

The city as a mediating device and as a symbol in Finnish poetry of the 1960s

Harri Veivo

CIEH&CIEFi

Université Sorbonne Nouvelle – Paris 3

1, rue Censier

75005 Paris, France

e-mail: harri.veivo@univ-paris3.fr

Abstract. In Finnish poetry of the 1960s, the city, and above all the capital Helsinki, is the scene where the metamorphosis of Finland from an agrarian into an urban society is staged, analysed and commented. It is also a symbol that serves to situate the country in the global context, with all the contradictions that were characteristic of the position of Finland in the cold war system. Writing about the city was a means to reflect on the transformations of social and political reality and of the physical environment, a means to represent the confusion these transformations produced or to work towards understanding them. The article analyses the city in texts belonging to the “new poetry” of the 1960s, as well as in texts representing the modernist poetics of the 1950s, arguing that the very co-existence of two contrasting poetic discourses was crucial for the semiotic development of Finnish culture in the period of time in question.

In 1964, the Finnish writer Matti Kurjensaari noted in his journal a sharp difference between the 1960s and the earlier decades. If in the 1930s the Finns had been praying and hoping, and during the war only hope had been left, the 1960s were a time of thinking. “Never before have there been so passionate debates in Finland as today,” Kurjensaari wrote in the entry of June 20 (Kurjensaari 1973: 16). From today’s perspective, Kurjensaari’s claim seems to be correct. The sixties saw a series of transformations that changed Finland from a mainly agrarian society into a modern consumer society. TV started to invade the living rooms and to acquire a dominant position among the media. Hand in hand with the TV came the tabloid press and western entertainment production, which in turn fed the rising youth and underground cultures. Income levels, free time and mobility were constantly increasing, all this causing a profound transformation of habits, social roles and identities.

At the same time, the “physiognomy” of the country was under negotiation on two fronts. The two preceding decades had seen a short revival of rural culture, but the sixties was a period of rapid urbanization. Construction works changed old city centres as well as suburbia, demolishing old buildings and producing new living environments often marked by a lack of historical roots and of traditional social cohesion (see Peltonen *et al.* 2003). On the other hand, Finland’s place between the two blocks of the Cold War had to be redefined constantly. The country carefully avoided expressing opinions that could have been interpreted as hostile towards the Soviet Union, yet on the other hand it was a democratic western-type society with a market economy. Foreign policy was conceived of as a means to preserve the internal situation. This produced a close connection between the two spheres. Discussions of the East and the West were discussions about the Finnish society, about its possible models and modes of functioning, and efforts to change the politics in Finland were reflected in considerations of international relations (see, e.g., Ylikangas 2007: 303–317).

Literature and the arts were sensitive to these tensions and developments, and this is especially true of the cinema, which saw the rise of a number of ambitious young talents in the sixties (see Toiviainen 1975), and of poetry, which is the topic of this article. Politically, the poetry of the sixties was often connected to leftist thinking, occasionally explicitly Marxist, yet it was open to western influences. Aesthetically it was experimental, developing techniques such as montage and collage in order to open the space of the text to foreign voices and materials and to connect with everyday life, politics and a wide range of social discourses (Veivo, *in press*). Semiotically it gave a prominent place to processes of creolization and contamination and to the use of proper names, expanding the system of poetry to cover new words, objects and social realities and also functioning as a mediator translating and negotiating the relation between tradition and the rapidly changing contemporary world. This was perceivable also in the editorial policies of literary journals and anthologies, where poetry was made to coexist with articles on issues varying from real estate market analysis and foreign politics to statistics on alcohol consumption. Poetry was a mode of participation in the passionate debates Kurjensaari was so fond of.

In these aspects, the “new poetry” of the sixties was opposed to the modernist aesthetics of the fifties that had emphasized the autonomy of arts and defended image-based, critical and sceptical poetry in line with American and

British modernism. The two poetic discourses can be interpreted as evidence for two phases in the development of Finnish culture. The fifties was a period of gradual development, of self-definition and metadescription in the emerging cold-war system after the political, cultural and military defeat of 1944. The following decade witnessed a much faster and more fundamental development, an explosion-like redefinition of structures and categories that called for radical responses in literature and the arts. If the modernists of the fifties had sought to renew poetic discourse through concision, purification and elimination of archaisms, the poets of the generation of the sixties enhanced contamination and the intrusion of foreign voices and foreign references into poetry. If the poetics of the earlier decade had preferred a distanced mode of contemplation and the trope of the “no man’s land” (Viikari 1992), claiming that a man of letters must “eat and drink only ink and think and dream only about ink”, as Tuomas Anhava, the leading aesthetic authority of the decade had said (Repo 1954: 302; my translation), the poetics of the sixties urged for contact, embraced bohemian lifestyles inspired by the beatniks and developed a “culture of crisis” (Calinescu 1987: 124) typical for avant-garde experimentation. Even though the demarcation lines between the generation of the sixties and the modernists of the fifties were clear, the two aesthetic movements were, however, also in close contact, the first one defining itself in opposition with the second one, and individual poets often representing both paradigms (see, e.g., Haapala 2007: 280–284). The poetic experimentation of the sixties was pluralistic also in the sense that it accommodated the modernist discourse of the fifties, exemplifying the very co-existence of gradual and discontinuous processes within one literary genre (for gradual and discontinuous or explosive processes in culture, see Lotman 2004).

The two discourses, and the social tensions and transformations that motivate them, meet in representations of the city in the poetry of the 1960s. In modern literature, the city has been the symbol *par excellence* for representation and analysis of the modernisation of society and the deep transformations it has entailed, which have affected the status of literature as well (see, for example, Alter 2005; Lehan 1998; Pike 1981). In Finland, the early modernists of the *Dagdrivarna*-group in the 1910s and the revues *Quosego* and *Tulen-kantajat* in the 1920s and 1930s had participated in this questioning, bringing the first urban themes and characters into Finnish literature.¹ The city in

¹ The group *Dagdrivarna* and the revue *Quesejo* were Swedish-speaking. Among the influential writers in these were Torsten Helsingius, Runar Schildt, Gunnar Björling and

Finnish poetry of the 1960s inherited features from these traditions and situated them in a particularly complex situation where the city is represented in creolized and contaminated texts exposing disorder and dispersal, as well as in coherent and concise texts aimed at cultural ordering and metadescription. The city, and above all the capital Helsinki, is the scene where the metamorphosis of Finland from an agrarian into an urban society is staged, analysed and commented upon. It is also a symbol that serves to situate the country in the global context, with all the contradictions that were characteristic of the position of Finland in the cold war system. Writing about the city was a means to reflect on the transformations of social and political reality and of the physical environment, a means to represent the confusion these transformations produced or to work towards understanding them.

The city: culture and nature, persuasion and confusion

One of the key questions in the process of urbanization was the relation between culture and nature (and especially the forest), which had been constitutive of Finnish self-understanding since the rise of national literature in the first half of the 19th century. The new suburban housing complexes on the fringes of the cities and sometimes quite far in the forests provided thousands of people with high living standards, but they also deeply modified their relationship with their natural environment that now became framed by blocks of flats, parking lots, urban highways and occasionally also waste and dirt, that is, objects and materials in the wrong place.

Väinö Kirstinä, one of the leading poets of the generation of the 1960s, directly comments on this new reality where old distinctions between “pure” nature and culture become obsolete in his poem “Keskellä kulttuuria” (“In the middle of culture”; Kirstinä 1963: 48–49), which reads as an inventory of a random collection of natural and cultural objects found at an empty summer theatre site, such as birds, trees, tools, clothes, brand names and waste. The list is interrupted by citations from the fellow poet Arvo Salo and tabloid press headlines, bringing into the text voices other than the poet’s. Kirstinä’s poem does not seek to order these things or to criticize their apparent disorder;

Henry Parland. *Tulenkantajat* was published in Finnish and edited first by Olavi Paavolainen (pseudonym Olavi Lauri), who urged Finnish writers to focus on the city and to adopt influences from European modernism and avant-garde.

rather, it questions the very validity of hierarchies and oppositions such as those between culture and nature, poetry and journalistic discourse, valuable things and waste, and, ultimately, between the real and the unreal. When the lyrical I expresses himself, the tone is both joyful and sardonic. He claims to “love you amateurs of culture” and to be “the lamp [and] you the light”, yet also to “burst out in a deadly laugh” (my translation – H. V.).

A similar kind of complex attitude can be found in Pekka Lounela’s 1964 poem “Kaupungit, mustetahrat” (“Cities, blots of ink”; Lounela 1964: 15) in which the lyrical I declares, in a complex manner, his love for both the forest that is being invaded by TV and radio antennas, symbols of technological progress, and for the popular music that is transmitted through the antennas. The metaphors in the poem describe antennas as forest and music as flowers and thus tend, like Kirstinä’s inventory, to transcend the separation of the domains of culture and nature. The title of the poem, on the other hand, compares cities with ink and thus implicitly with writing and culture, yet also with dirt, with material that is accidentally in the wrong place. The expansion of the city is seen as a brutal and disordered process, but it entails also progress of culture, multiplicity, diversity and hybridization. This offers a definition of the poet’s task, as he claims in the last lines of the poem that “my task is thus to moderately preach puberty / alone amid cities and literatures, / amid paper, languages and useless inventions” (my translation).

For Lounela, the city with its brutal intrusion into nature and the contrasts and oppositions it produces provides a rhetorical space that can be used in argumentation to define the poet’s role. A similar kind of approach with a similar kind of function can be found in texts that address another fundamental set of relations that was being modified by the process of urbanization, namely the relations between the individual and society, and between different social groups. In Brita Polttila’s, Pekka Lounela’s and Claes Andersson’s poetry, for example, Helsinki becomes a series of juxtaposed and conflicting scenes and figures. The strongly contrasting elements of the city – such as the new buildings for commerce and banking and the poverty and decay next to them (Polttila 1970: 15; Lounela 1967: 28–47), or the TV broadcasts on civil war in Bolivia and the hippies hanging around in the streets (Andersson 1996[1969]: 41) – are conceived as parts of a topos, as material for an argument that seeks to draw attention to the unequal distribution of wealth and to the generalized feeling of solitude, the two being considered the most urgent problems of the welfare society that was still at its beginning. The representation of the city

supports a claim on the society as a whole. Even though the texts represent strongly contrasting elements, they remain subjected to this defining mode, and in this sense belong to the self- and metadescriptive moment in cultural dynamism characteristic of the poetics of the 1950s, even though the texts were published in the late 1960s and in 1970.

The use of the city as a rhetorical space presupposes an intention of persuasion, and thus an instrumental approach to the topic. The city was, however, perceived also as a place of confusion that did not permit such an attitude, but rather questioned the very foundations of the poet's identity. At the end of the 1960s and the beginning of the 1970s, Matti Paavilainen represents in several texts the city, and especially Helsinki, where he was born, as a philosophical space prone to fundamental dialectical reflection (see, for example, Paavilainen 1970: 43–59; 1972: 15–28). He argues that in urban space creation has replaced nature, demolition is loss but also renewal, and diversity and multitude bring disagreement, but also transcendence of disagreements. “Everything you see,” he writes in his collection *Kaupunki enemmän kuin kohtalo* (*City more than destiny*, 1972), “is an answer to the question you didn't have time to make [...] The city lives in my heart like I / live in the city. The houses rise in me and I want to be / an eternal question to the city, which gradually is an answer to everything” (Paavilainen 1972: 18–21; my translation – H. V.). In Paavilainen's poetry, the lyrical I deeply identifies himself with the city, but he is also constantly out of step with the development of the urban environment. Demolition and construction change the familiar places that serve for the poet's projective self-identification. However, this does not lead to nostalgic melancholia as in Charles Baudelaire's paradigmatic texts on the modern city experience in *Les fleurs du mal* (1857). If the city questions the very premises of his constructed identity, it also offers, with diversity and multiplicity, new models for shaping oneself.

Paavilainen's dialectic urban space is reminiscent of Pentti Saarikoski's approach, which the latter characterized with the term “dialectic poetry” in a famous programmatic text from 1963 (Saarikoski 1963), and also of Arvo Turtiainen's poems from the 1960s. The poets share the understanding of the city as a complex space characterized by difference and disagreement. Turtiainen, who had started his career already in the 1930s, portrays Helsinki and its recent history using slang and through fictional characters as well as personal memories (see Turtiainen 1962 and 1968). Saarikoski, the leading young poet of the 1960s next to Kirstinä, is interested in the city as a

heteroglossic space of different kinds of discourses that represent different kinds of value systems and approaches to reality, and which he wants to incorporate in his texts. In his 1965 collection *Kuljen missä kuljen* (*I'm going where I'm going*, Saarikoski 2008: especially 109–134) this poetic principle is realized through an extended use of citations from varying sources extending from everyday discussions to newspaper headlines. The citations expand the space of the city – on this occasion, again Helsinki – towards global politics and distant places mentioned and commented in the material Saarikoski works with. On the other hand, the citations are embedded in a series of impressions and reflections that permit the reader to chart the lyrical I's wanderings in the city and the thoughts this urban environment provokes. Thus Helsinki becomes a site that gathers indexical references to the global world and heterogeneous citations into a local scale organized around the lyrical I (on the notion of 'site', see Cauquelin 2007). The movement is that of a *flâneur*, but whereas the classic Baudelairian figure of the *flâneur* retains a critical distance to the city space (see Benjamin 2002: 57–100), Saarikoski's lyrical I is constantly addressed by other people, traversed by their talk, and only occasionally does he take a stance towards the observed phenomena, and even then in an interrogative mode.

The city between the East and the West, the local and the global

As I mentioned earlier, the “physiognomy” of Finland was not only changed by the process of urbanization; it was also affected by the constant process of negotiation that concerned its position in the geopolitical space of Europe. The city – and above all the capital, Helsinki – is a key element also in this respect. It functions as a multivalent symbol in texts that seek to articulate Finland's position in the bipolar space of the Cold War and in relation to cultural centres and peripheries at the scale of Europe and the world. Here as well we can observe the two tendencies of integration and creolization at work. Saarikoski's 1962 poem “Minä asun Helsingissä” (“I live in Helsinki”) is a good illustration of self- and metadescriptive use of the symbol of Helsinki at the level of geopolitical relations:

Helsinki is where I live.
Helsinki is the capital of Finland.
It lies by the sea 120 miles to the west from Leningrad.
Helsinki is an expanding city, and the rents are high.
We sit here surrounded by our forest, backs turned to the giant
and stare at his image in a well's eye. He wears a dark suit,
white shirt, silver-grey tie. In his country everything is
quite different, there people walk on or without their heads.
We sit here in the midst of our very own forests,
but far away in the West there is a land where huge eyes float
by the shore, and they can see us here.
Helsinki is in the process of reconstruction, according to the
plans made by Mr Alvar Aalto.
(Saarikoski 1967: 23; translation by Anselm Hollo)

The poem begins with a simple, encyclopaedia-like discourse stating banal facts about Helsinki, but adopts a more figurative mode as it moves on to discuss Finland's position in relation to the East and the West. At this point, Helsinki functions as the symbol for the whole country, and the lyrical I moves from the first person singular to the first person plural, giving voice to what the poet proposes as a collective experience. The giant stands for the Soviet Union, and the clothes have been identified as referring to Nikita Khrushchev (see editorial notes in Saarikoski 2008: 295). Interestingly, the giant is not faced directly, but observed as a reflection in a well that is in the middle of the Finnish forest. The forest as a natural phenomenon obstructs sight, and the fact that it belongs to the Finns ("our forests") is underlined, adds a self-ironical note to the text, whereas an image on the surface of water is traditionally loaded with significations of fascination and mystical communication. The image can thus be interpreted as representing the peculiar relationship of interference in the 1960s' Finland between the internal and external politics that I commented on at the beginning of the article. It represents Finland as a closed society where direct contact with foreign countries is hindered, but where the influence of the eastern superpower is experienced like a compelling force. The other superpower, on the other hand, is represented indirectly as an observer. In a geo-political reading, this can be understood as a comment on the West's interest in Finland's somewhat experimental and atypical position as a basically neutral country between the two spheres of influence. Historically this position was particularly evident in 1962, when the Soviet-dominated World Festival of Youth and Culture was organized in Helsinki, transforming the city for a

couple of weeks into a field where the balance between the West and the East was disputed principally in terms of cultural and political propaganda, but also in fights between the festival supporters, their adversaries and the police (see Krekola 2009).

Saarikoski's poem, a "humorous and ironical definition of a condition" that is a resignation according to Herbert Lomas (1991: 11), is based on the coherent use of concise images and as such follows the poetic principles of Finnish modernism of the 1950s. Interestingly, texts using the typical poetic techniques of the 1960s – such as a floating and undulating layout, citation technique and montage – articulate geopolitical and geocultural relations in more flexible ways. Anselm Hollo's 1964 poem "Teräsmies pienenä" ("The Superman as a child") exemplifies this technique:

[...]
 Les Tricheurs
 did Pound have to leave
 the little Athens of Idaho
 yesterday today
 Neruda germinates
 in Pitäjänmäki

in Wiesbaden
 sunglasses during the night-time
 hipsters
vingt ans après
 Der Miles
 and der Miles Davis
 so schön
 a couple of thousands of miles
 away booms «Zone»
 in the attic on the 8th street
 a frightening voice
 howls in Allen's head

[...]
 (Hollo 1964: 17–18; my translation – H. V.)

The city of Helsinki, represented here metonymically by one of its suburbs, Pitäjänmäki, is weaved into a textual fabric that consists of references to world cities, to authors and works representing the tradition of avant-garde modernism and the American beat-generation, and to symbols of jazz music

and French cinema. What is particularly interesting here is the use of proper names (on proper names in semiotics of culture, see Lotman 2004: 57–65, 171–176). The names of places connect Pitäjänmäki to the 8th street and to the “little Athens of Idaho”, but also to Wiesbaden and, through the names of Marcel Carné’s film *Les tricheurs*, Apollinaire’s poem “Zone” and the Chilean poet Neruda, to Paris and Latin America. The names of the artworks, as well as those of Miles Davis and the Beat poet Allen Ginsberg, serve as tools situating the text in relation to the artistic landmarks of the 1960s, but also in relation to a certain lifestyle, that of the be-pop, hipsters and the existentialist youth of Saint-Germain-des-Prés. The elements are treated equally by the text, without rhetorical operations that would place one element as central in relation to the others. Over and above this play of connecting and identification, the use of proper names shows also the intrusion of external factors into the semiotic space of Finnish culture, and testifies to the poet’s willingness to come to grips with this intrusion, to insert them into the poetic discourse that becomes thus transformed. At the same time, tension is created between the text and the reading community in the sense that the reception of the text necessitates specific cultural competencies that permit to understand the references established by the names that are delivered without explanations.

Similar kind of texts are to be found in Veijo Polameri’s (1967), Kari Aronpuro’s (1964: 31–39) and Jarkko Laine’s (1967; 1970) poetry, and also in many of Saarikoski’s works from the mid-1960s (Saarikoski 2008: 109–134). Here, the city – Helsinki in Polameri’s and Saarikoski’s case, the Tampere of Aronpuro and a less recognizable Turku in the case of Laine – is further related to entertainment and consumer culture, to global events like the war in Vietnam and the revolution in Cuba, and to yet other symbols of avant-garde modernism and the emerging pop culture. The geocultural and geopolitical space is not organized around two dominating poles, but is rather constructed around a plurality of centres, and it is a space of a multitude of cultures, languages and intertexts that makes efforts of coherent meta-description impossible.

For Saarikoski in the 1960s, Helsinki was the essential place to be, even though he occasionally spent long periods of time elsewhere. The poem “Helsinki” from 1966 expresses the complex function the city has as a central symbol in a network of references connecting the everyday living environment to contemporary discussions on poetry and politics, to the poet’s youth and childhood and further to figures in classical literature Saarikoski was translating

and strongly identified with. The poet's relationship to the city appears as fundamentally ambivalent. On the one hand, he declares that "Helsinki my City remains in my mind, in good order / and when I am gone, it still moves like a tree". The city is a stable element that creates continuity, yet this continuity is also movement, change, and thus source for alienation and loss as it appears in Baudelaire's poetry and in many other central works of modern urban literature. On the other hand, the poet claims to "carry a bomb in [his] briefcase" and to "destroy Helsinki" (Saarikoski 1967: 46–47; translated by Anselm Hollo). This claim, that reminds of the bomb in Andrei Belyi's *Petersburg* (final edition 1922²) is, however, not an expression of hatred, but rather of the avant-gardist impulse to create conditions for a new society through making a *tabula rasa* of what exists. From the beginning of the 1960s onwards, Saarikoski defended new poetry by calling for a "construction plan for culture" and by warning of "the dispersion of avant-garde into individuals" (Saarikoski 1965: 6; 1964: 4). Twice he also stood as a candidate at parliamentary elections and was generally recognized as the leading left-wing intellectual of his generation. This public role was, however, in contradiction with Saarikoski's poetry, where an intellectual, analytical and distanced mode of observation is dominant, despite the use of montage and the calls for dialectical poetry. In "Helsinki", the poet seeks to adopt two roles or *personae* that give expression to this contradictory situation and its conflicting demands and desires. He is Odysseus, the subtle and cunning one, the *polytropos* who has travelled much; yet he is also Oudeis, that is, 'no one' (the name Odysseus claims to be his when he escapes from the Cyclops's cave), which in Saarikoski's words signifies also "not skilful, not widely travelled". Helsinki is the place where these two roles meet. It is the city of public action, of skilled and brilliant texts and close intellectual contacts, but also of hesitation, tiredness, of the desire "to be an outsider", and the travels Saarikoski as Odysseus has travelled are as much travels in the city as travels in time, from childhood's metaphysical questions to a writer's career.

² An excerpt of *Petersburg* was published in issue 8 of the revue *Parnasso* in 1964, followed by the translator Esa Adrian's essay on the novel that mentions the motif of the bomb. Although we cannot be sure whether Saarikoski had read the translated excerpt and Adrian's essay, it is quite likely that the text was discussed in Saarikoski's circles.

The city in the cultural dialogue of the 1960s

Saarikoski's Helsinki is a mediating device that brings multiple and, in many respects, contradictory elements into contact with each other. It is the place of identification with figures from classical literature, as well as that of experimentation with new forms of writing; it is the capital of a small nation involved in global politics as well as the poet's home town of personal memories and private thoughts and emotions. When observed at the level of explicit description and detail, the city in "Helsinki" is reduced to basic elements such as speech, human contacts, the street and walking, interrupted by bucolic elements from the ancient Greek tradition. It is not the generic modern city of technology, transport, industry and crowds, but the space of a quest and of what is essential to it. Helsinki in the 1960s was, nevertheless, a huge construction site: the city was not only expanding into the surrounding nature, but also its core was engaged in a constant process of destruction of the old and construction of the new. It is tempting to think that Saarikoski's complex play with forking references and identifications was possible only in this period in the development of the city when change was the dominating impression and the modernist idea of progress was still widely accepted, yet the old and the new still coexisted side by side and between each other like phrases in a conversation. In the 1970s, the pace of modernization and especially of urbanization slowed down after the peak year of 1974 (Sarantola-Weiss 2008: 26–28), and the writers' search for new forms of writing and a new readership that had caused a profound reorganization of the genre system in Finnish literature was also over (Laitinen 1981: 573–574 and 587–590).

The relation between urbanization and literature – and especially poetry – is not a fortuitous parallelism, but of a more profound, dialogical nature. "Dialogue creates identity," as Peeter Torop writes when commenting on Lotman's theory of cultural dynamism (Torop 2002: 401). Dialogue here is not to be understood in its everyday meaning of verbal exchange, but as a fundamental semiotic mechanism of culture, as a mediating and creative relation between cultural languages. This is particularly valuable for the analysis of Finnish culture in the 1960s. It was a decade when Finns discussed and debated more than ever before and poetry was brought into contact with most varying contexts and discourses. This discussion was not only about opinions and arguments, but also, and more profoundly, a dynamical process in which poetry reacted to the intrusion of new realities into Finnish culture and the two dominating poetic languages, the modernism of the 1950s and the new poetry

of the 1960s, reflected and redefined each other, thus working towards new ways of conceiving of the world and of poetry. The use of concise imagery to represent Finland's geopolitical situation and the treatment of the city as a rhetoric space exemplifies a tendency towards integration and self-understanding and metadescription characterizing the culture as a whole. On the other hand, the dialectical approach to the city and the willingness to open up the space of the poem to diverse citations, intertexts and discourses, the weaving of Helsinki and Finland into the fabric of world culture and global information flow, represent creolization of cultural languages and the increasing communication between different areas of culture, beyond the levels of national culture. The city was a central element in both of these discourses, mediating in varying ways between the old and the new, the East and the West, culture and nature, and thus offering the country multiple connections, parallels and reflections, step by step building up its identity as a modern state.

References

- Alter, Robert 2005. *Imagined Cities. Urban Experience and the Language of the Novel*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Andersson, Claes 1996. *Runoja meren pohjalta*. (Saaritsa, Pentti, trans.) Helsinki: WSOY.
- Aronpuro, Kari 1964. *Peltiset enkelit*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- Benjamin, Walter 2002. *Charles Baudelaire. Un poète lyrique à l'apogée du capitalisme*. (Lacoste, Jean, trans.) Paris: Payot.
- Calinescu, Matei 1987. *Five Faces of Modernity. Modernism, Avant-Garde, Decadence, Kitsch, Postmodernism*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Cauquelin, Anne 2007. *Le site et le paysage*. Paris: PUF.
- Haapala, Vesa 2007. Kokeellinen kirjallisuus ja kirjallinen vastarinta Suomessa – kiintopisteenä 1960-luku. In: Katajamäki, Sakari; Veivo, Harri (eds.), *Kirjallisuuden avantgarde ja kokeellisuus*. Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 277–304.
- Hollo, Anselm 1964. *Trobar: löytää*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Kirstinä, Väinö 1963. *Puhetta*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Krekola, Joni 2009. Helsingin nuorisofestivaali kylmän sodan maailmankartalla. *Idäntutkimus* 4: 28–38.
- Kurjensaari, Matti 1973. *Syntynyt sivulliseksi. Näkyjä ja näkemyksiä 1960–1973*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Laine, Jarkko 1967. *Muovinen Buddha*. Helsinki: Otava.
- 1970. *Tulen ja jään sirkus*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Laitinen, Kai 1981. *Suomen kirjallisuuden historia*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Lehan, Richard 1998. *The City in Literature*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Lomas, Herbert 1991. *Contemporary Finnish Poetry*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Bloodaxe Books.
- Lotman, Juri 1990. *Universe of the Mind. A Semiotic Theory of Culture*. (Shukman, Ann, trans.) London: I. B. Tauris.
- 2004. *L'explosion et la culture*. (Merkoulova, Inna, trans.) Limoges: PULIM.
- Lounela, Pekka 1964. *Asiaa*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- 1967. *Helsinki*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Paavilainen, Matti 1970. *Muistoja Pohjolasta*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- 1972. *Kaupunki enemmän kuin kohtalo*. Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä.
- Peltonen, Matti; Kurkela, Vesa; Heinonen, Visa (eds.) 2003. *Arkinen kumous. Suomalaisen 60-luvun toinen kuva*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Pike, Burton 1981. *The Image of the City in Modern Literature*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Polameri, Veijo 1967. 365. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Polttila, Brita 1970. *Surua seuraa ilo*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Repo, Eino S. (ed.) 1954. *Toiset pidot tornissa*. Jyväskylä: Gummerus.
- Saarikoski, Pentti 1963. Dialektisesta runoudesta. *Kansan uutiset*, December 8.
- 1964. Tehtävien asettelua. *Aikalainen* 1: 3–8.
- 1965. Masentavaa. *Aikalainen* 1: 3–6.
- 1967. *Helsinki*. (Hollo, Anselm, transl.) London: Rapp & Carroll.
- 2008. *Runot 61–66*. (Kantola, Janna; Riikonen, H. K., eds.) Helsinki: Otava.
- Sarantola-Weiss, Minna 2008. *Reilusti ruskeaa. 1970-luvun arkea*. Helsinki: WSOY.
- Toiviainen, Sakari 1975. *Uusi suomalainen elokuva: 60-luvun alusta nykypäivään*. Helsinki: Otava.
- Torop, Peeter 2002. Introduction: Re-reading of cultural semiotics. *Sign Systems Studies* 30(2): 395–404.
- Turtiainen, Arvo 1962. *Minä paljasjalkainen*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- 1963. *Puhetta Porthaninrinteellä*. Helsinki: Tammi.
- Veivo, Harri in press. Finnish avant-garde poetry of the 1960s between art and the everyday, the high and the low. In: Anderberg, Birgitte; Engström, Andreas; Hjartarson, Benedikt et al. (eds.), *The Cultural History of the Nordic Avant-garde 1950–1975*, vol. 3. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Viikari, Auli 1992. Ei kenenkään maa. 1950-luvun tropologiaa. In: Makkonen, Anna (ed.), *Avoin ja suljettu. Kirjoituksia 1950-luvusta suomalaisessa kulttuurissa*. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 30–77.
- Ylikangas, Heikki 2007. *Suomen historian solmukohdat*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Город как посреднический прием и символ в финской поэзии 1960-х гг

В финской поэзии 1960-х гг город и прежде всего столица Хельсинки становятся сценой, с которой представляют, анализируют и комментируют превращение Финляндии из сельскохозяйственного общества в городское. В то же время сам город является символом, с помощью которого эта страна помещается в глобальный контекст вместе со всеми противоречиями, характерными для Финляндии в ситуации холодной войны. Выбор города объектом описания явился средством, с помощью которого можно было размышлять об изменениях социальной и политической реальности, окружающей среды, изображать сопровождающий изменения беспорядок или стремиться к пониманию изменений. Статья анализирует город в “новой поэзии” 1960-х и в текстах, отражающих модернистскую поэтику 1950-х; указывая при этом, что именно сосуществование двух противоположных поэтических дискурсов имело решающее значение в семиотическом развитии финской культуры рассматриваемого периода.

Linn kui vahendav võte ja sümbol 1960ndate aastate soome luules

1960ndate aastate soome luules on linn, ja ennekõike pealinn Helsingi, selleks lavaks, millel esitatakse, analüüsitakse ja kommenteeritakse Soome muundumist põllumajanduslikust ühiskonnast linlikuks. Samuti on linn sümbol, millega see maa asetatakse globaalsesse konteksti ühes kõigi vastuoludega, mis iseloomustasid Soome positsiooni külma sõja süsteemis. Linnast kirjutamine oli vahend, mille abil mõtiskleda sotsiaalse ja poliitilise reaalsuse ning füüsilise keskkonna muutuste üle, kujutada muutustega kaasnenud segadust või püüelda muutuste mõistmise poole. Artikkel analüüsib linna 1960ndate “uues luules”, aga ka tekstides, mis esindavad 1950ndate modernistlikku poeetikat, osutades, et just kahe vastandliku poeetilise diskursuse koosinemine oli otsustava tähtsusega soome kultuuri semiootilises arengus vaadeldaval perioodil.