the City University of New York. He is also Associate Director of the Center for Place, Culture and Politics at the GC. His books include *Dialogics of the Oppressed*, *Oscillate Wildly*, *Imaginary States*, *The Long Space*, and *Labor in Culture*. He has also co-edited *The New Public Intellectual* and another anthology on *The Debt Age*. He has contributed to the journals *Dialogism*, the *Bakhtin Newsletter*, and *Dialog/Carnival/Kronotop* as well as several anthologies on the work of Mikhail Bakhtin. His latest article is “Worlds of Americana” for a collection on American literature as world literature. His next book is on Postcoloniality and the State.

Roger Holmström, PhD

Dr. Roger Holmström (†2016) was Lecturer in literary studies at Åbo Akademi from 1978 to his retirement in 2012. For long periods, he acted as the Chair of the discipline, and in the early 1990s he was visiting professor in Scandinavian literature at the University of Washington, Seattle. He was the chairman of the section of literary studies in the Society of Swedish Literature in Finland from 1992 to 1998, and he also chaired the literary *Runebergsällskapet i Åbo* for a long time. For more than a decade he belonged to the editorial board of *Finsk tidskrift*, and he was the editor of several books. In his research, one of his concerns was the literary descriptions of ordinary life and customs, but his main topics were the practice and history of literary book reviewing as part of Finland-Swedish culture, and modernism in Finland-Swedish literature. His most important works on the latter were a two-volume biography of Hagar Olsson and the book *Vindfartsvägar*, a treatise on Bo Carpelan's novel *Urwind*.

Nanny Jolma

Nanny Jolma is a Doctoral Researcher in Literary Studies at Tampere University, Finland. She started to explore the world of Bo Carpelan's fiction as early as her Master's thesis. Currently Jolma is working on the summary of her article-based dissertation on experiencing and remembering the past in Carpelan's novels. She is interested in first-person narratives, memory, and Finland-Swedish literature. Her publications include articles on the grotesque, archival metaphor, and nostalgia.

Pauli Tapani Karjalainen

Pauli Tapani Karjalainen is Professor Emeritus of Human Geography at the University of Oulu, Northern Finland. In the mid-70s he started as an economic geographer, but rather soon realized the abstract emptiness of regional economic models. He then became interested in the philosophies of human existence, which led him to geography's humanistic methodologies. He went on to study the meaningful human natures of spatial life only to understand that the spatial dimension needs to be tied up with the temporal dimension. Hereby he has been able to create concepts such as topobiography, place memory, perception position, and narrative position, all these at least partially explaining the individual processes making up the human identity. Of this kind of topic, he has published numerous studies in Finnish, English, and Swedish.

Brian Kennedy, PhD

Brian Kennedy is Professor of English at Pasadena City College, where he teaches British and post-colonial literature and writing courses. Dr. Kennedy is Canadian, and his publications include the best-selling work of creative nonfiction *Growing Up Hockey* as well as his most recent book, *Mixing Memory and Desire: Why*

Literature Can't Forget the Great War, a critical study of contemporary literature on World War One. He also wrote an examination of the place of hockey in Canadian culture called *My Country Is Hockey*. He is the author or editor of nine books and numerous articles on Bakhtin, contemporary British and Commonwealth literature, and pedagogy.

Catherine Maloney

Catherine Maloney is a PhD candidate in the Philosophy Department at York University in Toronto, as well as the Manager, Intercultural Initiatives and Learning Strategy, at the Centre for International Experience, University of Toronto. She earned her MA in philosophy at University College Dublin and her BA in English and Philosophy at the University of Toronto. Coming out of both feminist epistemological and continental philosophical traditions, her work explores dialogism as a mode of understanding across difference. At the Centre for International Experience, she designed and leads experiential intercultural learning programs for both undergraduate and graduate students.

Stephen Souris, PhD

Stephen Souris is Professor of English at Texas Woman's University, which he joined in 1992. He earned his Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin-Madison, his M.A. from the University of Michigan, and his B.A. from Harvard College (all degrees were in English and American literature and language). He is an Americanist specializing in modern American literature as well as literary theory with numerous publications and conference presentations in those fields. He teaches entirely online and was one of the first professors at TWU to teach online using podcasts. He serves as the producer of a monthly literary discussion group at the Denton Pub-

lic Library (“Professor’s Corner”) and as the host of Texas Poets Podcast (TexasPoetsPodcast.com). He lives near Dallas and sails with his wife and kids on Lake Ray Roberts.

Erkki Vainikkala, PhD

Erkki Vainikkala is emeritus professor of contemporary cultural studies at the University of Jyväskylä, where he started in the Department of Literature in the late 1970s. He earned his Ph.D. in contemporary cultural studies from the University of Jyväskylä, his M.A. in comparative literature at the same university, and his M.A. in English and American literature at the University of California, San Diego. He has been chairperson of the Society for Cultural Studies in Finland, member of the editorial board of the journal *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, and Editor of the series *Nykykulttuuri* (Publications of the Research Centre for Contemporary Culture, University of Jyväskylä). He has published in the areas of cultural theory, reception research, narrative theory, and ideological discourse, lately in the context of populism. He has translated fiction and nonfiction from English and German into Finnish.

NYKYKULTTUURIN TUTKIMUSKESKUKSEN JULKAISUJA

1. Symbolit • Toim. Katarina Eskola. 1986. (110 s.)
2. Maaria Linko • Katsojien teatteri. 1986. (116 s.)
3. Näkökulmia kulttuurin tuotantoon • Toim. Katarina Eskola & Liisa Uusitalo. 1986. (127 s.)
4. Kimmo Jokinen ja Maaria Linko • Uusi Tuntematon. 1987. (122 s.)
5. Kimmo Jokinen • Ostajat, lukijat, arvioijat, tukijat. 1987. (115 s.)
6. Juha Lassila • Kultalevyn alkemia. 1. painos 1987, 2. painos 1988. (162 s.)
7. Liisa Uusitalo & Juha Lassila • Vanhojen kirjojen kenttä. 1988. (65 s.)
8. The production and reception of literature • Edited by Katarina Eskola & Erkki Vainikkala. 1988. (78 s.)
9. Martine Burgos • Life stories, Narrativity and the Search for the Self. 1988. (28 s.)
10. Heikki Hellman & Tuomo Sauri • Suomalainen prime-time. 1988. (130 s.)
11. Erik Allardt, Stuart Hall & Immanuel Wallerstein • Maailmankulttuurin äärellä. 1988. (86 s.)
12. Kimmo Jokinen • Arvostelijat. 1988. (131 s.)
13. State, Culture & The Bourgeoisie • Edited by Matti Peltonen. 1989. (82 s.)
14. J.P. Roos • Liikunta ja elämäntapa. 1989. (72 s.)
15. Anne Brunila & Liisa Uusitalo • Kirjatuotannon rakenne ja strategiat. 1. painos 1989, 2. painos 1991. (114 s.)
16. Reino Rasilainen • Julkaistu ja julkaisematon kirjallisuus. 1989. (89 s.)
17. Juha Lassila • Riippumattomat televisiotuottajat. 1989. (126 s.)
18. Literature as communication • Edited by Erkki Vainikkala & Katarina Eskola. 1989. (215 s.)
19. Anne Raassina • Lukutaito ja kehitysstrategiat. 1990. (123 s.)
20. Juha Lassila • Mitä Suomi soittaa? 1990. (263 s.) Painos loppunut.
21. Johanna Mäkelä • Luonnosta kulttuuriksi, ravinnosta ruoaksi. 1. painos 1990, 2. painos 1992 (89 s.) Painokset loppuneet.
22. Sublim Ylevä sublime • Toim. Erkki Vainikkala. 1990. (107 s.)
23. Timo K. Salonen • Konserttimusiikin yleisö makujen kentällä. 1990. (104 s.)

24. Maaria Linko • Teatteriesitykset ja julkisuus. 1990. (81 s.)
25. Kyösti Pekonen • Symbolinen modernissa politiikassa. 1991. (154 s.)
26. Ulrich Beck, Klaus Mollenhauer & Wolfgang Welsch • Philosophie, soziologie und erziehungswissenschaft in der postmoderne. 1991. (69 s.)
27. Päivi Elovainio & Zeinab Shahin • The Gender Fate of Women in Rural Egypt. 1991. (112 s.)
28. Eija Eskola • Rukousnauha ja muita romaaneja. 1992. (152 s.)
29. Urpo Kovala • Väliin lankeaa varjo. 1992. (204 s.)
30. Maaria Linko • Outo ja aito taide. 1992. (121 s.)
31. The First Thirty • Edited by Urpo Kovala. 1992. (132 s.)
32. Vanguard of modernity • Edited by Niilo Kauppi & Pekka Sulkunen. 1992. (188 s.)
33. Timo Siivonen • Avantgarde ja postmodernismi. 1992. (122 s.)
34. Katarina Eskola, Kimmo Jokinen & Erkki Vainikkala • Literature and the New State of Culture. 1992. (60 s.)
35. Sanna Karttunen • Musiikki kulttuurisessa tietoisuudessa. 1992. (174 s.)
36. Risto Eräsaari • Essays on Non-conventional Community. 1993. (214 s.)
37. Annikka Suoninen • Televisio lasten elämässä. 1993. (171 s.)
38. The Cultural Study of Reception • Edited by Erkki Vainikkala. 1993. (215 s.)
39. Mieheden tiellä • Toim. Pirjo Ahokas, Martti Lahti ja Jukka Sihvonen. 1993. (185 s.) Painos loppunut.
40. Jukka Kanerva • ”Ryvettymisen hyvä puoli...” 1994. (151 s.)
41. Uusi aika • Toim. ja kirj. Nykyculttuurin tutkimusyksikön tutkijat. 1994. (260 s.)
42. Tuija Modinos • Nainen populaarikulttuurissa. 1. painos 1994, 2. painos 2000. (124 s.) Painos loppunut.
43. Teija Virta • Saippuoopperat ja suomalaiset naiset. 1994. (135 s.)
44. Anne Sankari • Kuntosaliruumis. 1995. (108 s.)
45. Kai Halttunen • Pienkustantajan arkipäivä. 1995. (95 s.)
46. Katja Valaskivi • Wataru seken wa oni bakari. 1995. (114 s.)
47. Jukka Törrönen • Aito rakkaus maskuliinisessa maailmassa. 1996. (100 s.)
48. Tuija Nykyri • Naiseuden naamiaiset. 1996. (144 s.)

49. Nainen, mies ja fileerausveitsi • Toim. Katarina Eskola. 1996. (274 s.)
Painos loppunut.
50. Raine Koskimaa • Cultural activities in five European countries. 1996.
(152 s.) Työraportti, vain tutkimuskäyttöön.
52. Raine Koskimaa • Seksiä, suhteita ja murha. 1998. (215 s.)
53. Timo Siivonen • Kyborgi. 1996. (209 s.)
54. Aina uusi muisto • Toim. Katarina Eskola & Eeva Peltonen. 1. painos
1997, 2. painos 1997. (355 s.)
55. Olli Löytty • Valkoinen pimeys. 1997. (147 s.)
56. Kimmo Jokinen • Suomalaisen lukemisen maisemaihanteet. 1997. (226 s.)
57. Maaria Linko • Aitojen elämysten kaipuu. 1998. (92 s.)
58. Kai Lahtinen • Vem tillhör teatern? 1998. (258 s.)
59. Katja Möttönen • Riitasointuja vai tema con variazioni. 1998. (128 s.)
60. Aki Järvinen • Hyperteoria. 1999. (187 s.)
61. Susanna Paasonen • Nyt! Ja ikuisesti – rewind. 1999. (188 s.)
62. Pirkkoliisa Ahponen • Kulttuurin kierreportaikossa. 1999. (168 s.)
63. Reading cultural difference • Edited by Urpo Kovala & Erkki Vainikkala.
2000. (334 s.)
64. Inescapable Horizon: Culture and Context • Edited by Sirpa Leppänen
& Joel Kuortti. 2000. (273 s.)
65. Otteita kulttuurista • Toim. Maaria Linko, Tuija Saresma & Erkki
Vainikkala. 2000. (422 s.)
66. Kimmo Saaristo • Avoin asiantuntijuus. 2000. (191 s.)
67. Jaakko Suominen • Sähköaivo sinuiksi, tietokone tutuksi. 2000. (368 s.)
68. Cybertext yearbook 2000 • Toim. Markku Eskelinen & Raine Koskimaa.
2001. (202 s.)
69. Sari Charpentier • Sukupuoliusko. 2001. (155 s.)
70. Kirja 2010 • Toim. Lauri Saarinen, Juri Joensuu & Raine Koskimaa. 1.
painos 2001, 2. painos 2003. (259 s.)
71. Irma Garam • Julkista yksityiselämää. 2002. (102 s.)
72. Cybertext yearbook 2001 • Toim. Markku Eskelinen & Raine Koskimaa.
2002. (196 s.)
73. Henna Mikkola • Sukupolvettomat? 2002. (138 s.)
74. Satu Silvanto • Ecce Homo – katso ihmistä. 2002. (161 s.)
75. Markku Eskelinen • Kybertekstien narratologia. 2002. (106 s.)

76. Riitta Hänninen • Leikki. 2003. (161 s.)
77. Cybertext yearbook 2002–2003 • Toim. Markku Eskelinen & Raine Koskimaa. 2003. (283 s.)
78. Sanna Kallioinen • Rannalla merirosvon morsiamen kanssa. 2004. (134 s.)
79. Tutkija kertojana • Toim. Johanna Latvala & Eeva Peltonen & Tuija Saresma. 1. painos 2004, 2. painos 2005. (399 s.)
80. Writing and Research – personal views. Toim. Marjatta Saarnivaara & Erkki Vainikkala & Marjon van Delft. 1. painos 2004, 2. painos 2005. (160 s.)
81. Annikka Suoninen • Mediakielitaidon jäljillä. 2004. (274 s.)
82. Milla Tiainen • Säveltäjän sijainnit. 2005. (227 s.)
83. Petri Saarikoski • Koneen lumo. 1. painos 2004, 2. painos 2005. (471 s.)
84. Yksinäisten sanat • Toim. Kimmo Jokinen. 2005. (314 s.)
85. Aktivismi • Toim. Susanna Paasonen. 2005 (275 s.)
86. Nykyaika kulttuurintutkimuksessa • Toim. Erkki Vainikkala & Henna Mikkola. 2007. (351 s.)
87. Tutkimusten maailma • Toim. Juha Herkman & Pirjo Hiidenmaa & Sanna Kivimäki & Olli Löytty. 2006. (307 s.)
88. Mari Pajala • Erot järjestykseen! 2006. (506 s.)
89. Hanna Lindberg • Vastakohtien Ikea. 2006. (307 s.)
90. Taiteilija tutkijana, tutkija taiteilijana • Toim. Risto Pitkänen. 2007. (326 s.)
91. Nykytulkintojen Karjala • Toim. Outi Fingerroos & Jaana Loipponen. 2007. (325 s.)
92. Tuija Saresma • Omaelämäkerran rajapinnoilla. 2007. (255 s.)
93. Tekijyyden ulottuvuuksia • Toim. Eeva Haverinen & Erkki Vainikkala & Tuomo Lahdelma. 2008. (314 s.)
94. Tuuli Lähdesmäki • ”Kuohahdus Suomen kansan sydäimestä.” 2007. (607 s.)
95. Moniääninen mies • Toim. Kai Åberg & Lotta Skaffari. 2008. (276 s.)
96. Fanikirja • Toim. Kaarina Nikunen. 2008. (241 s.)
97. Cult, Community, Identity • Veera Rautavuoma, Urpo Kovala & Eeva Haverinen (eds). 2009. (356 s.)
98. Irma Hirsjärvi • Faniuden siirtymiä. 2009. (361 s.)
99. Suhteissa mediaan • Toim. Sirkku Kotilainen. 2009. (247 s.)
100. Outi Fingerroos • Karjala utopiana. 2010. (253 s.)

101. Hiihto ja häpeä • Toim. Erkki Vettenniemi. 2010. (224 s.)
102. Karoliina Lummaa • Poliittinen siivekäs. 2010. (372 s.)
103. Matti Savolainen • Atlantin ylityksiä. 2011. (170 s.)
104. Eliisa Pitkäsalo • Kalevalaiset sankarit nykymaailman menossa. (Digitaalinen kirja.) 2011. (274 s.)
105. Nina Säaskilahti • Ajan partaalla. 2011. (400 s.)
106. Media, kasvatusta ja kulttuurin kierto • Toim. Sirkku Kotilainen, Erkki Vainikkala & Urpo Kovala. (Digitaalinen kirja.) 2011. (184 s.)
107. Kertomuksen luonto • Toim. Kaisa Kurikka, Olli Löytty, Kukku Melkas & Viola Parente-Capkova. 2012. (308 s.)
108. Tango Suomessa • Toim. Antti-Ville Kärjä & Kai Åberg. 2012. (230 s.)
109. Tommi Römpötti • Vieraana omassa maassa. 2012. (528 s.)
110. Marjo Kamila • Katsojana ja katsottuna. 2012. (490 s.)
111. Katja Mäkinen • Ohjelmoidut eurooppalaiset. 2012. (352 s.)
112. Ilana Aalto • Isyyden aika. 2012. (380 s.)
113. Kustaa H. J. Vilkkunen • Kapina kampuksella. 2013. (466 s.)
114. Mikko Carlson • Paikantuneita haluja. 2014. (352 s.)
115. Maisemassa • Toim. Tuija Saresma & Saara Jäntti. 2014. (292 s.)
116. Sami Kolamo • FIFAn valtapeli. 2014. (304 s.)
117. Liisa Avelin • Kåren kellari. 2014. (628 s.)
118. Prekarisaatio ja affekti • Toim. Eeva Jokinen & Juhana Venäläinen. 2015. (230 s.)
119. Sari Östman • ”Millä tavalla päivittyminen tästä saisi?” Elämäjulkaisijuuuden kulttuurinen omaksuminen. 2015. (308 s.)
120. Elämykset kulttuurina ja kulttuuri elämyksinä • Toim. Sanna Karkulehto & Tuuli Lähdesmäki & Juhana Venäläinen. 2016. (390 s.)
121. Maamme romaani • Toim. Jussi Ojajarvi & Nina Työlähti. 2017. (354 s.)
122. Populism On The Loose • Edited by Urpo Kovala & Emilia Palonen & Maria Ruotsalainen & Tuija Saresma. 2018. (276 s.)
123. Heidi Keinonen: Televisioformaatti ja kulttuurinen neuvottelu. 2018. (242 s.)
124. Jere Kyyrö • Mannerheim ja muuttuvat tulkinnat. 2019. (406 s.)
125. Hulluus ja kulttuurinen mielenterveystutkimus • Toim. Saara Jäntti & Kirsi Heimonen & Sari Kuuva & Annastiina Mäkilä. 2019. (354 s.)
126. Voicing Bo Carpelan. Urwind's Dialogic Possibilities • Edited by Brian Kennedy. 2020. (212 s.)
127. Heta Lähdesmäki • Susien paikat. 2020. (506 s.)

