

Matti Hyvärinen

The Fictional Versions of 'Valta' (Power)

*Reading Aleksis Kivi, Arvid Järnefelt and
Juhani Aho Conceptually*

Introduction

The gradual birth and widening of Finnish polity during the 19th century renders a very particular case for conceptual history¹. Written Finnish was established during an astonishingly short period of time, approximately from the 1840s to 1870s. Far from being a centuries long experimental process, the creation of the conceptual bases of Finnish political culture took place as a conscious project lead by a fairly narrow nationalist elite. One of the great paradoxes of this process was embedded in the strictly limited political freedom and space of politics under the tsarist Russian power, which meant that the invention of language was both a sensitive and scrupulously inspected process. The Finnish word for 'power', *valta*, was appar-

ently one of the most sensitive concepts in terms of censorship, but otherwise it seems to be a deviant case of the general model. It was not coined, translated or circulated to the people by the elite but was an age-old Germanic loan word from the same root as *Gewalt*. For this reason, *valta* has its own, popular history on the level of vernacular. To get grip on this history, I have studied the leading 19th century Finnish novelists Aleksis Kivi, Arvid Järnefelt and Juhani Aho. Reading these writers conceptually, I argue, offers perspectives on the two-way traffic of meanings of *valta*: both from the vernacular to the elites, and from the European debates of the elites to the vernacular.

Until 1809, 'Finland' was hardly more than a name for the northeastern provinces of the Swedish empire. The political, cultural and administrative language of the entire empire was unquestionably Swedish, and Finns had to change both their language and names before receiving formal education. After the Russian army had occupied the province, and Tsar Alexander I had promised 'Finland' both autonomy and its own estate Diet as a Grand Duchy of Russia, the formation of a distinct nation was ready to set out. When the Finnish nationalist movement, the "Fennomen"², was born and gained momentum from the 1840s onwards, the direction of primary protests was against the language of the *previous* empire, not directly against Russia or Russian. In order to find, educate and love the Finnish people, the Fennomen first pursued the creation of the written Finnish language and poetry, then the Fennification of the whole Swedish-speaking administration, public arena and political culture.

In the first place, there were two actual opponents of this national project, the old Swedish-speaking aristocracy and the reactionary Russian government. A significant part of the established elite understood the national issue in terms of a conflict between Swedish culture and Russian

backwardness. For them, any attempt to foster the uncivilized Finnish language might jeopardize the continuity of the historical Swedish heritage and pave the way for the Russification of the province. The old elites were successful, at first, in presenting much of the Finnish endeavors as a political threat to the peace of Russian empire. The Crimean War (1853–56) and the rise to power by Alexander II consequently changed this pattern. Hence the Swedish language began to signify contacts with a foreign threat, and support for the Finnish language, culture and economy was understood by the Russian government as an attempt to separate “Finland” more thoroughly from its Swedish linkage and therefore as an opportunity for the further unification of the empire. For these reasons, at least the moderate aspirations of the Fennoman movement had a partial ally and supporter in the Russian government almost until the end of century, even if all attempts to popular mobilization were tightly inspected and controlled (Liikanen 1995).

Under these circumstances of substantially limited political freedom, the history of *valta* as a potentially critical concept becomes particularly interesting. During the period of time under study, from about 1870 to 1917, conceptual changes seem to occur on three different levels: i) the location or site of power (i.e. which phenomena are or can be discussed in terms of *valta*) changes; ii) the characterization of *valta* changes over time; and iii) the plurality and diversity of usages of *valta* grows over time.

There are two further reasons to consult fiction in the case of power, one general and one particularly Finnish. Firstly, even among the concepts of political theory, power appears as exceptionally intangible and flexible. To get a better grip on this ambiguity, theorists of power have repeatedly told more or less convincing stories and anecdotes of power. At times, readers have been likened to observers at the billiard table or compared to occasional

on-lookers and traffic officers who have been thought to orchestrate traffic (Ball 1988; Clegg 1989; 1993; Dahl 1958). Michel Foucault (1977) dramatizes his *Discipline and Punish* by contrasting the public play of power, manifested in a brutal execution, with the secretive and disciplinary power embedded in the model prison of the Panopticon. It seems to me that theorizing on power repeatedly calls for such stories, which in terms of Kenneth Burke (1969) might be named as *representative anecdotes*, and which accordingly allow for radically different vocabularies of power. The debate on the numerous “faces of power” has been partly a debate on the representative case of power: what is the scene, who, and of what kind are the agents, what is done, and for what purpose.

It is here that literature comes in. I take it that novelists tell very similar stories and anecdotes of power, stories which posit power in time and place, and in a net of relationships. In telling stories, the authors of fiction have apparently the same power of visualizing, reflecting as well as changing the usage of this concept. There are, of course, some reservations to be made when we speak about novelists as “theorists of power”. Authors may also have explicit theories and attempts to describe processes of power without the vocabulary of power (Linna 1990). I have no interest in these authorial theories as such, only the actually written and vocabularized world of power interests me in this study. On that level, not only do we recognize the explicit theories of power that the authors may have, but also the authors’ recognition of possible fictional and or mimetic languages that the characters employ in different contexts.

Secondly, the creation of Finnish literature was, of course, one of the key political objectives of the nationalistic movement. “Literature” and “politics” were far from such separate spheres as they appear nowadays, after the modernist breakthrough³. Such prominent writers as

Järnefelt and Aho personally knew and socialized with a significant part of the Fennoman political and cultural elite. As a journalist, Aho himself was an active politician and radical Fennoman.

The Two Realms of 'Valta' (Power)

What do I mean by the "location" or "site" of power? Perhaps it is best to begin with the prehistory of *valta*. During the Swedish power, a number of legal statutes and religious texts were translated into Finnish. This old usage appears to be extremely divided, as if there had been two distinct spheres of *valta*: it appears either in the meaning of 'authorities' (the German word 'Obrigkeit' better transmits the Lutheran meaning of the word), or in the meaning of *subjective right* or entitlement. The first of them, *esivalta*⁴, seems to have governed as an undivided and unquestioned anonymous agent above all of the mundane actors. It is quite obviously a permanent power, which cannot be legitimately challenged, resisted or struggled for. *Esivalta* is not a tool, method, or resource, it is the totality of the combined moral action of the Ruler and the Church, no matter whether it actualizes itself in the capital city or in the smallest countryside village. The word for a regional totality of this *esivalta* was empire, *valtakunta*⁵ (German 'Reich' and Swedish 'rike' bring the meaning closer).

The opposite and counterpart of this massive agent *authorities* was the strictly personal, subjective right, *valta*, power to do what one pleases within specified circumstances. The 1820-22 Statutes, for example, put it this way:

The master shall have the power (*valta*) at any time he wishes to sign his hirelings for still a year's service onwards and advance the hiring fee to validate this contract.

The location of *valta* is here interestingly narrative, as in many other status of that time. This is a power that a king, a master, or any single person can have. For example, the Statutes repeat that “nobody” has the power to demand a horse, or anything else, from an innkeeper, if one is not capable of paying for these services. Within conventional limits, defined by various narratives of *valta*, it offers almost absolute freedom of action. As regards the legal discourse, this *valta* clearly precedes the usage of ‘right’, and outnumbers it still at the beginning of the 19th century.

The old way of conceptualizing *valta* as entitlement seems to have at least two separate sources. Firstly, it is not so far from the biblical usage of power. J.A. Lopmeri (1944), in his study on old Finnish and Estonian toponyms, suggests a second and local source. According to him, big estates were called ‘powers’, and therefore several old names had the affix *-valta*. In this old usage, *valta* was able to mean a village or even the population of a village (Itkonen et. al., 1975). All of this seems to allude to a state of affairs, where the owners of an estate or even the inhabitants of a village were entitled to decide relatively freely about things within the limits of their premises. At least they had a regional entitlement to act, which was called *valta*. By the end of the Swedish power, this power as entitlement seems to be reduced – possibly from a political system with its own foundation – to the power of the master within his farm.

It is quite evident that a significant number of features that we nowadays inscribe into the sphere of power evade this bipolar system of ‘*esivalta*’ and ‘power as entitlement’. Neither of them genuinely conceptualizes power from the perspective of resources, neither of them conceptualizes power as a tool to be used, neither of them allows speculation on the division of power. *Esivalta* is far from the Foucauldian effectiveness of disciplinary power.

These gaps seem to inform of the lack of genuine political space and struggle. *Valta* does not catch the institutional structure of the Grand Duchy of Finland: it is either a feature of separate individuals or it is the unchallenged totality of Ruler and Church. Power *is*, it is not struggled for. The birth and enlargement of political space can thus have been as a process of marginalizing the area *esivalta* and broadening the area and applicability of *valta*.⁶ So far, my selection of novels is limited to the time under Russian power, and is not, of course, exclusive.

The Power of *Seven Brothers*

Alexis Stenvall (1834–1872) published the first Finnish novel *Seven Brothers* in 1870 under the Finnish pen name Aleksis Kivi, and since then he has maintained his position as either one of or *the* key figure of Finnish literature. Stenvall studied at the University of Helsinki, and had socialized with the group of nationalist *Fennomen*. The young student was the first winner of the State Prize of Finnish Literature, and was therefore both a celebrated (by the young nationalists) and hated (by his older competitors) figure before the publication of his novel.

In order to outline the national importance of this novel, I offer a schematization of the three major stages in the reception of this book. Immediately after its publication, the book was fiercely attacked and even condemned by the leading Finnish intellectuals. The book gave, said the critics, a totally crude, uncivilized and unidealistic picture of the Finnish people and peasants. This lack of spirit and an overarching ideal made the book totally unfit for the program of Finnish nationalism. The Swedish elite had continuously maintained that only the Swedish language could guarantee a cultural tradition. In terms of this conflict between new and old elites, the wild and

carnevalistic life of Kivi's brothers was an insult to the finest aspirations of the new Fennoman elite.

Towards the end of the century, when the position of the Finnish language and the new elites was established, this reception was radically rejected and Kivi was erected as a lonely and romantic hero of the Finnish nation. If anybody, Kivi knew the Finnish soul and its connectedness to nature and its wild, indigenous life. Kivi's novel was now interpreted as a story of growing national maturity, consciousness and responsibility after a wild period of life. Only recently (Kinnunen 1987, for instance) has a picture of Kivi as a splendid applier of popular humor and irony partly replaced the old romantic reception. It is easy to see how this third way of reading Kivi makes the first much more understandable: Kivi was originally criticized and even hated partly because of his daring plebeian humor and irony.

The frame of the story is simple: seven youngish brothers carry on an unruly and lazy life on their farm in Southern Finland. However, they cannot marry without learning to read, at least the catechism. Due to the crude way of teaching by the parish clerk, the brothers decide to escape all civilization by retreating into the forests and living there as hunters and cultivating fields by clearing and burning woodland. After ten years of wild solitude and a series of conflicts with the village people, the brothers decide to return to the village again and gradually change into responsible citizens. What makes Kivi's book so exciting is that the author thoroughly knew both his peasants and his Cervantes, Virgil and Shakespeare. Therefore, he seems to radically escape the political dilemma – and even tragedy – of Finnish nationalists, who had constantly declared and demanded the love for the Finnish people, but who had, at the same time, maintained a purely idealized image of humble, assiduous and silent people. The people had to be loved and praised, not heard.

As the first Finnish novel, and as a book rooted so thickly in peasant culture, *Seven Brothers* is an exceptionally valuable book in terms of the conceptual history of *valta*. Even if the book was written during the great translation project of political and social vocabulary, it still employed and documented older, popular usages of the Finnish language. The perspective of Helsinki, the capital city, and its intellectual elite dominated this novel less than any of its immediate followers. Kivi's particular position and way of using *valta* is easily recognized by reading the two published English translations (by Alex Matson, 1952, and Richard A. Impola⁷, 1991). Once, after a conflict with the minister, and under the compulsion to learn to read, the oldest of the brothers, Juhani asks, after cursing:

Hasn't a man a power (*valta*) to live in peace and... (Kivi, 1972, 95)⁸.

Alex Matson translates this section as follows:

A thousand flaming goblins! Hasn't a man the *right* to live his own life as he likes in peace, when he stands in no one's way, tramples on no one's rights? (Kivi, 1973, 94, italics mine)

It is noteworthy, that Kivi uses both 'valta' and 'oikeus' (right) in the same sentence. Impola, then, puts the same section thus:

One thousand fiery devils! *Can't* a man live by himself in peace and freedom if he meddles with no one, hurts no one's rights? (Kivi, 1991, 84, italics mine)

Conceptually, Matson is somewhat closer to Kivi's lost world, even if 'right' is here a much narrower concept than *valta*. For Kivi, a master and a man should have their own room and *valta*. Similarly, when brothers decide to rent out the southern part of the farm and escape to the

forests of the northern part of their farm, the deal which they made promised the brothers

...the power to do and live as they please. (Kivi, 98)

According to Matson *valta* is translated

In the northern section of the farm's holding, around Impivaara, the brothers were *free* to do and live as they pleased, this applying both to the clearings and the forest. (Kivi, 1973, 96-97, italics mine)

Impola again chooses a less conceptual approach:

They *could* have the northern part of the farm around Impivaara *at their disposal*, to do as they please in field and forest. (Kivi, 1991, 87, italics mine)

Right seems to be the most common translation for this old conception of *valta*, but the translators use also the words 'entitlement', 'domination', 'freedom' and the modal verb 'can'. The translations miss Kivi's conceptual world perhaps most radically at the moment of brothers' return to their old home. Recalling the regional background of *valta*, and its vital connection to the role of a master, it is consequential that Kivi writes:

It is a pale day in September, when brothers have decided to go to reach their previous *valta* in Jukola farm. (Kivi, 299)

Impola, changing even the weather of the day, puts it this way:

The date set for *repossessing* Jukola farm, which the brothers had not seen for nine years, was a clear day in September. (Kivi 1991, 280, italics mine)

Matson emphasizes the same point of possession:

It is a pallid day in September, the day on which the brothers are going to *take possession* again of their former home... (Kivi, 1973, 278, italics mine)

Possession may be reached by a decision, or by a fairly distinct act. But masters have legal, moral and practical obligations to fulfill before again reaching their previous *valta* in their farm. As the story goes on, the brothers learn that their fields and the house have fallen into disrepair. I presume that by *valta* Kivi alludes to even this kind of control and domination over the practical life of the farm, the need for proper tending and care of their possessions. Indeed, the brothers did not just go to take over the *valta*, they want to *reach* it.

So far, I have tried to characterize one aspect of Kivi's – and as I maintain, a more generally Finnish – usage of *valta*. The radicality of the conceptual change of *valta* since Kivi is quite evident in the sheer fact that neither of the current translators have translated *valta* into *power* in any of these instances. I have no reason to accuse Matson or Impola of poor translations, they only illustrate the clear conceptual change since Kivi. However, my point is not to maintain that Kivi and his contemporaries are just outdated and that they discuss and conceptualize totally different things with their *valta* than contemporary speakers would do. There are areas of continuity and overlapping. I will next discuss an episode, which is, in slightly different forms, repeated three times in the book. This story introduces the ironic and apparently politically suspicious Kivi. In my analysis, these episodes are stories about *establishing potestas*, a social and political order out of wild chaos, in a parallel way as the westerns analyzed by John Nelson (1996).

To understand Kivi's ironic radicality, we need to remember the clear bipolarity between the public *esivalta* and private *valta*, which was the state of affairs when Kivi wrote his book. A story about establishing potestas, therefore, is apparently a provocation. Kivi's literal and political ingenuity manifests itself in his way to insert this classical republican theme into the arguments of seven, backward brothers. The discussion about this politically explosive theme takes place in the most innocent-looking and ironic context. Nevertheless it does take place. The typical course of action is that Aapo, whose role is to be the ponderer among the brothers, even to the point of self-importance, opens up the discussion about the need for an organized life. Power and leadership must be given to one of the brothers, and every time it is naturally offered to the oldest brother, the headstrong Juhani. At first, Juhani is fascinated with his power over his brothers, and how to punish the disobedient hard enough. Balance and peace is never attained, for the rest of brothers do not accept the humiliations that Juhani holds for them. Alex Matson's version of the first episode, right in the beginning of the book, goes as follows:

AAPO: One thing, however, we must do now. The case is this: if we wish for order and a firm foundation for our household, let one of us be leader and master. This right and duty, we know, is Juhani's both as his birthright and by our mother's command.

JUHANI: Ay, mine's the right, the power and the strength.

AAPO: See then that you use them mildly for the common good.

JUHANI: I'll try my best. If you'll only obey me without the whip or a clout in the face. However, I'll do my best.

AAPO: The whip?

JUHANI: If it so be needed.

TUOMAS: Speak to you(r) dogs of the whip. (Kivi, 1973, 21)

As we can see, in this more modern context 'power' is used in both translations. The next discussion takes place in the woods, in their temporary hut in Impivaara⁹. This time, the term *valta* is not openly used, instead Aapo demands that someone must be "chief, leader of our councils, settler of our quarrels" (Kivi, 1973, 106). However, the brothers are soon thinking about appropriate punishments for obstinacy. Juhani, again, has his ideas:

JUHANI: I'll shut him in one of the caverns on yonder height, and carry a heavy pile of rocks to close up the cavern's mouth. There he can sit a day or two, as matters and circumstances demand. Ay, there he can suck his nails and ponder over what causes his solitude.

LAURI: I won't agree to that for one.

TUOMAS: Nor I.

TIMO: Am I then a wrinkly-faced badger, whose home is a stuffy mountain cave? Far from it. (Kivi, 1973, 107)

A modern commentator would probably say that Kivi is introducing here both the theme and a critique of *usage* of power. However, this is a term which does not surface in any brother's speech, nor in the whole book, and it is because *valta* is not yet regarded as a tool to be used. It is important to remember here both sides of *valta*: power as an entitlement and right, and as *potestas*. Every master, every man shall have the first as a part of his identity. However, social and political order seems to necessitate punishments, but the crudity of these punishments seem to endanger the identities of free men, making poor animals of them. Kivi seems to maintain that as far as there is a real danger of the loss of identity – or the old *valta* – there won't be any real social and political order.

Kivi's intertextual irony seems to emphasize the conscious character of his political provocation. Above, in the first version of establishing the *potestas*, he makes Juhani utter the important words:

JUHANI: Ay, mine's the right, the power and the strength.

Above we can see that Juhani doesn't take anything less than the position of God, the Church and Ruler, that is, he takes the position and glory of *esivalta*. Unmistakably, we can hear the subtext of the Lord's Prayer, and in particular the words:

But deliver us from evil.
For Thine is the kingdom
And the power
And the glory,
Forever.¹⁰

Similarly, the idiom "power and strength", in one order or another, is repeated once and again both in religious texts and the legal statutes of 18th and 19th centuries. In the case of Juhani, we can trust in his earnest will to take on this impossible position of the authority; Eero, the youngest of the brothers would have ridiculed, with the very same words, the authorities consciously (see Kinnunen 1987). Kivi, as the author, at any rate is laughing at the pomposity of *esivalta* by putting its self-important way of speech into the mouth of a stubborn and illiterate peasant. Juhani's words seem to carry a double meaning conceptually. In the first place, they document the generally positive attitude towards *valta*: it was possible to declare: "The power is mine!". However, Kivi pushes, by his usage of wording, this old positive and identity-bound *valta* into the territory of *esivalta* and gets reasons to ridicule both Juhani and his models.

The parallels between Kivi's anecdotes and the Arendtian conception of power are illuminating. Quite obviously, above we have been discussing about "the power generated when people gather together and 'act in concert,' which disappears the moment they depart" (Arendt 1958,

244). Power grows out of a joint enterprise, of the need to act together, and to bear the growing individuality of the brothers. As long as their parents are alive, the problem of authority is solved in paternal terms. However, the foundation of power is consensual only on the level of statement. The brothers go as far as to express and celebrate their social contract, nevertheless it is only a truce, and they immediately get into new struggle and conflict. The consensual bases fall in pieces, and only very slowly and only through repeated conflicts and misfortunes can the real power grow out. In Foucauldian terms, as far as the brothers tried to contractually establish clear relationships of domination, their attempts failed, but when they were ready for more strategic and free relationships of power, they succeeded also in the village. (Hindess 1996, 98-104)

During every version of this episode, the cruel punishments are about to change the power back to the use of sheer force: "Power is actualized only where word and deed have not parted company, where words are not empty and deeds not brutal..." (Arendt, 1958, 200). Interestingly, in the second episode, the brothers are capable of agreeing on a punishment for permanent obstinacy: it was the dismissal from the common house of brotherhood, out of the common sphere of power.

The relevance of Arendtian forgiveness, as an obligatory precondition for political space of power and action, is also thematized in the third and final episode. The brothers have been hunting bears, when an enormous herd of bulls pursues them, and forces the brothers to seek refuge in a huge rock. The bulls don't go away, but beset the brothers day after day. In this case, Aapo first gives the metaphor of a ship, and then of a besieged fortress for the need to establish order and leadership. The brothers badly need order, for they have no food and drink left, with the alarming exception that Lauri had saved a flask

of spirits for himself. Lauri drank continuously, without sharing a sip, and was driving the rest of the brothers crazy by mocking them and their efforts as provocatively as only a drunken man can. This time, the brothers were soon able to agree on the fatal punishment for the lack of discipline: the disturber will be cast down, to the mercy of the bulls. Juhani tells Lauri to be quiet, but Lauri continues and continues to irritate everybody. Matson's version is this:

JUHANI: Lauri, must I now say the dread word that turns you in a twinkling to hash? And that merciless word is this: let him be thrown to the bulls. Shall I say this?

LAURI: Say nothing, but sing while I dance a Jussian jig. Hih!

JUHANI: Let him be thrown to the bulls, and may God be with him! Amen. Now it's said. Let him go.

LAURI: Let's all go together, hand in hand out of this vale of starvation – Life!

TUOMAS: Let the law be fulfilled, and go to your death.

JUHANI: What the hell, Tuomas!

TUOMAS: Down from the rock, lad!

JUHANI: Stop, for Heaven's sake!

Even if Juhani was ready to manifest his power and determination and to condemn Lauri to death, he was far from prepared to put the sentence into force. Unfortunately, Tuomas, the physically strongest man among the brothers, decided to take the “final” decision earnestly. The five men had a terrible job to stop him, and stay, at the same time, on the rock with the absurdly drunken Lauri. – Later on, the brothers badly need this very same forgiveness when they are ready to come back to the village, for they have killed all of the forty bulls to save their lives, they have publicly mocked the minister, and fought on the public roads.

Kivi's figure of seven brothers establishing a new if transient order and power among themselves was totally

alien to the imagery of the Fennomen (Liikanen, 1995). Where is the educated elite, which alone was able to lead and teach "the people" on its Hegelian way to self-consciousness, and to find the deepest roots and traditions of the Finnish people? Where is the permanent and solemn peace after the social contract? *Seven Brothers* apparently was a book, which was written from the wrong perspective.

The most outstanding feature of Kivi's anecdotes is the trial to establish negotiated power and economic order in a fictional space. Even if Juhani, as the oldest, repeatedly and formally gets the power of the master and leader, negotiation and struggle takes place immediately among brothers, giving everybody a say in the practical course of action. This contractual basis maintains that the overall character of power is still positive: gaining power and gaining identity are parallel and almost equal processes. Kivi is very strict in confining the usage of *valta* within this positive area. No episodes narrating the conflicts with the minister, church clerk or other authorities, utilize the terminology of *valta* or *esivalta*.

A Fennoman Considers his Youth

Arvid Järnefelt (1861–1932) represented the next generation of Fennomen, and had an absolutely different social background than the tailor's son Kivi. Järnefelt's mother belonged to the Russian aristocracy, and his father was a successful Finnish officer in the Russian army before he was assigned to Finland to oversee various administrative tasks. His career in the Russian army did not prevent him from sharing the ideas of Fennoman movement, and later on, as the Governor of Mikkeli and Kuopio, he immediately chose Finnish as the language of administration. The home was, at least in the Finnish context, exceptional in

its orientation towards the arts, education, and the Finnish language. His mother was the inspiration, a daughter of an artistic family, whose theories of art seem to have an impact on Juhani Aho, for instance¹¹.

The differences with Kivi do not end here. Järnefelt, and similarly Juhani Aho, belonged to a generation that had witnessed the partly opening political arena since the 1860s, and themselves participated in the struggle of the Young Fennomen over the “power” in the Student Union with the Swedish-minded activists. Järnefelt’s first novel *Fatherland* (published in 1893) critically evaluates his youthful activism, and his “love” for the Finnish people. Järnefelt’s book offers, as a reflection of his intellectual career, a plethora of abstract concepts such as the Fatherland, the people, education (the German *die Bildung* again better transmits the Hegelian idea), society, and power. The book is a *bildungsroman* of a farmer’s son, Heikki, who is sent to the Finnish capital city Helsinki to acquire higher education. Heikki tries to return to his home farm after his studies and period of Fennoman political idealism, but soon realizes that he is dismissed both from belonging to “the people” and the idealistic naiveté of the past movement. The almost absolute separateness of the worlds of countryside life (“the people”) and the idealistic fervor of the students in Helsinki (“the love for the people”) is the painful message of the book.

With regard to *valta*, the change of the tone since Aleksis Kivi is dramatic. *Valta* has ceased to be a positive part of a master’s identity. Typically, the critical term “lust for power” appears as a contrasting concept for ideal and moral pursuits. Järnefelt refers below to the leading Finnish Hegelian figure, J.V. Snellman, who began his political career in student life in the 1830s, was a publisher of relatively radical journals in the 1840s, before becoming a more moderate-minded professor in the 1850s, and later a Senator and organizer of Finnish economy in the 1860s.

The youth understood Snellman's doctrine word by word as a great and mighty demand to abandon all desires for vanity, social reputation, *power*, wealth, and personal happiness, and to solely pledge oneself to the service of the people... (Järnefelt, 1953, 26, italics mine)

Of course, we must recognize the almost cynical tone of the narrator, and realize that we are speaking here about something which is past at the time of the narration, and something which was sadly naive. Still the list of rejected superficial features is compelling: vanity, social reputation, richness, personal happiness, and power. The ideal and good souls seek something greater and more essential than power, they want to serve the people. The idealism of Hegel and Snellman seems to offer to the young students the conceptual contradiction of *Ideal and Power*. Ideal was now needed for a solid identity, not *valta*. The only apparently positive formulation is based on the primacy of Spirit, but not even here is it without a trace of irony:

And they had to wonder at the great *power* of Spirit which thus had come into their hands. (Järnefelt, 1953, 24)

This repeats, of course, an old biblical usage of the term. One of the oldest ambiguities of the concept may be in the paradox that fear, sin, lust, spirit, laziness or whatever may *have a power* over a person, or vice versa, a person may have these things in his or her power. However, it is clear that Järnefelt's *valta* is predominantly a negative and critical concept. What is of importance here is that he introduces a number of new fora for power, beginning with the village and parish. The original reason for sending the young protagonist to Helsinki was a competition between two leading farmhouses.

Thus, the master of Vuorela had understood the minister's words about that new *power* in the world which was called

cultivation – and accepted the minister's proposition for a new battle plan against the Niemeläs... and so that would mean the end of the Niemeläs' *power*. (Järnefelt, 1953, 22, italics mine)

The result of this arrogance is eventually quite the opposite: Heikki turns into an ambiguous idealist who has no interest in farming, and no professional position in Helsinki. As we can see, every master no longer had a *valta* but it belonged to the one who was the strongest. In sharp contrast with the contractual projects of establishing *valta* by Kivi, power is now plainly struggled for. *Bildung* was the particular sort of strength which was useful in this struggle. Järnefelt's zero-sum power is apparent in the two, politically central episodes he recounts in the beginning of the novel:

Even the older people carefully followed the news about those stormy student meetings where the Finnish language and the Finnish Spirit were making their first exertions to gain sovereignty (*ylivalta*) over the Swedish language and the Swedish Spirit. (Op.cit., 26)

As it was, they were already defeated, those Swedes, downhearted they wandered out of the Student House where up until now they had had the sovereignty. (*ylin valta*) (Op. cit., 27)

Järnefelt's power is nowhere as physically present as in the struggles in the Student House. There is a permanent dose of melancholic irony in all of these stories. The greatness of these moments is gone, and no one is idealistic enough any longer. Was the struggle worth all of this fervor, were the great speeches made in vain and vanity?

Järnefelt's representative anecdote of power includes an important new feature, the mobilization of idealistic supporters. Power needs struggle, opposition, ideas, great

talks, and mobilization. The story now includes the clear and programmatic opposition between the Finnish and Swedish speaking parties. The word for political party, *puolue*, was itself a result of the translation program, and it interestingly comes out in the same story. Heikki, the protagonist, was invited to the inner circles,

... where they delivered their most heated patriotic speeches and hammered out their most courageous political party stands. (Op. cit., 27)

Because of the fact that there are only the two parties struggling for the zero-sum power, the power itself turns into domination (*ylivalta*; or over-power). The sharing or division of power appears as a totally impossible conception from Järnefelt's perspective. Järnefelt seems to reject the necessity of power from parallel reasons. The descent from the high Hegelian spirit and atmosphere of the student years of the early 1880s to the practical resolutions of life was apparently the trauma of a generation (Viljanen 1953). Economic and social vistas for a relatively prosperous life opened for a growing part of the educated Finnish minority which decreased the interest in ceremonial speeches. In the 1880s, the key figure of earlier young Fennomen, Yrjö Koskinen, was nominated to the Senate. As a Senator, Yrjö Koskinen was condemned to make a distance from his most enthusiastic young followers and allies in the student circles. Political space was limited from two different directions: the 'old ones' with Yrjö Koskinen were neither supposed to express all of their ideas publicly, nor to trust in such a direct mobilization of people as they were used to in the 1870s. The young followers, on their side, were not too enthusiastic about appreciating or understanding such a pragmatic play of politics, it was just deformation of their ideas. A normal fraction or political party formation might have solved

this dilemma, however, the “Finnish cause” was understood and maintained to be just one common non-party affiliation. (Liikanen, 1995)

Järnefelt had experienced a Tolstoyian conversion just two years prior to publishing his *Fatherland*. So he rejects both the cold pragmatism of the 1890s and the overly abstract love of the people of the 1880s. He looks for a deeper and more genuine love of the people, and there is no room for *valta* in this project. The reasons to send Heikki to Helsinki were wrong in the first place – to struggle for power – and the idealism of the 1880s had its dirty and unidealistic side, the struggle for power. Together the idealistic Hegelianism and the idealistic Tolstoyianism produces a very critical conception of power, which does not give much space for politics proper. In the matrix of Järnefeldian thought, it would have been utterly despicable to enter into a political struggle for power. Perhaps for similar reasons, the entire sphere of *esivalta*, the authorities, is politely put aside. The Student House of Helsinki is the highest forum of vocabulary of power. The Senate, the Diet, the Russian presence in Helsinki are not mentioned, at least not in terms of *valta*.

In Järnefelt’s work, *valta* has deceased to be a subjective right or entitlement. From the purely individual or regional level of an estate, it has moved into a village and to the Student House in Helsinki. Neither of them, however, is an immediate part of the germinating political organization of the Grand Duchy. The political structure proper is left aside, and *valta* lives in other fora where struggles and opposition divide the Finnish people. – A comparison with his friend from the student years, Juhani Aho, may help to locate some reasons for his particular usage of *valta*.

Juhani Aho: A Fennoman Grows to a Liberal

Juhani Aho (1861–1921) was born in a pietistic countryside vicarage in the same year as Arvid Järnefelt, and got to know him and his family in Helsinki. They experienced the very same national awakening of the 1880s. In spite of all of his later criticism of the 1880s, Aho endured in the Fennoman movement and gained an undisputed position as a novelist as well as a writer of patriotic, educational texts and as a leading literary authority. He is worth discussing most of all because of his central national position, not because of his particular artistic qualities. For decades, Aho has been considered representative of Finnish literature in all school instruction.

Aho discussed his relationship to the idealism of the 1880s in his novel *Kevät ja takatalvi* (Spring and Winter Again), published in 1906. Aho's story takes place in the 1840s, during the first national awakening of the young intellectuals. Snellman is still a school principal and radical publisher who is deported to countryside, bereft of any officially recognized position. Only a small group of students is interested in studying Finnish, and searching for the real heritage of the true Finnish culture and its folksongs. The basic drama and tension of the book is set between two different national popular awakenings, between the educated Hegelian awakening coming from "above", and the more popular religious awakening inspired by pietism¹². Both of these movements run into conflict with the authorities, but differently: the students in a naive and arrogant way, the pietists, in a devoted and respectable way.

Aho's vocabulary of power is much richer than Järnefelt's. The lust for power surfaces every now and then, however, there are no traces of such moralistic *pa-*

thos as in Järnefelt's work. In a typical instance, a Swedish-speaking professor reprimands Snellman as follows:

He is a conceited, *power-hungry* man who thinks he understands and is able to rule over all matters better than anybody else. (Aho, 1944, 58)

It is easy to recognize the moralistic criticism of the struggle for power used as an argument against a whole person. In spite of this similarity, Aho does not follow Järnefelt's lead here. The moralizer above is the character, not Aho, because Snellman is one of the undeniable heroes of the book. Similarly, in clear contrast to Järnefelt, Aho has maintained the older, positive connotations of *valta*. In the second part of the book, just after the Russian authorities have forbidden all Finnish publications except religious texts, a hunter and recluse declares his prophecy to the student protagonist:

Still it will be for our eyes to see that this Finnish language will attain such strength and *power* that there will be no other language heard. (Aho, op.cit., 399, italics mine)

The usage above is undeniably positive, and again carries intertextual traces from biblical and legal phrases from the 18th century. On the other hand, *valta* is used here in the particular Finnish way of referring to a preponderance or the hegemonic position of majority (Hyvärinen 1997). As a noun, this expression gives the word *valtakieli* ('the power language'; the preponderant language)¹³. The power of a master and a house appears twice in the book, and in a partly critical context. In the end of the book, the old minister wants to arrange a space for dancing during the wedding party of his daughter. His son, now a keen pietist, accuses him of sin. The father's answer includes both aspects of *valta*:

– Ah yes, there it is now! You yourself cannot say what is sin in innocent joy...and you don't even want this for any other cause but that you would everywhere be able to demonstrate your *power*, – it is nothing but a fanatical *lust for power* which wants to cast everything into the same mold so that you could everywhere boast of its victory...

You will not be content of having to wean me from my parish with your friend Helander, but now you yet wish to deny me the *power* of the master in my own house. But I say that I will not allow myself to be terrorized by one anymore than the other and that in my own house, I still have such power that I can wed my own daughter as the proper ancient custom demands. (op.cit., 535)

The first part of the quotation shows once again, how the birth of social, political and religious movements also produced conflicts and accusations of lust for power: the opponent is understood and described in terms of *valta* (negative) and the lust for power. A similar pattern is discernible in Santeri Alkio's *Puukkojunkkarit* (1894). In a sense, one can see here a more delicate application of the Järnefeltian contradiction between idealism and power. In particular, those actors who present themselves in terms of ideal – here religious – objectives, are soon and keenly resisted by the accusations of lust for power.

The amazing thing in Aho's episode is his open usage of conflicting connotations of *valta*. In the latter part we can see the old, typically Kivian, usage of the *valta* as an element of identity. The house, the autonomy of the master, and *valta* are used together as interconnected properties of a valid identity. Aho seems to maintain that, even if the old minister did not want to live along the lines of pietism, his identity should have been protected from the attacks of the young, fanatical converts. In his acceptance and usage of the old, identity-power, Aho differs radically from his moralistic friend Järnefelt. Aho had a thicker

background knowledge and experience of popular Finnish than his aristocratic friend of the people. The Kivian positive power survived well into the 20th century, and the one-sidedly negative power of Järnefelt seems rather to result from his Russian and elitist background, together with Tolstoyian idealism.

Aho's book was published in 1906, that is, a year after the General Strike of 1905, and the subsequent parliamentary reform¹⁴, and the general enlargement of the political freedom. Therefore, the book contains a couple of daring conceptual openings, even if the events described take place in the totally different political climate of the mid-1840s. Aho does not forget and pass the *esivalta* (the authorities), quite the contrary. He puts his characters both to support, criticize and make proposals to the authorities. This was something that the literary and political radical Kivi was not able to imagine doing, instead it was the moderate conservative Aho who opened these perspectives. In the first instance, it is the local chief constable who introduces the term *esivalta* and the theme of how to consider it:

– The best policy is that each and everyone obeys the authorities (*esivalta*) and does as he is told. That is the way to be serve our Emperor and Fatherland. And a toast to that! (op.cit., 208)

Even this harmless statement suggests the alternative of not obeying the authorities. The unquestioned legitimacy of the authorities is over, and the maxim of “best policy” does not dispel the embedded paradox of the statement: the genuine perspective of politics is never just to obey. The police chief has unfortunately stepped into a misguided and suspicious vocabulary, where his point will automatically be inconsistent and doomed to fail. The same problem concerns the wicked opponents of the pietists,

who repeat their demand that the authorities should forbid "such meetings". The authorities are supported, and they are expected to react into pietists' disquieting activities. All of this means an active, political attitude towards the authorities, not in an unquestioned and passive respect. Be it support or criticism or embarrassed questions, all of them add to the erosion of the old unitary *esivalta*.

The climax of the book, as well as the criticism of the authorities, takes place in a final trial against the pietists for trespassing on a farm in a situation when the use of the church was forbidden to them, and the congregation was looking for a path to a hill where they could arrange their prayer meeting. Aho opens the chapter with clear class concepts:

Opposite to each other, as two different worlds, sat the masters and the peasants in the courthouse, on different sides of the judge's bench. (op.cit., 500)

A number of pietists are accused of arranging meetings without a permit, trespassing, and breaking a fence, and finally for gnawing at "the authority of the superiors". The accused deputy minister defends himself by turning the accusations around:

In the proceedings I am accused of contempt for my superiors and thus, allegedly, degrading the status of the authorities (*esivalta*) in the eyes of the people. But if anything, are not these court sessions held for this purpose liable to shake the status of the authorities (*esivalta*) in the eyes of the people. (op. cit., 506)

Similarly, the young protagonist of the novel steps forward as a witness. During his longish monologue, he says:

The authorities (*esivalta*) and the Church stand, again as many times before, armed against their own, in their blindness

they don't see, and in their stupidity they don't understand that by wanting to suppress this movement they, at the same time, suppress what is best and most noble in our people. (op. cit., 511)

The contradiction and political opposition between the authorities and the people is now openly declared. *Esivalta* is studied, evaluated, questioned, and challenged. The automatic respect for its unitary action is gone, and its individual representatives can be opposed with its more general, or imperial good will. If Kivi wrote anecdotes about the contractual foundation of *valta*, Aho has written an impressive anecdote about the erosion of unchallenged *esivalta* as *Obrigkeit*. Apparently there is a good deal of anachronism in Aho's vocabulary in the sense that he has projected the new liberties of resistance of 1905 back to the 1840s. Be it as it may, my point is that the direct conceptual challenge of *esivalta* has become possible at least after the General Strike of 1905. When the acts of particular bureaucrats are put under the discussion and consideration, the whole critical repertoire of the "use of the power" is opened, and the tools to discuss and criticize those who "have the power" are enlarged. Aho's novel does not clearly open this new repertoire, nevertheless its position seems to be as far as on the threshold of the new vocabulary.

Aho did not leave the territory of *esivalta* untouched. His abundant literary production gives interesting support to my theses on the negotiated site *valta*. Indeed, he published journals of his travels to Italy in 1893. In the context of Italy, and its Roman history, *valta* is now used freely on a very general level. Outside of Finland, Aho can thus employ the standard European discourse of international politics where states and societies in totality are discussed in terms of power. After visiting the catacombs, Aho puts it this way:

Thus, here in these confined closets developed and grew that *power* that tore down those temples and statues whose miserable remains we only recently saw in the Forum... (Aho, 1921, 201, italics mine)

Aho has no difficulty in describing and naming the clerical power (*pappisvalta*) in Italy. It was obviously possible to ask who had the power in Italy or in any other foreign country, not yet in Finland. During the years of Russian oppression of Finnish autonomy (1899–1905), Aho wrote a collection of short patriotic writings (*Katajainen kansani/ My Sturdy and Persevering People*), most of them relatively naive parables of unity and resistance. The last text, however, was written in November 1905, just after the General Strike, and it was entitled “*To my free pen*”. Now, for the first time in my literary material, *valta* refers to something which is directly connected to the Russian authorities. The territory of *valta* has expanded at this particular moment of national arrogance, and the meek and humble vocabulary of *esivalta* is pushed, temporarily, aside:

You tremble for joy for you know you are free...

You now must obey yourself, you must draw up your laws and instructions from your own understanding and intellect. Until now, you have had to be used to circle around the law of arbitrary rule (*mielivalta*) and violence (*väkivalta*) and your greatest satisfaction, and often your only purpose, has been to deceive your guardians. Before you were under another command, now may you have your own discipline, before you were pressed as an outward threat only a material fine, now you are pressed from within by moral compulsion. Yesterday the specter of a stranger loomed over you, now your foundation is your own obligation.

There is your new freedom. Tremble for that, don't as before you trembled for *power*: for hatred and anger for the degrading feeling of oppression, but the greatness of the feeling of your own liability for respect for the higher powers [*voimat*, ‘forces’ in Finnish] of your own self – and for the joy for you finally being free! (Aho, 1921, 173–174)

The power in this declaration has no connection to the old Kivian concept of *valta* as entitlement. In spite of the emotional tone of the text, it is as far from the Järnefeltian moralistic criticism of power. Instead, it is easy to recognize the dramatic, liberal dichotomization of power and liberty. Power is now related to “fear”, “chains”, “warder”, “arbitrary rule”, “other’s command”, “outward threat”, “a foreign intimidation”, and “oppression”. Power is now unmistakably *domination*, it is power over “us”. The task Aho takes to himself as a writer, and to Finland in a metaphorical meaning, astonishingly resembles the self-contradiction built “into the liberal idea of power”, as Barber says, “the beast who is father to the individual needs to be both tamed (controlled by power) and preserved (insulated from power)” (Barber, 1988, 31). The need for domestic law, order and peacefulness is as strong as the feeling of freedom, a freedom *from* the foreign power.

In his other works, Aho manifested a good capacity to employ a pluralistic conception of power, even within one and the same episode. Why this sudden one-sidedness, why the rejection of the positive aspects of *valta*? I suggest a dual answer. I think, that immediately after the depressive years of Russian oppression, it was enjoyable just to name the Russian power as power. The liberal dichotomy of power and liberty just fits so well to the high atmosphere of that moment. However, the whole collection consists in educational, patriotic parables. The obvious point is to teach and guide the ordinary readers into a good, national direction. From this perspective, the General Strike was far from an innocent event. The event was a strike, and thus the decisive entrance of the working class and landless tenants into the new political arena. Within this national horizon, it is probably more convincing to project *valta* only on to the foreign oppressor, forget the theme of domestic powers altogether, and speak about “moral obligation”, “responsibility” and “own law” instead.

Be that as it may, the extract above manifests an obvious move ahead of the strong Hegelian and Snellmanian inheritance of the Fennoman movement towards the rhetorics of liberalism. As such, the move is evidently one element in the process in which the old connotations of entitlement and self-determination are wiped out of *valta*. However, Aho does not give up the paradoxical character of *valta* but tries to deal with it by new a finer distinctions. In the summer of 1917, after the Russian February Revolution, the political situation in Finland was growing increasingly unstable. The troops of Russian army which still remained in Finland were not necessarily loyal to local authorities but socialized with "the people". Aho, as an active fisherman, writes a short story "To Fish – Nyet". For years, he had fished on the Huopana falls in Central Finland. The falls were privately owned, and fishing was only allowed to a group of fishermen who had rented it. Now, because of the ongoing war, Russian troops were building fortifications around. At the same time, the soldiers had decided to "occupy" (*vallata*) the falls. When the fishermen are approaching the falls, a local "hooligan", who had been jailed for theft, but was a "best buddy" with the new masters, runs and "commands" them to visit the officer. The "hooligans" want the falls to themselves, and disgracefully with the help of foreign army. However, one of the fishermen succeed in phoning to the local Chief Constable, who arrives in fury.

Thus begins a mighty riotous scene. The Finnish constabulary takes the offensive against brutality and – is victorious. ... "You people here have no kind of right to police (*poliisivalta*), you have nothing to do besides dig your ditches, but I answer for the road and the travellers...", declares the triumphant Chief Constable. (Aho 1921, 532)

Aho's conceptual contrasts half a year before the Finnish Civil War (1918) are illuminating. He has the list of revo-

lution (*vallankumous*), occupation (*valtaus*), people's power (*"kansan valta"*) only within quotation marks, and he describes the time as "the worst period of lawlessness and violence (*väkivalta*) (op. cit., 533), and the contrasting concepts of *järjestysvalta* (power as order, or 'ordering power') and *poliisivalta* (rights of police). The growing violence, capriciousness and threat of revolution, Aho argues, call for a new power as order. The vocabulary is now much more direct than in 1905. "Own discipline", "moral compulsion", and other expressions of self-regulation were inadequate during the escalating conflict.

Aho's short story seems to offer a closure to the old divide between *valta* and *esivalta*. The new power-as-order Aho is demanding resembles astonishingly the old *esivalta*. However, now the concept seems to be a more direct equivalent of English 'authorities' or German *Herrschaft* than the German *Obrigkeit*. *Järjestysvalta* is not for Aho any unquestionable or immovable power above "us"; it is something "we" must somehow produce and be part of. In other words, the pure existence of *esivalta* is not enough, it must be legitimate. The dangerous family of occupation, revolution and violence, in contrast, seems not to condense all the risky connotations of causally effective power (or German *Macht*). The short anecdote does not just reflect the question who has the power, it is as much about what is the power.

In conclusion, Juhani Aho's work manifests an important paradox: the anecdotes of power he narrates in his works are mutually incompatible, and they might ground considerably different theories of power. In this sense, Aho is a modern intellectual as compared with Kivi or with young Järnefelt in his consequently moralistic condemnation of power (Hyvärinen 1997).

The Power of Anecdotes

In this article, I tried to elaborate the suitability of literature, and novels in particular, as a material in my study on the conceptual history of the Finnish *valta*.

The stories that the three early Finnish novelists told about power, obviously provided a foundation and vocabulary for radically different theories of power. Kivi emphasized the contractual-and-conflictual foundation of *valta* as a positive entitlement, Järnefelt introduced a morally reprehensible *valta* in the context of conflicting and unapprovable motives, Aho instead offered a changing plurality of possible theories, as well as the capacity to shift fluently from one conception to another.

Power was a tricky and dangerous concept at the time of the emerging political space and freedom in Finland. At first, the scope of the *valta* as entitlement was quite narrowly confined to individuals. The birth of first religious and political movements generated conflicts and the need to criticize "the lust for power", and the parish and Student Union appeared as new forums of power. The need to resist politically, rather than any need to analyze objectively, has given the decisive impetus to enlarge the area of applicability of this concept. On the national level, the concept first referred only foreign countries, and 'Finland' only after the General Strike and parliamentary reform of 1905. This development seems to allude to the possibility that the concept may have been so explosive politically that the questions of power had never before been openly raised in the context of the Russians, the Tsar and the *esivalta*. Through the Period of Autonomy, the meaning of *esivalta* changes from the Lutheran "Obrigkeit" to the liberal "authorities" which needed to be legitimized.

In spite of this growing number of applications, some contemporary and popular ways of discussing power are still missing in this material. The authors were not ready to conceptualize power as a resource, not at least as a resource which might be accumulated. The theme and possibility of the division or share of power did not surface. For fairly obvious reasons, the normative discourse of the “people’s power” was not yet apparent but hegemonic (Hyvärinen 1997).

Notes

¹ This paper is part of an ongoing study on the conceptual history of *valta*, which in turn, is a part of larger research project, “Concepts in Motion. The Conceptual History of Finnish Political Culture”. With regard to its methodological sources, the project mostly relies on the work of Reinhart Koselleck (1979; 1997; see also Palonen 1997) and Quentin Skinner (see 1989). Richter (1995) is a good survey on the field. – An earlier version of this paper was presented at the workshop on “Political Myth, Rhetoric, and Symbolism” at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, Washington, D.C., August 27. 1997. I am very grateful to Suzanne Duval Jakobitti, John Nelson, Kari Palonen, Risto Alapuro, and Susanna Noki for their gracious comments.

² The name was originally pejorative, meaning Fenno-maniacs (Liikanen 1995)

³ The last Finnish trial against “blasphemy” in fiction took place as late as in the 1960s.

⁴ “Esi” is an old Fenno-Ugrian word whose basic meaning is “(something) in front of” [‘edessä oleva’], also “interest” or “profit”. In compound nouns, however, “esi” seems, in some cases, to follow its Swedish equivalent “före”. For instance, “Model” is in Finnish ‘esi+image’ = *esikuva*; in Swedish ‘före+image’ = *förebild*; “superior” (boss) is in Finnish ‘esi+man’ = *esimies*; in Swedish it is ‘förmän’. “Example” is

in Finnish 'esi+sign' = *esimerkki*. Interestingly, *esivalta* is constructed without a direct Swedish model. The word was first used in written Finnish by Mikael Agricola, a student of Luther and the translator of New Testament.

- ⁵ The most common modern meaning of '*kunta*' is municipality. However, 'fire brigade' is in Finnish '*palokunta*' (fire+kunta) and the name for the whole profession of teachers is '*opettajakunta*' (teacher+kunta). In this sense, its meaning resembles the German and Swedish affixes *-schaft* and *-kår*. Flexible as it is, it does not allow for any strict interpretation of its 'original' meaning in this compound noun. However, a shorter version of *valtakunta* (empire) could simply be *valta*, a close predecessor of the modern meaning of state.
- ⁶ In my previous article (Hyvärinen, 1997) I tried to schematize the current 'repertoires of *valta*'. Without repeating the whole scheme here, I just note that I have used it as a matrix of comparisons, and in order to clarify the newness of particular new expressions. I hope that this "implicit methodology" does not hinder the reading of this paper excessively.
- ⁷ Impola's translation was published by an American-Finnish association, and his name is a typical combination among the second generation Finnish immigrants (Richard+ Finnish family name), whereas Matson was a well-known Finnish writer and translator.
- ⁸ Quite obviously, the power of the master is a gendered phenomenon. However, it does not mean that the mistress would not have her particular *valta*, as well.
- ⁹ The name of "Impivaara" lives strongly in Finnish political imagery. For instance, every now and then the opponents of European Union were accused of "Impivaaraism", of a retreat from common social reality and civilization. The name itself means "the hill of virgins".
- ¹⁰ Matthew 6:9-13. The New Encyclopædia Britannica, 15th edition (1992), Vol. 7, p. 478. The older, Protestant wording of the prayer.
- ¹¹ As an old man, Järnefelt published his biographical novel, "My Parents' Novel" (1930), which is an invaluable source on the history of the family and Fennoman cultural circles. Its vocabulary, however, is so distinct from the literature of

the Period of Autonomy, that I have to confine myself here to the work of young Järnefelt.

¹² Lauri Kivekäs, the most prominent leader of the Young Fennomans of the 1880s, actually tried to negotiate for a political alliance between radical Fennomans and the pietists. The attempts failed badly. (Liikanen 1995)

¹³ To corroborate its character as preponderance, I can refer to similar expressions, such as *valtameri* ('power-sea'; ocean) or *valtatie* ('power-road'; main road).

¹⁴ The old Diet, based on the representation of the four estates, was replaced by a one-chamber House of Representatives and universal franchise.

Source material

Aho, Juhani (1921/1893) *Mitä mitäkin Italiasta. Kootut teokset, VI*. (Notes from Italy. Collected Works VI). Porvoo: WSOY.

Aho, Juhani (1944/1906) *Kevät ja takatalvi*. (Spring and Winter Again). Porvoo: WSOY.

Aho, Juhani (1921/1905) *Katajainen kansani. Kootut teokset, VI*. (My Sturdy and Persevering People. Collected Works VI). Porvoo: WSOY.

Aho, Juhani (1921/1917) 'Kalasta – Nyet!'. Lastuja VIII. *Kootut teokset, VI*. (To Fish – Nyet!. Shavings VIII. Collected Works VI). Porvoo: WSOY.

Alkio, Santeri (1944/1894) *Puukkojunkkarit*. (Ruffians with Sheath Knives). Porvoo: WSOY.

Järnefelt, Arvid (1953/1893) *Isänmaa* [Fatherland]. *Valitut teokset*. (Complete Works). Porvoo: WSOY.

Kivi, Aleksis (1972/1870) *Seitsemän veljestä* [Seven Brothers]. Teokset 4. Helsinki: Otava.

Kivi, Aleksis (1973/1952) *Seven Brothers*. Transl. by Alex Matson. Helsinki: Tammi.

Kivi, Alexis (1991) *Seven Brothers*. Transl. by Richard A. Impola. New Palz: Finnish American Translators Association.

Bibliography

- Arendt, Hannah (1958) *The Human Condition*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Ball, Terence (1988) *Transforming Political Discourse. Political Theory and Critical Conceptual History*. New York: Basil Blackwell.
- Barber, Benjamin (1988) *The Conquest of Politics. Liberal Philosophy in Democratic Times*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Burke, Kenneth (1969) *A Grammar of Motives*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Clegg, Stewart (1989) *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage.
- Clegg, Stewart (1993) 'Narrative, Power, and Social Theory', in Dennis K. Mumby (ed.): *Narrative and Social Control: Critical Perspectives*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Dahl, Robert A. (1958) 'The Concept of Power'. *Behavioral Science* 2, 201- 15. Reprinted in R. Bell, D.V. Edwards and R.H. Wagner (eds.) (1969): *Political Power: A Reader in Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Foucault, Michel (1977) *Discipline and Punish*. New York: Pantheon.
- Hindess, Barry (1996) *Discourses of Power. From Hobbes to Foucault*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Hyvärinen, Matti (1997) 'The Rhetorical Construction of 'Valta' (Power)', in Matti Hyvärinen and Kauko Pietilä (eds.): *The Institutes We Live By*. Tampere: The Research Institute for Social Sciences, 17/1997.
- Itkonen, Erkki & Joki, Aulis J. & Peltola, Reino (1975) *Suomen kielen etymologinen sanakirja V. Lexica Societatis Fenno-Ugricae XII,5. (The Etymological Dictionary of the Finnish Language)* Helsinki: Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.
- Kinnunen, Aarne (1987) *Tuli, aurinko ja seitsemän veljestä: tutkimus Aleksis Kiven romaanista. (The Fire, the Sun and the Seven Brothers: A Study of the novel by Aleksis Kivi)* Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (1979) *Vergangene Zukunft. Zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Koselleck, Reinhart (1997) 'The Temporalization of Concepts'. *Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought*, Vol. 1, 16-24.

- Liikanen, Ilkka (1995) *Fennomania ja kansa: joukkojärjestäytymisen läpimurto ja Suomalaisen puolueen synty*. (Fennomania and the People: The Breakthrough of Mass Organization and the Birth of the Finnish Party). Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.
- Linna, Väinö (1990) 'Hiilikoukku lapioksi' (From Coal Poker to Shovel), in V. Linna: *Murroksia. Esseitä, pubeita ja kirjoituksia*. (Essays, Speeches, and Other Writings) Porvoo: WSOY.
- The New Encyclopædia Britannica, 15th edition (1992), Vol. 7.
- Lopmeri, J.A. (1944) 'Valta-nimistä'. (On the Names of Power) *Virittäjä* 48, 259B271.
- Nelson, John S. (1996) 'The Western Craft of Forgiving and Forgetting: Overcoming Western Vengeance as Violence in Reverse'. *A paper for the APSA Annual Workshop on "Political Myth, Rhetoric, and Symbolism"*, San Francisco.
- Palonen, Kari (1997) 'An Application of Conceptual History to Itself. From Method to Theory in Reinhart Koselleck's Begriffsgeschichte', in *Finnish Yearbook of Political Thought*, Vol. 1.
- Richter, Melvin (1995) *The History of Political and Social Concepts. A Critical Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Skinner, Quentin (1989) 'Language and Political Change', in Terence Ball, James Farr and Russell N. Hanson (eds.): *Political Innovation and Conceptual Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 6-23.
- Viljanen, Lauri (1953) Johdanto [An Introduction], in A. Järnefelt: *Valitut teokset [Selected Works]*. Porvoo: WSOY.