Timo Salminen (Helsinki)

In between research, the ideology of ethnic affinity and foreign policy: The Finno-Ugrian Society and Russia from the 1880s to the 1940s

Russia has always been one of the parameters defining the activities of the Finno-Ugrian Society (*Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura*). During the 19th century, nationalism of a general European character, viewing mankind as specific peoples whose character is expressed primarily through language, literature and poetry, spread to both Finland and Russia, one of its Finnish manifestations being the founding of the Finno-Ugrian Society. Owing to the ideological background of the society, its specific character entailed a potential conflict with pan-Russian nationalism. In order to carry out its work in Russia, the Finno-Ugrian Society therefore had to place particular emphasis on the scholarly and non-political nature of its activities. This was done despite the fact that Finnish research in Russian territory contained clearly colonialist features. As political nationalism evolved during the first decades of the 20th century, the Finno-Ugrian Society also had to redefine its relationship with issues of a political nature. The society's activities reveal a complex interrelationship of ideology, political views and scholarly professionalism, in which researchers called upon themselves to be objective and assumed that they followed this requirement, while their ideological points of departure nonetheless influenced activities.[1]

What were the aims of the Finno-Ugrian Society in Russia from the 1880s to the 1940s, and what means did it apply to achieve them? What was the role of nationalist ideology in the society's definition of its aims? What was the society's relationship with Russia as a political entity?

The present article is based on the author's history of the Finno-Ugrian Society, which appeared in Finnish in 2008.[2]

The Quasquicentennial of the Finno-Ugrian Society.
Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran Toimituksia = Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 258.
Helsinki 2009. 225–262.

1. Early scholarly and Finno-Ugrian nationalist pursuits concerning regions to the east of Finland

Explorers from Finland began to travel among the speakers of Finno-Ugrian languages in Russia in the late 17th century. These efforts took on a systematic character in 1819, when the Imperial Russian Academy of Sciences persuaded A. J. Sjögren (1794–1855) to visit Russia. In his research, Sjögren was able to combine Russian interests, i.e. obtaining general information on the subjects of the Emperor, with specific interest in the Finno-Ugrian languages that had been aroused in Finland by the pro-Finnish *Fennophiles*. During the course of his career, Sjögren became a permanent member of the Academy of Sciences, where he rose to a position of considerable authority.[3] There were good overall conditions and political demand for closer contacts with Russia after 1809, when Finland was separated from Sweden to become a Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire. The rising interest in Finnish and its related languages was made to serve the distancing of Finland from Sweden.[4] The scholarly and scientific community of Finland began to gain an independent character soon after the mid-19th century. Nationalism had brought forth the idea that the centre of research concerning the Finns was to be in the Grand Duchy of Finland and not in Russia. Modernization gradually permitted Finland to provide the necessary infrastructure for these purposes – education, scholarly institutions and learned societies. Moreover, Russian nationalism began to emphasize Russian and Slav identity, rejecting other nationalities and Western orientations. As late as the early 19th century, the ethnic identity of the population had been of secondary importance for the Russian administration, but this situation gradually changed. Russification began to gain pace in the western parts of the empire in the 1830s.[5]

After Sjögren's death, Finns no longer enjoyed their former support in St. Petersburg. Despite this, there was neither any room for research concerning the Finno-Ugrian peoples in Finland's few learned societies. As a result, in the late autumn of 1872 Professor Otto Donner (1835–1909) contacted several scholars of Finno-Ugrian languages in different parts of Europe with his proposal for establishing an international journal of Finno-Ugrian studies. The Hungarians, in particular, felt this plan was premature, and it was forgotten.[6]

Finno-Ugrian archaeology, however, had come under way in Finland. In 1872–1874, J. R. Aspelin (1842–1915) carried out both research in museum collections and excavations in Russia, with the aim of discovering the lost past of the Finno-Ugrians. He followed M. A. Castrén's assumption of an ancestral home of the Finns in the Altai Mountains and concentrated on establishing how they migrated from there to Europe. Over the following years, both Aspelin and

Donner drew up, both together and separately, various plans for research expeditions to Russia. The most ambitious of these was presented by Aspelin at the Finnish Archaeological Society (present-day Finnish Antiquarian Society) in the spring of 1876. The aim of this plan was the archaeological investigation of the whole of Russia by Finnish scholars over a period of four years.[7]

At a meeting held in connection with the 50th anniversary of the Finnish Literature Society, Aspelin proposed that the Society was to be converted into an academy of science for the study of the Finno-Ugrian peoples. The president of the Society, Yrjö Koskinen (1830–1903), among others, opposed the plan. His policy was based, on the one hand, on loyalty to Russia and, on the other hand, on emphasizing the Western heritage of Finnish society. Finnish contacts with Finno-Ugrian peoples could be interpreted in Russia as support for separatist movements. Moreover, the Finnish nationalist movement wanted to make a distinction between the Finns and Hungarians, who had achieved statehood and the Finno-Ugrian peoples of Russia, who were at a lower level and in the process of extinction. Nonetheless, in Aspelin's case, for example, the idea of the Russification of the Finno-Ugrian peoples of the east as a kind of natural process led to the Finns being regarded as the rightful heirs and owners of cultural heritage of the former. Therefore he began in the early 1870s to strive for the founding of a Finno-Ugrian Central Museum in Helsinki.[8]

At the same time, there were efforts, fanned by the ideology of Finno-Ugrian affinity, to establish a society for the friends of the Estonian language. After the assassination of Emperor Alexander II (1818–1881), a society of this kind along the lines of Finno-Ugrian ethnicity was felt to arouse undue suspicion in Russia. Therefore, it was decided in the spring of 1882 to redefine the main purpose of the society in a scientific and scholarly direction. Nonetheless, a number of archaeologists, ethnologists and linguists published, also in the spring of the same year, their exhortation to join in founding the Society of Finno-Ugrian Peoples (*Suomen Heimokansojen Seura*), serving the aims of scholarship and popular education. Otto Donner still had mainly a learned society in mind, presumably to make it easier to obtain the permission of the Russian authorities. The activities of the Society of Finno-Ugrian Peoples ended before ever coming under way.[9]

After various experiments the only way to provide opportunities for Finno-Ugrian studies was to establish a new and completely separate learned society. Donner began preparations for this in early 1883, and in November of the year, the "Finno-Ugrian Society for linguistics, archaeology, ethnology and ancient history" was established. The developments leading to its founding were by no means straightforward or consistent, being instead greatly influenced by political conditions, relations with Russia and chance events.[10]

2. The Finno-Ugrian Society's aims become established in Russia

From the outset, the Finno-Ugrian Society had the aim of sending explorers to collect material on all the Finno-Ugrian languages. In order to launch its work in Russia, the society had to ensure the positive attitudes of authorities and to establish the necessary scholarly contacts. The first step was to appoint a president whom the Russians could regard as reliable. This post went to Clas Herman Molander (1817–1897), head of the State Finances Committee of the Imperial Senate of Finland, and widely respected in the Grand Duchy of Finland. The society selected as its first honorary members Fedor Heiden (1821–1900), Governor-General of Finland, and Minister Secretary of State Theodor Bruun (1821–1888). Its first foreign correspondent member was Nikolaj Il'minskij (1821–1891), head of the Kazan' Seminar.

In the late 19th and early 20th century Kazan' was an important base for Finnish scholars, a leading university city with both Finno-Ugrian and Turkic peoples living in its vicinity. Il'minskij had established a seminar in Kazan' in 1872 for training teachers and clergy for the non-Russian peoples of the region. The purpose of this was, via teaching and religious ceremonies in ethnic languages, to link these peoples more closely to the Orthodox Church, which would naturally lead to their Russification. The seminar, however, became an important catalyst of nationalism among the peoples of the Volga region. The Russians soon began to suspect ethnic patriotism, and these suspicions also applied to the Finno-Ugrian Society.[11]

The first to travel east on a grant from the Finno-Ugrian Society was Volmari Porkka (1854–1889) who went to study the Mari language in the summer of 1885. The expeditions undertaken by Heikki Paasonen (1865–1919) and Yrjö Wichmann (1868–1932) around the turn of the 1880s and 1890s to the Mordvins and Udmurts established the goals and procedures of Finno-Ugrian Society expeditions. In addition to linguistic material, the grant recipients would generally collect a wide range of material on all aspects of folklore, folk poetry and tales, religious beliefs, ways of life and livelihoods. They were led by concern over the disappearance of languages and cultures in the wake of modernization and uniform culture. Uniform culture had another name, Russification, a point that the Finno-Ugrian Society grant scholars were not afraid to state.[12]

In the spring of 1891, when Yrjö Wichmann travelled in the spring of 1891 to the Udmurts, Il'minskij, the head of the seminar, made his students available to Wichmann. "Il'minskij gave me a fatherly warning against making *propaganda* among the Votyaks (!!) and said that Munkácsi had done so among the Votyaks and the Voguls," wrote Wichmann. On a later expedition in 1902, Wich-

mann inquired about information on the Komi poet Ivan Kuratov (1839–1875) from the latter's nephew, who avoided answering for fear of arousing political suspicions.[13]

On the river boat to Kazan', Wichmann struck up a conversation with a Polish student "who wanted to know if we Finns hate the Russians like they do. And was very satisfied when I said 'yes'." The attitudes of Finnish scholars towards Russians and the Russian way of life appear to have been mostly contemptuous and scornful, and sometimes incredulous. "The more one lives here in Holy Russia and comes to know conditions, the more miserable and despicable things begin to appear," wrote Heikki Paasonen. On the other hand, individuals, such as scholars and others who offered help were respected, even very highly.[14]

For the scholars of the Finno-Ugrian Society, Russia was in fact only a kind of framework for their activities. The Finno-Ugrian peoples, in turn, were the subjects of research, for whom the role of collectors of materials at most was reserved. Even their present state was not important for research. Instead, their languages and cultures were regarded as sources of historical data. Finnish archaeologists working in Russia had also adopted this attitude. Russia was the focus of scientific colonialism, and the material that was collected there was to be kept in collections founded in Finland. Naturally there were different nuances among the attitudes of different researchers.[15]

For these reasons, also the Finno-Ugrian Society made full use of all opportunities to make a distinction with regard to Russia. For example, it sent its publications to World's Fairs, which in the late 19th century become important forums for constructing and presenting Finnish identity.[16]

3. Archaeology and Turkology

The Finno-Ugrian Society also participated in archaeological research in Siberia in 1887, 1888 and 1893. The Finnish Archaeological Society had launched in 1887 the collection of enigmatic stone inscriptions surviving in Siberia and Central Asia and this work was supported by the Finno-Ugrian Society. The expeditions sent in 1887–1889 to Minusinsk in Western Siberia were led by J. R. Aspelin, who assumed that the inscriptions there would reveal a Finno-Ugrian language and would date from the Bronze Age, thus being the oldest writing of the Finno-Ugrians. With reference to the material collected by the Finnish scholars, the Danish linguist Vilhelm Thomsen (1842–1927) proved in 1893 that the inscriptions were Turkic and dated from the 7th and 8th centuries AD. At the beginning of the following decade the Middle Iron Age of Western Siberia became the subject of study. The results of these expeditions forced the Finns to recon-

sider their ancestral-home theories – the concept of Altaic roots began to be undermined. Within the Finno-Ugrian Society, a broad, international orientation towards Asia significantly superseded the more limited Finno-Ugrian perspective maintained by archaeologists.[17]

The activity that began with investigations of the Siberian and Mongolian inscriptions was continued in the second half of the 1890s in Russian Turkestan (present-day Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan), becoming part of the international scientific and political race into Central Asia that had begun in the 1870s. Three expeditions to Turkestan were organized within the Finno-Ugrian Society in 1897, 1898 and 1899. They were mostly of an archaeological nature and the results were meagre. The expeditions were most financed personally by Otto Donner.[18]

Finnish activity in the field of Russian archaeology, however, decreased in the 1890s. As the ancient past of the Finns was not found through expeditions to Siberia and the materials thus obtained remained unpublished, there was no desire to appeal to the public for funding new ventures. Furthermore, the work of archaeologists began to focus more and more on investigating and protecting Finland's own antiquities, as required by the Antiquities Decree given in 1883.[19]

The Finno-Ugrian Society also turned its attention to East Turkestan, which belonged to China. In 1906, the Russian military authorities sent Colonel C. G. E. Mannerheim (1867–1951) on a two-year expedition to East Turkestan to gather intelligence. To hide the military purpose of his mission, Mannerheim posed as an explorer, collecting ethnographic and archaeological material and even carrying out small excavations on behalf of the Finno-Ugrian Society. This was one of the few occasions when the interests of the society and the Russian authorities coincided.[20]

At the society's annual meeting in 1896, Otto Donner had underlined tasks whose connections with the Finno-Ugrian context were indirect at the most, no doubt to emphasize the society's international and non-ethnically aligned profile. The society was to direct its attention to Mongolia and China, among other subjects of interest. Sinology could even be regarded as assisting the aims of Russian foreign policy in the Far East, where Nicholas II (1868–1918) sought support from China for his imperialistic aims against Japan.[21]

The Finno-Ugrian Society organized four archaeological-philological expeditions to Mongolia under the direction of J. G. Granö (1882–1956) and G. J. Ramstedt in 1906, 1909 and 1912. On the last of these expeditions, Ramstedt desired efficient support from his old benefactors who had now risen to leading positions in newly independent Mongolia, but this proved to be a disappointment. Instead, soon after arriving in the country Ramstedt found himself embroiled in

Mongolian-Russian political negotiations and disputes, in which the Mongolians sought to reduce the influence of the Russians and the Russian Consul-General V. F. Ljuba, who had taken effective lead of the country. General Ljuba threatened to deport Ramstedt to Russia upon hearing about his role in the political manoeuvres. Nonetheless, the expedition was able to gather material on Turkic inscriptions and the Mongolian language.[22]

4. Russian policies concerning Finland at the turn of the century

During the second half of the 19th century, Russia sought to link its western peripheries closer to the centre of the empire. In February 1899, Nicholas II issued a manifesto according to which imperial legislation came into force in the Grand Duchy of Finland. There were internal divisions in Finland regarding reactions to the Russian measures. The so-called constitutional position emphasized Finland's own constitutional laws and absolute compliance with the Finnish interpretation of them. The appeasement line, on the other hand, felt that the main issue was to secure the survival of the Finnish language and Finnish culture, and some concessions could be made regarding autonomy and interpretations of constitutional law. Both positions had supporters within the Finno-Ugrian Society and political disagreements did not impede the collaboration of researchers at least to any major degree.[23]

As a result of these developments, some Finnish learned societies completely ceased to appoint Russians as honorary or associate members. The Finno-Ugrian Society, however, increased its contacts with Russian scholars, no doubt in order to secure access to the east for research purposes. The society still engaged in relatively little actual cooperation with the Russians.[24]

In late 1905 there was a process of liberalization throughout the Russian Empire as revolutionary unrest and strikes in the aftermath of the Russo-Japanese war led to the establishment of a constitutional system of rule. While the February Manifesto concerning Finland was not revoked, it was no longer implemented. The Russian authorities resumed their unification policies in Finland in 1908. The acerbated situation also posed problems for scientific research. Difficulties had emerged for Finnish research conducted in Russia during the revolutionary unrest of 1905–1906. Yrjö Wichmann, who travelled in the Mari regions with funds from the University of Helsinki, had to interrupt his work because of unrest. In 1907 the ethnologist U. T. Sirelius (1872–1929) could not carry out properly his planned collection of materials among the Udmurts, because of the excessive suspicion of the local population.[25]

When E. N. Setälä (1864–1935) became the president of the Finno-Ugrian Society after the death of Otto Donner, the society began to place increasing emphasis on the national basis of its work and the Finno-Ugrian context, with less focus on the international dimension and the Ural-Altaic orientation preferred by Donner. In practice, however, there were few changes in activities before the First World War.[26]

The society's own recommendations and references for the recipients of its grants lost their effect as the authorities grew increasingly suspicious, and it had to obtain recommendations from the Russian Academy of Sciences. The Academy was thanked for its "excellent good will" towards the research carried out by the Finno-Ugrian Society and it was hoped that also other government authorities would be assured that "the individuals recommended by the society are purely scientists committed to their obligation of not interfering with the internal political disputes of the Empire, and with even greater cause to their obligation of not engaging in any kind of political propaganda".[27]

These hopes were in vain. The problems were particular prominent in the areas near the Finnish border. There is no reason to assume that the views of the influential Finnish writer Professor Zachris Topelius (1818–1898), who maintained that East Karelia belonged to Finland, were unknown in Russia.[28]

The Finno-Ugrian Society tried to be cautious to prevent its activities from arousing the suspicion of the authorities. This, however, was not always successful. In 1909 the society was preparing the publication of a collection of Estonian riddles gathered by Pastor Jakob Hurt (1839–1907). The editor, an Estonian student named Karl Wachtberg (1887–?) was imprisoned for being "politically suspect" and deported to Pärnu in Estonia, and all the papers in his possession were confiscated. Estonian folklore material most obviously aroused further suspicion among the Russian authorities concerning Wachtberg and perhaps also the motives of the Finno-Ugrian Society. Although the material was recovered later, the printing of the collection was prevented by the war.[29]

The uncommunicativeness of the local populace and the suspicions of the authorities encountered by Finnish researchers in the east led the Finno-Ugrian Society to plan material collection courses for native speakers of Finno-Ugrian languages. This idea received further support when Vasilij Nalimov (1879–1939), a Komi student, achieved good results in collecting Komi folklore material in 1907. Nalimov and the Mari teacher Timofej Evsev'ev (1887–1937) were invited in the spring of 1908 to Finland to study the Finnish language and to learn collection work. In this connection Heikki Paasonen proposed organized courses for collectors and it was decided to make preparations for them. As the situation in Russia became strained, it was finally decided in 1910 to refrain from the courses "for the time being". Even the last opportunities to arrange training for collectors were lost with the outbreak of the First World War.[30]

From the perspective of the Russian authorities, the work of Finnish researchers among the Finno-Ugrian peoples of Russia was thus by no means as apolitical as regarded and assured by the Finno-Ugrian Society. Even without the dissemination of any kind of propaganda, the very presence of Finns was a politically charged matter. Therefore, when underlining in 1912 the need for continuous financial support from the state, the Finno-Ugrian Society felt it was necessary to particularly emphasize the "most positive evaluations" of its work that it had received "above all from Russian scholars". The society and Finnish researchers in general had associates in Russia who spread information of their achievements in the Russian scholarly community. One of the most important of these was Professor Nikolaj Katanov (1862–1922) of Kazan'.[31]

In 1912, the Mari Vasilij Jakmanov (1882–1938) came to Finland, explaining that he was on a study trip. Yrjö Wichmann collected linguistic material from him, and Jakmanov later returned to Russia, from where he sent, among other items, Mari costumes to the National Museum of Finland via the Finno-Ugrian Society. In 1928 it emerged that Jakmanov had fled the Russian authorities, who were looking for him because of his membership in the Mari sect known as *Kugu Sorta* ('The Great Candle'), which was regarded as politically dangerous and was banned in Russia. Jakmanov had been banished in 1906 from the Government of Vjatka because of his anti-government activities, after which he hid from the authorities in different parts of Russia. The Finno-Ugrian Society and Wichmann had thus unwittingly given shelter to a political refugee.[32]

5. The First World War, the Russian revolutions and Finnish independence

The First World War broke out in Europe in the summer of 1914. Of the recipients for grants from the Finno-Ugrian Society at the time, Kai Donner (1888–1935) and Toivo Lehtisalo (1887–1962) were among the Samoyeds in Siberia, Toivo Itkonen (1891–1968) was researching the Skolts of the Kola Peninsula, Lauri Kettunen (1885–1963) was with the Votes in Ingria, and A. O. Väisänen (1890–1968) was collecting folk tunes in the Mordvin regions. Donner managed to complete his work and returned home with relative ease, as also did Lehtisalo in 31 December 1914. Väisänen and Itkonen, however, had to leave their research unfinished.[33]

The war increased Russian suspicions of the motives of the Finns, since one of the main scenarios of a military threat was a German invasion of Finland. Suspicions were also fanned by the strong German connections of Finnish research and cultural life. In the spring of 1915, the magazine *Novye Dni* published the text of a paper delivered by Mixail Borodkin (1852–1919) on the

nationality issue on Finland. He pointed to the existence of a pan-Finnish movement for the incorporation all the Finno-Ugrian peoples under Finnish rule. He wrote that suspicious contacts were being maintained especially with the Estonians and Hungarians, and even with peoples as geographically distant as the Samoyeds. Borodkin specifically referred to the Finno-Ugrian Society in this connection.[34]

In 1915, the learned societies of the Russian Empire, including Finland, were ordered to expel from their membership all subjects of countries that were at war against Russia, "except those of Slav, Italian or French origin". This was duly done also by the Finno-Ugrian Society. E. N. Setälä even proposed that the Finno-Ugrian Society should, for the time being, operate only as an explicitly Finnish society, but this was rejected by the board. The publication of *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* was halted in 1916, because of the ban on German-language periodicals during the war in the Russian Empire.[35]

The war was not successful for Russia, and Imperial rule was overthrown in the late winter of 1917. This immediately provoked nationalist activities among the minority populations of the empire, which also made it necessary for the Finno-Ugrian Society to decide on what attitude it should take. Soon after the March Revolution, the society received a letter from the so-called Federation of Small Peoples of the Volga Region, which included Maris, Mordvins, Udmurts, Christian Tatars and Kalmucks. The Federation hoped that contacts between the related peoples would be liberalized under the new regime and commended the educational aims of the Finns. The Finno-Ugrian Society replied that "although our main objective is of a purely scholarly nature, we are happy to hear of your work and are greatly sympathetic towards your aim of making the mother tongue the basis of cultural development and of raising the cultural and material standards of your peoples". The Federation no doubt hoped that the Finno-Ugrian Society would also provide political support if necessary.

The Finno-Ugrian Society also received a letter from a Mari teacher serving as a military officer, who hoped that members of the Finno-Ugrian peoples would be admitted to the University of Helsinki and the Finno-Ugrian Society could hold preparatory courses for these students in the Finnish language and other necessary subjects. The letter ended in the words "Long live brotherhood and unity!" The Finno-Ugrian Society concluded that while such courses were beyond the Society's means, "we must nonetheless take note of these signs of the times, be sympathetic towards them and when conditions have become established we must, where possible, seek to direct the strength arising from national sources towards work in areas of national scholarship." The Society was thus trying to strike a balance between its research agenda and emerging national-

ist sympathies, without knowing what attitude to take regarding all the new developments.[36]

The situation soon changed again with the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia and Finland's declaration of independence in December 1917. As civil war broke out in Russia, some of the leaders of the Finno-Ugrian Society provided direct advice on how Finland should try to utilize Russia's weakness. At the opening ceremonies of the University of Helsinki in January 1918, Professor J. J. Mikkola called for expanding the territory of Finland, with the aid of Germany, to the White Sea and the Arctic Ocean. Professor Kaarle Krohn (1863–1933) concurred. As a body, the Finno-Ugrian Society did not take an official position on these suggestions.[37] The Slavist scholar Mikkola was perhaps the best expert on Russia within the Society.

The work of the Finno-Ugrian Society was almost halted by political unrest, the continuously declining value of Finnish currency and rising printing costs. The situation soon also erupted in war in Finland, beginning as anti-Russian war of independence but turning at the same time in civil war as the result of revolution declared by socialists in Helsinki. The civil war lasted from late January to the middle of May in 1918. The Finno-Ugrian Society resumed its work quickly after the war, and it expressed the hope that there would be financial support from public funds for "this, so to speak, most national of our national disciplines, the special field most distinctly belonging to us." It was also assumed that once the civil war ended in Russia it would again be possible to undertake expeditions there as before.[38]

6. Ideological conflicts of the inter-war years

There was, however, no return to the past state of affairs. Finnish independence had severed connections with Russia. While there were internal disputes over the aims of the new Republic of Finland, a Western orientation was nonetheless desired. The Soviet Union both isolated itself and was isolated from the community of international learned organizations. Expeditions among the Finno-Ugrian peoples were thus out of the question. In addition, anti-Russian sentiments grew stronger in Finland and an ideology of ethnic affinity gained emphasis in attitudes regarding the Finno-Ugrian peoples. This meant that a Finnish-national perspective was the shared goal of almost all science and scholarship in Finland. To ensure their economic existence, along with other aspects, learned societies had to appeal in increasingly more direct ways to the nationalist ideology that had gained ascendancy in society.

The Finno-Ugrian Society became involved in several projects arising from ethnic affinity. In 1922, for example, the Foreign Delegation of Karelia contacted the Finno-Ugrian Society and other learned societies in order to create a journal "elucidating historical, linguistic and ethnological matters concerning the population of East Karelia" and to present them to the League of Nations to seek support for Finnish claims to East Karelia. E. N. Setälä, the president of the Finno-Ugrian Society, was chosen to be a member of the committee set up for this purpose. Setälä had supported General Mannerheim's plan to invade St. Petersburg in 1919 and was still a proponent of annexing East Karelia to Finland.

Finland, however, did not acquire East Karelia. This failure and anti-Russian ideological sentiment provided the basis for the Academic Karelia Society (*Akateeminen Karjala-Seura*), a student association founded in 1922. While the Finno-Ugrian Society as such did not take a position regarding the uncompromising pan-Finnish ethnic policies of the Academic Karelia Society, the latter had supporters and proponents in the Finno-Ugrian Society, for example Kai Donner.[39]

The dual role of E. N. Setälä in the service of the state and the scholarly community would sometimes lead to conflicting situations. While seeking contacts with researchers in the Soviet Union and local instructors in the Finno-Ugrian languages in his capacity as president of the Finno-Ugrian Society, Setälä rejected, as Finland's foreign minister (1926) the Soviet Union's offer of bilateral talks on a non-aggression pact and sought so-called border-state cooperation with Poland and the Baltic countries. In the Soviet Union, where all matters were decided by the Communist Party, research policies could not be distinguished from foreign policy, which may also have influenced the attitudes of the authorities regarding the Finno-Ugrian Society.[40]

Since there was no access to Russia, the Finno-Ugrian Society sought, funds permitting, to finance research in Lapland and the Finnic regions. In 1920 and 1922, E. N. Setälä proposed the study of the Karelian language as the most urgent task for the Society. When a large number of Karelian refugees crossed the border into Finland, a seven-man expedition was sent in 1921 with funds from the Finnish Ministry of Education to collect linguistic and ethnographic material from the refugees. Driven by famine, people began to flee from East Karelia to Finland in 1917, and the exodus continued until the end of the 1930s. The peak years were around the time of the Karelian uprising in 1921–1922.[41]

In order to preserve opportunities of at least some kind for contacts and especially expeditions to the Soviet Union, the Finno-Ugrian Society could not express too openly its distaste for the country in general or its political system. Accordingly, when the Komi teacher Igon Mösseg (Ignatij Mošegov, 1880–1965), who had escaped from Russia to Estonia in 1920 and had come to Finland with the assistance of Lauri Kettunen, applied four years later for a grant from the

Society for preparing a history of the Komi people, he did not receive it. Mösšeg later published a few works on the Komi, in which he fiercely attacked the Soviet system, Russians and Jews, and served on the board of the Prometheus Society of Finland.[42] The international Prometheus federation was an anti-Bolshevik émigré organization founded in 1926. Its Finnish chapter was established in 1932 and it focused specially on investigating the history and conditions of the non-Russian peoples of Russia and supporting their real and assumed aims to achieve independence. It was chaired by G. J. Ramstedt, the first vice-president of the Finno-Ugrian Society.[43]

The Society was able to restore some of its former contacts with Russia during the course of the 1920s. The exchange of publications began to revive in 1922, when the Tjumen' Scientific Society wrote to the Finno-Ugrian Society and requested exchange. In the mid-1920s E. N. Setälä contacted the Finnish Embassy in Moscow to find out how the Finno-Ugrian Society could obtain for its library books published in Russia in the Finno-Ugrian and Altaic languages, both past and forthcoming. At the time, there was a natural desire for Western contacts in scholarly circles in Russia, but difficulties for obtaining visas and other problems of an ideological nature kept connections at a minimum. As late as the 1930s, the Soviet Union remained outside international scientific and scholarly organizations.[44]

In 1922 Professor Wilhelm (Vasilij) Barthold (1869–1930) of Petrograd attended a meeting of the Finno-Ugrian Society, delivering a paper on his research in Turkestan. The Finno-Ugrian Society’s long-standing assistant, the Mari Timofej Evsev'ev contacted the Society requesting economic assistance and sending Mari folklore material. The collaboration was resumed and Evsev'ev was even able to visit Finland in 1927. The Soviet authorities cut off his contacts abroad in 1929.[45]

The Komi linguist Vasilij Lytkin (1895–1981) was able to come to Finland in 1926, continuing from here to Hungary, where he gained his doctorate. Lytkin’s teacher at the University of Moscow, Afanasij Seliščev (1886–1942), professor of Slav philology, was selected in 1926 as an associate member of the Finno-Ugrian Society mainly in recognition of his role in furthering Lytkin’s career. Seliščev had also been one of the founders of a Finno-Ugrian association in Moscow.[46]

Contacts with the Finno-Ugrian Society were not without problems for the few scholars that the Soviet Union allowed to travel abroad, or had other Western contacts. The Komis Vasilij Lytkin and Vasilij Nalimov, the Mari Timofej Evsev'ev and the Udmurt Kuzebaj Gerd (1898–1937) were arrested in the early 1930s. Lytkin and Gerd were accused of belonging to the Fighting League for the Liberation of the Finno-Ugrian Peoples (SOFIN), a fictional organization created by the People’s Commissariat for Internal Affairs of the Soviet Union

for the purpose of accusing Finno-Ugrian intellectuals of conspiring against the state. Gerd was the alleged chairman of the League. In interrogations, Lytkin was accused of contacts with the Finno-Ugrian Society with its aims of Greater Finland and erasing Soviet rule from the Komi region through armed rebellion. Lytkin also had to deny "bourgeois" comparative linguistics. Lytkin had been sent to Finland by the Institute of Eastern Peoples and said that, upon the urging of the Soviet Embassy, he visited all the places where he was invited. Lytkin was sentenced to a work camp in Far East for five years; the sentence was later reduced to three years. He was not allowed to return to Komi until he was officially rehabilitated in 1957. Kuzebaj Gerd and Timofej Evsev'ev were executed in 1937. Nalimov was released after his first arrest but was rearrested in 1937. He died in a prison camp in 1939.[47]

The Finno-Ugrian Society does not seem to have anticipated ideological connections or danger to associates. Instead, the Society naively believed that the Soviet Union ultimately functioned like other states, even though it could be seen in concrete terms that something was different. This was evident particularly in the grandiose expedition projects of the late 1920s and the revived attempts of the 1930s for research cooperation with the Soviets. In 1927 there were namely indications from the Soviet Union that it could again become possible to arrange expeditions. D. V. Bubrix (1890–1949) of the Soviet Academy of Sciences wrote in the spring to Yrjö Wichmann and proposed Finnish-Russian cooperation in order to continue research in the Mordvin regions. No invitation, however, ensured.[48] After waiting for a while, the Finno-Ugrian Society itself applied for permission to travel in 1928 to the Mordvin regions for a five-man Finnish group of scholars consisting of Professor Uno Harva (1882–1949), Albert Hämäläinen PhD (1881–1949), Lauri Kettunen PhD, E. A. Virtanen MA (1897–1970) and Paavo Ravila MA (1902–1974). Ravila was to have remained in Russia for a whole year, while the other members of the expedition would have been three months on the expedition.[49] The Soviet authorities regarded the group to be too large, and no doubt the plans of the Finns to travel in the countryside did not suit them either. Accordingly, travel permits were not granted, even despite the fact that Anatolij Lunačarskij (1875–1933), People's Commissar of Educational Affairs, had assured his country's cooperativeness to Ambassador Pontus Artti (1878–1936). After the first attempt failed, a visa was sought already in the same summer for Ravila alone for a period of three months, but even this was unsuccessful. There were also unsuccessful attempts to arrange a visit to Finland for a Mordvin language instructor for Ravila.[50] Nor was Julius Mark (1890–1959) of Estonia allowed to visit the Mordvins at the time, although the Soviet Embassy in Tallinn had given him reason to hope for permission. The Finno-Ugrian Society had awarded a grant to him for the visit. The clos-

ing of doors that had already been half-open to foreign scholars may have been influenced by a power struggle on the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1927, in which Josif Stalin (1879–1953) outmanoeuvred the left wing of the party, and the right wing in the next year. Mark was allowed, however, to carry out his research in Leningrad and Moscow in late 1928 and early 1929.[51] A. M. Tallgren (1885–1945), professor of archaeology, who had been on expeditions to Russia and the Soviet Union in 1908, 1909, 1915, 1924 and 1925, was also allowed to travel mainly to South Russia in 1928. In a letter to Ravila, Bubrix said that the permit for Tallgren had been made possible by the fact that he was already known.[52]

In the late summer of 1927 the Finno-Ugrian Society approached Sergej Oldenburg (1863–1934), secretary of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, in another matter. A Nenets from among the students of the Institute of the Eastern Peoples in Leningrad was requested to be sent to Helsinki to assist in experimental phonetic research conducted by Kai Donner and Toivo Lehtisalo. At the same time, a letter was sent to Professor Vladimir Bogoraz-Tan (1865–1936) requesting the assistance of a Nenets, Even and Ket in research in Finland. There was also a desire to study vocabulary in order to establish the origins of the Samoyeds. It was already learned in January 1928 that there were persons suitable for the purpose among the students of the institute. Adjunct Professor (Docent) Artturi Kannisto (1874–1943) also wrote to D. V. Bubrix expressing his wish to have an instructor in the Mansi language sent to Finland. Finally, the Tundra Nenets Matvej Jadne (1907–?), the Even Gavriil Nikitin and the Ket Il'ya Dibikov (1909–?) came to Finland for the summer of 1928. Toivo Lehtisalo, Arvo Sotavalta (1889–1950), Kai Donner and occasionally also Martti Räsänen PhD (1893–1976) and Professor Frans Äimä (1875–1936) worked with them. There were later attempts to have language instructors sent to Finland, but they failed.[53] Paavo Ravila's expedition to the Mordvin region was reattempted in 1929, this time successfully. He worked in this region for one month and for another month in Moscow, checking the Mordvin material collected by Heikki Paasonen and collecting more items of vocabulary.[54] In the following year, Ravila applied for permission to travel to Moscow, but it was not granted. The reason given for this was that according to the terms of his permit, he should have remained in the summer of 1929 in the cities of Leningrad, Moscow, Kazan' and Saratov, but he had set out on his own into the countryside to find a language instructor.[55]

In addition to collecting linguistic material, the Finno-Ugrian Society participated in the late 1920s in gathering historical and ethnological material on Finland and the Finno-Ugrian peoples from Soviet archives. After the trip, it was also proposed in Finland that ethnologically valuable sources in Soviet archives should be photographed for use in Finland.[56]

While waiting for permission to travel, all available opportunities were attempted for the study of even more distant languages. In 1930, Toivo Uotila (1897–1947) collected material on the Komi language from two Komi families living in Petsamo (present-day Pečenga), which belonged to Finland at the time. The parents of both families still spoke their original mother tongue. They had come to Petsamo already before the Revolution. Material also became available in late 1931 to G. J. Ramstedt and Arvo Sotavalta when three Yakuts who had escaped from the Solovki prison camp were given political asylum in Finland. They provided the scholars with linguistic and folklore material, as well as results in phonetic studies.[57] There were no participants from the Soviet Union in a conference of scholars of the Finno-Ugrian languages held by the Finno-Ugrian Society in 1931. One of the last private messages came in 1932 via the Finnish Embassy in Moscow from Olyk Ipaj (1912–1937) and Garri Kazakov, Mari students of cinematography, who sent to the Finno-Ugrian Society an anthology of poetry in the Mari language entitled *The Forest Murmurs*. No doubt these contacts and other nationalist activity led at least to Ipaj being arrested and executed in November 1937.[58]

Despite caution, the increasingly closer relationship of the Finno-Ugrian Society and other Finnish scholarly organizations with the ideology of ethnic affinity did not remain unnoticed or unutilized in the Soviet Union. Finnish archaeological and ethnological interest concerning Russian territory was branded in the Soviet Union as the political objective of bourgeois-nationalist ideology to act against the Soviet Union and the working class of Finland. A. M. Tallgren's criticism of Soviet science, among other comments, aroused a wave of protest in Soviet journals between 1931 and 1934. Adding to this, phenomena such as anti-Soviet activities among the Khanty and Nenets, conditions were not positive for Finno-Ugrian research. Studies of languages and traditional culture also suffered from the fact that shamans, regarded as messengers of anti-Soviet reaction were singled out for repression. Had Finns been allowed to study this culture, branded as dangerous, it would have eroded outright the foundations of Soviet rule.[59]

The most strongly-worded anti-Finnish statement was published in 1931 by the Estonian born Marta Palvadre, who mainly aimed her comments at ethnography in an article in the journal *Sovetskaja Ètnografija*. In her article entitled "Bourgeois Finnish ethnography and the policies of Finnish fascism", she claimed that science and scholarship in Finland were in the service of imperialistic policies of aggression and invasion. Certain fascist-led learned societies together with fascist organizations were working to demonstrate the right of Finland to the whole area between the Gulf of Bothnia and the Ural Mountains. Palvadre accused the Finno-Ugrian Society, the Finnish Archaeological Soci-

ety (present-day Finnish Antiquarian Society) and the Finnish Academy of Sciences for collaborating with the extreme right-wing Lapua Movement and the Academic Karelia Society. The whole Finno-Ugrian movement and its meetings of Finno-Ugrian scholars were also reflections of the same spirit. The movement extended to Estonia as well. According to Palvadre, the Finno-Ugrian perspective was emphasized because the bourgeoisie was seeking an escape from the economic crisis by seeking a Greater Finland extending as far as the Ural Mountains and to seize the natural resources of the western parts of the Soviet Union.[60]

At least formally, there was still hope in Finland that cooperation would improve. In 1932, for example, Kai Donner expressed the wish that the Russian Academy of Sciences would be as ready to cooperate with the Finns as it had been during M. A. Castrén's time.[61]

Professor E. A. Tunkelo (1870–1953) was in fact able to travel in 1932 to the Vepses, with funding from the University of Helsinki. Tunkelo's trip appears to have been associated with the Finno-Ugrian Society having been contacted the year before by the Veps-born S. A. Makar'ev, director of the Scientific Research Institute of Karelia in Petrozavodsk. The Finno-Ugrian Society had expressed the wish that a Finnish scholar would be allowed to travel to Karelia to conduct research. Makar'ev instead requested questionnaires, through which the Finns could obtain the information that they wanted. The questions were drawn up by E. A. Tunkelo and sent to Petrozavodsk. The correspondence passed through the Soviet Embassy in Helsinki, which meant that it was of an official nature. This gave the Finno-Ugrian Society cause to assume that the ice was breaking in general and the east would open up. This impression was strengthened by the initiative of the Soviet ambassador in Helsinki, Boris Stein, in 1934 concerning deeper scientific and scholarly cooperation between the Soviet Union and Finland. Related consultations were held, with E. N. Setälä and J. J. Mikkola attending, among others. Apparently this meeting led to Professor Lauri Kettunen, Lauri Posti MA (1908–1988) and Paavo Siro MA (1909–1996) being allowed in 1934 to spend three months in the Veps region to collect linguistic material.[62]

In 1935, a number of Finnish scholars held a meeting for planning cooperation with Soviet colleagues. The initiative in this matter was taken by Aarno Yrjö-Koskinen (1885–1951), who was ambassador of Finland to Moscow. The Finno-Ugrian Society was represented at the meeting by J. J. Mikkola, Arturi Kannisto and G. J. Ramstedt. The purpose was to establish a permanent organization to develop Finnish-Soviet relations, with members selected by the learned societies. The Finno-Ugrian Society, the Finnish Archaeological Society and the Finnish Literature Society were in favour of founding the organization, while the other societies lacked interest. In practice, the meeting remained

inconsequential, for around the same time, Stalin ended the Western contacts of Soviet scholars and scientists. Among the Finno-Ugrian Society, Professor A. M. Tallgren was practically the last person to be allowed on a long research expedition to the east. He travelled in the Soviet Union during the summer of 1935 with his Estonian pupil Harri Moora (1900–1968). After the trip Tallgren wrote an article describing his observations of the persecutions of researchers and his criticism of such measures. Also Tallgren's connections were cut off and he was stripped of his membership in learned societies in the Soviet Union.[63]

As late as the 1930s, some researchers from Europe were still able to undertake actual expeditions in the Soviet Union. One of them was Dr. Wolfgang Steinitz (1905–1967) of Germany in 1934. As a Jew and a Communist he could no longer return to Germany, and he remained in Leningrad for three years, being removed in 1937 from his post at the Institute of the Northern Peoples and deported.[64]

The last pre-war trip from among the Finno-Ugrian Society to the Soviet Union took place in 1937, when A. O. Väisänen visited the phonogram archives in Leningrad.[65]

Professor David Zolotar'ev (1885–1935) of the University of Leningrad visited the Finno-Ugrian Society in the winter of 1930, followed by Academician Aleksandr Samojlovič (1880–1938) in the late winter of 1935. As late as 1939, the Finno-Ugrian Society tried to obtain language instructors from Leningrad. There was a response to the request, but it did not lead to any practical measures.[66]

As research expeditions could not be undertaken, the Finno-Ugrian Society concentrated on publishing earlier bodies of material, for which the state began to provide funds in 1930s. Publication, however, was soon slowed by the international financial depression, and the Second World War broke out at the end of the decade.[67]

7. The Second World War

The outbreak of war in Europe in the autumn of 1939 and the Soviet invasion of Finland in late November interrupted the work of the Finno-Ugrian Society. When peace was concluded with the Soviets in March 1940, before further hostilities in 1941–1944, the society soon resumed its work in a more or less normal manner. Even contacts with the Soviet Union showed signs of reviving, for in the summer of 1941, the Finno-Ugrian Society received a letter from the Ukrainian Academy of Sciences requesting a copy of Eliel Lagercrantz's *Lappischer Wortschatz*.

During the war years, the Society's role as a national-level actor gained further emphasis. Of its members, the Professor Albert Hämäläinen, an ethnologist, was the chairman and Professor Jalo Kalima (1884–1952), a Slavist scholar, was a member of a committee appointed by the Council of State that began to plan a Finnish-Russian cultural association in the summer of 1940. The ultimate aim of this scheme was to slow the founding and work of the Finland-Soviet Union Society, which had emerged from a left-wing political base. Accordingly, the planned society could not be accepted by the Soviet Union, despite its accommodating attitude. Another association founded to compete with the Finland-Soviet Union Society was the Baltic Sphere Society, which included from the Finno-Ugrian Society Dr. Lauri Posti and Dr. Kustaa Vilkuna (1902–1989). This society aimed at cultural cooperation among all the countries on the Baltic, but since it, too, was rejected by the Soviet Union, it mainly became a channel of Finnish-German cooperation.[68]

Finland began to approach Germany in late 1940s and relations in the sphere of science and scholarship followed in the wake of political contacts. In the summer of 1941, Germany invaded the Soviet Union and Finland followed suit, trying to recover the territory lost in the Winter War of 1939–1940. The Finno-Ugrian Society gave its support for the new policy by granting associate membership in December 1940 to Heinrich Harmjanz (1904–1944), head of the department of ethnography of the Deutsches Ahnenerbe research institute. Harmjanz's task was to remove cultural property regarded as German from the eastern territories conquered by Germany, especially from Poland, in other words the looting of local museums and libraries. It is not clear what was exactly known at the Finno-Ugrian Society about his duties.[69]

The early stages of the war during the summer of 1941 appeared to be successful in an almost unreal manner. Finnish forces occupied East Karelia and the dream of Greater Finland seemed to be in the process of being realized. The Finno-Ugrian Society lent its linguistic expertise to the process of building Greater Finland already in the autumn of 1941, when together with a number of other organizations it submitted a proposal to Marshal Mannerheim, the commander-in-chief of the Finnish forces, regarding the codification of place names in East Karelia.[70]

In 1941 the State Scientific Committee for East Karelia was founded to lead research in the occupied areas. The learned societies representing the humanities noted that "national research within the humanities [...] is the field of study best suited for establishing the absolute ethnic and historical affinity of the new areas with the former territory of Finland." The Finno-Ugrian Society sent only Lauri Posti to conduct research in the occupied areas, for the purpose of collecting material on the Veps language in 1942. In other respects, the so-

ciety concentrated on gathering material from prisoners of war taken by the Finnish Army. The political barriers that had hindered the collection of material for over two decades had been removed by military means, which the Society greeted with enthusiasm.

War-time research in East Karelia continued along established traditional lines. Already in the 19th century, natural scientists, linguists, collectors of folk poetry, architectural historians and artists had travelled in the region. The work conducted during the war can be compared to the collection of material carried out by Estonian scholars in Ingria and east of Lake Peipus, which had been made possible by the German occupation.[71]

During the Finnish-Soviet Continuation War of 1941–1944 some 64,000 Red Army soldiers were taken prisoner by the Finnish forces. It immediately became clear to the Finno-Ugrian Society in 1941 that this provided a rich material that was immediately at hand. The Society began to plan research involving prisoners of war in the autumn of 1941. Professor Konrad Nielsen (1875–1953) of Norway was invited to Finland to collect linguistic material from prisoners of war, but he could not come. An invitation was then sent to Dr. Jenő Juhász (1883–1960) of Hungary to study the Mordvins. Dr. Juhász came to Finland in the spring of 1942 to check his manuscript of a dictionary of the Moksha language. In addition material on various languages was collected by the Society's own researchers.[72]

At the same time, Estonian linguists, such as Julius Mägiste (1900–1978) and Paul Ariste (1905–1990) collected materials from prisoners of war taken by the Germans and brought by them to Estonia.[73]

The Finno-Ugrian Society was also linked in a way to German war plans. In 1942–1943 Paavo Ravila worked in Berlin at the Institut für Grenz- und Auslandsstudien (Institute for Border and Foreign Studies) where he edited cartographic material on the Finno-Ugrian peoples of Russia. The work for preparing the maps was related to German plans for the reorganization of Europe, in which, among others, the Mordvins studied by Ravila were to be given more territory at the cost of the Russians. With German examples in mind, Ravila proposed the founding of a special institute of East European studies in Finland, with both scientific and political duties and assembling the various interests of learned societies with regard to Russia, among other work. The research expeditions of linguists and ethnographers would also have been focused according to political needs, which would also have determined the work of the Finno-Ugrian Society. Ravila condemned Nazism after the war.[74]

The war with the Soviet Union ended in a treaty in the autumn of 1944. Finland was not to have East Karelia and instead it had to accept the peace terms

dictated by the Soviet Union, while not having to surrender. At least some of the prisoners of war who had been in Finland and had been interviewed by the Finno-Ugrian Society were given sentences of 5 to 8 years upon returning to the Soviet Union, but it remains unclear to what degree this was due to serving as informants for linguists. This problem was apparently not recognized in the Finno-Ugrian Society.[75]

8. Scholarly, ideological-political and practical factors defining the Finno-Ugrian Society's relationship with Russia

Factors of highly different kinds helped shape the relations of Finnish learned societies with Russia. They can be roughly divided into four groups, i.e. factors of an ideological or ideological-political nature, factors from within the discipline concerned and practical factors. Their relative proportions have varied at different times. Ideological factors include nationalism, internationalism, Finno-Ugrian ethnic affinity and the aim of Finland to establish an image of itself as a Western nation.

On the borderlines of the ideological political spheres were the relationship of Finns with Russians and Finnish anti-bolshevism after 1917. The most purely political impulses were the internal political situation of Russia/the Soviet Union and its political relations with Finland and other countries.

Above all, economic factors controlled relations with Russia among the learned societies.

From within actual research there arose the need to assemble designated material to solve specifically defined questions.

How did the above factors influence the relations of the Finno-Ugrian Society with Russia at different times? The influence of factors within research is the most unequivocal one. The need to collect material on Finno-Ugrian languages spoken in Russia and their related cultures was without exception a "pulling" factor drawing the Society closer to Russia, often neutralizing the "pushing" effect of ideological and political factors.

Nationalism in the 19th-century Herderian sense was a factor of identity permeating the Finno-Ugrian Society throughout its early stages. On the other hand, it was associated with a strong internationalist aspect in the case of several late 19th-century scholars such as Otto Donner, August Ahlqvist and J. R. Aspelin. Otto Donner appears to have sought cooperation with both east and west

from the very beginning. According to Matti Klinge, Ahlqvist's internationalism was above all of a Western orientation, seeking to distinguish itself from Russia and its Finno-Ugrians. On the other hand, his practical work on research expeditions in Russia made it necessary to cooperate with Russians. In addition, he was from Eastern Finland, where a tradition of loyalty to Russia had specifically emerged. During the 1870s J. R. Aspelin still sought to avoid all manner of commitment to the Russians, but by 1890 he, too, had changed his views. Affinity with the Finno-Ugrian peoples had not been particularly common among the early leaders of the Society, although it could already be recognized in some form for example in the case of J. R. Aspelin.[76]

There was a strong need to underscore Western identity. This could be demonstrated, for example, by engaging in research in a discipline where the results could be published for an international readership. In relation to Russia, this also meant the aim of marking a distinction with regard to the Russians, whom Finns did not always regard as a capable of engaging in scientific research. This, however, did not yet involve actual ethnic anti-Russian sentiment of the kind that spread around the turn of the century.[77]

The internal political situation in Russia did not particularly favour Finno-Ugrian research in the 1880s or later. On the other hand, it did not actually restrict such research until the early 1900s. The assassination of Alexander II, however, marked the end of a period of liberalism in the Russian Empire.[78]

The economic conditions of the early decades can easily be summarized as follows. The first thirty years of the Society were a period of growing affluence permitting an increasingly wider range of activity among the Finno-Ugrian peoples of Russia.[79]

The situation began to change in the early 1890s. The new researcher generation of the Finno-Ugrian Society adopted the approach of ethnic affinity more clearly than their predecessors. This brought them closer to the peoples whom they studied and whose own nationalist activities had gained pace, while arousing increasing suspicion of the Finno-Ugrian Society among the authorities. At the same time, Russia's stricter policies in its western border regions such as Finland began to generate increasing anti-Russian feeling. In addition internal unrest in Russia posed difficulties for the work. These factors were also reflected in the conditions upon which recipients of Finno-Ugrian Society grants were able to work in Russia. On the other hand, the Society's economic opportunities for conducting research also in distant eastern areas improved through numerous donations, among other factors.[80]

Major change was caused by the First World War. For practical reasons, research and other activities became impossible in Russia, which was crippled by the difficulties brought on by the war. After inflation had depleted funds,

conditions no longer permitted long-range activities. Ideological-political attitudes to Russia became more pointed as the Finnish independence movement began to gain support. On the other hand, for example E. N. Setälä, president of the Finno-Ugrian Society, still tried to dampen enthusiasm for independence rather than promote it, and the other leading figures of the society did not express their views publicly. In the late summer and autumn of 1917, Setälä was the vice-chairman ("prime minister") of the Finnish Senate and he tried to negotiate with the interim government of Russia on arranging the position of Finland in the new political situation. Before long, however, he began to support national independence for Finland.[81]

The need for collecting material for research remained the same even after the revolutions in Russia and Finnish independence, but the ideological-political framework had changed. There was officially a state of war between Finland and Russia until October 1920, and relations remained strained even later. Ethnic-racial anti-Russian sentiment grew in Finland, and became associated with political anti-Bolshevism. In addition, there was emphasis on the national objects and ideals of all science and culture. As the ideology of ethnic affinity, which had become even stronger, now began to underline solidarity with other Finno-Ugrian peoples, the ideological relationship with Russia consisted even more clearly of two aspects – the relationship with the Russians and the relationship with the Finno-Ugrian peoples, which were regarded as opposites. In this situation the sympathies of the leading figures of the Finno-Ugrian Society were on the side of the Finno-Ugrians and against Russia and the Russians. The Society, however, had to avoid any explicit expression of this in order to restore its practical opportunities to work in the east. It thus found itself caught between political ideology and scholarship. This was also understood in the Soviet Union, where ideological factors gained the upper hand in the early 1930s in attitudes regarding the Finno-Ugrian Society and scholarly and scientific cooperation in general with foreign countries. As a result, the Finno-Ugrian Society's relations with Russia in the interwar years remained random in nature and were marked by a recurring tendency to overcome ideological obstacles and to resume practical efforts in the former areas where it had worked. The Society's economic situation gradually improved to the degree that such a return could have been possible for it. The Finno-Ugrian Society's relationship with Russia was marked either by a position of principle or naiveté, which was expressed as the aim of attending to relations with the east upon the same principles as with the west.[82]

During and after the Winter War of 1939–1940 the Finno-Ugrian Society was a national actor in an increasingly distinct manner. The need for national unity that had been emphasized in war-time conditions called for this in outright terms. After the outbreak of the Continuation War (1941–1944), the advance of

the Finnish Army into East Karelia meant that practical obstacles to research were surmounted with arms. Through its activities, the Finno-Ugrian Society appeared to accept Finland's official foreign policy and military aims, although even now it did not express its views regarding them in any open manner. Ideologically, Russia/the Soviet Union as such suddenly ceased to exist; there was now only research material obtained from there. On the other hand, the possibility of research expeditions extending further east than East Karelia or relations with Russia when the war might end were not considered. In war-time conditions and with economic support from the state, the Finno-Ugrian Society tried to make the best possible use of the opportunities that it had at the time.

Attempts to continue collecting research material in Russia continued immediately after the war. While the political situation had changed in principle as Finland and the Soviet Union had arranged their relations, the former mutual ideological suspicion nonetheless survived. Nor had scientific and scholarly relations been arranged at a formal level, and nothing was possible without them. Moreover, the Finno-Ugrian Society's economic situation was so weak that no extensive expeditions according to the former model would even have been possible.

In 1955, after the death of Stalin, the Finnish-Soviet Committee for Scientific-Technological Cooperation was established and it provided the framework for activities. Nonetheless, expeditions were not possible. While the Finno-Ugrian Society gradually lost hope in this respect, individual initiatives were still made until the 1980s. It was only after the collapse of the Soviet Union that it became possible to collect material through extensive fieldwork, but interest in it in the same way as in the past was no longer felt within the Finno-Ugrian Society.[83]

Endnotes

1 Anderson 2006; Hroch 1985; Nisbet 2006; Riikonen 2006; Häkkinen 2006; Branch 2006; Durrans 1994; Jones & Graves-Brown 1996; Díaz-Andreu 1996; Alapuro 1999; Upton 1999; Sihvo 1999; Geyer 1985; Stipa 1990: 241–244; Klinge 1989: 32–33, 39–40; Salminen 2003: 32, 67, 176–184.
2 Salminen 2008.
3 Stipa 1990: 167–168; Häkkinen 1996: 33–53; Salminen 2003: 36–37; Branch 1999: 129–134; Aalto 1971: 28–29.
4 Meinander 2006: 89–99, 108–114.
5 Branch 1999: 133–136; Jääts 2005: 40–71.
6 KA SUS correspondence: A. Schiefner to Otto Donner 12./24.11.1872, J. Budenz to Donner 30.12.1872, P. Hunfalvy to Donner 7.1.1873. *Pál Hunfalvy ja suomalaiset*, pp. 277–284 (Donner to Hunfalvy 12.11.1872, 19.11.1872, 16.12.1872, Hunfalvy to Donner 7.1.1873); Mikkola 1936: 103–104, 109–116 (Donner to Lönnrot 22.11.1872, 16.2.1873, Schiefner to Donner 12./24.11.1872, Budenz to Donner 30.12.1872, Hunfalvy to Donner 7.1.1983); *József Budenzin ja Otto Donnerin kirjeitä...*, pp. 40–46 (Donner to Budenz 19.11.1872, 16.12.1872, 17.12.1872, Budenz to Donner 30.12.1872). KA Donner 31 J. R. Aspelin to Donner 7.3.1874. Korhonen 1986: 103.
7 KA Donner 20: Plan för lingvistiska och arkeologiska forskningar angående de finska folken i Ryssland (three versions). Salminen 2003: 43–64 and references.
8 Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran viisikymmenvuotinen..., p. 157; Sulkunen 2004: 137–147, 190–192; Salminen 2003: 63–67, 71, 178–183.
9 KA SUS founding documents: Seura Suomen silta (proposed by-laws of the Suomen Silta Society). MV KIR SMY correspondence 1879–1882, unnumbered item pages 837–838: kehotus perust. Suomen Heimokansojen Seuraa (exhortation to establish the Finno-Ugrian Peoples' Society). Setälä 1932: 132–139; Rausmaa 2007: 12–13.
10 For more details, see Salminen 2008: 23–24.
11 KA SUS minutes 26.1., 23.2.1884, 22.3.1884, 17.1.1885; correspondence: Nikolaj Il'minskij to A. O. Heikel 28.9.1883, Heikel to Il'minskij 4./16.10.1883, the FUS to its honorary members 26.1.1884. Jääts 2005: 54–59, Appendix A (p. 267–); Lallukka 2003: 146–149; Salminen 2008: 13, 26.
12 KA SUS minutes 14.2., 16.5.1891, 20.2.1892. Salminen 2008: 31–36.
13 KA SUS minutes 16.5.1891. KA Setälä/K: Yrjö Wichmann to E. N. Setälä 16.9., 17.9.1891. Korhonen et al. 1983: 79–86. KA SUS/tut Wichmann copy of Yrjö Wichmann's travel journal 1901–1902 (31.5.1902) and of Wichmann's letter to Helmi Setälä 27.6.1902.
14 KA SUS/tut Wichmann, copy of Yrjö Wichmann's letters to Emil Forsström 10.8., 4.9.1891, 24.3.1892, copy of travel journal 1901–1902 (28.7.1902); see also e.g. SUS/tut Karjalainen: A. R. Niemi to K. F. Karjalainen 17.9.1898, s. d. 1899. KA Mikkola: Heikki Paasonen to J. J. Mikkola. d. 1902. KA Setälä/K: Wichmann to Setälä 16.9.1891, Mikkola to Setälä 9.2.1894, Paasonen to Setälä 2.7.1902, U. T. Sirelius to Setälä 7.7.1897. KA Donner 24: Paasonen to Donner 19.11.1899. SKS KIA Krohn: Karjalainen to Kaarle Krohn 12.2.1900. Karjalainen 1921: 73 (Karjalainen to Elsa Cleve 13.10.1898). Salminen 2003: 45.
15 Salminen 2003: 32, 67, 176–184; Salminen 2007: 101, 103–104.
16 KA SUS minutes 23.3.1889, 27.5.1898; correspondence: National Board of Industry to the FUS 19.4.1898. SFOu compte-r. annuel 1900: 38–39. Smeds 1996: 163–172; *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran julkaisut*, p. 1; Lilja 2007: 89.
17 KA SUS minutes 2.12.1893, 17.4.1894; correspondence: Vilhelm Thomsen to the FUS 26.11., 29.12.1893. Thomsen 1894, 1896; Salminen 2003: 71–100, 108–110; Hovdhaugen et al. 2000: 283–284.
18 KA SUS press clippings: Die deutsche Turfan-Expedition, von Professor Dr. Karl Geldner (Marburg), clipping from an unidentified newspaper ca. 1906. Lehtonen 1972: 35–36; Salminen 2003: 110–114; Le Calloc'h 1987: 13–15.
19 Salminen 2003: 91–107; Salminen 2007.
20 Mannerheim 2008: 6–8; Salminen 2008: 57–58.
21 Donner, O. 1897, 1899, 1901, 1903, 1904, 1908. See also KA SUS correspondence: Donner to the FUS, September 1898. Luntinen 2004a: 292–294; Luntinen 2004b: 304–305, 308–312, 323–326.
22 KA SUS board meeting minutes 2.4.1912; correspondence: G. J. Ramstedt to Karjalainen 15.1.1912. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1912: 33–34, 38. Halén 1998: 172–190.
23 Klinge 1997: 330, 344–358; Salminen 2008: 50, 214 (note 79).

24 See e.g. KA SUS correspondence: D. I. Richter's letters to Mikkola and the FUS 1902–1903, M. V. Latkin to the FUS 9.9.1906. SFOu compte-r. annuel 1900–1917. Cf. Lilja 2007: 44.
25 KA SUS correspondence: Sirelius's report draft s. d. 1907, copy of Wichmann's travel report to the Senate of the University of Helsinki 18.5.1907. SUS/tut Wichmann: copies of Wichmann's travel journal 1905–1906. SFOu compte-r. annuel 1907: 61–62. Paaskoski 2008: 49.
26 More extensively in Salminen 2008: 94–96.
27 SFOu compte-r. annuel 1910: 39–40.
28 KA SUS correspondence: Sergej Oldenburg to the FUS 6.4., 10.5.1911. KA Setälä/A 67: Draft of a letter from the FUS/Setälä to Oldenburg s. d. SFOu compte-r. annuel 1911: 23–24; 1912: 25. Korhonen et al. 1983: 214–219; Salminen 2008: 89; Tiitta 1994: 150–163.
29 KA SUS minutes 24.4.1909; board 18.11.1911; correspondence: Hannu-Pekka Lappalainen to the FUS 29.4.1981, attached with copies of documents concerning Wachtberg from the Office of the Governor-General (1909). SFOu rapp. ann. 1907: 56; 1909: 26, 31; 1910: 40. Ilomäki 2005: 77–79, 85–87.
30 KA SUS board 3.5.1908, 29.1.1910; correspondence: Vasilij Nalimov's letters to the FUS 1909. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1907: 60–61; 1908: 17–18; 1910: 37–38; 1913: 39.
31 Jääts 2005: 286–289; Sihvo 1999: 185–188; Sihvo 2003: 106–110, 119–126, 349; Salminen 2008: 42, 259–262; Salminen 2003: 100, 108, 111, 119, 129.
32 KA SUS board 26.10.1912, 21.1.1928. KA Setälä/K: Wichmann to Setälä 9.7.1912, Sirelius to Setälä 19.8.1912. Wichmann 1932: 2.
33 KA SUS correspondence: A. O. Väisänen to the FUS s. d. 1915, T. I. Itkonen to the FUS 29.2.1916; press clippings: Kuolanniemeltä, Esitelmä, jonka maist. T. I. Itkonen piti Suomalais-ugrilaisen seuran viime kokouksessa, *Uusi Suometar* 19.10.1915. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1914: 49–51; 1915: 63. Korhonen et al. 1983: 240–244; Lehtisalo 1959: 157; Kettunen 1945: 222–223; Louheranta 2006: 220–226.
34 KA SUS press clippings: Suomen asiat venäläisissä lehdissä, clipping (*Uusi Suometar*?) 7.5.1915. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1915: 63–64. On Borodkin's polemic relationship with Finland, see Jussila 2004: 575–581, 592–595.
35 KA SUS minutes 20.2.1915; board 1.3., 17.4.1915; SUS/tut Karjalainen: Setälä to Karjalainen 1.3.1915. KA Setälä/A 67: draft of a letter from the FUS/Setälä to the Senate of Finland s. d. 1915. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1916: 42. Klinge et al. 1989: 906–916.
36 KA SUS minutes 19.5.1917; correspondence: The Volga Region Federation of Small Peoples to the FUS 24.3.1917 and the text of the reply from the FUS s. d. SFOu compte-r. annuel 1917: 50–51. Lallukka 2003: 153–162.
37 Klinge et al. 1990: 19; Sihvo 2003: 375.
38 KA SUS correspondence: the FUS to the Finnish Senate 28.5.1918. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1917: 45–47.
39 KA SUS minutes 22.4., 9.11.1922; correspondence: Toivo Kaukoranta to the FUS 22.10.1926. Michelsen 2002: 149, 180–181; Häkkinen 1993: 28–29, 35; Nygård 1978: 45; Vares & Häkkinen 2001: 369–371, 382–392; Ahti 1987: 14, 43, 47, 84, 105–111, 131–146, 153, 183; Louheranta 2006: 161–162; Karemaa 1998: 126–127, 131–132; Sepp 2005: 148–164; Kuusi & Aitola 1991: 368–492.
40 Vares & Häkkinen 2001: 440–446.
41 KA SUS minutes 2.12.1921, board 21.9.1933. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1921: 68–69. Setälä 1932: 96–101, 121–123; Nygård 1980: 61–65, 72, 96; Nevalainen 1999: 21–35, 40–42 etc.; Salminen 2008: 117–121.
42 KA SUS board 16.2.1924; correspondence: Igon Mössеg to the FUS 18.3.1959. Mõssheg 1922: 5–7, 15–22; Mössheg 1924: 167–175; Mössеg 1930 etc.
43 Halén 1998: 290–293.
44 KA SUS minutes 21.10.1922, 2.12.1924, 21.11.1925; correspondence: the Tjumen' Scientific Association to the FUS 25.3.1922. Paaskoski 2008: 120–122.
45 KA SUS minutes 9.11.1922, 16.2.1924, 25.4.1925, 19.2.1927 etc., board 26.5.1923, 16.2., 31.5.1924, 19.2., 21.5.1927, 17.11.1928, 19.1., 23.2.1929 etc.; correspondence: the Finnish Embassy in Moscow to Sirelius 24.2.1927, Timofej Evsev'ev to the FUS 29.3., 6.10.1928. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1924: 9; 1928: 60; 1929: 104–105.
46 KA SUS minutes 20.2.1926, 2.12.1926, 19.2.1927, board 19.2.1927; correspondence: the Finnish Embassy in Moscow to the FUS 5.4.1924; Mikkola and Jalo Kalima to the FUS 20.11.1926, V. I. Lytkin to the FUS 15.1., 22.8.1927, 29.1.1929, the FUS to Lytkin 6.11.1928. Turkin 1997.
47 Gerd 1993: XIII–XIV; Kokkonen 1996; Vihavainen 2004: 404–407, 413–414; Lehtinen 1985: 18; Попов 1992: 106–108, 111; Juntunen 1999.
48 KA SUS board 23.4., 21.5.1927, 21.1.1928.

49 KA SUS board 21.1., 18.2., 25.2., 7.5., 19.5.1928; correspondence: drafts of FUS application to the Finnish Ministry of Education 8.9., 18.11.1927, Ministry of Education to the Governor of Uusimaa Province 15.12.1927, the FUS to the Soviet Academy of Sciences 26.3.1928, the FUS to Pontus Artti s. d. 1928, the FUS to D. V. Bubrix 24.3.1928, Artturi Kannisto to the Soviet Ambassador to Finland 26.4.1928, Paavo Ravila to the Institute of the Eastern Peoples of Leningrad 21.5.1928, Ravila to the Soviet Ambassador to Finland s. d. 1928, Ravila to an unidentified recipient 21.5.1928.

50 KA SUS board 15.9.1928, 23.2., 20.4.1929; correspondence: Artti to the Finnish Foreign Ministry 9.2.1928, the FUS to Artti. KA SUS/tut Ravila: Bubrix's letters to Ravila passim (16 letters from 1928). SKS KIA Wichmann: Kannisto to Wichmann 19.8.1928, Julius Mark to Wichmann 13.2.1928. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1928: 56–58, 60.

51 KA SUS board 20.2.1926; correspondence: Mark to the FUS 18.2.1926, 18.1.1928. KA SUS/tut Kannisto: Mark to Kannisto 22.4., 11.6.1928. Mark 1932; Ariste 1987: 677; Vihavainen 2004: 390–392.

52 KA SUS board 2.6.1928; correspondence: A. M. Tallgren to the FUS 21.5.1928. KA SUS/tut Ravila: Bubrix to Ravila 2.11.1928. Salminen 2003: 147.

53 KA SUS board 18.2., 2.6.1928, 20.4., 21.9.1929; correspondence: the FUS to Oldenburg 23.8.1927, the FUS to V. G. Bogoraz-Tan 23.8.1927, Oldenburg to the FUS 16.9.1927, the FUS to P. I. Vorob'ev 15.10.1927, the Institute of the Eastern Peoples of Leningrad to the FUS 25.1., 2.2., 30.5.1928, the FUS to Vorob'ev s. d. 1928 (two letters), the Consulate General of Finland in St. Petersburg to the FUS 1.6.1928, the Finnish Embassy in Moscow to the FUS 21.2., 14.3.1929. KA SUS/tut Kannisto: Bubrix to Kannisto 24.2.1928. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1928: 56–58. Lehtisalo 1930; Sotavalta 1930; Salminen 2008: 127–129.

54 KA SUS minutes 25.5.1929; correspondence: Artti to Kannisto 24.1.1929, Artti to the Finnish Foreign Ministry 18.9.1929, Kannisto to Artti 22.10.1929. KA SUS/tut Kannisto: Ravila to Kannisto 12.6., 17.6.1929. SKS KIA Wichmann: Kannisto Wichmann 23.7.1929. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1929: 103. Ravila 1932; Alhoniemi 2004.

55 KA SUS board 19.10.1929, 18.2., 17.3., 22.9.1932; correspondence: the FUS to P. V. Filipov 5.1.1930. KA SUS/tut Kannisto: Ravila to Kannisto 9.10., 13.11., 27.11.1929. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1930: 117.

56 KA SUS minutes 2.12.1927, 19.5.1928, board 25.5.1929; correspondence: Pontus Artti to the Finnish Foreign Ministry 19.11.1927, Kaarlo Blomstedt to the FUS 30.11.1927, the Finnish Historical Society to the FUS 4.5.1928, the State Archives et al. the Ministry of Education 5.3.1928, Albert Hämäläinen and Ragnar Rosén to the Archive Research Committee 19.2.1929; Hämäläinen and Kalima to the FUS S 12.2.1935.

57 KA SUS minutes 19.5.1932, board 27.5.1933, 25.1.1934, 25.4.1936. SKS KIA Wichmann: Uotila to Wichmann 21.5., 19.6., 19.7.1930. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1930: 118–119; 1932: 24. Halén 1989: 101–102.

58 KA SUS board 21.1., 19.5.1932; correspondence: Kauno Järvinen to the Finnish Foreign Ministry 10.12.1931, 14.4.1932, Garri Kazakov & Olyk Ipaj to the FUS 6.2., 6.4.1932. Bartens 2007: 166–171.

59 Tallgren 1932; Tallgren 1936; Худяков 1931: 29; Худяков 1934; Гольмстен 1932; Быковский 1932; Salminen 2003: 147–149 and references; Leete 2007: 137–144, 158–159, 167–180, 189–220, 274–288, 328–335 etc.; Halén 1989: 4–6.

60 Пальвадре 1931; Salminen 2003: 148 and references.

61 Donner, K. 1932, especially page 11.

62 KA SUS board 24.9.1931, 21.4.1932, 26.5.1934; correspondence: Lauri Kettunen to the FUS 23.5.1934, S. Makar'ev to the FUS 14.5.1931, 29.3.1932, 29.11.1933, VOKS/A. Majskaja letter of attachment 4.6.1931. KA SUS/tut Kannisto: Kettunen to Kannisto 10.7., 13.7., 17.8.1934. KA Setälä/K: Mikkola to Setälä 23.7.1932. SFOu compte-r. annuel 1934: 54–55. Kettunen 1941–1942; Tunkelo 1946: XXII; Suhonen 1988: 255.

63 KA SUS minutes 27.4.1935, board 27.4.1935; correspondence: Mikkola et al. to the FUS s. d. May. 1935. Tallgren 1936; Salminen 2003: 149 and references; Kinnunen 1998: 34; Salminen 2008: 121–132 and references.

64 KA SUS board 27.4.1935; correspondence: Wolfgang Steinitz to Setälä 14.2.1934, Steinitz to the FUS 20.4., 27.4.1935, 19.5.1950, the FUS to Steinitz 9.6.1950. Winkler 2000: 14–; Герасимова 2000: 32; Vihavainen 2004: 409.

65 KA SUS minutes 23.10.1937. Kettunen 1960: 247.

66 KA SUS minutes 18.1.1930, 4.3.1935; correspondence: Research Association of the Institute of the Northern Peoples to the FUS 23.5.1935, Bogoraz-Tan to the FUS 9.2.1939. The Institute of the Northern Peoples was the former Northern Faculty of the Institute of the Eastern Peoples, which became a separate organization in the late 1930s.

67 More extensively in Salminen 2008: 133–141.
68 KA SUS board 10.10.1941. Kinnunen 1998: 57–58, 60; Herlin 1993: 136–138.
69 KA SUS minutes 16.11., 2.12.1940, board 16.11.1940. Dehnel 2006; Lixfeld 1991; Paaskoski 2008: 149–152. Nikolaj (Nikolaus, Nicholas) Poppe, elected as an associate member of the FUS in 1930, worked from 1943 to 1945 at the Wannsee Institute, operating under the authority of the SS. The Institute's ethnic reports concerning the Soviet Union were also used to trace and exterminate Soviet Jews. Although Poppe denied any participation in the persecution of the Jews, the nature of his activities has remained unclear. Oppenheimer 1997.
70 KA SUS minutes 10.10.1941, board 2.12.1941.
71 KA SUS board 24.1., 21.2.1942; correspondence: the FUS and other societies to the State Scientific Committee for East Karelia 23.2.1942. Sihvo 1999, 2003; Hietala 2006: 99; Kaarninen 2006: 182–183, 191–200; Laine 1993: 100–164; Michelsen 2002: 189–193; Hietala 2002: 513; Talve 1990; Mägiste 1959: 11–13; Rui 2006: 325; Tanner 2007: 128–133; Pimiä 2007: 103–104; Salminen 2008: 148–151; see also Ariste 1985: 746.
72 KA SUS minutes 20.2.1943, board 2.12., 17.12.1941, 21.2., 18.4.1942, 20.2., 20.3.1943; correspondence: Kaino Heikkilä to Kannisto 7.4., 10.5., 10.6.1942, the FUS to Jenő Juhász s. d. 1941, Juhász to the FUS 2.1., 28.1., 10.2., 2.3., 28.3., 16.5.1942. SFOu compte-r. ann. 1942: 25–26. Pimiä 2007: 14, 148, 201–226.
According to records received by Lauri Posti in June 1942 from the Prisoner of War Office of the Finnish GHQ, the prisoner of war camps at the time contained 430 Mordvins, 120 Maris, 86 Udmurts, 130 Komis, one Saami, three Khantys, and 101 Vepses. Information was later received concerning at least two Khantys and two Mansis. Posti to Kannisto 18.6.1942. Penttilä 1942: 148–157.
73 KA SUS correspondence: Julius Mägiste to the FUS 29.11.1949. See e.g. Virtaranta 1984: 220.
74 Hietala 2006: 91–93, 114–117; Eskola 2004: 293; Pimiä 2007: 233; Paaskoski 2008: 152–153.
75 Pimiä 2007: 231, 237; Frolov 2005.
76 Klinge et al. 1989: 569, 633–634; Joki 1977: 60–61; Väisänen 2001; Salminen 2001; Salminen 2003: 46–47, 96–97, 168, 176–184; Sulkunen 2004: 95–96, 106, 135–137.
77 Smeds 1996: 165–166; Salminen 2008: 19–20; Salminen 2003: 31–33, 45–46, 52, 65, 101.
78 Jussila 2004: 249–256; Luntinen 2004a: 261–264, 280–282, 285.
79 Summarized in Salminen 2008: 269.
80 Luntinen 2004a: 291; Karemaa 1998: 18–20; Salminen 2008: 31–36; Jussila 2004: 467–691; Klinge 1997: 344–358. Cf. also Karjahärm & Sirk 1997: 275–277.
81 Zetterberg 2004: 327–333; Vares & Häkkinen 2001: 302–331.
82 Karemaa 1998 passim; Salminen 2008: 103–113, 121–132.
83 More extensively in Salminen 2008: 166–170, 189–200.

References

Unpublished sources

National Archives of Finland (KA)

The Donner family / Kai Donner Archive
The J. J. Mikkola Collection
The E. N. Setälä Collection of Documents and Correspondence
- Documents (Setälä/A)
- Correspondence (Setälä/K)

The Finno-Ugrian Society's Archives of Activities 1883–1983 (SUS)
- Founding documents
- Minutes of meetings
- Correspondence
- Press clippings

The Finno-Ugrian Society's Research Archives (SUS/tut)
- Artturi Kannisto
- Paavo Ravila
- Yrjö Wichmann

Manuscript Collection of the Library of the National Board of Antiquities (MV KIR)

Archives of the Finnish Antiquarian Society (SMY)
- Correspondence

Literature Archives of the Finnish Literature Society (SKS KIA)
- Kaarle Krohn's correspondence (SKS 110:5)
- Yrjö Wichmann's correspondence (SKS 1083–1088)

Published sources, literature and Internet

Aalto, Pentti 1971: *Oriental Studies in Finland 1828–1918*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828–1918. 10b. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Ahti, Martti 1987: *Salaliiton ääriviivat. Oikeistoradikalismi ja hyökkäävä idänpolitiikka 1918–1919*. Espoo: Weilin + Göös.

Alapuro, Risto 1999: Social classes and nationalism: the North-East Baltic. – Michael Branch (ed.), *National History and Identity.* Studia Fennica, Ethnologica 6. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. 111–121.

Alhoniemi, Alho 2004: Paavo Ravila volgalaiskielten tutkijana. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 90: 280–286.

Anderson, Benedict 2006: *Imagined Communities. Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso.

Ariste, Paul 1985: Julius Mägistet meenutades. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 12/1985: 744–746.

Ariste, Paul 1987: Julius Mark pedagoogina ja õpetlasena. – *Keel ja Kirjandus* 11/1987: 676–679.

Bartens, Raija 2007: *Kultainen aamunkoi. Neljän marilaisen runoilijan muistolle*. Bibliotheca ceremissica VII. Savaria: Berzsenyi Dániel Főiskola.

Branch, Michael 1999: The Academy of Sciences in St. Petersburg as a centre for the study of nationalities in the north-east Baltic. – Michael Branch (ed.), *National History and Identity.* Studia Fennica, Ethnologica 6. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. 122–137.

Branch, Michael 2006: Herderin vaikutus Anders Johan Sjögreniin ja sen seuraukset: tapaustutkimus. – Sakari Ollitervo & Kari Immonen (eds.), *Herder, Suomi, Eurooppa.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1060. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 312–355.

Compte-rendu annuel de la Société Finno-Ougrienne: see Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran vuosikertomus.

Dehnel, Regine 2006: Die Täter, die Opfer und die Kunst. – Osteuropa 1–2/2006. – http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2006-03-30-dehnel-de.html 14.7.2008.

Díaz-Andreu, Margarita 1996: Constructing identities through culture. The past in the forging of Europe. – Paul Graves-Brown, Siân Jones & Clive Gamble (eds.), *Cultural identity and archaeology. The construction of European communities.* London: Routledge. 48–61.

Donner, Kai 1932: M. A. Castrén's Memory in Russia. Marginal Notes to Памяти М. А. Кастрена. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLV,1: 1–15.

Donner, Otto 1897: Esimiehen, professori Otto Donnerin alkajaispuhe Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seuran vuosikokouksessa 18 2/XII 96. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XV,3: 13–16.

Donner, Otto 1899: Esimiehen, professori Otto Donnerin alkajaispuhe Suomalais-ugrilaisen Seuran vuosikokouksessa 18 2/XII 97. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XVI,3: 29–32.

Donner, Otto 1901: Discours prononcé par le professeur O. Donner à la séance annuelle 19 3/XII 00. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XIX,3: 15–20.

Donner, Otto 1903: Discours prononcé par le professeur O. Donner à la séance annuelle 19 2/XII 02. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XXI,6: 17–25.

Donner, Otto 1904: Discours prononcé par le professeur O. Donner à la séance annuelle 19 2/XII 03. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XXII,3: 44–57.

Donner, Otto 1908: Työalamme. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XXV: 1–5.

Durrans, Brian 1994: Theory, profession, and the political role of archaeology. – Stephen Shennan (ed.), *Archaeological approaches to cultural identity.* London: Routledge. 66–75

Eskola, Seikko 2004: Paavo Ravila yhteiskunnallisena vaikuttajana. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 90: 287–318.

Frolov, Dmitri 2005: Sotavankien paluu Neuvostoliittoon 1939–1956. – *Idäntutkimus* 1/2005: 55–62.

Gerd, Kuzebai 1993: *Ethnographica. Человек и его рождение у восточных финнов*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 217. Helsinki.

Geyer, Dietrich 1985: Funktionen des russischen Nationalismus 1860–1885. – Heinrich August Winkler (ed.), *Nationalismus*. 2., erweiterte Auflage. Königstein: Athenäum. 173–186.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 1993: Suomen kielen tutkimus kansallisen diktatuurin kourissa. – Heikki Ylikangas (ed.), *Vaikea totuus. Vuosi 1918 ja kansallinen tiede*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 603. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 18–45.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 1996: *Suomalaisten esihistoria kielitieteen valossa*. Tietolipas 147. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Häkkinen, Kaisa 2006: Suomen kielitieteen nousu 1700- ja 1800-lukujen vaihteessa. – Sakari Ollitervo & Kari Immonen (eds.), *Herder, Suomi, Eurooppa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1060. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 291–311.

Halén, Harry 1989: From Siberia to Finland. The Story of M. F. Kornilov, a Yakut convict. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 82: 101–121.

Halén, Harry 1998: *Biliktu Bakshi. The Knowledgeable Teacher. G. J. Ramstedt's Career as a Scholar*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 229. Helsinki.

Herlin, Ilkka 1993: *Kivijalasta harjahirteen. Kustaa Vilkunan yhteiskunnallinen ajattelu ja toiminta*. Helsinki: Otava.

Hietala, Marjatta 2002: Tutkimuksen rahoitus ja kansainväliset yhteydet. – Päiviö Tommila (ed.), *Suomen tieteen historia 4. Tieteen ja tutkimuksen yleinen historia 1880-luvulta lähtien*. Helsinki: WSOY. 492–561.

Hietala, Marjatta 2006: Tutkijat ja Saksan suunta. – Marjatta Hietala (ed.), *Tutkijat ja sota. Suomalaisten tutkijoiden kontakteja ja kohtaloita toisen maailmansodan aikana*. Historiallinen Arkisto 121. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 30–141.

Hovdhaugen, Even & Karlsson, Fred & Henriksen, Carol & Sigurd, Bengt 2000: *The History of Linguistics in the Nordic Countries*. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Hroch, Miroslav 1985: Das Erwachen kleiner Nationen als Problem der komparativen sozialgeschichtlichen Forschung. – Heinrich August Winkler (ed.), *Nationalismus*. 2., erweiterte Auflage. Königstein: Athenäum. 155–172.

Ilomäki, Henni 2005: Eesti ja Soome rahvaluulealased teaduskontaktid kahe maailmasõja vahel. – Sirje Olesk & Triin Kaalep (eds.), *Kultuurisild üle Soome lahe. Eesti-Soome akadeemilised ja kultuurisuhted 1918–1944*. Tartu: Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum. 71–109.

Jääts, Indrek 2005: *Etnilised protsessid Vene impeeriumi siseperifeerias 1801–1904. Komi rahvusluse sünd.* Dissertationes ethnologicae Universitatis Tartuensis 2. Tartu: Tartu University Press.

Joki, Aulis J. 1977: August Ahlqvist fennougristina. – Lauri Posti et al. (eds.), *Kielen ja kulttuurin kentältä. Neuvostoliittoinstituutin vuosikirja* 25: 51–62.

Jones, Siân & Graves-Brown, Paul 1996: Introduction: archaeology and cultural identity in Europe. – Paul Graves-Brown, Siân Jones & Clive Gamble (eds.), *Cultural identity and archaeology. The construction of European communities*. London: Routledge. 1–24.

József Budenzin ja Otto Donnerin kirjeitä vuosilta 1867–1886. Toim. Viljo Tervonen. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 201. Helsinki 1989.

Juntunen, Alpo 1999: SOFIN kansainvälisessä yhteydessä. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 88: 39–47.

Jussila, Osmo 2004: *Suomen suuriruhtinaskunta 1809–1917*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Kaarninen, Mervi 2006: Yliopisto sodassa. – Marjatta Hietala (ed.), *Tutkijat ja sota. Suomalaisten tutkijoiden kontakteja ja kohtaloita toisen maailmansodan aikana.* Historiallinen Arkisto 121. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 142–235.

Karemaa, Outi 1998: *Vihollisia, vainoojia, syöpäläisiä. Venäläisviha Suomessa 1917–1923.* Bibliotheca Historica 30. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.

Karjahärm, Toomas & Sirk, Väino 1997: *Eesti haritlaskonna kujunemine ja ideed 1850–1917*. S. l.: Eesti Entsüklopeediakirjastus.

Karjalainen, K. F. 1921: *Siperian-matkoilta. Sata kirjettä*. Kirjoittajan elämäkerran esittänyt Kaarle Krohn. Porvoo: WSOY.

Kettunen, Lauri 1941–1942: Mitä näimme Venäjällä Vepsän-matkalla v. 1934. – *Heimotyö* V: 105–132.

Kettunen, Lauri 1945: *Tieteen matkamiehenä. Kaksitoista ensimmäistä retkeä 1907–1918*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Kettunen, Lauri 1960: *Matkapakinoita ja muita muistelmia*. Helsinki.

Kinnunen, Kaisa 1998: *Suomi-Neuvostoliitto-Seuran historia 1944–1974*. Jyväskylä: Suomi-Venäjä-Seura ry.

Klinge, Matti 1989: *Mikä mies Porthan oli?* Tietolipas 116. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Klinge, Matti 1997: *Keisarin Suomi*. Suom. Marketta Klinge. S. l.: Schildts.

Klinge, Matti et al. 1989: *Keisarillinen Aleksanterin Yliopisto 1808–1917. Helsingin Yliopisto 1640–1990, toinen osa.* Helsinki: Otava.

Klinge, Matti et al. 1990: *Helsingin Yliopisto 1917–1990. Helsingin Yliopisto 1640–1990, kolmas osa.* Helsinki: Otava.

Kokkonen, Paula 1996: Vasili Lytkin – Suur-Suomi-aatteen komilainen uhri. – *Hiidenkivi* 2/1996: 20–23.

Korhonen, Mikko 1986: *Finno-Ugrian Language Studies in Finland 1828–1918*. The History of Learning and Science in Finland 1828–1918. 11. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Korhonen, Mikko & Suhonen, Seppo & Virtaranta, Pertti 1983: *Sata vuotta Suomen sukua tutkimassa. 100-vuotias Suomalais-ugrilainen Seura*. Espoo: Weilin + Göös.

Kuusi, Matti & Ville-Paavo Aitola (eds.) 1991: *Neljätuhatta veljestä, sataneljä elämäntarinaa. AKS:läinen elämäkerrasto*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Laine, Antti 1993: Tiedemiesten Suur-Suomi – Itä-Karjalan tutkimus jatkosodan vuosina. – *Historiallinen Arkisto* 102: 91–202. Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura.

Lallukka, Seppo 2003: *From Fugitive Peasants to Diaspora. The Eastern Mari in Tsarist and Federal Russia*. Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae, Humaniora 328. Helsinki: Academia Scientiarum Fennica.

Le Calloc'h, Bernard 1987: Charles de Ujfalvy – pionnier des etudes finno-ougriennes en France, explorateur de l'Asie centrale. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* 81: 7–18.

Leete, Art 2007: *Muutused ja meeleheide. Põhjarahvad ja nõukogude võim 1920.–40. aastatel*. Eesti Rahva Muuseumi sari 7. Tartu: Eesti Rahva Muuseum.

Lehtinen, Ildikó 1985: *Timofej Jevsevjevs ethnographische Sammlungen über die Tscheremissen*. Travaux ethnographiques de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XII:1. Helsinki: Museovirasto – Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura.

Lehtisalo, T. 1930: Kertomus työskentelystäni jurakkisamojedi Matvei Ivanovič Jaadnjen kanssa kesällä 1928. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLIV,4: 20–26.

Lehtisalo, T. 1959: *Tundralta ja taigasta. Muistelmia puolen vuosisadan takaa*. Porvoo: WSOY.

Lehtonen, J. U. E. 1972: *U. T. Sirelius ja kansatiede*. Kansatieteellinen arkisto 23. Helsinki: Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys.

Lilja, Johanna 2007: Kansallisen tieteen kansainväliset verkostot. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran ja Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen julkaisuvaihto 1831–1914. Sivuainetutkielma, Tampereen yliopisto, informaatiotutkimus. [http://tutkielmat.uta.fi/pdf/gradu01967.pdf 25.2.2008.]

Lixfeld, Hannjost 1991: The German Forschungsgemeinschaft and the Umbrella Organizations of German *Volkskunde* during the Third Reich. – *Asian Folklore Studies* 50: 95–116. [http://www.nanzan-u.ac.jp/SHUBUNKEN/publications/afs/pdf/a833.pdf 14.7.2008.]

Louheranta, Olavi 2006: *Siperiaa sanoiksi – uralilaisuutta teoiksi. Kai Donner organisaattorina sekä tiedemiehenä antropologian näkökulmasta*. Research Series in Anthropology, University of Helsinki 9. Helsinki.

Luntinen, Pertti 2004a: Uudenaikaistumisen paine. – Heikki Kirkinen (editor-in-chief), *Venäjän historia*. Helsinki: Otava. 261–298.

Luntinen, Pertti 2004b: Vanhan Venäjän viimeiset rauhanvuodet 1905–1914. – Heikki Kirkinen (editor-in-chief), *Venäjän historia*. Helsinki: Otava. 299–326.

Mägiste, Julius 1959: *Woten erzählen. Wotische Sprachproben*. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 118. Helsinki.

Mannerheim, C. G. 2008: *Across Asia from West to East in 1906–1908*. New revised edition. Translated by Edward Birse, revised by Harry Halén. Travaux ethnographiques de la Société Finno-Ougrienne XVIII. Helsinki.

Mark, Julius 1932: Kertomus Venäjän-matkastani 1928–29. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLV,7: 47–49.

Meinander, Henrik 2006: *Suomen historia*. Suom. Paula Autio. 2. p. Helsinki: WSOY.

Michelsen, Karl-Erik 2002: Tiede rauhan ja sodan vuosina. – Päiviö Tommila (ed.), *Suomen tieteen historia 4. Tieteen ja tutkimuksen yleinen historia 1880-luvulta lähtien*. Helsinki: WSOY. 148–219.

Mikkola, J. J. 1936: Vorbereitungen zur Gründung der Finnisch-ugrischen Gesellschaft. – *Memoria saecularis Ottonis Donner 1935. XII. 15.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne LXXI. 101–120.

Mösšeg, I. 1930: *Hätähuuto kansojen vankilasta*. Helsinki: Otava.

Mõssheg, I. 1922: *Totuus bolshevismista. Heimokansalaisen, Puna-armeijasta Suomeen paenneen syrjäänin kuvaus kokemuksistaan*. Helsinki: Otava.

Mössheg, I. 1924: *Idän hiidenkattilassa. Erään syrjääniläisen muistelmat.* Jyväskylä: K. J. Gummerus Oy.

Nevalainen, Pekka 1999: *Viskoi kuin Luoja kerjäläistä. Venäjän pakolaiset Suomessa 1917–1939.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 742. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Nisbet, H. B. 2006: Herder: kansakunta historiassa. – Sakari Ollitervo & Kari Immonen (eds.), *Herder, Suomi, Eurooppa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1060. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 90–113.

Nygård, Toivo 1978: *Suur-Suomi vai lähiheimolaisten auttaminen. Aatteellinen heimotyö itsenäisessä Suomessa*. Helsinki: Otava.

Nygård, Toivo 1980: *Itä-Karjalan pakolaiset 1917–1922*. Studia historica Jyväskyläensia 19. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

Oppenheimer, Martin 1997: Social Scientists and War Criminals. – *New Politics* 6, No. 3 (new series), Whole no. 23. [http://www.wpunj.edu/newpol/issue23/oppenh23.htm 15.7.2008.]

Paaskoski, Jyrki 2008: *Oppineiden yhteisö. Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia 1908–2008*. Helsinki: Otava.

Pál Hunfalvy ja suomalaiset. Kirjeitä vuosilta 1853–1891. Toim. Viljo Tervonen. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 197. Helsinki 1987.

Penttilä, Aarni 1942: Suomenheimoiset sotavangit kielenoppaina. – *Virittäjä* 46: 148–157.

Pimiä, Tenho 2007: *Sotasaalista Itä-Karjalasta. Suomalaistutkijat miehitetyillä alueilla 1941–1944*. Helsinki: Ajatus Kirjat.

Rapport annuel de la Société Finno-Ougrienne, see Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran vuosikertomus.

Rausmaa, Heikki 2007: *Tuglaksen tuli palaa. Tuglas-seuran ja suomalais-virolaisten suhteiden historiaa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1136. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Ravila, Paavo 1932: Kertomus matkastani mordvalaisten luo v. 1929. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLV,7: 49–50.

Riikonen, H. K. 2006: J. G. Herderin tuntemus Turun Akatemian piirissä Porthanin ja Franzénin aikana. – Sakari Ollitervo & Kari Immonen (eds.), *Herder, Suomi, Eurooppa*. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1060. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 265–290.

Rui, Timo 2006: Tiedemiehet sodan jaloissa. Näkökulmia suomalais-virolaisiin tieteellisiin suhteisiin toisen maailmansodan aikana. – Marjatta Hietala (ed.), *Tutkijat ja sota. Suomalaisten tutkijoiden kontakteja ja kohtaloita toisen maailmansodan aikana.* Historiallinen Arkisto 121. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura. 299–345.

Salminen, Timo 2001: Aspelin, Johan Reinhold. Kansallisbiografia-tietokanta. – http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi 28.2.2008.

Salminen, Timo 2003: *Suomen tieteelliset voittomaat. Venäjä ja Siperia suomalaisessa arkeologiassa 1870–1935.* Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistyksen Aikakauskirja 110. Helsinki: Suomen Muinaismuistoyhdistys.

Salminen, Timo 2007: Finnish archaeologists in Russia 1870–1935. – *Archaeology, ethnology and anthropology of Eurasia* 2007: 1: 100–110.

Salminen, Timo 2008: *Aatteen tiede. Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura 1883–2008.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 1172. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Sepp, Helena 2005: Kultuurisild või kaitseliin? Üks vaatenurk Soome-Eesti üliõpilassuhete arengule 1920.–1930. aastatel. – Sirje Olesk & Triin Kaalep (eds.), *Kultuurisild üle Soome lahe. Eesti-Soome akadeemilised ja kultuurisuhted 1918–1944*. Tartu: Eesti Kirjandusmuuseum. 133–247.

Setälä, E. N. 1932: *Problèmes et tâches. Conférences faites aux assemblées annuelles de la Société Finno-Ougrienne en 1914–1926. – Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLIII, édition française.

Sihvo, Hannes 1999: Karelia: a source of Finnish national history. – Michael Branch (ed.), *National History and Identity.* Studia Fennica, Ethnologica 6. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. 181–201.

Sihvo, Hannes 2003: *Karjalan kuva. Karelianismin taustaa ja vaiheita autonomian aikana*. 2. tark. ja täyd. p. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 940. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Smeds, Kerstin 1996: *Helsingfors – Paris. Finland på världsutställningarna 1851–1900*. Skrifter utg. av Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland 598. Helsingfors: Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland.

Sotavalta, Arvo 1930: Kertomus työskentelystä lamuutti Gavril Nikitinin kanssa kesällä 1928. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLIV,4: 26–33.

Stipa, Günter Johannes 1990: *Finnisch-ugrische Sprachforschung von der Renaissance bis zum Neupositivismus*. Redaktionelle Bearbeitung und Zusammenstellung der Bibliographie Klaas Ph. Ruppel. Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 206. Helsinki.

Suhonen, Seppo 1988: Lauri Posti 1908–1988. – *Virittäjä* 92: 253–260.

Sulkunen, Irma 2004: *Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 1831–1892.* Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 952. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran viisikymmenvuotinen juhla Kesäkuun 30– Heinäkuun 2 pp. 1881. – *Suomi. Kirjoituksia isän-maallisista aineista* II: 15: 138–439. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 1882.

Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran julkaisut – Publications de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 1885–2004. Helsinki: Société Finno-Ougrienne 2005.

Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran vuosikertomus – Rapport annuel de la Société Finno-Ougrienne – Compte-rendu annuel de la Société Finno-Ougrienne 1884–2007. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne*, passim. [Years of edition, see *Suomalais-Ugrilaisen Seuran julkaisut*, pp. 1–19.]

Tallgren, A. M. 1932: Zur russischen archäologischen Literatur. – *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* VII.

Tallgren, A. M. 1936: Archaeological Studies in Soviet Russia. – *Eurasia Septentrionalis Antiqua* X.

Talve, Ilmar 1990: Matka vatjalaisiin 1942. – *Inkerin teillä. Kalevalaseuran vuosikirja* 69–70: 46–66. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Tanner, Satu 2007: Salaperäinen Suomen Suku. Tutkimuslaitos Suomen Suvun historiikki. Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskuksen verkkojulkaisuja 3. Helsinki: Kotimaisten kielten tutkimuskeskus. – http://scripta.kotus.fi/www/verkkojulkaisut/julk3/Suomen_suku.pdf 8.7.2008.

Thomsen, Vilhelm 1894: Déchiffrement des inscriptions de l'Orkhon et de l'Iénissei. Notice préliminaire. – *Bulletin de l'Académie Royale des Sciences et des Lettres de Danemark* 1893. Copenhague.

Thomsen, Vilhelm 1896: *Inscriptions de l'Orkhon déchiffrées par Vilhelm Thomsen.* Mémoires de la Société Finno-Ougrienne V. Helsinki 1894–1896.

Tiitta, Allan 1994: *Harmaakiven maa. Zacharias Topelius ja Suomen maantiede.* Bidrag till kännedom av Finlands natur och folk 147. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica.

Tunkelo, E. A. 1946: *Vepsän kielen äännehistoria*. Proff. Lauri Kettusen, E. N. Setälän y. m. sekä itse keräämänsä aineiston nojalla. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seuran toimituksia 228. Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura.

Turkin, Adolf 1997: V. I. Lytkinin päiväkirja. – Johanna Laakso (ed.), *V.I. Lytkinin satavuotismuisto. 15.12.1995 järjestetyn permiläisten kielten symposiumin esitelmiä.* Castrenianumin toimitteita 52. Helsinki: Castrenianumin laitokset – Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura. 21–26.

Upton, Anthony 1999: History and national identity: some Finnish examples. – Michael Branch (ed.), *National History and Identity.* Studia Fennica, Ethnologica 6. Helsinki: Finnish Literature Society. 153–165.

Väisänen, Maija 2001: Donner, Otto. – Kansallisbiografia-tietokanta. – http://www.kansallisbiografia.fi 28.2.2008.

Vares, Vesa & Häkkinen, Kaisa 2001: *Sanan valta. E. N. Setälän poliittinen, yhteiskunnallinen ja tieteellinen toiminta*. Helsinki: WSOY.

Vihavainen, Timo 2004: Vallankumouksesta toiseen maailmansotaan. – Heikki Kirkinen (editor-in-chief), *Venäjän historia*. Helsinki: Otava. 372–418.

Virtaranta, Pertti 1984: Julius Mägiste 1900–1978. – *Finnisch-Ugrische Forschungen* XLVI: 217–225.

Wichmann, Yrjö 1932: Über eine Reformbewegung der heidnischen Tscheremissen. – *Journal de la Société Finno-Ougrienne* XLV,7: 21–46.

Winkler, Rose-Luise 2000: Wolfgang Steinitz' Expedition im Ob-Gebiet im Jahre 1935. Eine wissenschaftshistorische Betrachtung. – *Lomonossow, DAMU-Hefte* 2/2000: 9–23. [http://www.lomonossow.de/2000_02/winkler.pdf 6.6.2008.]

Zetterberg, Seppo 2004: Venäjästä Neuvostoliitoksi. – Heikki Kirkinen (editor-in-chief), *Venäjän historia*. Helsinki: Otava. 327–371.

Быковский, С. Н. 1932: Археология и политика. По поводу недоразумений проф. А. М. Тальгрена. – *Сообщения Государственной Академии Истории Материальной Культуры* 1932: 7–8: 40–43

Герасимова, Диана В. 2000: Вольфганг Штейниц и финно-угорская лингвистика. – *Lomonossow, DAMU-Hefte* 2/2000: 31–33. [http://www.lomonossow.de/2000_02/rus02.pdf 6.6.2008.]

Гольмстен, В. 1932: Письмо в редакцию. – *Сообщения Государственной Академии Истории Материальной Культуры* 1932: 7–8: 79–80.

Пальвадре, М. Ю. 1931: Буржуазная финская этнография и политика финляндского фашизма. – *Советская Этнография* 1931: 1–2: 39–43.

Попов, Александр 1992: Дело о так называемих *финских шпионах* в СССР в 1930-е годы. – *Studia Slavica Finlandensia* IX: 103–112.

Худяков, М. Г. 1931: Финская экспансия в археологической науке. – *Сообщения Государственной Академии Истории Материальной Культуры* 1931: 11–12: 25–29.

Худяков, М. Г. 1934: К истории начального периода финляндской археологии. – *Проблемы истории докапиталистических обществ* 1934: 6: 88–93.

English translation by Jüri Kokkonen