Reforming Oral Tradition by Elias Lönnrot and Otto Manninen : Nineteenth-century Textual Processes, Textualization, and Genetic Criticism

Hämäläinen, Niina

Indiana University Press
2023-12

Hämäläinen, N & Karhu, H 2023, 'Reforming Oral Tradition by Elias Lönnrot and Otto Manninen : Nineteenth-century Textual Processes, Textualization, and Genetic Criticism', Textual cultures, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 74-105. https://doi.org/10.14434/tc.v16i2.36766

http://hdl.handle.net/10138/569138
10.14434/tc.v16i2.36766

Reforming Oral Tradition by Elias Lönnrot and Otto Manninen

Nineteenth-century Textual Processes, Textualization, and Genetic Criticism

Niina Hämäläinen and Hanna Karhu

Abstract

Collecting, editing, publishing, and re-writing folklore was an essential part of Romanticism and Romantic Nationalism. The increased interest in folklore and oral poetry was related to the aim of creating elite cultures and literatures. In this process, questions such as what was included in the folklore publications and literature, and what was ignored and hidden are of importance. The focus of this article is on the methods of textualization and genetic criticism used in the study of the making of national heritage and literature in nineteenth-century Finland. Textualization theory emphasizes the practical-technical process whereby oral/written texts are transformed, interpreted, represented, and published, whereas genetic criticism focuses on the study of writing processes of literary works in the context of e.g. linguistic and aesthetic analysis. However, these two approaches deal with similar questions concerning textual processes and variants involved in text-making, particularly variation in the process of creating a nationally-recognized literature.

En mie sen vuoks laulele että heliä on ääni
Laulelen huvitukseksen, tuli heiliä ikäväni
suurta
Laululla mina laimentelen ~~ainaista~~ ikavääni

I don't sing because my voice is so melodious
I sing to entertain myself because I miss my sweetheart
huge
With singing I try to weaken my ~~everlasting~~ longing
— Poet Otto Manninen's rewriting of a folk song from the 1890s.
(A1908, Otto Manninen's archive, SKS.)

Textual Cultures 16.2 (2023): 74–105. DOI 10.14434/tc.v16i2.36766

Writing and editing are always processes in which some textual elements remain while others disappear and still others are rewritten or changed. In studying variants, it is possible to construe something about the genesis and transformation of texts. In this article we look at this phenomenon in the context of folklore and literature and propose guidelines for studying and analyzing the making of folklore publications and literature alluding to oral tradition in nineteenth-century Finland. The analysis reveals how, and on what principles, oral material has been transformed into written material. As illustrated in the above extract from a manuscript by the Finnish poet Otto Manninen (1872–1950), the analysis of different written versions of a work can demonstrate the ways an author modified a folk song text in the writing process. Even small changes to words can profoundly affect the essence of poetic texts, transforming vernacular expression into culturally valued "high literature".

This article[1] draws on the international scholarly discussion of oral and written cultures and their overlapping relationship (Perraudin & Cambell 2017; Bak et al 2015; Kuismin & Driscoll 2013; Baycroft & Hopkin 2012; Leerssen 2008). Our knowledge of oral cultural heritage is based on written documentations or literary representations even though the collected material transcribed directly from the oral tradition and oral sources has generally been regarded as exhibiting the most authentic part of culture or heritage. Images of folklore come from selected written presentations of that material, e.g., the *Kalevala* (1849) and other folklore publications, produced by the educated elite (Kuutma 2006, 15; Anttonen 2012, 325). Literature participated in this project by alluding to folklore in different literary genres (lyric, prose, and drama), e.g., meters and formulas of oral tradition used in poetry, proverbs and fairy tales, and folk songs sung in plays. All these utilizations of folklore in literature were based on certain opinions about the value of the oral tradition and on perceptions about how folklore should be used in literature.

Collecting, editing, publishing, and rewriting folklore into literature was a transnational process in the nineteenth century, and it can be categorized as being a part of Romanticism, nationalism, and a wider interest in folklore in art and research (Perraudin & Campbell 2017; Leerssen 2012). Even though oral and written cultural transmission is by no means only a nineteenth-century phenomenon (see e.g., Kallio et al

1. This article is a part of the research project "The muted muses of oral culture. Ideology, transnationalism and silenced sources in the making of national heritages and literatures", 2019–2023, Academy of Finland.

2017), it increasingly emerged during that century, particularly after Romantic ideas of folk and poetry were introduced by J. G. Herder and James Macpherson's *Songs of Ossian* (1760). Similarly in Finland, due to a rising sense of national identity, language, and history, the social elite[2] sought authentic and appropriate elements of the past in unlettered people and their vernacular culture, especially oral poetry (Anttonen 2012, 333).

The historical material used in this article consists of an early folklore-based publication, the *Kalevala*, the national epic of Finland (1849), and Finnish late nineteenth-century art poetry displaying the textual elements of rhymed folk songs. There were two main poetic registers in the oral tradition in nineteenth-century Finland and Karelia. Poetry in archaic tetrameter, known as Kalevala-meter, as it was named after the *Kalevala*, was widely sung in Karelia, on the borderlands of Finland and Russia, as well as in Finland.[3] Rhymed folk poetry, associated with extemporaneity and recklessness (Hämäläinen & Karhu 2021), entered oral poetry late and gradually replaced Kalevala-meter poetry during the nineteenth century (Sykäri 2022, 173). Elias Lönnrot (1802–1884), who edited oral folk poems into the *Kalevala*, and his fellow collectors regarded old epic songs sung in Kalevala-meter as the most valuable. Old songs were also seen as threatened by modernization and extinction, and collectors were in a hurry to write them down. The documentation history of Kalevala-meter poetry and the *Kalevala* itself is rich and thick. By 1848, when Elias Lönnrot finalized the long version of the *Kalevala*, he had approximately nine thousand transcribed text variants as a source for the epic, including other lyric poetry, charms, wedding songs, and proverbs.[4]

For a long time, researchers neglected the rhymed folk songs sung widely in dances and gatherings of young people. To date, with the exception of

2. By the term *elite*, we refer to a group of educated men who were enthusiastic about Finnish language and culture. Many of them had modest backgrounds, but by education and social relations they received higher status in society. The elite is contrasted to the peasantry, often non- or self-educated and illiterate, who formed multi-layered peasant-based communities largely in the countryside. (See e.g. Kuismin & Driscoll 2013.)
3. The Kalevala-meter has been used among Karelians, Finns, Ingrians, and Estonians as well as Seto and Votic people. In nineteenth-century Finland, the most prominent area of the Kalevala-meter poetry was situated at the border of Finland and Russia.
4. Most of the transcribed Kalevala-meter folk poems are published in the series *Suomen Kansan Vanhat Runot* / *The Ancient Poems of Finnish People* (1908–1948, 1997), also available online: https://skvr.fi.

some unfinished projects on rhymed folk songs, no proper publication of these works exists.[5] In the nineteenth century and far into the twentieth century, most of the cultural elite defined rhymed folk songs as too modern and morally questionable, and therefore, unsuitable folklore, and this is one of the reasons for excluding rhymed songs from the canon of Finnish cultural heritage (Hämäläinen & Karhu 2021). Although new interest in this oral genre emerged in the 1980s (see e.g., Asplund 1981; Laitinen 2003; Sykäri 2022), the body of research is still much narrower than that on Kalevala-meter poetry.[6]

In this article, the focus is on those textual and writing practices of folklore-based publications and literature of the long nineteenth century that derived from the modernization of culture and society. As a Grand Duchy under Russian rule, the region later named Finland had Swedish as a main language of administration, education, and literature until 1863. Spoken mostly by the peasants, Finnish had no official status in the first half of the century, and Finnish written culture was still developing by 1900. However, as Finland's national school system stabilized — a process set by 1866 — and learned peasants engaged in diverse writing and publishing practices, new media, e.g., journals, literature, and diverse folklore collections, multiplied. Referring to ideas first proposed by Benedict Anderson, Finnish music researcher Vesa Kurkela points out that print culture impacted a nation-state by carrying an implicit notion of shared national identity, language, and culture (Kurkela 2012, 355–56; Anderson 2006, 76–82; Baycroft 2012, 3–5). Printed items became widely available and created new audiences that suddenly had a voice to express their views of social and cultural life. Editing folklore texts for publication strongly determined collective perceptions of Finnish language and culture; literature alluding to folklore also engaged in this project.[7]

The text-making processes and practices of the nineteenth century have already been investigated in the context of textual scholarship and nation-building, where the focus has been on how published text served

5. For example, Elias Lönnrot planned to publish a pamphlet of rhymed folk songs, but did not, probably because of other writing commitments, such as the *Kalevala* (Hämäläinen & Karhu 2021).
6. This is the case despite the vast material of rhymed songs preserved in the archives.
7. Both text-making projects also carried transnational ideas. Instead of concentrating on national or countrywide practices, the transnational perspective considers different phenomena as part of wider cultural and social connections and transactions (Wimmer & Glick Schiller 2003).

as a nationalistic endeavor to mold the nation's memory and how nation-building and textual scholarship intermingled in the long nineteenth century (Hulle & Leerssen 2008; Baycroft & Hopkin 2012). In respect to the historical background, we discuss how certain textually-oriented fields of literary criticism and folklore studies can offer new insights into the ways oral cultural heritage was tangibly shaped in writing for different literary and textual purposes. We shall concentrate on two textual methods used in literary and folklore studies, *genetic criticism* and *textualization*, both of which investigate questions of processes and textual variants involved in text-making. Both methods are used to study different versions of the same text and to explore textual variance, and through these methods, we can investigate the following questions: What features of folklore were considered valuable, or, conversely, unsuitable for purposes of written presentations? And with what textual interventions was oral folklore textualized and used for artistic purposes? The methods can be categorized as disciplines of textual scholarship, which is an umbrella concept for distinct approaches that show an interest in the genesis of literary works and textual variation (e.g., Katajamäki & Lukin 2013, 8; Greetham 2007). Variation in processes of forming oral-derived literary texts is the key concept of our article. We ask how variation between different versions can be studied, what can be said about the rewriting and revision processes in which the texts have been transformed from oral works into written works, and what the analysis of variation reveals about the cultural and aesthetic values of the long nineteenth century.

Methods of folklore studies dealing with documentation of historical sources (writing down the oral performance and editing collections from these texts) are closely connected to the questions asked in textual scholarship (Katajamäki & Lukin 2013, 8–9; see also Kuutma 2006, 20–21). As this article emphasizes, textualization within folklore studies offers an especially rich and thick perspective on the processes and practices of writing down, editing, and representing oral sources in the context of written literature (see Honko 2000b). The textualization method asks what has been included; what has been excluded and silenced; to what extent an editor has changed the linguistic, poetic, and textual elements of oral poetry; and how the products were assessed (Bauman & Briggs 1990; 2003). Usually, textualization analysis compares oral text variants and/or the versions of written publications based on them with editors' versions and manuscripts. Genetic analysis of archival materials, such as notes, drafts, and transcriptions of oral folklore, can reveal the selection and rewriting processes by which oral texts were transformed

into written literature. The analysis of writing processes leads us to ask the same questions as the examination of textualization methods: what kind of folklore was included or excluded, and to what extent did the writer change linguistic or poetic elements of oral poetry when drafting new textual entities into written literature? In this article the possibilities of the genetic approach are explored through the analysis of the archival materials of Otto Manninen, who wrote art poetry alluding to rhymed folk songs.

An interdisciplinary approach, combining textualization and genetic criticism, enables new insights into the phenomenon in which oral folklore expression was shaped, utilized, and selected for diverse literary, aesthetic, and textual purposes. However, there are some differences between these approaches. As a comparison of oral and written texts strongly involving oral source material, textualization is mainly used in folklore studies and linguistic anthropology, and the method is not well known in literary studies, which usually defines textualization purely as writing. Genetic criticism encompasses diverse disciplines that investigate the formation processes of creative works, also mainly conducted in writing. Folklore materials/texts have still been only narrowly studied among the geneticists (see however Joosen et al 2019). Prior to this article these two methods have not been concurrently applied by scholars (exp. Hämäläinen & Karhu 2019).

Editor Elias Lönnrot and Poet Otto Manninen

This article focuses on the writings of two individuals who lived and worked in the long nineteenth century: district doctor, public educator, collector, and publisher of oral folk poetry Elias Lönnrot (1802–1884) and poet and translator Otto Manninen (1872–1950). Elias Lönnrot is famous for the *Kalevala*, based on oral folk poetry collected and transcribed by himself and his fellow collectors in the field, but created, molded, and interpreted in written form by him alone. Elias Lönnrot grew up in modest circumstances but through education became part of the social elite. He was Finnish-speaking by background and learned Swedish in school. As a district doctor, Lönnrot gained a deep understanding of the Finnish-Karelian speaking peasants, their customs, and their beliefs. Gathering epic songs of male heroes at the border of Finland and Russia and having an example of long epic songs sung in Viena Karelia by his fellow collector Zacharias Topelius, Lönnrot started to think of an extended narrative that could combine different kinds of oral folk songs in one literary entity.

Lönnrot's first smaller anthologies of folk poetry, *Kantele* (I–IV), were published between 1829 and 1831, and the first version of the *Kalevala* (known as the *Proto-Kalevala*) was completed in 1833.

The aim of Lönnrot's textual editing was to unite diverse Finnish and Karelian oral poetry into a single literary entity and thus to raise the value of the tradition and the Finnish language to a shared national level. Lönnrot's textual practices were at least twofold. First, he aimed at authentic epic representation of oral sources by carefully following oral poetry documents and singers. In line with the methods of oral singers, Lönnrot described his method as, if necessary, combining lines of oral poems with his own: "In singing good singers are a little bit hesitant if they are not managing to remember a poem word by word, but still, are singing a piece of the poem totally forgotten by using their own words" (Borenius & Krohn 1895, 2–3). Furthermore, contemporary readers had expectations that Lönnrot aimed to meet in his textualization, e.g., to make oral songs readable and to polish the language and content of oral poetry. In creating a nationally shared knowledge of Finland's past for an educated, largely Swedish-speaking nineteenth-century elite, written representations, such as the *Kalevala*, were made in ways that addressed the needs of readers. The consciousness of modernity embedded in the written publications of oral tradition still affects our comprehension of the Finnish tradition and heritage (see Bendix 1997; Anttonen 2012, 346–47).

For Finnish writers at the turn of the twentieth century, folklore was a common source of inspiration. Writers were inspired by Karelianism, or interest in the Karelian spirit and the *Kalevala* in Finnish arts and music. Many of them traveled to Karelia to experience the sense of the *Kalevala* and its oral poems and singers. Poets were especially interested in rhymed folk songs, a popular form of traditional singing of the era (Karhu 2021). Alluding to folk songs in written poetry was a nationalistic phenomenon in which literature sought the inspirations of folk songs, as well as a transnational phenomenon taken up by poets across Europe (e.g., Akimova 2007).

Otto Manninen is an important figure in the history of Finnish literature, even though he published only four books of poetry (1905, 1910, 1925, and 1938) during his lifetime. His first collection of *Säkeitä* (Verses) appeared in 1905 and the second, *Säkeitä. Toinen sarja*, in 1910. Manninen was also a notable translator of poetry. He published only a few poems that distinctly refer to rhymed folk songs by obeying their meter and other formalistic features, but more implicit references to the folk song tradition are found throughout his oeuvre. Manninen's use of folklore is not well

known, and in certain cases it is noticeable only through familiarity with Manninen's archive, held in the Archives of the Finnish Literature Society (SKS), which include transcriptions of folk songs and their rewritings (Karhu 2019b; Lyly 1983). Manninen's first collections are best known for their symbolist features (Rantavaara 1984, 600; Karhu 2012), and in the context of literary symbolism, it is important to note that the French symbolist movement was also inspired by folk songs (Bénichou 1970; Akimova 2007).

Like Lönnrot, Manninen had original notes of folklore in his possession. He did not gather folklore but read and observed the notes on oral songs with great interest. However, as a poet, Manninen had a different approach to altering folklore material. Manninen did not have to consider questions of authenticity, the proper image of folklore sources, or the expectations of readers in the same way as Lönnrot. He could use the material more freely and alter folk songs according to his ideas on aesthetics and poetry (Hämäläinen & Karhu 2019).

Textualization in Practice: The Case of Folklore

Textualization is a methodological research tool to investigate the use of folklore material on a diverse textual, written level. By textualization we here refer to conscious objectives and intentions relating to the process of making folklore into literary productions (Honko 2000a; Bauman & Briggs 2003; Seitel 2012; Hämäläinen 2014; 2012).[8] Questions such as what parts of oral sources are included or excluded, what role removals have in the text-making process, and what other routes textualization could have taken are crucial. In this research, textualization is not a transcription or translation of folklore into literary form,[9] but an interpretative and ideological process of mediating oral tradition for a wider readership.

8. For other concepts of textualization, e.g., in oral performance, see Bauman & Briggs 1990; Reichl 2000; Bauman & Briggs 2003. See also Silverstein & Urban 1996; Foley 2000; Marques 2010.
9. Textualization can also be seen as starting at the very moment of writing down an oral song. Folklore notes might have been rewritten several times before they were sent to archives and can be studied as text-making practices. The stages of the writing process can deepen our understanding of textualization practices. For example, a collector's own aesthetics and general appreciations of the time influence the process (see Karhu 2019a).

As a form of representation, textualization can be regarded both as practical and ideological (see Anttonen 2012, 325; Bauman & Briggs 2003, 15; Kuutma 2006, 21). While a text is defined as a shared cluster of cultural concepts (Silverstein & Urban 1996, 1–2), textualization is a cultural process that enables change, adaptation, and interpretation of texts (Urban 1996, 21). In this process, both traditional and modern demands are referred to and adhered to (see Foley 1995; 2000; Seitel 2012). In oral culture, the understanding of a performance by the audience is dependent on a shared register and knowledge of that tradition (Hanks 1989), whereas in textualization, referential features do not only, or necessarily, concern the traditional features, but also include elements of modern culture (see Anttonen 2012, 343; Honko 2000a, 5, 20–21). It is common for readers of the textual representations to define the edited publication as inadequate or misrepresenting the oral tradition on which it is based (e.g., Foley 2000, 74). This is also the case for the *Kalevala*.[10] John Miles Foley (ibid. 72–6) has addressed the audience horizon of expectation in the textualization of oral tradition into written form. Therefore, textualization (of the *Kalevala*) can also be defined as negotiating and articulating the textual and written representations as the editor strives to balance traditional and modern demands.

The interest in textualization in Finnish folkloristics arises from international research on epics and is heralded by Lauri Honko (e.g., Honko 1999; 1990). Honko called Lönnrot a singing scribe and the *Kalevala* a tradition-oriented epic that has its roots in the oral poetry tradition but that is rebuilt in written form. After finding an epic singer from India (Gopala Naika), Honko (1998) started to examine the composition of the sung oral epic by concentrating on its poetic sections (e.g., formulas, multiforms). Honko's understanding of textualization was based on an oral composition method created by Milman Parry and Albert Lord. Oral-formulaic theory strives to understand how oral poetry and its formulaic language are transmitted by singers and how specific formulas support memorization (see Foley 2000).

Building upon and significantly furthering Honko's vision, Lönnrot's representational work on oral folk poetry has been studied as an editorial and ideological practice revealing contextual choices, add-ons, and

10. Elias Lönnrot was criticized for exaggerating and repeating folk poems and their lines. Those who knew the oral poem material by collecting it defined the *Kalevala* as an inauthentic representation of the folk poetry. See Hämäläinen 2012, 60.

removals of folk poetry texts in national publications such as the *Kalevala* (Hämäläinen 2014; 2012; Hyvönen 2004; 2001). The analysis is usually done at the level of verses, motifs, and formulas in relation to oral sources, and textual choices are compared to a wider cultural and ideological context (see *Avoin Kalevala*, *Open Kalevala*).[11] Lönnrot's editorial work has been investigated since the late nineteenth century to determine the oral basis of the lines in the *Kalevala* (see Borenius & Krohn 1891–1895; Krohn J. 1888; Krohn K. 1896; Niemi 1898). Later, literary scholar Väinö Kaukonen carried out massive line-by-line verse studies of the *Kalevala* to find a precise example verse Lönnrot utilized for each line of the epic (e.g., Kaukonen 1956; see also Hämäläinen 2020). The early research on Lönnrot's editorial method, however, rested at the verse and linguistic level and was not intended to disentangle the ideological meanings attached to his editorial modifications.

To identify the meanings and links the Brothers Grimm used in their textualization work with folklore material, Richard Bauman and Charles Briggs (2003, 208–11) propose the concept of metadiscursive practices: diverse meta-textual methods of making oral text comprehensible and readable, including, among other things, direct quotation and use of other genres. Developing the ideas of Bauman & Briggs, Kristin Kuutma (2006, 21, 28–30) focuses on interactions and collaborations between editors, documenters, researchers, and oral performers by analyzing the language and rhetorical features in the process of making oral tradition as a cultural textual representation in cultural and sociopolitical contexts. Meta-textual uses of textualization have the power to guide reception and to create distance between the oral tradition used by marginalized people and the readers of the textualization, the social elite (see Briggs 1993, 389–90).

The material for investigating Lönnrot's textualization practice is hybrid: it includes all the levels of textualization of the *Kalevala* and its different

11. Open Kalevala is an open-access critical edition of the *Kalevala* (1849) containing the published *Kalevala*, transcriptions, and the manuscript. It is based on a careful analysis of the source material and on commentaries made of the poems and words of the epic. The edition is linked to other digitized sources surrounding the *Kalevala*. There are also short articles on Lönnrot's editorial methods, Kalevala language, oral Kalevala-meter poetry, and ideals of the nineteenth century etc. The main idea of the edition is to provide a solid knowledge and material of the *Kalevala* and its creation on one platform. See http://kalevala.finlit.fi.

manuscript and print versions,[12] as well as the transcribed oral folk poetry Lönnrot utilized in compiling the epic. Furthermore, Lönnrot's editorial work on the *Kalevala* was influenced by his other publications, such as the *Kanteletar* (1840, 1841), the anthology of Kalevala-meter lyric poems. Textual representation of the oral poetry tradition was a lifetime project for Lönnrot, commencing in the 1820s with his first collecting journey and first folk poetry publication (*Kantele* I–IV, 1829–1831) and lasting until the year he died, 1884, when he was still working on an extended version of a folk lyric publication of the *Kanteletar*.

We next illustrate some metadiscursive practices, textual selections, and ideological emphases Lönnrot conducted in the *Kalevala* by using a short example of one poem.[13] The opening lines of Poem 4 of the *Kalevala* narrate the story of a young maiden, Aino, in the forest carrying birch whisks to use in the sauna. Väinämöinen, the old sage and bard of the epic, meets her there and proposes to her.[14] The same story is found in the folk poem models, but Aino is an unnamed young girl and Väinämöinen a mythical wooer, Osmoinen. At a quick glance, these two texts seem similar. However, a closer comparison of lines and words reveals the obvious difference between the oral and written performances (see below).[15] On the left, there is a section of Lönnrot's Aino poem in the *Kalevala*, and on the right, the transcription of the oral folk poem he made in Viena Karelia (Russian side of the border) in 1834. The oral singer is

12. The *Cycle Kalevala* 1833 (manuscript), the *Proto-Kalevala* 1833 (manuscript), the *Old Kalevala* 1835 (publ.), the *New Kalevala* 1849 (publ.), the *School Kalevala* 1862 (publ.). Besides, there is a working version of the *Old Kalevala* (the *Interleaved Old Kalevala* 1836–1837) to which Lönnrot added extra, empty pages to gather and develop more lines for the new version of the *Kalevala*.
13. In this article it is not possible to show all the levels of the earlier *Kalevala* versions that have influenced this precise poem of the epic. See more Hämäläinen 2012; 2014.
14. In the Kalevala, the story of Aino is set up by Joukahainen, the brother, and his promise of giving his sister to an old, steady Väinämöinen to save his own life. Afterwards, Aino gets proposed to by Väinämöinen in the woods and runs crying back home where family members don't understand her grief. Aino mourns her destiny of unwanted marriage, but the mother insists Aino take a traditional role as a woman. At the end of the story Aino drowns or transforms into a water nymph. After Aino's death, the story continues by presenting Väinämöinen fishing, looking for the lost maiden. A fish grabs his fishing rod, and not recognizing the fish as the dead Aino, Väinämöinen is mocked by her.
15. Differences compared to oral poem model are highlighted by colors and bolding.

unknown; this transcription,[16] however, has been referred to as one of the main examples Lönnrot followed while compiling this precise song of the *Kalevala* (Kaukonen 1956; Hämäläinen 2020, 225).

First, Lönnrot added extensive parallelism (green) to the *Kalevala*, even though the oral poem, in trochee form, also contains it. The use of parallelism between and within song lines and poem sections is one of the main differences between the version made by the oral singers and the version produced by Lönnrot (see Krohn K. 1896, 164; Hämäläinen 2014). Lönnrot also added far more frequent alliteration (yellow) than was present in the oral poem. Further, he standardized the language (red), using declensions of words and replacing dialectical or Karelian expressions with written Finnish. Moreover, to create a narrative line in the poem, Lönnrot not only added linkage words (blue) to the lines but also named the characters of the epic (**bold**). The central character of the oral poem is anni tytti (anni girl), but in the *Kalevala* she is named Aino, a sister of Joukahainen, with a qualifier "nuori" (young). Also, a wooer who is described as a mythical male character, Osmoinen, is presented as Väinämöinen, the eternal and wise sage of the epic. Along with these changes, Lönnrot used dialogue between characters and added other genres inside the epic narrative, though this precise example does not include those add-ons (e.g., Hämäläinen 2012).

Tuopa **Aino** neito nuori,	Anni tytti, aino tytti
Sisar nuoren **Joukahaisen**	
Läksi luutoa lehosta,	Läksi vastoa metsästä
Vastaksia varvikosta;	Vassan päitä varvikoista.
Taitto vastan taatollensa,	Taitto vassan taatollase[k]
Toisen taittoi maammollensa,	Toisen taitto maamollahe[k]
Kokoeli kolmannenki	Kolmatta kokoelo[o]
Verevälle veiollensa.	Nuorimmalle veiolla.
Jo astui kohtin kotia,	
Lepikköä leuhautti,	
Tuli vanha **Wäinämöinen,**	Osmonen orosta kirku
	Kalevainen kaskimaista:
Näki neitosen lehossa,	
Hienohelmen heinikössä,	
Sanan virkkoi, noin nimesi:	

16. The documented poem (SKVR I1 234) contains 160 lines and includes diverse motifs such as the Hanged Maiden, which is the main reference to the Aino poem of the *Kalevala*.

"Eläpä muille neiti nuori
Kun minulle neiti nuori
Kanna kaulan helmilöitä,
Rinnan ristiä rakenna,
Pane päätä palmikolle,
Sio silkillä hivusta!"
(*Kalevala*, poem 4, lines 1–20.)

"Kasva, neiti, m[iussa] m[ielin]
Elä muissa nuorisoissa,
Kasva kaioissa somissa,
Veny verka vaattiessa,
Kasva leivän kannikalla,
Veny leiv[än] viploisilla!"
(SKVR, I1 234, Uhtua,
E. Lönnrot 1834, lines 1–15.)[17]

Now, that Aino, the young maid
young Joukahainen's sister
went for a broom from the grove
and for bath-whisks from the scrub;
broke off one for her father
another for her mother
gathered a third too
for her full-blooded brother.
She was just stepping homeward
tripping through alders
when old Väinämöinen came.
He saw the maid in the grove
the fine-hemmed in the grasses
and uttered a word, spoke thus:
'Don't for anyone, young maid
except me, young maid
wear the beads around my neck
set the cross upon your breast
put your head into a braid
bind your hair with silk!'
(The *Kalevala*, poem 4, trans. by Keith Bosley 1999.)

In his ongoing writing process, Lönnrot made notes on his manuscripts to explain the poem in question. His marginalia focused on glossing words in the poem that would present challenges to readers who were not necessarily familiar with dialects of the Finnish-Karelian language[18]

17. In transcribing songs in a hurry, Lönnrot used cut words, or as in this case, wrote down just the first letter of a word. In the volume *Suomen Kansan Vanhat Runot* brackets indicate the missing parts of words from the folk song transcription or dialectical language.
18. Karelian spoken in the border of Finland and Russia was close to Finnish language and therefore understandable to collectors of folklore. However, the

(e.g., lehosta — lehtimetsästä, veiollensa — veljellensä; Lönnrotiana manuscript 38) and commented on specific sections of the *Kalevala*. For example, when Aino has thrown away her jewelry, Lönnrot noted in the margin that "She thought that Väinämöinen was attracted by her jewelry" / "Arveli muka niitä syyksi siihen, että W oli mielistynyt häneen" (Lönnrot manuscript 121, 31–34). As Lönnrot prepared manuscripts for publication, he indicated that a precise line or section was ready by drawing vertical lines besides (Hämäläinen 2014, 106).

Besides marking the textual and poetical changes, marginal notes and vertical lines can also be considered as meta-textual practices used by Lönnrot to guide the meaning of the written representation. With regard to ideological messages, changes and interventions of the textualization work are not particularly evident in the text itself, even though it can be noted that all the changes Lönnrot introduced can be understood as ideological. For instance, the parallel lines that Lönnrot added to the poem (green) frame and stress the shape of the young girl, Aino (e.g., Young Joukahainen's sister — The fine-hemmed in the grasses). To reveal the wider ideological highlights in the Aino poem, we need a contextualization of nineteenth-century culture and premodern society that the oral poem sources reflect. In the source for the Aino poem, the folk poem Hirttäytynyt neito [Hanged Maiden], the meeting is shaped by different threats. The wooer is a hybrid of human being and animal, Osmoinen, who climbs up from the dangerous bog. The girl is outside her home, and therefore, endangered. Very often only seeing the strange wooer upsets the girl, so she removes her jewelry and head scarf and runs crying back home. The poem alludes to sexual violence (the jewelry and scarf are the symbols of a virgin maiden: Siikala 2012, 300), but as usual in the oral tradition, this allusion remains unexplained. Instead, the folk poem emphasizes the social, familial reaction toward the proposal. The message of the poem is that a young girl's chance to get decently married (her only option for having a good life) is ruined by the unwanted, mythical, dangerous proposal.

When reworking this folk poem, Lönnrot made some textual and narrative changes to enhance cultural and societal issues of the nineteenth century. He shaped the proposal by the deep contrast of a young maiden and an old man. By reflecting Aino's grief and, in the end, her death, the *Kalevala* poem fuses the traditional demands on a woman and her role in a family with modern ideas of gender relations. As Väinämöinen proposes to Aino, this indirectly indicates that she has been touched, seduced, and

---

Karelian language has many dialectical variants, and it is a distinct language, not a Finnish dialect.

therefore has lost her chances for a culturally-sanctioned marriage. The Aino poem deals with modern questions of marriage by choice and a young girl's right to her own body and emotions (Hämäläinen 2012). Bauman & Briggs (2003, 205) use the term "violence of modernity" to specify, on the one hand, the process of the textual editing of the oral tradition into literature; but, on the other hand, the manipulative and authoritative way of using traditional expressions in a new, unfamiliar context. Here, Elias Lönnrot developed the idea of a young girl and a wooer meeting in the forest to raise modern questions about the role of women. By introducing all these linguistic, poetic, textual, and ideological changes, Lönnrot aimed at making the oral song comprehensible to readers and meeting their aesthetic expectations for a literary product. Paradoxically, his textualization work created a distance between the oral poems and their written representation, the *Kalevala*.

Lönnrot's textualization work can be followed in his detailed notes on both manuscripts and published editions. The text-making process can be analyzed through a comparison of versions, changes, modifications, add-ons, and removals along with the oral poem sources Lönnrot utilized and was aware of in his editorial work. Further, textualization analysis also illustrates other possible textual and oral representations Lönnrot could have approved. As shown in the *Kalevala* example, Lönnrot modified and manipulated oral poem sources by adding parallelism and alliteration, changing characters and creating new ones, and combining different poems and sections (see Kaukonen 1956). Close analysis and contextualization of Lönnrot's textualization expounds how the text-making process was multifaceted and directed not only at a linguistic but also at poetic, thematic, and ideological level. The poem example of the *Kalevala* above, the Aino poem, gives a small but descriptive illustration of what kinds of modifications oral poetry underwent in producing literature.

Genetic Criticism and Rewritings of Rhymed Folk Songs

Genetic criticism, a method to study the processes by which texts are formed from diverse genetic materials, such as notes, manuscripts, and proof sheets, can provide intriguing insight into the use of oral folklore in written literary works. Genetic criticism concentrates on literary expression taking shape *before* the published text and investigated through the *avant-texte* of a literary work. In addition to considering materials preceding the

final text, the method also considers hesitations and stylistic experiments that can only be detected from the manuscripts (see Hay 2002; Grésillon 1994; 2008; Biasi 2005; Deppman, Ferrer & Groden 2004; Hulle 2022).

The chief concern of genetic criticism, the reconstruction and analysis of writing processes, enables us to understand how the meanings of folklore are carried in literature and to what extent the formalist features of folklore have been molded during the process of writing a literary work. Features connected to gathering and handling source material of writing projects from different versions to final, published texts can reveal writers' attitudes toward the oral poetics of traditional communities. Text development is shaped by discourses, and this process affects the outcome (Grésillon 1994, 172; Mitterand 1979). In genetic criticism, the text is not seen as a fixed, finished object, but rather as a dynamic, ongoing process that becomes a contingent manifestation of a diachronous play of signifiers. Genetic critics are interested in the often-contradictory possibilities that different versions manifest. It is said that "genetic criticism is contemporaneous with an esthetic of the possible" (Contat, Hollier & Neefs 1996, 2; Deppman, Ferrer & Groden 2004, 5). Likewise, the study of Manninen's manuscripts testifies to the experimental and dynamic nature of draft writing. Folklore notes served as a basis for Manninen's own creative activity, which manifested in different versions: some of Manninen's experiments were abandoned; some were upgraded later in this process.

Genetic intertextuality and cultural historical analysis are of use when studying how folklore is molded in the process of writing art poetry. Emphasizing the dynamics of writing, genetic intertextuality is focused on the phases and processes in which intertexts, features of earlier works or texts, have been incorporated into the forthcoming literary work through acts of selecting, writing, rewriting, and adapting (Debray-Genette 1988; Biasi 2005, 89–90; Van Hulle 2004; Biasi & Gahundu 2021). The terms *exogenetics* and *endogenetics,* introduced by Raymonde Debray-Genette (1988), conceptualize two stages of evolving intertextuality. The term *exogenetic* refers to "any writing process devoted to research, selection, and incorporation, focused on information stemming from a source exterior to the writing", whereas the term *endogenetic* refers to "the process by which the writer conceives of, elaborates, and transfigures pre-textual material" (Bailey 2013, 33; Biasi 1996, 42–46).

Genetic analysis can explore the way external forces interact with the progress of the text (Deppman, Ferrer & Groden 2004, 5). According to Henry Mitterand, like archaeology, genetic criticism "carries the material strata of history out into the open" (Mitterand 2004, 118). Genetic

cultural and historical analysis is interested in the *context* of a certain moment of cultural and literary history in which a text is written, in the author's evolving expression but also in extra-authorial phenomena. This approach presumes that all preparatory (avant-textual) documents echo both individual creativity and larger social discourses and trends, the thoughts and tastes of the surrounding culture (Deppman 2004, 117).

Working manuscripts of folklore writers and collectors enable us to uncover many aspects of the use of oral folklore for written purposes that are not visible in published works of literature or other finished texts. Publication masks several stages of the working process. Archival materials illustrate the channels through which Finnish writers received their knowledge of rhymed folk songs and their attitudes to the poetics and meanings of oral tradition. At the turn of the twentieth century, not all features of folklore were seen as valuable or potential sources for literary work. For instance, Manninen excluded humoristic songs and dirty jokes, familiar to this folk song genre (see, e.g., Asplund 1981, 105–09), and instead, wanted to work with melancholic and sentimental ones.

As an active form of singing tradition at the end of the nineteenth century, writers were familiar with rhymed folk songs. Manuscripts in writers' archives indicate the writers' methods of handling folklore material and their aims in reading and studying these songs at the very early stage of the writing process. As Almuth Grésillon (2008, 67) has remarked, writers are also readers. Geneticists are aware that reading and making reading notes is often a compulsory part of the creative writing process. Oral-based texts are one such type of reading material. Although he knew the folk song genre well, Otto Manninen worked with written lyrics of the songs and made notes regarding them.

To remember and to materialize ideas and expressions with reading notes is a common part of writers' working methods. In many writing processes, making notes is an obligatory preliminary phase (Biasi 2005, 35). Notes provide us an overview of what has been read regarding a project and enable us to analyze writers' reading practices and to reconstruct early phases of the writing process, e.g., how the reader-writer chooses the readings, approaches them, and transforms, deforms, and cites the texts that have been read (Grésillon 2008, 68). Notes are often the first materialization of an evolving work, and more coherent literary expression is written based on these notes.

This becomes apparent in the markings poet Otto Manninen made while reading folk songs from his notebook. Manninen made slight changes to the transcriptions, and, as we will see, at this point orally-based texts began

to be drafted into high literature. The poetics of folklore transform into the poetics of literature. This notebook[19] of transcriptions of rhymed folk songs and Manninen's writings is an important material artifact regarding both the exogenetic and endogenetic phases of the process. The notebook contains written notes on Finnish folk songs, collected in the middle of the 1890s from different informants (Lyly 1983; Karhu 2019b). Toward the end of the nineteenth century, many students collected folklore from the countryside, inspired by the *Kalevala* and the Romantic idea of gathering folklore (Karelianism). One of them was Manninen's friend, the writer and teacher Antti Rytkönen, who collected and gathered the folklore in this notebook (Lyly 1983, 112; Karhu 2019a).

Apart from the folksong transcriptions, the notebook consists of Manninen's marks in the margins or directly on the folk song texts. In some cases, it is difficult to say whether Manninen is only making comments on the folk songs or beginning to write a new literary text: whether they belong to exogenesis, endogenesis, or both. Manninen's alterations manifest the intertwining of exogenesis and endogenesis. As Dirk Van Hulle (2004, 7) points out in *Textual Awareness*:

> Every writer has his or her own methods, and this division [into exogenesis and endogenesis] is merely a structuring device, for the exogenetic process contains within itself the principle of its own effacement. Documentation is often left unused or changed so thoroughly during the endogenetic incorporation that it ends up disappearing. But these transformations are precisely the reason why the study of this vague transition zone can be valuable.

In Manninen's case, the documentation is clear as the notebook is preserved in his archive; how to read the alterations and understand the exogenetic and endogenetic processes, however, is a matter for interpretation. As Pierre-Marc Biasi (2005, 90) reminds us, the study of writing needs better tools and concepts to capture and analyze the essence of this phenomenon where exogenesis and endogenesis are linked. In the context of oral-literary sources the intersection captures the textual moment in which oral tradition is transformed into literature. What kind of textual acts and aesthetic decisions does this transformation demonstrate? The analysis of the phenomenon is intriguing for genetic criticism.

19. A1908, Otto Manninen archive, SKS.

Most of Manninen's markings in the notebook are in the margins, namely lines and circles made next to certain stanzas. It seems that Manninen marked the stanzas he liked the most (Lyly 1983, 112), and a closer look at the material reveals that he was interested in certain verse structures, especially long verses (Karhu 2023). In Manninen's case the markings manifest his process of selecting certain oral-literary material. Analyzing this exogenetic phase enables us to make observations about Manninen's appreciations of certain features of oral expression that at least partly mirrored the dominant values and aesthetics of the time.

Further analysis of Manninen's poetic material, especially the study of archival rewritings of the marked stanzas, drafts of new textual entities, as well as his published adaptations of rhymed folk songs, disclose why Manninen was drawn by long verses. First, the long verses gave him space to use paeon feet,[20] a rhythmic innovation of Finnish art poetry in the 1890s. Paeon feet were largely used in rhymed folk songs and writers became inspired by this rhythmic feature of folklore (Hormia 1960). Manninen's rewritten folk song verses were often composed of even more syllables than the long verses of the original folk songs. The long verses naturally also gave him space to enlarge and enrich the poetic expression (Karhu 2023). The message of the folk songs was often not too profound; the primary intention was to amuse listeners. Manninen, in contrast, was a serious young aesthete, who wanted to express something weighty with his verses. Long verses offered him a better opportunity to do that.

In altering the folk song stanzas, Manninen partly followed the variation practices of oral poetics. In oral tradition, the formulaic first verse pair remained intact, and the argument verse pair varied (Asplund 1981, 97). The same strategy is observable in Manninen's decisions (Karhu 2023). This feature manifests in the example presented at the beginning of this article. The changes are targeted to the second verse pair:[21]

En mie sen vuoks laulele että heliä on ääni
Laulelen huvitukseksen, tuli heiliä ikäväni
suurta
Laululla mina laimentelen ~~ainaista~~ ikavääni

20. In poetry written in Finnish, this meant that one syllable was stressed and three unstressed.
21. Finnish rhyming folk song (rekilaulu) is composed of two rhyming verse pairs, a priming pair and an argument pair (Sykäri 2022, 172).

I don't sing because my voice is so melodious
I sing to entertain myself because I miss my sweetheart
huge
With singing I try to weaken my ~~everlasting~~ longing

This example also reveals Manninen's affection for full rhymes. Folk songs used assonance and other sound patterns that did not satisfy Manninen's preference for authentic rhymes, and he immediately changed them to full rhymes. In this example, the rhyme pair of the folk songs was ää**ni** — ikävä**ni** (voice — longing), but Manninen changed it into **ääni** — ikävä**ääni**, which forms a full rhyme with the same vowel length (Karhu 2021).

Apart from the formalistic changes, Manninen also modified words or parts of verses that changed the meaning and atmosphere of the texts. In the example above, Manninen has changed words of the song relating to courting and the troubles of love into expressions that reflected larger questions touching on modern aesthetics and feelings of fin-de-siècle disappointment (Karhu 2021, 210). The folk songs were often related to momentary pleasures and transitory sentiments, such as dancing and young love (Hämäläinen & Karhu 2021), and Manninen wanted to convey the eternal nature and profound aesthetic pleasure of the songs with his words. In these alterations Manninen was beginning to formulate his own poetics; this type of writing is thus part of the endogenetic phase.

Manninen continued to work with the folk song in question in a poem draft of four stanzas. In this text, the verses are now written in four lines, as was the custom in Finnish art poetry of the time:

En minä sillä laulele ~~että~~
että Heleä ois ääni
Laululla minä laimentelen
Suurta ikävääni.
(A1908, Otto Manninen's archive, SKS.)

I don't sing ~~because~~
because my voice is so melodious
With singing I try to weaken
my huge longing

The rhythm of this stanza differs from that of the original folk song. For example, in the folk song, the latter part of the argument pair consists of three words containing nine syllables in total ("tuli heiliä ikäväni", 'because I miss

my sweetheart'). In the poem draft, the last verse contains only two words with six syllables. With this modification the last verse ("suurta ikävääni", 'huge longing') gets weightier and underlines the words that capture the essence of the whole draft. The rhythmicity has also changed in the course of writing. Manninen had first written the word "että" (because) at the end of the first verse, but then crossed it out and added it at the beginning of the second verse. In doing so, he formed two symmetrical verses. Both now have the same number of syllables, eight in each. (Karhu 2023.)

As noted elsewhere (Karhu 2023), the verses of folk songs in the notebook were composed of varying numbers of syllables, but Manninen preferred regularity and symmetry.[22] As he started to draft his own poetic expression, he regularized the number of syllables per verse. This highlights one major difference concerning the contexts of the stanzas. While the rhymed folk song stanzas were individual textual entities that were mixed freely in an oral singing performance, for Manninen the texts were material for poem drafts, where individual stanzas constituted parts of a longer, more fixed literary entity. Manninen's rewritten folk song stanzas had to act as a functioning part of his poetics.

This is also noticeable in an early draft of the poem "Kosken ruusu" ("The Rose of the Rapids") published in the journal *Koitar* in 1897 and written in Finnish rhyming couplet meter. "The Rose of the Rapids" tells a story about a young man who glides down the rapids in his boat. He sees a red rose on the bank of the rapids and tries to grab it. The boy fails, and the rose looks after him and his apparently sinking boat, with longing.

The beginning of the poem retells a popular folk song:[23]

Ensin oli vettä vellovaa,
Ja sitten kuohuva koski.
Kuohuvan koskenpa reunalla kasvoi
Se ruusu purppuraposki.
(*Koitar*, 1897).

First there was bubbling water
And then the rushing rapids.
In the shores of the rapids there grew
A purplecheeked rose.

22. The lengths of verses in folk songs varied significantly because of the many kinds of metrical feet featured in them. This is seen as the most important part of the rhythmical play of this song genre (see Laitinen 2003, 288).
23. Several variants of this song were collected between 1886 and the 1940's (SKS).

The song also appears in the notebook, where it has been marked, once again, with a line in the margin:

Ens oli vettä sit oli mettä sit oli kuohuva koski,
Kuohuvan kos(k)en rannalla asui riiari punaposki.
(A1908, Otto Manninen's archive, SKS.)

First there was water then there was a forest/honey then there was a bubbling rapid,
Along the shores of the rapids there lived a suitor with red cheeks.

In Manninen's poem the actual living person, the suitor of the folk song, has been changed into a rose, a flower that appears very often in folk songs, especially when describing young beautiful girls.[24]

An early draft of this poem has been written in pencil in the middle of the notebook, after the transcriptions of the folk songs, and then rubbed out. The draft is nevertheless legible, and it consists of two stanzas. Here is the opening stanza:

Ensin oli vettä ja sitten oli mettä
Ja sitten oli kuohuva koski
Ja kuohuvan kosken rannalla [unclear word]
kasvoi
~~Se~~ [unclear word]
Ruusu purppuraposki
(A1908, Otto Manninen's archive, SKS.)

First there was water then there was a forest/honey
and then there was a bubbling rapid
And on the shores of the rapid [unclear word]
grew
~~The~~ [unclear word]
A purplecheeked rose.

Again, the formulaic verse pair remains intact, except from the removal of dialectical formulations, and the argument verse pair varies and introduces the purple-cheeked rose.

24. For example, a broadside ballad of a deceived young man, published for the first time in Finnish in 1873, begins with a description of a girl "red as a rose" (Asplund 1994, 385).

In the published version of the poem Manninen has abandoned "mettä" of the first verse, which has two meanings. It can stand for "forest" or "honey". The word has advantages because of its sonority with the word "vettä", but it can also be interpreted in an erotic context. The rhyming folksongs often contain erotic connotations, sometimes hidden, sometimes more open. As rhymed songs utilized in art poetry, the Finnish literature of that time in general was chaste, as it was expected to express the ideas of virtuousness (Karhu 2023; Karhu & Kuismin 2021, 27 and 35). In light of the material handled here, it seems that Manninen had a stricter approach to formal flaws than to content. He immediately changed the slant rhymes of the folk songs to exact rhymes in his writing process but at least initially approved the erotic tone in his draft, even if it was deleted at a later stage in the process.

The second stanza drafted in the notebook is a variant of the second stanza of the published poem:

Ja koski sen kukkia kuvasti
Ja koski sen juuria juotti

Se kosken tuovaksi vuotti
(A1908, Otto Manninen's archive, SKS.)

And the rapids reflected its flowers
And the rapids watered its roots

The rose waited for the water to bring

This is not a rewritten folk song but a completely original poetic text. It pictures how the torrent reflects the flowers like a mirror, that is to say, it uses one of the key images of literary symbolism. In nineteenth-century symbolism, water was a mirror in which a modern subject could look at themself, identify themself, and see their innermost feelings (Forrestier 1982, 115). The published version of "The Rose of the Rapids" also includes this image. Here, a flower that grows by the shores of a waterway is mirrored in the water:

Koski se ruusua kuvasti
Ja juurta hentoa juotti.
Poimijapoikasen punasessa purressa
Kosken tuovaks se vuotti.
(*Koitar*, 1897.)

The torrent reflected the rose
And watered its delicate root.
The rose waited for the red boat of the boy who will pick her
To come down from the torrent.

The stanza draft is also interesting for another reason: the central third verse of the stanza ("poimijapoikasen punasessa purressa", the rose waited for the red boat of the boy who will pick her) is still missing. This verse is key to the whole poem, introducing for the first time the other agent, "the boy". Unfolding at length with two paeon feet, the verse feels very rhythmically refined (Karhu 2023). In drafting his stanzas, Manninen used several different strategies (Karhu 2012): in this case he just wrote some of the verses to frame the most significant verse that was still in formation.

Manninen's archival documents crystallize the diachronous play of signifiers, the rivalry of different meanings and hesitations, always present in the ongoing, dynamic process of draft writing. The archival documents analyzed here capture many characteristics of the poetics of Manninen's poems based on folk songs, and they show in detail what kinds of textual changes Manninen made while beginning to draft his own poetic expression. Like Lönnrot, Manninen rewrote oral texts to make them adhere more closely to the aesthetic and literary conceptions of the nineteenth-century readership, even though he obeyed the models of oral variation by focusing his changes on the later part of the stanza.

Resemblances and Differences

The variation and processes through which oral tradition has been molded into lofty literature is present in both cases discussed in this article. In their uses of folklore, both Lönnrot and Manninen moved through several textual stages and made diverse textual choices. Textualization and genetic analysis show that the variations were focused on linguistic, poetic, and thematic levels. Furthermore, not only literary aesthetics but also ideological values affected the text-making processes and practices, particularly in the case of the textualization of folklore. The expectations and competence of the readers also guided both projects, and the ideals of the elite, e.g., their perceptions of suitable emotions, had a particular impact on the decisions made in editing and rewriting. While ideological

impacts have not necessarily been seen as essential in genetic criticism, aesthetic values have often been overlooked in the study of textualization. As this article illustrates, both these dimensions of text-making processes can be reciprocally present.

Using two methods to scrutinize different text materials enables us to decode similar processes of literary writing using oral tradition by an editor and a poet. In both cases, the exploitation of oral folklore material was not only crucial, but also quite similar; at the same time, the literary genre, the purpose of writing, and the expectations of readers diverged in each case. Elias Lönnrot aimed at writing a coherent epic based on folk poetry with a fixed storyline that could unite the elite and the peasantry, whereas Otto Manninen composed art poetry for sophisticated readers. In revealing variation between different stages of a text, textualization analysis focuses mainly on the contextualization of oral and written poetry (linguistic, thematic, and ideological changes) with both traditional and modern elements, while genetic criticism focuses on the aesthetic and linguistic aspects of variation. The two main poetic registers of the nineteenth-century Finnish and Karelian oral tradition used by Lönnrot and Manninen reveal the multifaceted and intertwined processes of writing and textualizing folklore into literature. Examining Kalevala-meter poetry and its textualization together with rhymed folk songs used in art poetry concurrently, as we have done here, deepens our understanding of these textual phenomena.

Even in the cases of Lönnrot and Manninen, whose manuscripts and other textual variants are well preserved, we can, however, only substantiate part of the process of documenting oral tradition (Kuutma 2006, 30) and the writers' genetic processes (Grésillon 1994, 24). Nevertheless, even incomplete reconstruction of the textual processes of the past gives us detailed knowledge about how folklore-based publications and literature were formed in the long nineteenth century. The genetic analysis of Manninen's archival material, folklore transcriptions, notes, rewritings, and drafts enables us to locate the writing moment in which oral expression begins to turn into literary expression. From a genetic perspective, even a small alteration in the transcription of a folk song can give birth to meanings that will grow into published poetry.

It is obvious that Elias Lönnrot and Otto Manninen had different creative and literary minds. Lönnrot was above all an editor interested in how oral poetry could be represented in a literary form to a national

audience. As Lönnrot defined his mission, textualization work was driven by readability and followed oral singers' examples. Thus, Lönnrot had to consider both traditional references to oral poetic culture and contemporary expectations of the elite. In textualization, adequate editing skills and plausible articulation are important. Lönnrot's fame in Finland was not based on his faithfulness to the oral tradition in every detail, as his textualization methods distanced folk songs from the orally performed poetry, its dialectical Finnish and Karelian language and rural, everyday context, but on his "authentic" articulation of oral tradition. Lönnrot's way of representing the oral poetry tradition was highly acclaimed because he revised oral texts to make them adhere more closely to the aesthetic, literary, and conventional conceptions of a nineteenth-century readership. The *Kalevala* received status as a national epic because of Lönnrot's textualization methods. As Pertti Anttonen (2012, 349) points out, Lönnrot "believed that he had brought it [folk poetry] back to its original cultural and political context. Lönnrot justified his textual practices with the notion that the folk poems that he used as his sources had their origin in the culture and heritage of the forefathers of all Finns."

As a poet, Otto Manninen aimed at creating lyrical and artistic literary expressions with contemporary aesthetics. His approach to oral tradition was not linked to the question of how to present folklore authentically: rather, with artistic freedom, he was able to re-shape his source texts, rhymed folk songs. His writing process reveals a tendency to balance new meanings with old practices. Manninen wanted to write poetry that arose from the commonplaceness of folk songs but that also transformed oral expressions concentrating on momentary sentiments and pleasures into poetic sayings with a more profound tone. At the same time, he used the same means of variation as the oral singers.

Methods of textualization and genetic criticism lead us to understand not only the making of the canonical texts of the nineteenth century but also of texts disregarded by the literary canon, such as rhymed folk songs and their literary adaptations. These texts are of indisputable importance for comprehending the nationalist objectives and the idea of Finnishness. The two methods introduced in this article shed light on how the elite transformed the oral tradition in the process of writing, or to what extent the aesthetics of written literature and other requirements intervened in the writing process.

University of Helsinki, Kalevala Society, Finnish Literature Society

Works Cited

Manuscripts

Manuscripts of Elias Lönnrot, Archives of the Finnish Literature Society
Lönnrotiana 38 and 121.
Manuscripts of Otto Manninen, Archives of the Finnish Literature Society
SKS/KIA, A1908.

Printed and Digital Sources

Akimova, Anna. [2005] 2007. *La chanson populaire et la poésie symboliste en France et en Russie (1880–1914)*. Lille: Atelier national de Reproduction des Thèses.

Anderson, Benedict. [1983] 2006. *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. (Revised edition). London and New York: VERSO.

Anttonen, Pertti. 2012. "Oral Traditions and the Making of the Finnish Nation". In *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe during the Long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Timothy Baycroft and David Hopkin, 325–50. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Asplund, Anneli. 1981. "Riimilliset kansanlaulut". *Kansanmusiikki*, edited by Anneli Asplund and Martti Hako, 64–124. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

———. 1994. *Balladeja ja arkkiveisuja*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Atkinson, David. 2007. "Editing the Child Ballads: Agency, Intention, and the Problem of Version". *Variants: The Journal of the European Society for Textual Scholarship*, 6: 123–62.

Atkinson, David. 2014. *The Anglo-Scottish Ballad and its Imaginary Context*. Cambridge: Open Book Publishers.

Bailey, Iain. 2013. "Allusion and Exogenesis: The Labouring Heart of Samuel Beckett's Ill Seen Ill Said". In *The Boundaries of the Literary Archive. Reclamation and Representation*, edited by Carrie Smith and Lisa Stead, 31–43. Farnham; Burlington, VT: Ashgate.

Bak, János M., Patrick J. Geary, and Gábor Klaniczay, eds. 2015. *Manufacturing a Past for the Present. Forgery and Authenticity in Medievalist Texts and Objects in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Bauman, Richard, and Charles L. Briggs. 1990. "Poetics and Performance as Critical Perspectives on Language and Social Life". *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 19: 59–88.

———. 2003. *Voices of Modernity: Language Ideologies and the Politics of Inequality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baycroft, Timothy. 2012. "Introduction". In *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe during the Long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Timothy Baycroft and David Hopkin, 1–10. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Baycroft, Timothy, and David Hopkin, eds. 2012. *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe during the Long Nineteenth Century*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Bénichou, Paul. 1970. *Nerval et la chanson folklorique*. Paris: J. Corti.

Bendix, Regina. 1997. *In Search of Authenticity. The Formation of Folklore Studies*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

Biasi, Pierre-Marc de. 1996. "What is a literary draft? Toward a functional typology of genetic documentation", translated by I. Wassenaar. *Drafts*. Special Issue of *Yale French Studies*, 89: 26–58.

———. [2000] 2005. *La Génétique des textes*. Paris: Armand Collin.

Biasi, Pierre-Marc de, and Céline Gahungu, eds. 2021. *Genesis: Intertextualité—Exogenèse, Revue internationale de critique génétique*. http://www.item.ens.fr/genesis-51-exogenese/

Borenius, Aksel, and Julius Krohn. 1891–1895. *Kalevalan esityöt I–III*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Bosley, Keith. 1999. *The Kalevala: An Epic Poem After Oral Tradition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Briggs, Charles L. 1993. "Metadiscursive Practices and Scholarly authority in Folkloristics". *Journal of American Folklore*, 106.422: 387–434. https://doi.org/10.2307/541905

Cambell, Matthew, and Michael Perraudin, eds. 2017. *The Voice of the People. Writing the European Folk Revival, 1760–1914*. London, New York, and Delhi: Anthem Press.

Contat, Michel, Denis Hollier, and Jacques Neefs. 1996. "Editor's Preface". *Drafts*. Special Issue of *Yale French Studies*, 89: 1–5.

Debray-Genette, Raymonde. 1988. *Métamorphoses du récit: autour de Flaubert*. Paris: Seuil.

Deppman, Jed. 2004. "Introduction to the article of Henri Mitterand". In *Genetic Criticism. Texts and avant-textes*, edited by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, 116–17. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Deppman, Jed, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden. 2004. "Introduction: A Genesis of French Genetic Criticism". In *Genetic Criticism. Texts and avant-textes*, edited by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, 1–16. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Foley, John Miles. 1995. *The Singer of Tales in Performance*. Bloomington and Indianapolis: Indiana University Press.

———. 2000. "The Textualization of South Slavic oral epic and its implications for oral-derived epic". In *Textualization of Oral Epics*, edited by Lauri Honko, 71–87. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Forrestier, Louis. 1982. "Symbolist Imagery". In *The Symbolist Movement in the Literature of European Languages*, edited by Anna Balakian, 101–18. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Greetham, David C. 2007. "What is Textual Scholarship?" In *A Companion to the History of the Book*, edited by Simon Eliot and Jonathan Rose, 21–32. Blackwell companions to literature and culture 48. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Grésillon, Almuth. 1994. *Eléments de critique génétique*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.

———. 2008. *La mise en oeuvre. Itinéraires génétiques*. Paris: CNRS Editions.

Hämäläinen, Niina. 2012. *Yhteinen perhe, jaetut tunteet. Lyyrisen kansanrunon tekstualisoinnin ja artikuloinnin tapoja Kalevalassa*. Turku: Turun yliopisto. https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-951-29-5170-3

———. 2014. "Why is Aino not described as a black maiden? Reflections on the textual presentations by Elias Lönnrot in the Kalevala and the Kanteletar". *Journal of Finnish Studies*, 18.1: 91–129.

———. 2020. "Säe säkeeltä. Väinö Kaukosen säetutkimukset Kalevalasta". *Sananjalka*, 62.62: 215–35. https://doi.org/10.30673/sja.91113

———, ed. 2019–2021. *Avoin Kalevala. Kansalliseepoksen digitaalinen, kriittinen editio* I–III (*Open Kalevala*). Helsinki: SKS, 2019–2021. http://kalevala.finlit.fi

Hämäläinen, Niina, and Hanna Karhu. 2019. "Elias Lönnrot, Otto Manninen ja tekstin tuottamisen prosessit". In *Satuperinteestä nykyrunoon. Suullisen perinteen ja kirjallisuuden yhteyksiä*, edited by Niina Hämäläinen, Hanna Karhu, and Silja Vuorikuru, 110–49. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran Toimituksia 1446. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

———. 2021. "Riimillisen laulun asema pitkällä 1800-luvulla". *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja*, 119.3: 288–301.

Hanks, William. 1989. "Text and Textuality". *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 18: 95–127.

Hay, Louis. 2002. *La littérature des écrivains: questions de critique génétique*. Paris: Corti.

Honko, Lauri. 1990. "The Kalevala: The Processual View". In *Religion, Myth, and Folklore in the Worlds Epics. The Kalevala and its Predecessors*, edited by Lauri Honko, 181–229. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

———. 1998. *Textualising the Siri Epic*. Folklore Fellows' Communications 264. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

———. 1999. "Pitkän eepoksen laulaja". In *Kalevala 1835*, viii–xx. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

———. 2000a. "Text as process and practice: the textualization of oral epics". In *Textualization of Oral Epics*, edited by Lauri Honko, 3–54. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

———. 2000b. "Thick Corpus and Organic Variation: An Introduction". In *Thick Corpus, Organic Variation and Textuality in Oral Tradition*, edited by Lauri Honko, 3–28. Studia Fennica Folkloristica 7. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Hormia, Osmo. 1960. *Suomalaisen runouden peonirytmit*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Hyvönen, Jouni. 2001. "Vanhan Kalevalan loitsujaksojen tekstualisointi. Lönnrotin toimitusstrategiat tutkimustradition jatkumolla". *Elore*, 8.1. https://doi.org/10.30666/elore.78304

Hyvönen, Jouni. 2004. "Lönnrotin eläytyminen kansanrunouden maailmaan". In *Kalevala ja laulettu runo*, edited by Anna-Leena Siikala, Lauri Harvilahti, and Senni Timonen, 299–339. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Hyvönen, Jouni. 2005. *Vanhan Kalevalan Vipusessa käynti-runon tekstualisointi: Elias Lönnrotin tekstualisointistrategiat*. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto.

Joosen, Vanessa, Vincent Neyt, and Dirk Van Hulle. 2019. "Épigenèse et littérature pour enfants: à propos des contes des frères Grimm". In *Genesis: Intertextualité — Exogenèse, Revue internationale de critique génétique, 48*: 21–36. https://doi.org/10.4000/genesis.3922

Kallio, Kati, Tuomas m. s. Lehtonen, Senni Timonen, Irma-Riitta Järvinen, and Ilkka Leskelä. 2017. *Laulut ja kirjoitukset. Suullinen ja kirjallinen kulttuuri uuden ajan alun Suomessa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Karhu, Hanna. 2012. *Säkeiden synty. Geneettinen tutkimus Otto Mannisen runokäsikirjoituksista.* PhD thesis. Helsinki: Helsingin yliopisto. https://helda.helsinki.fi/handle/10138/37099

———. 2019a. "Suullisen perinteen arkistoaineistot ja kirjoituksen variaatio — Antti Rytkösen keräämät rekilaulut". *Elore*, 26.2: 3–25. https://doi.org/10.30666/elore.84544

———. 2019b. "Piipatusta simapillin, paimenhuilun pajatusta? Otto Mannisen 'Pellavan kitkijä' ja 'Luistimilla'-runot ja rekilauluperinne". *Kirjallisuudentutkimuksen Aikakauslehti Avain*, 16.2: 24–41. https://doi.org/10.30665/av.74177

———. 2021. "Many Ways to Use and Play with the Rhymes — Poet Otto Manninen and the Rhymes of Finnish Rhyming Couplet's". In *Versification: Metrics in Practice*, edited by Satu Grünthal Frog, Kati Kallio, and Jarkko Leino, 200–16. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. https://doi.org/10.21435/sflit.12

———. 2023 (forthcoming). "Apprentissage poétique d'Otto Manninen — Réécritures des strophes de chanson populaire". *Études finno-ougriennes*, 55: 211–42.

Karhu, Hanna, and Anna Kuismin. 2021. "'Rekiviisujen' halveksunta ja houkutus — Keskustelu arkkiviisuista ja rekilauluista 1870-luvulta 1910-luvulle". In *Kasvatus & Aika*, 15.1: 22–44. https://doi.org/10.33350/ka.95615

Katajamäki, Sakari, and Karina Lukin. 2013. "Textual Trails from Oral to Written Sources: An Introduction." In *Limited Sources, Boundless Possibilities. Textual Scholarship and the Challenges of Oral and Written Texts. RMN Newsletter*, 7: 8–17.

Kaukonen, Väinö. 1956. *Elias Lönnrotin Kalevalan toinen painos*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Krohn, Julius. 1888. *Kalevalan toisinnot. Suomen kansallis-eepoksen ainekset järjestettyinä sisällyksen ja laulupaikkojen mukaan*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Krohn, Kaarle. 1896. "Kalevalan esityöt". *Virittäjä*, 157–79.

Kuismin, Anna, and M. J. Driscoll, eds. 2013. *White Field, Black Seeds. Nordic Literature Practices in the Long Nineteenth Century*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Kurkela, Vesa. 2012. "Sorrowful Folk-Song and Nationalism in Nineteenth Century Finland". In *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe during the long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Timothy Baycroft, and David Hopkin, 351–69. Leyden and Boston: Brill.

Kuutma, Kristin. 2006. *Collaborative Representations. Interpreting the Creation of a Sámi Ethnography and a Seto Epic*. Folklore Fellows' Communications 289. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia.

Laitinen, Heikki. 2003. *Matkoja musiikkiin 1800-luvun Suomessa*. Tampere: Tampereen yliopisto. https://urn.f/urn:isbn:951-44-5707-2

Leerssen, Joep. 2008. "Introduction. Philology and the European Construction of National Literatures". *European Studies,* 26: 13–27.

———. 2012. "Oral Epic: The Nation Finds a Voice". In *Folklore and Nationalism in Europe during the Long Nineteenth Century*, edited by Timothy Baycroft and David Hopkin, 11–26. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Lyly, Pentti. 1983. "Otto Mannisen 'Pellavan kitkijä'". In *Kirjojen meri. Professori Annamari Sarajaksen juhlakirja 12.10.1983,* edited by Kai Laitinen, Irja Rane-Peltola, and Urpo Vento, 110–15. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Manninen, Otto. 1897. "Kosken ruusu". *Koitar: Savo-karjalaisen osakunnan albumi*, 5: 47–48.

Marques, J. J. Dias. 2010. "The Creative Editing of Traditional Ballads". In *From "Wunderhorn" to the Internet: Perspectives on Conceptions of "Folk Song" and the Editing of Traditional Songs*, edited by John Eckhard and Tobias Widmaier, 180–89. Trier: Wissenchaftlicher Verlag.

Mitterand, Henri. 1979. "Programme et préconstruit génétique: le dossier de L'assommoir". In *Essais de critique génétique,* edited by Louis Hay, 193–226. Paris: Flammarion,

———. 2004. "Genetic Criticism and Cultural History: Zola's Rougon-Macquart Dossiers". In *Genetic Criticism. Texts and avant-textes,* edited by Jed Deppman, Daniel Ferrer, and Michael Groden, 117–31. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Niemi, A. R. 1898. *Kalevalan kokoonpano I. Runokokous Väinämöisestä*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuraß.

Perraudin, Michael, and Matthew Campbell. 2017. "Introduction". In *The Voice of the People. Writing the European Folk Revival, 1760–1914,* edited by Matthew Campbell and Michael Perraudin, 1–7. London, New York, and Delhi: Anthem Press.

Rantavaara, Irma. [1982] 1984. "Symbolism and Finnish Literature". In *The Symbolist Movement in the Literature of European Languages*, edited by Anna Balakian, 595–601. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.

Reichl, Karl. 2000. "Silencing the voice of the singer: problems and strategies in the editing of Turkic oral epics". In *Textualization of Oral Epics*, edited by Lauri Honko, 103–27. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Seitel, Paul. 2012. "Three Aspects of Textuality". In *A Companion to Folklore*, edited by Regina F. Bendix & Galit Hasan-Rokem, 75–93. Malden, Mass.: Wiley-Blackwell. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118379936.ch

Siikala, Anna-Leena 2012. *Itämerensuomalaisten mytologia*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Silverstein, Michael, and Greg Urban. 1996. "The Natural History of Discourse". In *Natural Histories of Discourses*, edited by Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 1–17. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Suomen Kansan Vanhat Runot (=SKVR). 1908–1948, 1997. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. https://skvr.fi

Sykäri, Venla. 2022. "Rhymer's Microcosm. Variation and Oral Composition of the 19th Century Finnish Rekilaulu Couplets". In *Rhyme and Rhyming in Verbal Art, Language, and Song*, edited by Venla Sykäri, and Nigel Fabb, 172–97. Studia Fennica Folkloristica 25. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. https://doi.org/10.21435/sff.25

Urban, Greg. 1996. "Entextualization, Replication, and Power". In *Natural Histories of Discourses*, edited by Michael Silverstein and Greg Urban, 21–44. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Van Hulle, Dirk. 2004. *Textual Awareness. A Genetic Study of Late Manuscripts by Joyce, Proust, and Mann*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.

———. 2022. *Genetic Criticism. Tracing Creativity in Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van Hulle, Dirk, and Joep Leerssen, eds. 2008. *Editing the Nation's Memory. Textual Scholarship and Nation-Building in Nineteenth-Century Europe*. Amsterdam, New York: Rodopi.

Wimmer, Andreas, and Nina Glick schiller. 2003. "Methodological Nationalism, the Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology". *The International Migration Review*, 3.3: 576–610.