

INTERMEDIAL EXPERIENCE AND DISCURSIVE VOICE IN PRINTED TEXT, AUDIOBOOK, AND PODCAST: H. P. LOVECRAFT'S "THE STATEMENT OF RANDOLPH CARTER"

Jarkko Toikkanen, University of Oulu & Mari Hatavara, Tampere University

This essay studies H. P. Lovecraft's short story "The Statement of Randolph Carter" (1919, SRC from now on) as a printed text, audiobook, and online literary podcast at The H. P. Lovecraft Literary Podcast site.¹ In the previous chapter, Hazel Smith discusses how voice functions as a strong agent of affect and the political tool in digital literature. We focus on intermedial experience between the media platforms, and how the different versions make use of voice in medium-specific ways in producing the narrative. In doing so, we employ the narratological concept of discursive voice and a three-tier model of mediality to show how remediating (see Bolter & Grusin 1999) a first-person narrative in print into an audiobook and podcast expands on the concept of voice affecting its interpretive capacity. The voice of the narrator becomes vocalized, amassing new qualities such as tone and intonation, and other characters quoted by the narrating self may gain a physical voice of their own (see Mildorf & Kinzel 2016). Auditory elements including sound effects are designed as objects in the story world. At the same time, the audio dramatizations affect the interpretive ambiguities of the printed text – by resolving, for example, how particular instances of voice materialize.

Speaking about media platforms, the different versions of SRC are transmedial in the form of shared characteristics *across* various media such as recurring elements of story and narration (see Salmose & Elleström 2020; Elleström 2019, 4–10; Thon 2016; Ryan & Thon 2014). The plot remains unchanged and allusions to arcane mysteries in the Lovecraftian mythos occupy every version. However, to focus on the use of discursive voice (Genette 1980, 213; Hatavara et al. 2016, 2–4) in ways specific to each medial environment, as we want to emphasize the differences *between* media and the way they are experienced, our theoretical and methodological framework has to do with intermediality. In the proposed three-tier model of mediality, as explained below, medial objects engage the senses through different ways of presenting, including words and sounds, that mediate the ideas and interpretations of the work at hand.² How the reader encounters the disparity between media products such as printed texts, audiobooks, and podcasts can be studied as intermedial experience – as what the work, through its medium-specific design, makes the reader perceive or imagine perceiving (Toikkanen 2021; 2020; Hatavara & Toikkanen 2017).

The three-tier model serves as a counterpoint to the concept of discursive voice to bring out the difference in intermedial experience between SRC as a printed text and its audio dramatizations. Combining the two methods of studying voice and experience in three versions of the short story provides the basis of our analysis. We concentrate on how the shift from the printed verbal to vocalized and dramatized verbal, coupled with sound effects, influences the interpretation and intermedial experience of the two transmedially verbalized minds – the first-person narrator Randolph Carter and his friend in dialogue, Harley Warren.

Methods and material

Our approach to voice follows the narratological tradition in literary studies. Voice in narratology is a term used to denote the enunciating instance of a text, to describe the narrative situations and the narratorial idiom (Genette 1980, 212–215) across media. Voice carries agency and expresses subjectivity – speakers, both narrators and characters, appear in a text as and through different stylistic choices that are interpreted to characterize them. For this reason, the ways a narrator or a character speaks are essential for analyzing and interpreting their character. (Aczel 1998, 468–472, 494–495.) In a verbal text, the way of speaking explicitly refers to stylistic choices and idiomatic uses of language. At times, a character’s speech has been assumed as the most reliable part of a fictional world, available for the reader without a narrator’s mediation. It has also been pointed out that direct speech is both part of a selective process of narrating and often schematic in its evocation of the mimetic illusion. (Fludernik 1993, 401–402, 444–445; Thomas 2012, 15–17.)

For the study of represented minds in fiction, three modes of representing a character’s thoughts and speech are a standard approach: direct discourse by the character, indirect discourse by the narrator, and free indirect discourse that mixes linguistic traces from both. These categories were first elaborated by Dorrit Cohn (1978, 11–15) who used a different terminology, and they have since been studied extensively in regard to both speech and thought representation and in third- and first-person narration (see Palmer 2005; Fludernik 2005). The crucial distinction is drawn between a character, whose voice in the narrative expresses agency, and a narrator, who in telling the story mediates the character’s experience within their own voice (Fludernik 1993, 433–445).

In first person narration, the same person, in our case Carter, acts both as a narrating and an experiencing self (Cohn 1978, 143–145). Especially in cases where the instance of narrating becomes dramatized, including Lovecraft’s short story, the experiencing and narrating I cannot be neatly separated but the telling itself is experiential for the teller (see Fludernik 1993, 436–437). What is more, the narrator in this story addresses the narratee as his audience directly (see Genette 1980, 259–261). In the analysis to follow, attention will be directed to discursive voices used to address the audience, as idiomatic of the two characters and in regard to the relations between Carter’s narrating and experiencing self.

Similar to analyzing particular instances of voice in various media through the narratological concept of discursive voice, intermedial experience can be studied between medial environments such as the printed text and audio dramatizations, in both audiobook and podcast. It can be expertly studied within the single medium of the verbal text too. Irina Rajewsky (2006), Werner Wolf (2011), Klaus Bruhn Jensen (2016), and Jörgen Bruhn (2016), among other theorists, have clarified methods for the intermedial analysis of verbal literary texts, and the three-tier model of mediality employed can be used for the purpose too. Jarkko Toikkanen explains that it involves “each aspect of the reading process as kinds of mediation interacting with one another: 1) senses as media, 2) ways of presenting, including words, as media, and 3) conceptual abstractions, such as ideas, as media” (2021; 2020, 73). In encountering SRC as a printed text, barring any visual challenges on the first tier, the process starts with reading the words that, as a second-tier way of presenting, bring about first-tier imagined sensory perceptions which then give rise to third-tier ideas and interpretations of the story’s meaning. In listening to SRC either as an audiobook or podcast, the process is similar except for the initial encounter not being visual but auditory, in the

form of voice acting and musical sound effects. In this way, the three tiers simultaneously overlap and require each other in the intermedial experience of any medial object, and the ongoing process of mediation is one of manifold interaction even when there is a single presenting medium involved for comparison, such as a printed text, audiobook, or podcast.

The three-tier model of mediality can therefore be used for analyzing all kinds of sensory images and how they turn into ideas in a text consisting only of words. Whereas across the media in which SRC is experienced, transmedial elements such as the plot and characters remain the same, other aspects change from one medium to another, including the intermedial experience of narrative voice and the kinds of ideas either the reading or listening of the story makes the reader imagine and feel. In each instance, SRC tells the story of two men visiting an abandoned cemetery at night with the purpose of entering one of the graves to learn its secrets. Warren, a veteran of the occult, leaves Carter, his dilettante, behind as he ventures underground with a strange telephone apparatus – only to gasp in horror at what he finds there, never to return.³ The plot is framed by a narrative of Carter being later interrogated by the police on what really happened that fateful night.

Medial environments and audiences

The short story starts with Carter addressing his audience at the time of the telling. In the first paragraph he speaks to “gentlemen” and reveals they have detained him and are questioning him as a suspect and a witness to horrible events. This provides a dramatized scene for the telling with a specific audience and a clear motivation to tell – to escape punishment. The information

provided in the first paragraph, however, is in many parts already known to his audience; they are the ones who have detained Carter and are repeatedly demanding him to reveal the events. While the mentioning of Carter's previous tellings is in the situation mimetically motivated by Carter's urge to plead with the men questioning him, the content of the speech crosses the narrator–narratee relationship. Redundant telling like this has a disclosure function directed to the reader for them to orientate towards the story (see Phelan 2005, 12). In this mode, the dual function of a first-person narrator as both a teller and a character is highlighted at the same time. Discursively, Carter speaks as a character in the story world to those present in the situation, which constitutes the communicative function, but the content of his words is directed to the reader of the short story, which constitutes the disclosure function of this narration (see Hatavara 2012, 168).

The SRC podcast from 2009 presents a medial environment with an audience that is quite different from the reader of the short story. It is a 34-minute production with hosts Chris Lackey and Chad Fifer conversing with Andrew Leman, the voice actor of the 17-minute audiobook version. The podcast consists largely of informal banter about SRC and Lovecraft in general, while snippets of another voice actor, Sean Branney, intoning the story are worked into the mix complete with musical sound effects. Much of the content of the discussion during the session can be deemed irrelevant to our analysis, but the podcast is to be recognized as a popular contemporary medium of production and reception. The online literary podcast creates a specific medial environment for consuming digital literature with which global social media users are familiar. These podcasts invite user participation as a kind of pastime. Since Lackey and Fifer are running a comments section on their site, together with the users they also have the

opportunity to engage with one another afterwards as the listeners contribute their own ideas and interpretations of the short story and podcast.

When the podcast is compared with the audiobook version of the story, medium-specific differences between the two media products become evident, especially with regard to audience design. With the hosts having a joint laugh in their session with Leman, they break off into tangents about the short story and its author, providing speculative explanations and distracting from experiencing SRC directly. As interaction, the medial environment has the quality of congenial spontaneity and improvisation. On the one hand, the audiobook forgoes such interaction to allow listeners to immerse themselves in the experience of SRC. Leman is the narrator of the audiobook version, and his predominant tone and intonation feels fragile and reserved, inviting sustained attention. On the other hand, in the podcast snippets Branney's voice sounds more mischievous and exaggerated – contributing to the spontaneous quality of the conversation. The musical sound effects remain similar in both audio dramatizations, designed to create a transmedial sense of ominousness through creaks, bangs, and howls in the story world, as well as an illusion of the sounds Carter must have heard in experiencing the horrors he is later telling about. However, intermedially the experience is very different because of the pronounced joviality of the podcast in comparison to the air of horrified disbelief of the audiobook.

Then again, when both the podcast and audiobook are compared to the printed text in terms of intermedial experience, one significant difference can be found in the pacing. Whereas the reader of SRC as words on the page or screen can soak in the atmosphere at their own pace, digesting Lovecraft's eccentric style and eldritch vocabulary, and take their time in imagining the sinister

innuendo of the story, the listener of SRC is tied to the vocal performances of Leman and the hosts. Here the three-tier model of mediality effectively demonstrates the disparity between the medial environments in question. As the audience listens to the audiobook, the sound is physically there, non-imagined, as SRC embodies the interpretive voices in the studio. The sense of hearing is activated for 34 minutes of podcast or 17 minutes of audiobook, in which time ideas and alternative interpretations arise that may, of course, be revisited once the recording stops. In reading SRC, nothing is physically there except the words as a way of presenting the story world, and all sensory perceptions about that world must be imagined, without set pace or interpretation. In this fashion, the intermedial experience of reading printed texts is slow whereas listening to the audiobook – or watching movies, for instance – is bound to a predicated duration in how the senses are engaged with, affecting the quality of their interaction with the ideas that encountering the media product gives rise to. Of course, in a first reading or listening when the audience is yet unfamiliar with SRC, an individual's experience of duration may be at odds with subsequent experiences of the kind when they already know what is going to happen and when.

The narrating Carter in Lovecraft's short story creates interpretive ambiguity with the repeated expressions of his own unreliability as a narrator, due to his failing memory and perceptions at the time of the horrible events. Unreliable narrators like Carter, who repeatedly express their failings and also their continuous effort to accuracy, can actually make their audience more sympathetic towards themselves contrary to deceiving unreliability with an estranging effect (Phelan 2007, 226–232). Dorrit Cohn (1978, 144–147) talks about dissonant self-narration in cases where the narrating self clearly takes distance from their former self. This is often mnemonically more plausible than claiming to remember one's past thoughts and action

precisely, and it also enables the narrating self to describe a change from their past incoherence or aberration. Carter often openly criticizes his former thoughts in a similar manner he describes a smell, which his “idle fancy associated absurdly with rotting stone.”⁴ The intermedial disparity between the mischievous and fragile tones of the podcast and audiobook accents the question of audience sympathy, resolving a particular instance of voice materializing in the media.

The dissonance from his past self is highlighted by Carter several times, as he discredits not only his past thoughts and perceptions but also describes his mind as having suffered “a mental blank” and being affected by “the dark cloud which has come over my mind” so that he can “no longer retain full comprehension.” Carter’s repeated use of “I seemed” is syntactically explicit when he describes his past actions. It suggests he is observing himself from outside, blocked from access to his past mind or thoughts. Close to the start, he says that he does not have a distinct memory of what had happened, but a picture of “one scene only.” Carter has lost his memory and his mind has been affected by “the dark cloud” caused by having heard the voice of “the thing,” which actually questions one of the basic principles in interpreting literary characters. Do they have coherence and continuity throughout the text and in first-person narration between the narrating self and the experiencing self (Alber et al. 2010; see Hatavara 2012, 153–155)? How do they end up affecting the audience either way? At least, the narrating Carter is discordant with his former experiencing self, but perhaps even radically different from him – Carter is no longer under Warren’s sway but has been strongly influenced by the thing, the undescribed horrible creature, whose voice is heard in specific ways in the three medial environments compared.

Voices Experiencing and Telling

The short story as printed at The H. P. Lovecraft Archive – a digital reproduction of the 1922 typescript – uses italics as a textual means to highlight parts of the text and separate them from the rest. Italics occur systematically in all speech heard from below the surface after Warren’s descent. They are used once before as Carter describes the studies he participated in with Warren:

I remember how I shuddered at his facial expression on the night before the awful happening, when he talked so incessantly of his theory, *why certain corpses never decay, but rest firm and fat in their tombs for a thousand years.*

Throughout the text, quotation marks are used to mark instances of characters’ speech within the frame of Carter telling the events during the interrogation. On this occasion, no quotation marks are present, but a part of the text is in italics, elsewhere used only in connection with instances of direct quoted speech. The lack of quotation marks suggests the italicized part would indicate indirect speech, with Carter as the narrator using his own discourse to relate what Warren had said. However, the indirect speech would conventionally be in the past tense of the reporting narrator. Instead, the present tense is used to suggest a direct quotation of what Warren said. Carter does indicate a specific occasion of Warren talking, “on the night before”, but at the same time he says Warren talked “so incessantly” indicating repeated activity. Therefore, the text in the italics may be interpreted as a schematized version of Warren’s talk – Carter does not use the specific words Warren used, but gives the main point in a language that is idiomatic of Warren. By using the present tense, Carter assumes Warren’s position, which emphasizes this is what

Warren had said, even if not in these very words but in many variations. Therefore, the words in italics compose a hybrid mix of Carter's and Warren's discourse.

The expressive idioms appearing in the italicized part – "*firm and fat,*" "*for a thousand years*" – could be interpreted as indicators of the character's discourse in discursive mixes like free indirect discourse (see McHale 1978, 269–270; Fludernik 1993, 223–226), but may also be part of the narrator's idiom in the case of schematized speech (see Fludernik 1993, 421). In SRC, Warren is described as calm and composed even when absorbed in his studies, whereas Carter is described as having bad nerves and using frantic expressions throughout his narrative. Therefore, the idioms in italics can be understood as Carter's imitation of what Warren said, colored with his own expressive style of description.

It is indeed interesting how the voices of Carter – both as a narrator and a quoted character – and Warren as quoted by Carter become mixed in SRC. The long quotation ("I'm sorry to have to ask you to stay on the surface...") that Carter says were Warren's last words before making his way underground provides an example of mnemonic overkill, in which a character narrator's ability to repeat lengthy parts of a conversation verbatim becomes questionable (see Cohn 1978, 162). Warren's speech is quoted only once before his descent, and the content of these words is very much aligned with what Carter himself has disclosed of his own relation to Warren – being subordinate to him and not even capable of reading all of his books on "forbidden subjects." Throughout SRC, and in this sole instance of Warren's talk quoted above ground, Randolph's frail nerves are emphasized in a manner that may support his claim of innocence in having been under the sway of another person and only for that reason having studied the occult topics.

SRC ends with the last words Carter hears from beneath the earth – “*YOU FOOL, WARREN IS DEAD*” – via the telephone apparatus Warren has taken there. In the printed text at The H. P. Lovecraft Archive, this particular quotation is the only part of the text in capital letters, instilling the sense of Carter’s horror at hearing the words of the thing from below. The words express some type of familiarity with Carter, berating him as a fool. Harley has been in the habit of talking down to Randolph throughout the short story, particularly in the long quotation discussed above. It could be argued through the analogy between style and agency, that it might still be Warren who speaks at the end; it might indeed be him who has been transformed into one of those corpses that never die. Perhaps Warren, who temporarily changes his tone when discovering the secrets of the grave, has at the end regained his own conceited self.

The narrating Carter dominates the experiencing Carter’s idiom too. Although the two Carters are discordant with one another, the narrating one discursively appropriates the experiencing one in several instances, indicating strong control over his narrative. In the moment, separating the voices and points of view often becomes complicated as discourses and observations mix (see Hatavara & Toikkanen 2019; 2017). In SRC, the word “now” is frequently used in reference to the experiencing self who is anxious about the unfolding events, together with a mental verb reflecting on the anxiety from a distance. For example, in “I now observed” the deictic adverb refers to the experiencing Carter even if the verb tense and type are those of the narrating Carter. This partial immersion into the experiencing self temporally and discursively is evident in the extract that immediately precedes Warren’s first words from the underworld: “He who had so calmly left me a little while previously, now called from below in a shaky whisper more

portentous than the loudest shriek.” The adverb “now” is used to refer to the point of experiencing in the past, reinforcing the validity of the original experience even if the narrating Carter’s failing memory and unreliability are emphasized elsewhere in SRC.

Descriptions of tones of voice in printed texts are interpretive ambiguities that the audiobook must resolve somehow or omit the parts with such descriptions altogether. In SRC, whereas the reader is left to wonder what quality particularly makes a shaky whisper “portentous,” the listener hears both the description of the tone and then the words uttered read aloud, devoid of the mystery of portentousness as the voices in question materialize in the medial environment of the audiobook. Another example of intermedial disparity is found in the examples of repeated instances of talk. Warren’s last words from beyond include repetition, as does Carter’s response to him:

“Curse these hellish things—legions— My God! Beat it! Beat it! Beat it!”

After that was silence. I know not how many interminable aeons I sat stupefied; whispering, muttering, calling, screaming into that telephone. Over and over again through those aeons I whispered and muttered, called, shouted, and screamed, “Warren! Warren! Answer me—are you there?”

In the printed text, the three occurrences of “Beat it!” could be understood as suggesting further repetitions of which just the first few instances are printed, similar to three full stops of elliptical continuation. Read aloud, the three shouts can appear conclusive, which might also explain why the anthologized Del Rey version of SRC actually capitalizes the last “BEAT IT!” expression (Lovecraft 1995, 34) as if to stress the rising intonation and finality of the third shout.⁵

While this kind of iterative happening can be economically narrated, printed on the page or screen as descriptions of tones of voice, the repetition of the character's response in the story world is not iconically imitated by the voice actor. Carter sits through "interminable aeons," keeping up the telephone connection, and while his response is told to happen "over and over again," it is only quoted once in the printed text. As a result, the voice actor speaks it just once. Whereas the repetition of Carter's words is described as occurring in several different tones, the reader of the text must choose which one to hear in the single instant of enunciating the iterative words. They may, of course, slow down the reading and take their time in imagining how Carter must sound in his responses across what seems like eternity, and revisit the words to hear them again either in the printed text or as Leman's performance in the audiobook, but each iteration will materialize as just one possible resolution of the interpretive ambiguity in the moment.

Sensory images and medial tiers

Toikkanen has studied (2021; 2017; 2014) the rhetorical design of visual, auditory, and haptic images in the short stories of Edgar Allan Poe, a major influence on Lovecraft, with the three-tier model of mediality through which the interaction between the senses, ways of presenting, and ideas can be intermedially analyzed either in various media or in a single presenting medium. In SRC, the sensory imagery of the "ancient cemetery" visited by Carter and Warren after "a lethal silence of centuries" is conjured up with vivid descriptions straight off the Gothic tradition. The auditory imagery we have focused on analyzing as instances of discursive voice is replete with dialogue in the story world – both at the cemetery and in the frame narrative of the police interrogation room – that materialize and are interpreted differently between the printed text and

audio dramatizations, with the transmedially appearing sound effects in the audiobook and podcast adding their own weight. A decisive instance of this kind of voice appears towards the end:

I do not try, gentlemen, to account for that *thing* – that voice – nor can I venture to describe it in detail, since the first words took away my consciousness and created a mental blank which reaches to the time of my awakening in the hospital. Shall I say that the voice was deep; hollow; gelatinous; remote; unearthly; inhuman; disembodied? What shall I say? It was the end of my experience, and is the end of my story.

The afflicted Carter is speaking of the last scene that took place at the cemetery, or the moment when someone – or some *thing* – finally responded to him (“*YOU FOOL, WARREN IS DEAD!*”) through the telephone apparatus, the one end of which he is holding. Carter waives his ability to describe his first-tier sensory perception accurately at the time of the told, and only attempts to revisit his experience at the time of the telling through second-tier frantic adjectives. The initial two images (“deep” and “hollow”) describe echo-like auditory perceptions on the first tier that, in the second-tier audiobook, seem enacted in the Lemay’s performance to make the narrator sound as if he was speaking in an empty room, raising the third-tier idea that there might not really be anyone with him, and he is just rambling on his own, losing his mind alone.

The third image (“gelatinous”) in the passage is fascinating because it shifts from the auditory to the haptic in how the nether voice is imaginatively perceived on the first tier. How is it possible to experience voice as anything that resembles gelatinous – at least within the sensory parameters of familiar reality? In the rhetorical design of SRC, it can be argued that the second-tier haptic image of gelatinous voice at the end of the story amplifies the third-tier ideas the reader will have

about the source of the voice. How will they interpret who or what it is that answers Carter from the depths of the earth? In outlandish viscosity, the “thing” sounds “unearthly”, “inhuman” and “disembodied” and so must be out of this world – similar to the “*firm and fat*” corpses who lie undead in their graves, as expressed earlier in SRC in the hybrid voice of Carter and Warren, with which Leman’s interpretation of the final line in the audiobook may also correspond.

Another aspect of intermedial experience in the story world has to do with the second-tier media of spoken dialogue between Carter and Warren either in person or through the weird technology of the telephone apparatus they are carrying with them. Whereas the lines uttered by Warren to Carter directly before his descent into the grave are written into the bulk text without textual markers other than regular quotation marks, the lines recited from down below are set down in italics – underlined in the 1922 typescript – endowing them with the specific quality of dialogue mediated through auditory technology instead of conventional face to face delivery. Being left alone on the surface, the unusual experience of holding a coil of wire alone in the middle of the night in a strange place overtakes Carter: “I was alone, yet bound to the unknown depths by those magic strands whose insulated surface lay green beneath the struggling beams of that waning crescent moon.”

The organic and reassuring quality of human interaction through speech with people present in the same place vanishes to be replaced by the technology of the telephone in a story from 1919. On the first tier, Carter’s intermedial experience is visually one of a magical connection with an unknown underworld that yet manifests under the natural moon of familiar reality. The horror begins once the second-tier enchanted line comes alive, the voice screaming words of dismay at

the frightful revelations, which finally jeopardizes the human identity of the utterer turned into alien jelly at the other end of the line. On the third tier, the natural moon has at the closing of the story become “an accursed waning moon”, the rhetorical image of an occult idea that no longer signals a familiar reality but reveals the secrets of an unfathomable cosmos.

In this way, Lovecraftian technology requires both advancing knowledge – experimentation and invention are key to it – and eradicating sanity through the very devices that make the learning possible. In SRC as a printed text, the eye is engaged by a technology of words that bring about sensory perceptions that range from the conventional to unconventional, giving rise to ideas and interpretations that, for the individual reader, may voice unknown dangers as threats to sanity, or they may not. In SRC as an audio dramatization, in either audiobook or podcast, the ear is engaged by the technology of words in a similar process of sensory perceptions giving rise to ideas, but with a different intermedial experience in each case, in ways specific to the medial environment.

Conclusion

We set out to study intermedial experience between the media platforms, and how the different versions make use of voice in medium-specific ways in producing the narrative. We employed the narratological concept of discursive voice and a three-tier model of mediality, and emphasized the intermedial differences between media and the way they are experienced.

On the medial environments and audiences of SRC, we identified distinctions in how the printed text, audiobook, and podcast involved the reader or listener, along with the kind of effect particular instances of voice would have on the intermedial experience. In analyzing the voices

experiencing and telling in the short story, we recognized a rich array of discursive voices by which the narrating Carter could dominate the experiencing Carter and compose a hybrid mix with Warren. Through the sensory images and medial tiers of the story, we also recognized a rhetorical design in which sensory perceptions presented in words could affect the ideas and interpretations of the reader or listener in the three medial environments compared.

With sites like The H. P. Lovecraft Archive and The H. P. Lovecraft Literary Podcast along with movies and television shows including *Color out of Space* (2019) and HBO's *Lovecraft Country* (2020) and academic anthologies such as *The Age of Lovecraft* (Sederholm & Weinstock 2016), Lovecraft's fiction is seeing another surge in popularity – and controversy – in the digital age. In further research, since Randolph Carter is a recurring character in Lovecraft's fiction, it would be productive to study how the narrating voice attributed to him develops, while paying attention to the rhetorical design and impact of the printed texts and their versions in other global media.

References

- Aczel, Richard. 1998. "Hearing Voices in Narrative Texts." *New Literary History* 3: 467–500.
- Alber, Jan, Stefan Iversen, Henrik Skov Nielsen, and Brian Richardson. 2010. "Unnatural Narratives, Unnatural Narratology: Beyond Mimetic Models." *Narrative* 18.2: 113–36.
- Bolter, Jay David and Richard Grusin. 1999. *Remediation: Understanding New Media*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Bruhn, Jörgen. 2016. *The Intermediality of Narrative Literature: Medialities Matter*. Palgrave Pivot. Cham: Springer.
- Cohn, Dorrit. 1978. *Transparent Minds: Narrative Modes for Presenting Consciousness in Fiction*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Elleström, Lars. 2019. *Transmedial Narration: Narratives and Stories in Different Media*. New York: Springer.
- Fludernik, Monika. 1993. *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction: The linguistic representation of speech and consciousness*. London and New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Fludernik, Monika. 2005. "Speech Representation." In David Herman et al. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London and New York: Routledge, 558–563.
- Genette, Gérard. 1980. *Narrative discourse*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Trans. Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hatavara, Mari. 2012. "History Impossible: Narrating and Motivating the Past." In Markku Lehtimäki, et al. (eds.) *Narrative, Interrupted: The Plotless, the Disturbing and the Trivial in Literature*. Berlin: De Gruyter: 153–173.

- Hatavara, Mari, Hyvärinen Matti, Mäkelä Maria, Mäyrä Frans. 2016. "Minds in action, Interpretative traditions in interaction." In Hatavara Mari et al. (eds.) *Narrative theory, literature, and new media: Narrative minds and virtual worlds*. New York: Routledge, 1–8.
- Hatavara, Mari & Jarkko Toikkanen. 2019. "Sameness and Difference in Narrative Modes and Narrative Sense Making: The Case of Ramsey Campbell's 'The Scar'." *Frontiers of Narrative Studies* 5/1: 130–46.
- Hatavara, Mari & Jarkko Toikkanen. 2017. "The Sensational World of The Running Man." In Merja Polvinen, Maria Salenius and Howard Sklar (eds.), *Worlds of Imagination: Explorations in Interdisciplinary Literary Research*. Turku: Eetos ry, 161–81.
- Jensen, Klaus Bruhn. 2016. "Intermediality." In Bruhn Jensen Klaus et al. (eds.) *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, 3–12.
- Lovecraft, H. P. 2016. "Reading 10 – The Statement of Randolph Carter." Witch House Media. *The H. P. Lovecraft Literary Podcast*. <https://www.patreon.com/posts/18597296>
- Lovecraft, H. P. 2009. "Episode 9 – The Statement of Randolph Carter." *The H. P. Lovecraft Literary Podcast*. <https://hppodcast.com/2009/09/03/episode-9-the-statement-of-randolph-carter/>
- Lovecraft, H. P. 2009. "The Statement of Randolph Carter." *The H. P. Lovecraft Archive*. <https://hplovecraft.com/writings/texts/fiction/src.aspx>
- Lovecraft, H. P. 1995. "The Statement of Randolph Carter." In *The Dream Cycle of H. P. Lovecraft: Dreams of Terror and Death*. New York: Del Rey/Ballantine, 30–35.
- Lovecraft, H. P. 1922. "The Statement of Randolph Carter." *Brown University Library*. <https://repository.library.brown.edu/studio/item/bdr:425277/>

- McHale, Brian. 1978. "Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts." *Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3: 249–278.
- Mildorf, Jarmila & Till Kinzel. 2016. "Audionarratology: Prolegomena to a Research Paradigm Exploring Sound and Narrative." In Jarmila Mildorf & Till Kinzel, eds. *Audionarratology: Interfaces of Sound and Narrative*. Berlin: De Gruyter: 1–28.
- Palmer, Alan. 2005. "Thought and Consciousness Representation (Literature)." In David Herman et al. (eds.) *Routledge Encyclopedia of Narrative Theory*. London and New York: Routledge, 602–607.
- Phelan, James. 2007. "Estranging Unreliability, Bonding Unreliability, and the Ethics of *Lolita*." *Narrative* 15.3: 222–38.
- Rajewsky, Irina O. 2005. "Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality." *Intermedialités* 6: 43–64.
- Ryan, Marie-Laure & Jan-Noël Thon, eds. 2014. *Storyworlds across Media: Toward a Media-Conscious Narratology*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.
- Salmose, Niklas & Lars Elleström, eds. 2020. *Transmediations: Communication across Media Borders. Routledge Studies in Multimodality*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Sederholm, Carl H. & Jeffrey Andrew Weinstock, eds. 2016. *The Age of Lovecraft*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Thomas, Bronwen. 2012. *Fictional Dialogue. Speech and Conversation in the Modern and Postmodern Novel*. Lincoln: Nebraska University Press.
- Thon, Jan-Noël. 2016. *Transmedial Narratology and Contemporary Media Culture*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Toikkanen, Jarkko. 2021. "At the Cutting Edge: Touch Images in Edgar Allan Poe's 'The Pit and the Pendulum'." *Connotations – A Journal for Critical Debate* 30: 1–23.

Toikkanen, Jarkko. 2020. "Feeling the Unseen: Imagined Touch Perceptions in Paranormal Reality Television." Special issue "Sensuous Governance." *The Senses and Society* 15/1: 70–84.

Toikkanen, Jarkko. 2017. "Auditory Images in Edgar Allan Poe's 'The Tell-Tale Heart'." *The Edgar Allan Poe Review*, vol. 18, no. 1, 39–53.

Toikkanen, Jarkko. 2014. "Failing Description in Edgar Allan Poe's 'The Black Cat'." In Kaisa Koivisto et al. (eds.), *Kokemuksen tutkimus IV: Annan kokemukselle mahdollisuuden*.

Rovaniemi: Lapland University Press, 270–281.

Wolf, Werner. 2011. "(Inter)mediality and the Study of Literature." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 13.3. <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol13/iss3/2/>

Bio notes

Mari Hatavara is Professor of Finnish Literature and director of Narrare – Centre for Interdisciplinary Narrative Studies at Tampere University, Finland. Her research interests include interdisciplinary narrative theory and analysis, fictionality studies, intermediality and the poetics of historical fiction and metafiction. She specializes in the analysis of narrative voices across fictional and non-fictional narrative environments and in intermedial settings. During her professorship at Tampere University (since 2009), Hatavara has worked at Ohio State University Project Narrative (2019), York University Interdisciplinary Centre for Narrative Studies (2017), Aarhus Institute of Advanced Studies (2016) and The Swedish Collegium for Advanced Studies (2011). Hatavara is co-editor of special issues on *Narrating Selves in Everyday Contexts* (Style 2017), *Narrating Selves from the Bible to Social Media* (Partial Answers 2019) and *Real*

Fictions. Fictionality, Factuality and Narrative Strategies in Contemporary Storytelling

(Narrative Inquiry 2019).

Jarkko Toikkanen is Senior Lecturer in English at the University of Oulu, Finland, and Adjunct Professor at Tampere University, Finland. His research is focused on the concept of intermedial experience, or how experiencing literature and other media produces sensory perceptions, both imagined and non-imagined, through medium-specific ways of presenting that mediate the conceptual abstractions of language and culture. This three-tier model of mediality is a work in progress. Toikkanen has published articles, among other things, on paranormal reality television (2020) and Poe (2021; 2017; 2014), two co-authored articles with Hatavara (2019; 2017), the monograph *The Intermedial Experience of Horror: Suspended Failures* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), and two co-edited anthologies including *The Grotesque and the Unnatural* (Cambria Press, 2011). He has made research visits to Austria, Sweden and the UK.

¹ The H. P. Lovecraft Archive is run by Donovan K. Loucks and stores a vast array of Lovecraft materials. The H. P. Lovecraft Literary Podcast is managed by Chris Lackey, who lives in the UK, and Chad Fifer in the US. Their brand Witch House Media uses the San Francisco based Patreon platform to share their content.

² The model might be visualized as the three kinds of mediation (senses, ways of presenting, ideas) triangulating a space experienced as the medial object under study, such as SRC. The kinds of mediation make up tiers that rotate the basis of inquiry at a time. There is no medial object to experience without the ongoing interaction of each tier.

³ Randolph Carter is a recurring character in Lovecraft's fiction, developing into an seasoned expert of the occult over the course of his adventures. The major stories include "The Unnamable" (1923), "The Silver Key" (1926), "The Dream-Quest of Unknown Kadath" (1927), and "Through the Gates of the Silver Key" (1933).

⁴ The printed text of SRC published at The H. P. Lovecraft Archive is non-paginated.

⁵ The anthologized Del Rey version is interesting in three other aspects, at least. It is missing two full sentences at the start of the paragraph "In the lone silence of that hoary and deserted city of the dead;" it uses italics nowhere in the text; and in the last line only the word "DEAD" is capitalized somewhat similar to the "BEAT IT!" sequence.