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Abstract
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1. Introduction

This is a book about how two young persons did their best in order to take a place in academia and form as good outlooks as possible for themselves. These two persons are Elsa Enäjärvi (1901–1951) and Martti Haavio (1899–1973), who were Finnish folklorists and public figures in the political and cultural scene of their time.

Haavio and Enäjärvi became well-known and esteemed scholars. Haavio was appointed acting professor in Finnish and Comparative Folk Poetry in 1947 at the University of Helsinki and full professor in 1949. In 1956 he was appointed member of the Academy of Finland, which is the highest formal acknowledgement for a scholar in Finland. Enäjärvi was the first woman in Finland to obtain a doctoral degree in folklore, as well as the first woman to be appointed docent in her discipline.\(^1\) Both Haavio and Enäjärvi published multiple books and articles, and participated in the research field’s scholarly debate.

In politics, Enäjärvi and Haavio promoted nationalistic programmes, leaning towards the right on the political scale. During the interwar years, they were particularly engaged in politics for strengthening the status of the Finnish language, during a time when Swedish still was widely used in higher education, politics and administration. In the cultural scene, Enäjärvi and Haavio were well-known authors of reviews, causeries, and articles. Under the pseudonym P. Mustapää, Haavio was also acknowledged as a ground-breaking modernist poet. Both Enäjärvi and Haavio were associated with the modernist group Tulenkantajat (“the torchbearers”), which urged Finnish authors and artists to find inspiration from Continental European, in particular French, art and literature. Enäjärvi and Haavio were also a scholarly couple; after several years of friendship and romantic relations, they married in 1929.

The timeframe used in this book stretches from Haavio’s first year at university in 1918 to the year when both participated in their doctoral commencement ceremony in 1932. From the late nineteenth century, folklore had evolved into a discipline in close connection to national romanticism and

\(^1\) Docent is an academic title, which a scholar can apply for from his or her faculty after obtaining a doctoral degree and publishing a certain number of academic works. Despite only being a title and not a formal form of employment, typically the docentship came with economic benefits. At the University of Helsinki, most of the larger research grants were allocated for docents. In addition, about one third of all the teaching at the University of Helsinki was conducted by docents. Matti Klinge and Rainer Knapas, eds., *Helsingfors universitet 1640–1990. D. 3, Helsingfors universitet 1917–1990*, trans. by Perti Hakala (Helsinki, 1991).
nation building in Europe. Folkloristics and other folk culture studies were used to study and create a proud past and a national identity. Consequently, the research field gained particularly high status in newly independent states of the time, such as Finland, Norway, Ireland and Estonia. These countries also held relatively high status within the discipline internationally. Moreover, Finland was a kind of disciplinary centre. The world’s first full professorship in folklore was established in Helsinki in 1899, and the first professor, Kaarle Krohn, had developed the methodological school that dominated the discipline’s research approach and Helsinki hosted the discipline’s most highly regarded journal Folklore Fellows Communications.2

Through Enäjärvi and Haavio, I study how two young folklorists obtained and shared information about the expectations and requirements for what it took to be a scholar in their field, as well as how they, with the resources they managed, responded to these expectations. Sometimes their response was to form themselves in accordance with the expectations. Sometimes their resources did not match the expectations, and they tried to affect expectations to better fit into the scope of desirable or acceptable traits of a folklorist.

The question of how to establish a place for oneself in a research field springs from a line of research that has focussed on how academic work and knowledge-production are anchored in social and cultural frameworks. An influential contributor to the field has been Steven Shapin, who argues that historically shifting cultural and social frameworks direct what kinds of people are considered credible scholars and what knowledge is considered academic or scientific. In each historical context, scholars embody and present constellations of repertoires that respond to perceptions of trustworthy, reliable knowledge-producers, including norms concerning their character, lifestyle and body.3 For example, Shapin shows how during the early seventeenth century there was a general understanding that truth was best found in solitude and ascetism, an understanding with roots in Ancient Greek and Medieval Christian traditions.4 This idealised hermit life of scholars was later developed into ideals of gentleman-scholars during the eighteenth century.5 While Shapin studies how scholars historically embody different sets of presentations of credible scholars, Patricia Fara has studied how one and

---

5 Shapin, Never Pure, sec. chapter 8, in particular 140–143, 160–162.
the same scholar has been presented differently in different times. In her book on Isaac Newton (1642–1727), Fara studies how Newton from early on has been glorified as a genius. Fara shows that depending on the time, different aspects of Newton’s person were highlighted to illuminate what constituted a genius.  

In relation to the question of credibility in academia, researchers have also posed the question of why academia and science have so long been dominated by men and how features of scientificity have coincided with features perceived as masculine. In her seminal work *Women Scientists in America*, Margaret Rossiter maps the obstacles that U.S. women faced in academia and how they tried to overcome them. Rossiter discusses how these challenges were anchored in cultural notions of scientists and a scientific mind as masculine qualities, such as being tough, rational, competitive and unemotional—in contrast to female qualities. These notions could then be used to argue against admitting women entrance to higher education or in other ways exclude them and downplay their contributions.

American physicist and science philosopher Evelyn Fox Keller continues the discussion about the association of science and masculinity, and poses the intriguing question: “How is it that the scientific mind can be seen at one and the same time as both male and disembodied? How is it that thinking ‘objectively’, that is, thinking that is defined as self-detached, impersonal, and transcendent, is also understood as ‘thinking like a man’?” The reason, Keller argues, lies in that unlike women, men are typically not perceived as gendered. Keller establishes that the male bias in science has consequences for the knowledge produced. Because science is mainly done by men and for the interests of men, it is also a male perspective that becomes considered as objective scientific knowledge. In other words, gendered notions of what a researcher should be like affect what is perceived as scientific and what knowledge is produced, and in extension who are given access to research communities and acknowledgement for their work.

However, as Londa Schiebinger points out, the ways of connecting science with masculinity have been historically changing, and so have the ways of excluding women. In her book on early modern women in science, Schiebinger discusses how women have indeed been excluded on grounds connected to notions of women as irrational, delicate and emotional. At the same time, Schiebinger shows how some women had alternative, informal routes to scientific life and scientific prestige until the eighteenth century, when the role of the nobility began to wane, and in particular after the

---

institutionalisation and professionalisation of science in the nineteenth century. When entrance to the scientific community became dependent on formal degrees and affiliations with scientific societies, women were more efficiently excluded from scientific life. Women, however, began to gain access to this institutionalised higher education in the mid-nineteenth century, but only on an individual special permission. In Finland, Emma Irene Åström (1847–1934) was the first woman to obtain a master’s degree in 1882. The first doctoral degree was obtained by medical doctor Karolina Eskelin (1867–1936) in 1895.

In order to examine how Enäjärvi and Haavio oriented themselves within the expectations and requirements of their research field, I use the analytical concept of scholarly persona, also referred to as scientific persona. Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum, who introduce the concept in Science in Context’s 2003 theme issue on scientific persona, define the term as models for how to be a scientist or a scholar, located on an intermediate level between individuals and institutions. Daston and Sibum explain that these models are connected to the cultural and social circumstances of a particular time and place. I use the concept of persona to study how Enäjärvi and Haavio acted and formed themselves in relation to notions of what it took to be a folklorist, that is, how they formed themselves to become more alike an idealised, model folklorist. I am also interested in what happened when Enäjärvi and Haavio could not or did not want to conform to these models, something that becomes most obvious in Enäjärvi’s case, when her person did not correspond to the mainstream expectation of a scholar being a man.

The main title of this dissertation, Where Scholars are Made, establishes both the above-discussed issue, the making of scholars, as well as my second interest, namely where this formation took place. Often, of course, this happened within the university walls, but consulting previous research on the social history of science, we find several other settings as well: In the domestic environment, around the dinner table, in the colonies, in the smoking rooms, to name a few. I discuss five different arenas that were particularly formative.

13 The title construction bears similarities with the title of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s Tulenkantajat friend, author Mika Waltari’s autobiographical novel Siellä missä miehiä tehdään (“Where men are made”) about his military service. Mika Waltari, Siellä missä miehiä tehdään (Porvo, 1931).
14 Donald L Opitz, Staffan Bergwik and Brigitte van Tiggelen, eds., Domesticity in the Making of Modern Science (London, 2016); Staffan Bergwik, Kunskapens osynliga scener. Vetenskapshistorier 1900–1950 (Göteborg, 2016), 64–65, 106–108; Donald L. Opitz, “‘Not Merely Wifely Devotion’. Collaborating in the Construction of Science at Terling Place”, in Annette Lykknes, Donald L. Opitz, and Brigitte van Tiggelen eds., For Better or For Worse? Collaborative Couples in the Sciences (Basel, 2012), 33–34; Per Wisselgren, “‘Bakom varje framgångsrik man...’ Wicksells, Steffens, Cassels och sekelskiftets sociala reformrörelse”, in
for Enäjärvi and Haavio along their path to become acknowledged folklorists: the university; the capital that offered an intellectual community for politics, culture and semi-academic societies; the field; the transnational scholarly community between Finland and Estonia; the international scholarly exchange with Western Europe; and, lastly, the scholarly household.

The contents of this book are structured according to contexts, with each empirical chapter discussing a particular arena where the folklorists formed and performed their scholarly persona. The book’s focus widens with each chapter, from small arenas close to the University of Helsinki to arenas larger and further away, although eventually, the gaze shifts to the smallest arena of the book, that is the scholarly home and being a scholarly couple. Despite the geographical locations of these arenas, I would want to stress that my intention is not to conduct a spatial analysis of knowledge-making. Instead, I approach the arenas as contexts, and I am interested in what the individuals do or what structures they face within the contexts.

**Research objects and aim**

My aim with this dissertation is to study how scholarly expectations and structures framed who were accepted and acknowledged as good researchers, but also how this was to some degree negotiable by individuals in the new and small discipline of folklore studies during the interwar years. I approach the issue by studying the arenas of academic life that Elsa Enäjärvi and Martti Haavio interacted in and what they did to become recognised as credible folklorists. Moreover, I show how they reflected upon themselves and their colleagues as scholars during the early part of their time in academia; from their student years to their doctoral commencement ceremony, that is 1918–1932. I also highlight how several of these expectations and settings were gendered. I unravel this overarching question by posing five more concrete questions:

1. What explicit and implicit requirements, expectations and ideals concerning studies, research and the researcher did Enäjärvi and Haavio reflect upon and how did they obtain and circulate information about this?

2. How and in which contexts were these requirements, expectations and ideals activated in public life outside university?

---

3. How did Enäjärvi and Haavio establish their place in their academic community through discipline-specific practices outside university?

4. How did transnational and international travel and connections form Enäjärvi and Haavio as scholars and what role did their travels and these connections play for the development of the discipline?

5. What implications did it have for Enäjärvi and Haavio to be a scholarly couple when they were establishing their place in their discipline? How did they, and in particular Enäjärvi, reflect upon the choice of partner or, alternatively, of remaining unmarried?

All of these questions are discussed in more than one chapter in this dissertation, but each chapter focuses on one or two of these themes more than on others. The first question is examined in particular in chapter 2 but is addressed through the whole dissertation. Chapter 3 focusses primarily on the second question, while the third question is discussed primarily in chapters 3, 4 and 6. The fourth question is primarily discussed in chapters 5 and 6, and the fifth question is mainly discussed in chapter 7.

**Previous research**

This dissertation is situated at the crossroads between three fields of research: the social history of academia, gender history and the disciplinary history of folklore studies. These fields overlap each other thematically, but for the sake of clarity, I will here discuss them separately.

**A social history of academia**

My point of departure in this dissertation is that academic work is a social phenomenon. Steven Shapin, whose research has been very inspirational for my work, summarised that relational correspondence in the subtitle of his book: *Never Pure: Historical Studies of Science as if It Was Produced by People with Bodies, Situated in Time, Space, Culture, and Society, and Struggling for Credibility and Authority.*\(^\text{15}\) In the following section, I will discuss research on scholarship as a social phenomenon, where individuals pursue credibility and authority by following or contesting social and cultural notions of what constitutes good scholarship. After that, I discuss how these notions have been studied in terms of the relationship between state and

---

\(^{15}\) Shapin, *Never Pure.*
academia, followed by discussions on how individuals or biographies have been used to give insights in the social dimensions of academic work.

Shapin studies scientific life and scientific credibility in Early Modern England. He establishes that perceptions of what a good, credible, scientific scholar is like depends on the surrounding society as well as on the agency of individuals who promote their own ways of being scientific. In *A Social History of Truth* and *Leviathan and the Air Pump*, Shapin and Simon Schaffer demonstrate this claim by studying how Robert Boyle (1627–1691) promoted a new, experimental approach to scientific research. The experimental approach contrasted a philosophical approach when establishing scientific knowledge, the ideals of which were embodied in a most celebrated way in Thomas Hobbes (1588–1679). Shapin and Schaffer show that it was far from only scientific results that mattered in the dispute between Boyle, Hobbes and their respective supporters. Instead, in the debate, scientific qualities were argued by highlighting character, religious issues, behaviour, presentation and audience of research. Eventually, Boyle’s experimental approach gained more support. Shapin and Schaffer argue that there were two main reasons for this. Firstly, more general ideals and politics in society shifted towards being in favour for Boyle’s practical and experimental approach of problem-solving. Secondly, Boyle was more successful in arguing and networking to the benefit of his claim than Hobbes was, as well as he was more successful in embodying the repertoires associated with credibility as a scholar.\(^{16}\) In *Never Pure*, Shapin elaborates on a variety of time-specific dimensions of scholarly credibility, such as places of knowledge-making, practices, lifestyle, character and the physical body of the scholar. Shapin’s research on how individuals pursue credibility as scholars has been highly influential for studies in scholarly persona, a matter that I will discuss in more detail in the chapter section on scholarly persona.

In Sweden, the social history of academia has been studied, among others, by Sven Widmalm, who has studied social structures in Swedish scientific research and, inspired by Bruno Latour, how networks are created and maintained in the discipline of chemistry.\(^{17}\) A particularly interesting work for my dissertation has been conducted by Staffan Bergwik, who studies how academic work and success relies and builds on social structures and relationships. Similar to my approach, Bergwik discusses how many of the practices and social settings that dictate scientific work were located outside the university. Bergwik does this by examining scholars from various disciplines, such as chemistry, geology and oceanology. Through these case


studies, he illuminates various structures and practices, which also could be applicable in other disciplines. In my dissertation, many of the arenas (or scenes, to use Bergwik’s vocabulary) are more discipline-specific. I would, however, suggest that many of the practices of obtaining information about expectations of good scholarship as well as negotiations over expanding these expectations within the discipline of folkloristics, also give insights regarding such practices in academia in general. Bergwik’s approach is well served for his purpose of illuminating the variety of relationships and social settings that affect academic work. My dissertation additionally contributes with more focus on how the discipline’s special features established frameworks for these practices.

As my dissertation is on scholarly work in folklore studies, the connection between nation and scholarship is an inevitable issue. Cathryn Carson discusses the relationship between serving the state, the scientist and ideals of objectivity in her study on the physician Werner Heisenberg. Carson argues that the perception of what constitutes scientific trustworthiness shifted during the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, from being detached from political interests to serving the state with scientific knowledge. Overall, the connection between scholarship and the state has gained quite some interest among historians. In Sweden, Per Wisselgren has shown how the social sciences were formed during the first half of the twentieth century as a response to the state’s demand for “social engineering”. Petra Garberding has studied collaborations and invitations to collaborate between Swedish and German ethnologists, and how the scholars reflected upon race, scholarship and politics. In Finland, Tenho Pimiä has studied Finnish folk culture scholars during World War II and shows how the state had an interest in folk culture research for propaganda reasons, which benefitted scholars by allowing for opportunities to conduct collection work beyond the Finnish-Soviet border. In this dissertation, I discuss particularly in chapters 2–4 the
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relationship between a state/societal demand for research that could contribute to nation-building and constructions of a national identity, but also how the two scholars used their scholarly authority to influence society.

Like Shapin, Bergwik and Carson, I study the social dimension of academic work by focussing on individual scholars. This is a fairly common approach to the issue, not least in Finland where biographies or *henkilöhistoria* (literally translated “history of a person”), maintained an acknowledged status in historical research even during the post-war era, when biographies internationally went through a low-tide. In Finland, too, the so-called new biography has influenced research during the last decades of the twentieth century, shifting the research object from traditional biographies towards investigating social phenomena through individual lives or work.\(^{22}\)

The role of the individual and her/his biography in these studies varies. Hanna Lindberg has studied the work of social politics professor Heikki Waris (1901–1989) to examine perceptions of masculinities and how this affected debate and political decision-making in mid-twentieth century Finland. Lindberg stresses that her dissertation is not an intellectual biography. Instead, Waris’ texts and research (as well the research he managed) are used as an entrance to study publicly influential discourses.\(^{23}\) Niina Timosaari gives more room for the biographical in her research on how sociology professor Edward Westermarck (1862–1939) used his research and academic position to promote more liberal legislation for marriage and freedom of religion.\(^{24}\) Jouni Ahmajärvi uses a similar ratio of individual-society in his dissertation on how Westermarck’s student, anthropologist Gunnar Landtman (1878–1940) used his academic knowledge and authority to participate in public debate.\(^{25}\) Lives of individual scholars have also been used to investigate circumstances and structures within academia. Timo Vilén studies twenty years of the Finnish-Swedish physiologist and Nobel laureate Ragnar Granit’s (1900–1991) career and networking to study structures of rewarding and prize-giving in


academia. Marja Englund’s book on Finland’s first female professor, Alma Söderhjelm (1870–1949), is a rather traditional biography, but besides giving the life story of Söderhjelm it illuminates gendered structures in academia. Similarly to Vilén, I study a part of two individuals’ careers with the ambition to give insights both in the individual cases as well as more general practices in academia and in particular within the discipline of folklore studies. However, in chapter 3, I discuss the scholars’ participation in scholarly debates of the period in similar terms as do Timosaari and Ahmajärvi.

As well-known scholars and intellectuals of their time, Elsa Enäjärvi and Martti Haavio have also been objects of biography-writing. The most extensive work has been conducted by their daughter Katarina Eskola, who has written a source-embracing biography of Enäjärvi and Haavio, a work which I will discuss in more detail in the section on sources. Both have also figured in biographical presentations in works on Finnish folkloristics and folklorists. In addition, Haavio’s second wife, author Aale Tynni-Haavio (1913–1997), has written a biography of Haavio, with particular emphasis on his life as a poet. Ritva Sievänen-Allén has written a biography on Enäjärvi and in addition to the above named biographies, Eskola has also edited a book on Enäjärvi’s letters and diaries from before 1920. Enäjärvi has further been part of or in the centre of a number of academic and popular science articles on women in academia and folkloristics. Since there is so much already

26 Like Lindberg, Vilén points out that his book should not be read as a biography. Timo Vilén, Ragnar Granitin nobel-ura. Tutkimus tieteen palkinnoista ja palkintojen tieteestä (Helsinki, 2013), 18.
written about Enäjärvi and Haavio, the intention of this dissertation is not to provide new biographical details.

Generally, research on the social structures of science and academia tend to focus on senior, established scholars, as in all the above-mentioned works in this chapter section. In persona studies, this has typically meant studies in what kind of scholarly persona the scholar eventually formed. When students are the objects of study, they are examined in groups or in cohort, for example Sari Aalto has examined Finnish medical students, Carol Dyhouse studied British students and Lina Carls studied Swedish female students. One exception is Heini Hakosalo, who studies social dynamics in medical research through a controversy when the young medical doctor Elsa Ryti (1895–1931) claimed that her senior, docent Fredrik Saltzman (1881–1972), had taken the credit for her work. Instead of studying cohorts or senior, established scholars, I wish to contribute to this research field by shedding light on individuals at the earliest stages of an academic career, the time when a wide range of options are still open, and the future is full of uncertainty. In contrast to most previous research, I do not approach the student years as a background phase, but as a continuum connected to their later academic careers, the period when students and young scholars form themselves, and when they establish a foundation to further advance after obtaining their doctoral degrees. Moreover, I hope that the perspective provided in the dissertation will contribute with insights on students as more than passive receivers of information about how to be(s)come scholars or how they were moulded by their disciplines or academic traditions by showing how the students’ perceptions and agency also affected their disciplines and universities.

Women, men and gender in academia

Research on the gendered history of science has typically focussed on investigating why there have been so few women in academia and how these women overcame gender-based obstacles. Much less has been written on the gendered history of the male majority in academia. A seminal work in this research tradition is U.S. historian Margaret Rossiter’s book Women Scientists in America, in which she maps challenges
and strategies of U.S. women in academia from the mid-nineteenth century to 1940. In a second volume, Rossiter continued her research within the timeframe from 1940 to 1972. Rossiter identifies practices and structures in academia, which excluded women from academic education, work, funding and recognition. Some of these were explicit and formal, such as regulations that allowed universities to end contracts with employees who became pregnant or academic societies that did not accept female members. Others were implicit and informal, such as funding bodies diminishing the academic relevance of female dominated disciplines, or practices and spatial arrangements at social events that excluded women from networking opportunities and decision-making.

Rossiter also examines sex-based separation in academia. In part, these were institutional divisions, such as establishing separate women’s colleges and women’s academic societies. In part, some research fields were established or developed into being perceived as feminine, such as home economics or botany. These separate institutions and fields enabled women access to higher education and some of the institutions that academic work was dependent on. The development came at a time when women were not at all or only very scarcely admitted to men’s institutions. Without colleges, grants and employments for women only, women would have had much fewer opportunities to gain access to higher education or accomplish any academic work. The drawback was that women’s institutions were not acknowledged as equally high in stature as the pre-existing institutions that men had access to, as a point for example British historian Carol Dyhouse has shown regarding academic women in Britain.

Similar issues have been examined in Sweden. For example, Hanna Markusson Winkvist has investigated the challenges and strategies of women who obtained doctoral degrees during the first half of the twentieth century, and Lina Carls and Tord Rönnholm have studied the perception of female university students in the same time period. In Finland, for example, Heini Hakosalo has examined gendered structures and practices of students, researchers and practitioners in medicine during the early twentieth century.


39 Hanna Markusson Winkvist, Som isolerade öar. De lagerkransade kvinnorna och akademien under 1900-talets första hälfte (Ägerup, 2003); Carls, Våp eller nucka?; Tord Rönnholm, Kunskapens kvinnor. Sekelskiftets studentskor i mötet med den manliga universitetsvärlden (Umeå, 1999); Heini Hakosalo, ‘Tasohyppefä. Varhaiset suomalaiset naislääkärit ja
It is quite common within the history of science to discuss developments of research and scientific discoveries through the cases of individual scholars and scientists. The tradition has been criticised as hagiographic, both by those interested in the social structures of science and feminist scholars. At the same time, women’s history of science has also used biographic approaches to illuminate the presence and impact that women have had in the history of science.\textsuperscript{40} Patricia Fara combines biographical cases with more general observations (as well as popularising accessibility with analytical insights) in her works on women in science. In Finnish historical research, academically educated women have been studied in the anthologies \textit{Naisten aika} and \textit{Oma pöytä}.\textsuperscript{41} Another approach has been to study women’s academic organisations. For example, Maritta Pohls has written an intellectual history of the Finnish Association for University Women and Christine von Oertzen has studied the politics and ideologies of the International Federation for University Women.\textsuperscript{42}

Both biographical studies and studies of cohorts or other larger entities of women in academia illuminate the gendered structures and challenges in academia. This research has been helpful to me for observing excluding mechanisms in academia when I study how and when gender becomes a visible variable in the processes of becoming socialised into an academic field. Moreover, they offer viewpoints into asking how Enäjärvi’s persona formation was affected by the fact that as a woman she was in a minority in academia. Is it possible to see differences in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s reflections that are connected to Haavio’s status as normal or standard as a man and Enäjärvi’s status as exceptional or rare?

The gender historians’ focus on women in academia instead of men in academia has been criticised. Evelyn Fox Keller has argued that research on gender and science through studying only women in science typically falls into the trap of addressing only women as gendered. In Keller’s view, overlooking men as gendered beings hinders us from seeing gender as a social


category and that "as long as gender is thought to pertain only to women, any question about this role can only be understood as a question about the presence or absence of biologically female persons." Similarly and more recently, British historian Heather Ellis has argued that it is problematic that gender history of science so dominantly has focussed on how women have been excluded from science, often by contrasting women to men as more or less homogeneous groups. From this follows that the scientist becomes portrayed as embodying a simple and stable masculinity. Instead, problematizing the image of a coherent masculinity by highlighting its actual instability and its multiple of variations, would also enable us to see the agency and opportunities of women in science, instead of mainly their challenges and exclusion. Thus, broadening a gendered view to men in academia has benefits also for understanding women’s circumstances in academia. Ellis’ argument goes hand in hand with more general claims that investigating masculinities opens for more in-depth understanding of femininity and women and vice versa.

In my dissertation, I aim at studying negotiations of scholarly persona with a gender sensitive perspective, both for male and female scholars. I intend to demonstrate how Enäjärvi and Haavio reflected upon multiple dimensions of being a scholar, some with explicit feminine or masculine connotations, other dimensions appear to be less directly connected to notions of gender. The choice to study Enäjärvi and Haavio is based on a wish to gain insights into the practices and persona formation processes of both men and women. Focussing on a few individuals has the advantage that it offers insights into particularities and individual variations in a way that studies in larger groups cannot reach. Thus, I hope to illuminate the variation of processes, challenges and solutions that Enäjärvi and Haavio reflected upon, many of which we can see were connected to notions of femininities and masculinities. However, the source material is in this aspect asymmetric. When discussing academic expectations, ideals or practices regarding gender, both the private documents written by Enäjärvi and Haavio and the public documents concerning them discuss much more frequently women and femininities than men and masculinities. This has also given my discussion and analysis a heavier emphasis on women and femininities.

My choice of studying Enäjärvi and Haavio also places this dissertation into the research field of studying couples in science. According to Donald L. Opitz, Birgitte van Tiggelen and Annette Lykknes, the early works on collaborative couples were a type of "compensatory history" that aimed at highlighting the often invisible or unrecognised work of women in the history

43 Keller, Secrets of Life, Secrets of Death, 17.
of science. For example, Pnina G. Abir-Am’s, Helena M. Pycior’s and Nancy G. Slack’s *Creative Couples in the Sciences* showed how wives contributed to their husbands’ research and to the knowledge produced, while the credit of the work has been given to the husbands. Opitz, van Tiggelen and Lykknes acknowledge the need of this work, but state that a study of couples in science also responds to the kinds of challenges in gender history, as Keller’s and Ellis’ critique discussed above. Opitz, van Tiggelen and Lykknes state that studying couples in sciences is a gateway to examining how the roles and implications of gender are negotiated and changes over time, a process that involves both men and women.\(^{46}\) Annika Berg, Christina Florin and Per Wisselgren argued similarly in their introduction to the slightly earlier, Swedish anthology *Par i vetenskap och politik*, which explores how Swedish couples in sciences and politics have acted as couples in public.\(^{47}\) Donald L. Opitz has also contributed to the field with research that suggests that much scientific research has been situated in domestic environments.\(^{48}\)

**Historical approaches to folklore studies**

Works on the development of the field of folklore studies, both Finnish and international, typically start by giving an overview of the discipline’s historical background, which also can serve as contextual background in this dissertation. Folklore studies evolved in connection to national romanticism and national awakening, with a Herder-inspired search for the spirit of the nation in the early and mid-nineteenth century Europe. The national romantic movement engaged both amateurs and scholars, who headed into the countryside to collect as much as possible of what was perceived as the nation’s ancient and authentic vernacular folk culture. The extensive collections and mapping were part of nation-building projects in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, in which a coherent and ancient culture of the nation’s people was to be revealed and noted down before modernisation would wipe away what still remained. The collected folklore material was sent to and preserved in archives. For example, the Finnish


Literature Society took pride in claiming to have the world’s most extensive collections. This background is more or less a given part of any work on folklore as a discipline, but several research projects have focused more specifically on the connections between nationalism, nation-building and folklore. 

An important influence for both folklorists studying the discipline’s past and historians studying nationalism has been Eric Hobsbawm’s and Terence Ranger’s work on invented traditions. Particularly in the Finnish scholarly context, a seminal work on nationalism and folklore was William Wilson’s dissertation *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*. Wilson’s main argument was that the folklore discipline’s research and results were tightly intertwined with the agendas of the nation-building project.

The studies on the nationalistic connection to folklore studies is an important reference point for my interpretation of my sources and the circumstances around the people and events that I study. To some degree, I also elaborate further on this theme, primarily in chapters 4 and 5. At the same time, I wish to widen the scope to other extra-academic contexts beyond
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52 Wilson, *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*, ix; Wilson’s dissertation has also met critique, not least by Finnish folklorist Pertti J. Anttonen. Anttonen agrees with Wilson that folklore was a used for nationalistic aims, but finds Wilson’s presentation of the Finnish context and the re-constructed heritage problematic. Anttonen claims that Wilson overlooks cultural and linguistic minorities and local variations in Finland. This leads Wilson to repeat the same discourses as nineteenth and early twentieth century folklorists used regarding a Finnish nation with a homogeneous Finnish heritage. According to Anttonen, this perspective is unfortunate, because Wilson has influenced many later Finnish folklorists, who have continued to repeat and enshrine an image of folklore as a gateway to an ancient heritage of a coherent people instead of examining folklorists as active formers of the knowledge produced. Anttonen is particularly critical to how Lauri Honko continues Wilson’s legacy. Anttonen, *Tradition through Modernity*, 158; Lauri Honko, ‘Cultural Identity and Research Ethics in the Folklore Process’, *Arv*, 58 (2002), 7; Lauri Honko and Vilmos Voigt, eds., *Genre, Structure and Reproduction in Oral Literature* (Budapest, 1980), 42, 61.
nationalist-politics, namely artistic and opinion forming participation in the contemporary culture scene. I also wish to combine political motives with other factors. For example, in chapter 5, I discuss how scholars and the discipline were simultaneously affected by political ambitions, research tradition, economic circumstances and personal affections.

Beside research on the folklore discipline’s nationalistic connection, a research field of particular interest for my dissertation is research on the frameworks within which folklore knowledge was produced and the role of the scholar for the research conducted and the results gained. In my dissertation, I have been inspired by the Irish folklorist Diarmuid O’Giollain’s book Locating Irish Folklore. O’Giollain situates the folklore discipline and its scholars into historical contexts and investigates their role in the research conducted. In addition to inspiration and an in-depth analysis of the history of Irish folklore knowledge production, O’Giollain’s book is helpful for my work, as he ties Irish folklore history with a wider international context. In Sweden, ethnologist Agneta Lilja and historian Fredrik Skott have studied how Swedish folklore collectors, scholars and archivists formed the image and academic knowledge of Swedish folk culture in the early twentieth century. These works offer valuable opportunities to compare my reading of the Finnish folklorists with historical studies of the neighbouring Swedish folklorists and ethnologists.

In Finland, Pertti J. Anttonen has scrutinised the folklorists’ principal object of study: tradition. To do so, Anttonen studies folklore collections and knowledge production in nineteenth and early twentieth century Finland. Anttonen argues that tradition is a modern concept that is constructed by and obtains its meaning from the scholars who study it. Thus, research in tradition can only produce knowledge of tradition in relationship to modern society, not of tradition in and of itself. Relevant to my dissertation topic, Anttonen and the Finnish folklorist Lotte Tarkka have also discussed how nineteenth and early twentieth century folklorists claimed scholarly authority. Here, modernity is also a key factor. Anttonen and Tarkka argue that folklorists claimed authority by emphasising themselves as modern, urban and educated in contrast to the traditional rural, non-educated “folk”. I reflect upon these observations and arguments most frequently in chapter 4, where I discuss how Enäjärvi and Haavio, as folklore collectors, defined and created their research objects and the implications this perspective has this for folklore research.
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54 Fredrik Skott, Folkets minnen. Traditionsinsamling i idé och praktik 1919–1964 (Göteborg, 2008); Lilja, Föreställningen om den ideala uppteckningen; See also Karin Gustavsson, Expeditioner i det förflutna. Etnologiska fältarbeten och försvinnande allmogekultur under 1900-talets början (Stockholm, 2014).
With my dissertation, I hope to contribute to the research of historical studies of folkloristics with further understanding about how scholars navigated the discipline’s (and inherently also society’s) structures and cultural perceptions in order to gain positions from where they could participate in the scholarly debate: What happens to people, knowledge and institutions when various—sometimes conflicting—interests, structures and ideals are intertwined? As such, I hope that the dissertation will offer insights for readers interested in the history of folklore studies, despite the fact that it is not a history of the discipline.

**Scholarly persona as an analytical framework**

In this dissertation, I study how Enäjärvi and Haavio obtained information about the expectations and requirements for being good, acknowledged folklorists, and how they acted in response to this information. In order to observe and identify these context-bound expectations, requirements and the ways in which Enäjärvi and Haavio acted to become acknowledged as credible folklorists, I use the concept of scholarly persona. The concept has no fixed definition, and I will in this chapter section discuss some approaches to employing the concept of scholarly persona. In my view, the approaches are in many ways complementary rather than competing or excluding. Thus, I use them in this dissertation as perspectives that illuminate different sides of the same phenomenon.

Research on scholarly persona usually, and for good reason, begins by referring to the theme issue on scholarly persona in *Science in Context* 2003, and especially to Lorrain Daston and H. Otto Sibum’s introductory article which provided impetus to new research on the topic. Similarly, my work follows this path, as I find Daston and Sibum’s rather general definition of persona a very useful starting point. Daston and Sibum define persona as “[i]ntermediate between the individual biography and the social institution[...]: a cultural identity that simultaneously shapes the individual in body and mind and creates a collective with a shared and recognizable physiognomy.” In previous research, the terms “scholarly persona” and
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“scientific persona” appear to be used interchangeably. As I study primarily folklorists, I will for the sake of consistency use the term “scholarly persona” when not directly quoting literature that uses the other term.

Daston and Sibum derive the term “persona” from French anthropologist Marcel Mauss’s work on the development pattern of civilizations. Mauss argues that civilizations develop from a state where members of a group identify themselves primarily as part of their group, towards a state where the members primarily identify as individuals. In-between these stages lies an intermediate stage, in which members identify themselves through their role in the group, their persona. The word persona means mask in Latin, and Mauss stresses that the function of the mask in Roman theatre was not to hide the actor, but to expose the role that the actor played. In other words, the function of the mask was to make the actor into the role he played. Daston and Sibum argue that this metaphor also works for scholarly persona. In terms of scholarly persona, the mask should be seen as making an individual into a scientist. This, they emphasise, is in contrast to perceiving persona only as a role that individuals can take when they want to, or a mask that they can take on and off when they want to.

Their use of the concept has many similarities with how Pierre Bourdieu’s concept of habitus has been used. Both aim to illuminate how individuals are formed by conceptualisations of proper or desirable behaviour. The main difference, I would say, is that the concept of habitus is part of a larger theory used to explain structures, while scholarly persona is an analytical tool that enables us to examine practices and processes within contexts or structures. The two do not necessarily exclude each other, and Bourdieu’s theory can be used for interpreting scholarly personae. For example, the historian Gadi Algazi investigates the construction of a scientific persona as a “learned habitus”. However, works using persona and habitus, respectively, usually lay emphasis on different processes. For Bourdieu, habitus is most strongly formed and cultivated in the early stages of life, in the childhood family and in school. The studies that I so far have encountered on scholarly persona have focussed on the academic life of adults.

Dutch historian Herman Paul builds further on Daston and Sibum’s metaphor of a transforming mask and explains that persona should not be perceived as a role that an individual can step into and out from when she or he so desires. Instead, persona moulds the entire individual from within, forming her or him into a certain kind of person or scholar. By embodying a persona, scholars can respond to perceptions of “what it takes to be a scholar”.

61 Pierre Bourdieu, The Logic of Practice (1990), 54.
At the same time, Paul points out that no individual can ever achieve a perfect match with a particular model of a good scholar but will always only realise a partial match.\textsuperscript{62}

In Paul’s approach, the moulding process is something that happens both as an active forming by the scholar adapting to certain behaviour, skills and values, and by the community or institution that the scholar is trained in and works in. The skills are practical proficiencies, which for the historians that Paul mainly writes about, included language skills, reading old handwriting, or handling a certain referencing system. Virtues are rooted in the qualities and character of individuals, such as courage, exactness or diligence. They do not require technical abilities as skills do, but are learned in the same way through imitation and practice. Goods are guiding principles or values, such as equality, freedom or wisdom. They are the scholars’ higher aims, which reach beyond their academic life. Scholars can use their work to serve or reach these aims. According to Paul, identifying which goods scholars aim at is key for observing the other building blocks of persona. This is because goods direct virtues, which cannot exist without goods, because the virtues are formed to follow the goods as best they can. According to Paul, personae of different schools and disciplines can be pinpointed by marking which goods direct which combinations of virtues.\textsuperscript{63}

Of Paul’s categories, the category of skills is the most concrete and without need of further framing. Virtues and goods are more open for interpretation. I interpret Paul’s virtues as personal qualities or character traits that were desirable for folklorists—which might or might not overlap with those desirable for academics in Finland at the more general level. Moreover, I interpret Paul’s category of goods as a term for higher ideals that scholars tried to reach in their academic work. In this dissertation, the most apparent good is serving the national good.

Steven Shapin and the persona theme issue present explorations of various scholarly selves or personae in chronological order. This has evoked questions of whether it should be interpreted as the authors suggest that persona develops linearly from one template to another. For example, Dutch literature scholar Elisabeth Wesseling questions this approach. In her rhetorical analysis of U.S. psychologist Judith Rich Harris’ (1938–2018) self-presentation in her book \textit{The Nurture Assumption} (1998), Wesseling shows that despite an existing scholarly persona in a research field, alternative ways of being a scholar can also prove successful. Wesseling argues that Rich Harris, an outsider in her field, used older models for good scholarship to construct an alternative scholarly persona, which gave her credibility for her cause. Thus, Wesseling proposes that rather than perceiving scholarly personae as


\textsuperscript{63} Paul, ‘What Is a Scholarly Persona?’., 360–361.
developing linearly, we should observe how various scholarly personae co-exist.  

Dutch historian Mineke Bosch agrees with Wesseling and develops her perspective further, suggesting that scholarly persona should be perceived as a *bricolage* of repertoires that individuals construct for themselves in order to become recognised as credible in their field.  

However, as Bosch also notes in her article ’ ’Personae and the Performance of Identity’, the chronology of the articles in the *Science in Context* theme issue appears to be a matter of layout rather than a claim that personae would develop and disappear linearly.  

Similarly, it appears to me that Shapin’s perspective also provides room both for the possibility of co-existing scholarly selves and possibilities for individuals to negotiate the recognised ways of being scholars. In their work on Robert Boyle, Shapin and Schaffer discuss the agency of individuals to change or expand the ways of being acknowledged scholars and how competing models can indeed co-exist. This perhaps is the greatest difference between Wesseling and Shapin. Shapin focusses on competition between these models while Wesseling stresses the alternative, co-existing possibilities.  

Bosch’s approach has gained support and has been applied, for example, by Swedish historian Kirsti Niskanen in her research on the Rockefeller Foundation as a persona forming institution in Swedish social sciences.  

Another example where Bosch’s approach has been inspiring, and to some degree adapted, is Finnish historian Julia Dahlberg’s research on the Finnish artist Helena Westermarck’s (1857–1938) understanding of the role and responsibilities of the educated elite in late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Finland.

Bosch’s usage of persona differs from that of Daston, Sibum and Paul in the sense that Bosch describes persona as an individual’s identity. As Bosch is interested in examining how persona is constructed by embodying unique

---


66 Mineke Bosch, ‘Persona and the Performance of Identity Parallel Developments in the Biographical Historiography of Science and Gender, and the Related Uses of Self Narrative’, *L’Homme*, 24/2 (2013), 15. However, Bosch et al. later lean towards a more critical stance, describing the chronological disposition to be a “historical cavalcade” in contrast to and as less fruitful than the *bricolage* approach, in Niskanen, Bosch and Wils, eds., ‘Special Issue: Scientific Persona’, 2; Kirsti Niskanen, ‘Snille efterfrågas! Rockefeller Foundation, forskarpersona och kön vid Stockholms högskola under mellankrigstiden’, *Scandia*, 83/2 (2017), 12.


68 Niskanen, ‘Snille efterfrågas!’, 12.

69 Dahlberg, *Konstnär, kvinna, medborgare*, in particular 25.
compounds of repertoires that together give scholarly credibility, she examines these constructions of individual scholars. Bosch views this construction process as a performance in the same sense as Judith Butler claims that gender is created and re-created by repetitions of certain performances. According to Butler, the actions have a constructing and preserving function. By repeating actions, individuals form themselves, and since actions are based on cultural and social structures, the repetitions confirm and reinforce structures over and over again. Moreover, Bosch discusses that the practice of forming and performing a persona can be understood in the terms of Ervin Goffman’s theory on self-presentation and Stephen Greenblatt’s work on self-fashioning. Goffman establishes that individuals form and adjust their behaviour, or their presentation of themselves, in accordance to cultural and social norms and expectations for people in the setting they are in. Greenblatt uses the term self-fashioning for how individuals within a certain context (in his work the sixteenth century upper classes) shape identities, which is made visible in personality or character, behaviour and modes of perceiving the world.

Bosch states that one of the main benefits of using a biographical approach to studying persona is that it better than Paul’s approach provides understanding about how persona is embodied by scholars of various social background, gender, race and religion. In her own research, Bosch has focussed primarily on the category of gender. Investigating scholarly persona formation by studying individual scholars has, in fact, been a recurring approach. Several of the articles in the Science in Context theme issue used individuals as cases for studying persona. For example, Janet Browne studied the public image of Charles Darwin (1809–1882), and Cathryn Carson
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examined the perceptions of objectivity and political interests in science through the case of the physicist Werner Heisenberg (1901–1976). Similarly, for example, Eva Hemmungs Wirtén, Rozemarijn van de Wal, Christiaan Engberts, Sara Ehrman and Sarah Keymeulen have investigated the persona formations of individual scholars. Of these, Hemmungs Wirtén, van de Wal and Ehrman also incorporate gender analysis into their study of persona.

I, too, am inspired by Bosch’s work. Like Bosch, I use a biographic approach for studying persona through the cases of two individual scholars and I study the persona formation processes to a large degree through practices. Inspired by Bosch, I observe how Enäjärvi and Haavio develop different elements of scholarly credibility and how different dimensions of persona is activated in different situations or arenas in the making of folklore knowledge. Especially in chapter 6, I discuss how Enäjärvi also acted in order to expand the conceptions of good scholars by promoting a new model for female academics. I also discuss gendered notions of persona formation in other chapters. However, as Evelyn Fox Keller argues, limiting one’s view to the impact of gender in science runs the risk of missing other social and cultural elements of knowledge-production. Thus, in this dissertation I wish to explore socially and culturally affected processes of persona formation, some explicitlygendered, others appear to be less so.

While some approach persona through how individuals form their personae, others study the concept through examining the impact of institutions on persona formation. One example is Herman Paul, who argues that individual scholars pursue *desires*, that is, merits and qualities posed by institutions, such as university departments, publishers or funding organisations. In this view, institutions direct persona formation by rewarding scholars who meet the institutions’ ideals and requirements. For example, scholars develop certain skills, merits and character traits that they sense will
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be judged positively by funding organisations and thus result in research grants.  

While Paul discusses the impact of institutions on a theoretical level, Belgian historian Kaat Wils and Dutch historian Pieter Huistra demonstrate more concretely how institutions form persona. In their research on the Belgian American Educational Foundation’s (BAEF) exchange programme, Wils and Huistra show how the funding organisation had a great impact on what kinds of scholars became successful in academia. Research exchanges to the U.S. were considered highly meriting. As the BAEF admitted grants to scholars who best responded to the organisation’s aims and ideals, their selection grounds directly affected what kinds of scholars were considered good and successful scholars. Not only was this in regard to mind, merit and research interests, but also in regard to body and age, and Wils and Huistra also stress that the BAEF’s ideals favoured male scholars.  

This was far from unique for funding organisations, as for example Kirsti Niskanen shows in her above-mentioned research on the Rockefeller Foundation. Anna Cabanel shows how female scholars recognised the negative impact that this gender bias had on women’s academic careers, and how they contested it by establishing fellowships for women—and simultaneously affected female scholars’ persona formation.  

Conal Condren, Ian Hunter and Stephen Gaukroger take another approach to the institutional perspective of persona. They perceive scholarly persona as an office, which at the same time gives credibility and legitimisation to what the individual scholars as well as limits what the scholar can say and do as a scholar. They exemplify the office with the professor’s chair, which requires certain behaviour and character traits from the individual taking an office, but at the same time gives the individual the office’s authority (which, I read as corresponding to what Bosch identifies as credibility or trustworthiness). Swedish philosopher Erik Joelsson has studied a more specific institution in his dissertation on how the perception of doctoral students’ persona has changed in official Swedish government reports during the post-war era.  

The previous research that uses the concept of scholarly persona give interesting perspectives for studying the relationship between institutions and individuals and how individuals—some more than others—are socialised into

82 Anna Cabanel, “‘How Excellent... for a Woman’? The Fellowship Program of the International Federation of University Women in the Interwar Period’, Persona Studies, 4/1 (2018), 88–102.
academic communities. However, what remains somewhat obscure is the character of the concept of scholarly persona itself. Is it a theoretical perspective or a methodological viewpoint? Is the scholarly persona something that exists on its own, or is it a term that we use to frame an abstract phenomenon? And is there one persona for each context, are there co-existing personae in the same context, or do all scholars form a persona of their own? The literature does not give explicit answers to these questions.\[^{85}\]

The approaches and results imply that these questions can be answered differently. When Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum state that persona is a collective identity, they seem to be suggesting that persona is something that a group of people adapt to, not something that each construct for themselves. Correspondingly, Herman Paul’s perspective pictures a pre-existing persona, which individuals try to form themselves after—or which forms them. Both perspectives emphasise that individuals never fully fit any persona’s ideal model, and they allow for the possibility of individual agency to form the existing persona. However, would this mean that this collective identity, then, would re-shape for others in the collective?

Among others, Mineke Bosch enters persona analysis through the identity door. Here, persona is something shaped separately by each individual. The difference between these approaches, it seems to me, is that Daston, Sibum and Paul discuss the concept of persona in a way that is comparable to Plato’s ideal models that throw shadows on the cave wall. When Bosch and Wesseling study persona, their object of study appears to be the shadows. Neither perspective names the second object, the one that apparently is not persona. If persona is the ideal model, then what should we call the state when the individual is formed in accordance with a persona, but is never entirely responding to it? Is this the individual’s persona, is it an identity? Alternatively, if persona is this individual product, then what should we call the principal ideal that the individual forms him/herself after? Is it a meta persona, is it a model, is it an illusion?

In this dissertation, I intend to explore the possibilities of the concept of scholarly persona. I propose that different perspectives of scholarly persona can be used to illuminate different dimensions of academia—but also the other way around, namely that different dimensions of scholarly persona can be illuminated by studying different arenas of knowledge-production.

In this endeavour, Paul’s division of persona into skills, virtues and goods is a useful tool for identifying the frames of institutions, disciplines, schools or research traditions that idealise or demand particular ways of being a scholar. I use Paul’s approach for two main purposes. I use it to identify what kinds of expectations and requirements Enäjärvi and Haavio attempted to develop according to and how they obtained information about what these expectations and requirements were. In using this approach, it is primarily

\[^{85}\] See also Gadi Algazis critical discussion about the plethora of interpretations in Algazi, ‘Exemplum and Wundertier’.
skills and virtues that can be identified. However, the category of goods is helpful for identifying the discipline’s ambitions of what knowledge was considered ideal and relevant, and how Enäjärvi and Haavio conformed to these ideals. In addition to identifying skills, virtues and goods, I use Paul’s approach to study what consequences these expectations and requirements had on Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s academic work. For example, I do not only state that serving the nation was one of the goods that defined the persona formation of a Finnish folklorist. I am also interested in studying how this affected Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s agency. One result of the dominating nationalistic good was that nationalist political activism did not encroach on scholarly credibility, but instead was a compatible, even idealised part of the folklorist’s persona.

While Paul’s approach is helpful for identifying the frames of disciplinary requirements and how Enäjärvi and Haavio incorporated them into their own repertoires, Mineke Bosch’s approach is helpful for examining that incorporation process as well as negotiations of what was acceptable or desirable for a scholar. Studying private documents in order to examine persona formation as an individual formation process, as Bosch does, allows us to observe more nuances, challenges and discrepancies than the more, discipline-specific and context-specific persona that Paul’s approach enables us to frame. Together, I would argue, the different approaches to persona allow both observing a general picture and to nuance our understanding of it by zooming in on how individuals act within structures and models as well as develop them.86

Unless otherwise mentioned, this dissertation addresses scholarly persona as an individual identity construction that is formed in response to a collective model of how to be a scholar within a particular context. From this point of departure, I then elaborate on dimensions of scholarly persona as they are discussed or defined by other scholars. To summarise from the discussions above, the main approaches that I will discuss in the dissertation are:

– Persona shapes or moulds the person from within (Daston, Sibum, Paul);
– Persona is constituted by context-specific skills, virtues and goods (Paul);
– Persona is constructed by a compound of elements. These compounds can vary between scholars within the same research field at the same time, and scholars have agency to negotiate which elements can be acceptable or desirable within their academic community (Wesseling, Bosch);
– Persona can be formed by individuals (Bosch et al.);
– Persona can be formed by institutions (Wils, Huistra, Hunter, Condren, Gaukroner, Niskanen et al.)

A historical overview over the Finnish context

Most of the events discussed in this book took place in Finland, a newly independent state in Northern Europe, bordering on Russia in the east, Sweden in the west and Norway in the north, and with a long coastal line to the Baltic Sea. The population was small and, in a European perspective, urbanisation came late. In 1920, 70 per cent of the economically active population made a living from agriculture and forestry and only a third of the population was living in towns. The capital, Helsinki, was small but quickly growing, numbering 150,000 inhabitants in 1920 and over 200,000 in 1930.

The timeframe of this dissertation spans from 1918 to 1932. However, I will repeatedly refer to the so-called national awakening in the Finnish Grand Duchy of the Russian Empire during the nineteenth century and to debates concerning a language situation that was a product of a past as part of the Swedish kingdom. Thus, I will here give a very short overview over the political history of Finland up to the 1930s. For the sake of simplicity, I will in this context refer to this area as “Finland”, despite that the area in question was not referred to as such during the entire period discussed.

Until the twelfth century, the population of Finland was not organised under any state. Archaeological finds indicate that Christian customs had reached some parts of modern Finland by the seventh or eighth century. From the beginning of the twelfth century to the end of the thirteenth century, Sweden (Catholic) and Novgorod (Orthodox) organised crusades from both the West and the East, simultaneously claiming territory for their realms. The first peace treaty was made between the two in 1323, and it divided the territory roughly in half. Sweden continued to expand its territory eastward through colonisation and conquest until the early seventeenth century. The first city was founded in Turku in southwestern Finland in the early thirteenth century. Turku also hosted a university, which was established in 1640.

Administration of the territory was conducted in Swedish, and the upper strata of society were Swedish speaking, while the majority of the lower strata were Finnish speaking. The division had, however, a regional dimension, as the coastal areas were inhabited by proportionally many Swedish speaking people, including peasants and fishers. The inner parts of the territory were mainly inhabited by native Finnish speakers.

The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were times of recurrent Swedish warfare, with mainly successes until the late seventeenth century, but more
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losses in the eighteenth century. As a peripheral conflict of the Napoleonic wars, Sweden fought and lost against Russia, ceding Finland in 1809. Tsar Alexander I (1777–1825) established the Finnish Grand Duchy, with extensive autonomy, including a domestic parliament, powers of taxation, a separate monetary system and an independent postal service. The Duchy kept its old Swedish legislation and administrative tradition. The administrative centre was moved some 170 kilometres east from Turku to Helsinki. The university was moved to Helsinki after the great fire of Turku in 1827.  

During the first half of the nineteenth century, the Finnish educated elite became interested in the international trend of exploring and creating a national heritage and identity. In part, interest was directed towards Finland’s intermediate position between the East and West, but even more so towards exploring what was particular for Finland and the time prior to the crusades. This so-called national awakening was closely connected to the development and institutionalisation of folk culture studies, as will be discussed further in chapter 2. Moreover, this was a time of rising interest in developing the Finnish language and expand the context that it was used in. As a consequence of the region’s Swedish past, Swedish was still the main language in administration, governance and higher education, but also in art and elite social life—alongside French, Latin, German and Russian. The language question soon developed into a heated political debate about whether, and how, Finnish should be actively promoted and its usage expanded. Russia considered any distancing from Swedish connections as beneficial for their rule, which is why it initially was supportive towards the Finnish language activists. The debate continued in the twentieth century, and Enäjärvi and Haavio participated on the side that actively and at times aggressively promoted the status of the Finnish language.  

The national awakening movement was long cautious not to provoke or appear as disloyal to Russia. Russia’s approving attitude towards the Finnish national romanticism changed near the end of the nineteenth century, when Russia took measures to promote pan-Slavism and establish a more homogeneous empire, in Finland referred to as Russification. Moreover, the autonomy became more restricted. The political debate in Finland began to centre around how to respond to the new political situation, and whether it should be accepted or opposed to, and if opposed, then with what methods.  

At the turn of the century, Finland entered a turbulent period, affected by Russification politics, the Russian revolutions, large strikes, and the language debate on the political agenda. Universal suffrage was legislated in 1906 and the country was declared independent in 1917. The declaration of independence was followed by a civil war in spring 1918, fought between socialists and conservatives. The conservatives won, and the 1920s and 1930s
were years dominated by rightist governmental rule and saw also the establishment of extreme right-wing organisations. In World War II, the country fought two wars against the USSR, lost both, but remained independent.\footnote{Fred. Singleton, \textit{A Short History of Finland} (Cambridge, 1998), 1–2.}

\section*{Translating science and scholarship}

Writing about history in another language than that used by the people in focus for this study comes with quite a few challenges, not least, when the language of a past time need to be translated into, another, modern language. Writing about the history of science and academia comes with an additional and particular challenge, which is shared by several languages: In many languages, including Finnish, the word for “science” includes natural sciences as well as humanities and social sciences, while in English, “science” only refers to the natural sciences. In this dissertation, I try to circumvent the challenge by using the term “scholarship” and “scholar” when referring to any single or combination of these categories of academic research or researchers.

However, this is not an entirely satisfactory strategy. The problem of translating the Finnish terms \textit{tiede, tieteellinen} and \textit{tiedemies} (literally science-man) into “scholarship”, “scholarly” and “scholar” in English is that when the authors of the sources described something as \textit{tieteellinen}, scientific, this did not make any essential distinction between methods and knowledge in the natural and human sciences. This is particularly important to note when studying humanists during a time so strongly impacted by positivistic ideals as was case in the early twentieth century. Folkloristics, and Finnish folkloristics in particular, is especially interesting in this context, as the discipline during this time was dominated by a strongly positivism-inspired methodology.

\section*{Martti Haavio and Elsa Enäjärvi}

Martti Haavio was born in 1899 in the small rural municipality of Temmes in Northern Finland, where his father, Kaarlo Haavio (1860–1934), served as a priest. The family soon moved to the small municipality of Yläne in southwestern Finland. His mother, Anna Lydia (1874–1906, née Ahlgren), passed away when he was a child, and the father remarried to Hilja Bohm (1869–1937). Martti Haavio was the oldest of four siblings, with two brothers, Jaakko (1904–1984) and Heikki (1901–1977), and one sister, Katri (1903–1991, married Manninen). Martti Haavio’s letter collection shows that he kept in touch with all his family members from the time he moved from the family
home until a late age, but the most frequent, preserved correspondences are between him and Jaakko Haavio, who followed his father’s career path as priest.\textsuperscript{96}

Haavio went to upper secondary school in the Grand Duchy’s oldest and its second largest town, Turku. Beside his school activities, he participated in the right-wing Civil Guard’s exercises and was involved in the Civil War in 1918, in which he was overseeing prisoners and service but did not participate in close combat.\textsuperscript{97} He graduated from school the summer after the Civil War and registered directly for university studies in Helsinki.

In Helsinki, Haavio enrolled in the Faculty of Arts’ Section for History and Languages, where he studied Finnish and comparative folk poetry, Finno-Ugric language studies, and Romance languages. He obtained his bachelor’s degree in 1921 and master’s degree in 1923. After his degrees he continued with doctoral studies and obtained a licentiate in 1930 and was promoted doctor in 1932. He was appointed \textit{docent} in 1932, acting professor in Finnish and Comparative Folk poetry 1947–1949, and full professorship in 1949, all at the University of Helsinki. In 1956 he was appointed member of the Academy of Finland, which is the highest formal acknowledgement for a scholar in Finland.\textsuperscript{98}

During the time investigated here, Haavio travelled to Estonia, Germany, Denmark and Sweden for his studies and research. The Estonian connection was by far the strongest for him, as he travelled there most often, made longer stays, and corresponded most frequently with Estonian peers, in particular with the folklorist Oskar Loorits (1900–1961). Judging from the frequency, tone and contents of Haavio’s preserved correspondence, Loorits seems to have been one of his best friends. Also included in Haavio’s inner sphere were his schoolmate, later professor in Finnish language, Lauri Hakulinen (1899–1985) and the editor and political activist Niilo Kärki (1897–1931).

Kärki was a central figure in the public circles in Helsinki that Haavio very quickly got involved in during his student years. He was, among other things, the editor-in-chief of the student journal \textit{Ylioppilaslehti}, a leading member of the right-wing pan-nationalistic Academic Karelia Society (\textit{Akateeminen Karjala-Seura}, AKS), and employed at the publishing house Werner Söderström Osakeyhtiö (WSOY).\textsuperscript{99} These became also some of the most

important political bases, networks and income sources for Haavio. Haavio was also associated with the well-known modernist group Tulenkantajat, through which he participated in cultural debates. Moreover, he received recognition as a modernist poet under the pen name P. Mustapää, a work parallel to his academic career, although with a twenty-year break from the late 1920s onwards. Later, when he had become a family father, he also started writing alphabet and children’s books.

Elsa Enäjärvi was born in 1901 in the rural municipality of Vihti in southern Finland, where her family were land-owning farmers. The family consisted of her father Kustaa and mother Elin (née Andberg), the four sisters Elsa, Elvi (1904–?, married Toivola), Kaisa (1911–?) and Liisa (1918–1937) and the two brothers Jaakko (1904–1980) and Pauli (1914–1930). The family moved to Helsinki in 1908, where the father established a combined butchery and dairy shop. Although living in a working-class neighbourhood, the family lived a middle-class life. Enäjärvi graduated from the most modern upper secondary school at the time in Finland, the co-educational Uusi Yhteiskoulu, founded by its principal, member of parliament and international women rights’ activist Lucina Hagman (1853–1946). As many other Finns, Elsa and her siblings changed their Swedish surname into a Finnish one, in their case from Eklund to Enäjärvi in 1922. Elsa Enäjärvi lived with her family until she married Martti Haavio and they moved together in 1929.

Like Haavio, Enäjärvi corresponded with her family when she was travelling and after she moved away from home. Judging from her correspondence, the siblings seem to have been very close to each other. The letters of Haavio, Oskar Loorits and Elsa Enäjärvi suggest that Elvi Enäjärvi was part of their circle of friends. Later letters, too, show that the two sisters stood close to each other and that Elvi Enäjärvi would often provide help to Elsa Enäjärvi and her family in challenging and busy times. When Haavio was deployed at the front during World War II, Elvi sent him packages including food and clothes. She also served as a host to Haavio when he was transferred...
to the town Mikkeli, where she lived, and helped to mediate information between the spouses. In times of peace, she helped the family when Enäjärvi was to give birth, and later Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s children could stay with their aunt and her family when their parents were travelling for work. Elvi was also of help to the family during her sister’s final years, when she was sick and in hospital, and after Elsa’s death.

Elsa Enäjärvi first registered in 1919 at the University of Helsinki to study mathematics, physics and chemistry but changed during her first year to study Finnish and Comparative Folklore as her major. She completed her bachelor’s and master’s degree in 1923 and obtained, as the first woman in Finland, a doctoral degree in folkloristics in 1932. In 1947, she was appointed docent, all at the University of Helsinki in Finland. From the time she worked on her doctoral dissertation onwards, she published a large number of academic articles on folk poetry, festivities, song games and children’s folklore. In the 1920s, Enäjärvi travelled to Estonia, Latvia, Sweden, England, France, and Germany. The photo on the front cover of this dissertation pictures Enäjärvi and Haavio in Estonia in the early 1920s.

In addition to her engagement as a scholar, Enäjärvi was a political and cultural commentator, writing articles in favour of Finnish language politics, modernist culture, and more contacts with Estonia, as well as an author of reviews on theatre and literature. To a large degree, she was affiliated with the same cultural and political organisations and circles as Haavio. Both had been founding members of the Estonian-Finnish Student Club (Virolais-Suomalainen Ylioppilasklubi), later in the 1920s known as the Academic Kinship Club (Akateeminen Heimoklubi), she worked for the same student paper for the same publishing house as Haavio and was a member of Tulenkantajat. Later in life, in the 1940s and 1950s, she participated in party politics, joining the right-wing National Coalition Party (Kokoomus). Beside her academic work, she worked for the Family Federation of Finland (Väestöliitto). The aim of the organisation was to increase the growth and
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improve the health of the nation’s population. Enäjärvi had as a leading thought that this should be done by increasing social services and grants for families, educating young women for domestic service, and helping mothers to combine work and family life. She was also a board member of the International Federation of University Women (IFUW), participated in the Federation’s conferences in Denmark and Switzerland, and was the chair of its national organisation in Finland.

Haavio and Enäjärvi met in the second year of Enäjärvi’s university studies. In Enäjärvi’s accounts, their relationship was long described as a friendship, while Haavio’s documents tell of more passionate feelings from the beginning.110 After several years of a relationship that shifted between friendship and romantic affection, Enäjärvi and Haavio were engaged on New Year’s Night 1928, married a year later and eventually had five children.111 Enäjärvi passed away from cancer in 1951 after lengthy stretches of health complications. In 1960, Haavio married the translator, author and poet Aale Tynni, whom he lived with until his death in 1973.

When Enäjärvi participated in public debates on women’s possibilities to combine a career and family life, she could use herself as an example. This did not mean, however, that the arrangements in the family would have been based on the same premises for both spouses. One example of whose career took priority was evident when Enäjärvi gave some of her research material to Haavio when he applied for a professorship in 1932.112

Enäjärvi and Haavio were in many ways typical for students and scholars of their time. Like nearly 80 per cent of their student peers, they were from middle class homes and typically for their time, they were either from the cities or the countryside nearby the cities.113 In regard to gender, the question of representativeness is more complex. In chapter 2, I will discuss the proportion of men to women in folklore studies. In short, during the first half of the twentieth century folklore studies had about equal numbers of male and female students, while there were almost no women with doctorates or with academic positions in folkloristics. Thus, Enäjärvi and Haavio are rather representative as cases for the gender division among students in their academic field. Among postgraduate students who obtained a doctorate, Enäjärvi represents the typical situation of female scholars being the only or one of few women with a doctorate in her field.

110 Compare e.g. SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (15.11.1920). Case 5; Eskola, Kahden, 297.
111 This is also when Enäjärvi took the double surname Enäjärvi-Haavio, which she usually is called by in literature, as well as sometimes Haavio.
112 Pohls, Korkeasti koulutetut naisset, 74.
Sources and methodological points of departure

Choosing Enäjärvi and Haavio as cases through whom I study formations of scholarly persona is already in itself an initial methodological step in the dissertation processes. Since there are large collections preserved of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s documents, the second step in the study was a selection process of the material to be systematically analysed. In this chapter section, I will first present the collections and sources that I have used. After that, I discuss how I have used the sources in my analysis.

I have primarily used private letters and diaries written by Enäjärvi and Haavio. In these documents, Enäjärvi and Haavio reflect upon their experiences and perceptions of what constituted good scholars in their scholarly community. Typically, these are reflections upon their own role, development and position in that community. In addition to this, I have used private letters sent to Enäjärvi and Haavio, as well as some published and formal documents.

Most of the sources I use are preserved in the personal archives of Enäjärvi and Haavio in the Archive Materials on Literature and Cultural History (Kirjallisuuden ja kulttuurihistorian kokoelma, former Kirjallisuusarkisto, KIA) at the Finnish Literature Society (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, SKS) in Helsinki. The personal archive of Enäjärvi is divided into a letter collection (kirjekokoelma) and a manuscript collection (käsikirjoituskokoelma). In addition, there is a collection part, boxes 1–5 (laatikot 1–5), which contains research material as well as manuscripts and drafts for articles and books. This part of the archive is not recorded in the printed archive index at the SKS. Haavio’s archive is divided into collections of manuscripts, letters, photographs, prints and varia, the last containing Haavio’s laurel wreath from his master’s promotion.114 In total, Haavio’s archive measures 8.5 shelf metres and Enäjärvi’s 5.15 shelf metres in length.115

After Enäjärvi’s death, her documents were first in the possession of Martti Haavio, and after he passed away they were kept by his second wife Aale Tynni-Haavio. A first set of the documents was given to the Finnish Literature Society in 1985, followed by a second set that was found later in an attic. Thus, the indexed manuscript collection is divided into two parts, the earliest organised documents have signums I–XI and the ones found later have signums 1–10. Both contain similar types of material, such as diaries, notes, articles, press cuttings and speech drafts.116

114 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Both Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s personal archives are open to the public. I have, nevertheless, contacted their children about the writing of this book.
116 Eskola, Kahden, 31; Archive catalogue of Enäjärvi-Haavio’s manuscript collection, p. 1.
During the work with this dissertation, some of the cases have been re-arranged internally. The cases still have the same contents and headings, but some manuscripts have been placed in new envelopes with new headings within these cases. Some cases include several envelopes with the same heading, for example “manuscripts”. Some envelopes have rather indicative headings, such as the envelope “diary 1928”, which contains a diary with entries from 1928 to 1932. In this dissertation, I follow the archive’s instructions for referring to their collections by referring to the archive, the collection, the heading on the archive case and its signum. In addition, I write the date of the diary entry between the case name and the signum, or if the entry has no date, I write some other indication of how to find the correct passage. For example, I refer to Enäjärvi’s diary entry from June 30th 1922 by “SKS KIA. Archive of Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (30.6.1922). Case 5.” Here, “Diaries” (päiväkirjoja) is the case heading and “Case 5” (kotelo 5) is the signum. The parenthesis contains my added information of the specific location of the entry, in this case, by the help of the date.

The manuscript collections of Enäjärvi and Haavio also consist of speeches, which I only use to a minor extent. The number of speeches increases towards the end of the period examined, but the largest share of their speeches is dated after the time period studied here. For Haavio’s part, there are 6 dated speeches from the years 1918–1924, compared to a total of 18 dated speeches from the entire period of study. In Enäjärvi’s collection there are both fewer speeches from the time period and overall. Of her 11 speeches, the earliest is dated to 1923, with the numbers increasing when nearing the 1930s. Naturally, these numbers only illustrates the speeches preserved.

Both Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s archives include extensive letter collections: Enäjärvi’s collection consists of 16 cases and Haavio’s consists of 36 cases. The difference in total numbers is great, but within the timeframe and subject matter of this dissertation, they are much more comparable. The reason for this difference is partly because Haavio’s collection is larger since he lived 23 years longer than Enäjärvi, and partly because 3 volumes are only letters from professional authors and 3 are correspondences between other people than Haavio. Moreover, both collections have larger amounts of letters from later years, which is why the total number of letters during the early years are rather similar. In total, I refer to about 370 letters in this dissertation. Apart from letters received by Haavio and Enäjärvi respectively, their letter collections also include letters sent by them. Mainly, these are letters from Enäjärvi to her sister Elvi Enäjärvi and to her friend Maija Rajainen (née Ruuttu) and from Haavio to his brother Jaakko Haavio and to his friend Lauri Hakulinen. These

117 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries ("Diary 1928"). Case 5. One exception to the instructions is that in order to keep the footnotes more compact, I do not separate between cards and letters, but refer to both as "letters".
four siblings and friends, particularly Hakulinen, will appear frequently in the empirical examples of this dissertation.

The letter collections have two parallel signum systems. The original system follows a numbering from 1–13 (Enäjärvi) and 1–29 (Haavio), while the new numbering runs from 764–785 (Enäjärvi) and 729–763 (Haavio). The archive cases are numbered by the new system and the individual letters are numbered by the old system. In my references, I will therefore add the old numbering in parenthesis. For example, I refer to Elsa Enäjärvi’s letter to Martti Haavio written on October 8th 1927 with the signum “736:(8:)8:17”. The formal (new) full signum of this letter is “736:8:17”, where ”736” is the number that the archive case is found by. The individual letter has the signum “8:8:17” written on it.

In addition to Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s letter collections at the Finnish Literature Society’s archive, I have studied Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s letters to Estonian friends and colleagues preserved in the Estonian Archive for Cultural History (Eesti kultuurilooline arhiiv, EKLA) at the Estonian Literary Museum (Eesti kirjandusmuuseum, EKM) in Tartu. The letters have signums according to the collection and the sender of the letters and the individual letters have been paginated by the archive. I refer to these letters by archive, collection, signum, page number and, when possible, the date of the letter. For example, I refer to Martti Haavio’s letter to Oskar Loorits as “EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits. 1/1 (24.1.1925).” Here, “175” is the number of Oskar Loorits’ collection, “175:83:19” is the signum of Martti Haavio’s letters to Oskar Loorits, “1/1” is the page number given by the archive, and the parenthesis contains my added information of date.

There are preserved letters and diaries by and to Enäjärvi and Haavio for the whole time period of this dissertation, but they are not equally distributed over time. Haavio kept a diary during his first three years at university, thoroughly describing his thoughts and everyday life. From 1922 to 1941, there are no diaries in Haavio’s manuscript collection. In the case of Enäjärvi, there are diaries from all the years between 1918 and 1932, but with more infrequent diary entries from the last years. Also, since I focus on Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s lives from the time they entered university, I do not use to any depth Enäjärvi’s diaries from before 1919.

Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s daughter, the sociologist and culture scholar Katarina Eskola has edited a five-volume collection of Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s diaries and the correspondence between them from 1920 to 1951. These books include transcriptions of nearly all diary notes and letters between Enäjärvi and Haavio preserved in the personal archives at the SKS, but also some documents which the family has kept in private possession.

---

118 Eskola, Kahden; Eskola, Yhdessä; SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Diaries, notes and memoirs. Cases 5.1 and 5.2.
According to Eskola, these are Haavio’s diary from 1923–1925, five letters from Enäjärvi to Haavio and three from Haavio to Enäjärvi, all from the 1920s.\footnote{Eskola, \textit{Kahden}, 31.}

Enäjärvi and Haavio became public figures already during their student years and known to a larger audience, especially through their articles in journals and newspapers. These were reviews, political statements, travel letters, popular science articles, causeries and feature articles. I have accessed these sources through Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s press cutting collections and through the National Library of Finland’s digital collection of journals and newspapers.\footnote{Eskola, \textit{Kahden}, 31.} In chapters 2 and 6, I also use some articles written about Enäjärvi and Haavio. However, I have primarily focussed on Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s ways of portraying themselves and the contexts that they participated in, not how they or their work were discussed or received in public. In chapter 6, I also use Enäjärvi’s travel book \textit{Vanha iloinen Englanti} (“Merry Old England”, 1928).\footnote{Elsa Enäjärvi, \textit{Vanha iloinen Englanti}, 1st edn (Porvoo, 1928).}

With regard to other public sources, I use to a minor extent Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s travel grant applications, Enäjärvi’s travel report and Haavio’s \textit{docentship} and professorship applications, as well as the assessments of these. These documents are preserved at the University of Helsinki’s Archive and Registry.

Lastly, after discussing the documents that I have used, I wish to add a paragraph about a category of sources that I do not use. Since I study the processes of forming scholarly personae during the early academic years of two scholars, I have excluded sources that look back at the time studied. This means omitting, for example, Martti Haavio’s autobiography \textit{Nuoruusvuodet. Kronikka vuosilta 1906–1924}, which he published in 1972, Aale Tynni-Haavio’s biography \textit{Olen vielä kaukana. Martti Haavio—P. Mustapää 20-luvun maisemassa}, interviews with autobiographical outlooks on a life already lived and obituaries.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Diaries, notes and memoirs (Interviews). Case 5.1; Kai Laitinen, ‘Kukka, leikki, uni. P. Mustapään runouden piirteitä’, \textit{Työn lomassa. Säästöpankkien yleisölehti}, 7, 1962; Haavio, \textit{Nuoruusvuodet}; Tynni-Haavio, \textit{Olen vielä kaukana}.} Arguably these types of sources would also be highly relevant for a study in persona formation, which has been demonstrated by several works on scholarly persona using (auto)biographies.\footnote{See e.g. Amy Rubens, ‘Enacting Self and Scientific Personas: Models for Women Health Professionals in Dr. S. Josephine Baker’s Fighting for Life’, \textit{Persona Studies}, 4/1 (2018), 45–59; Secord, ‘Be What You Would Seem to Be’, 147–173; Bosch, ‘Persona and the Performance of Identity Parallel Developments in the Biographical Historiography of Science and Gender, and the Related Uses of Self Narrative’, 11–22.} The reason I
leave them out is that they give insights in constructions of persona during the time they were written rather than the times they describe. In other words, I would suggest that, for example, the autobiography is an effective practice for shaping and presenting one’s persona but it is a practice of the time of its writing, not a practice of the time written about. I make a couple of exceptions to this rule: In a few situations, I comment on details of circumstances that Haavio gives in *Nuoruusvuodet*, but which the primary sources fall silent off.

In my choice of approaching the research question through a deep reading of two individuals’ lives, I have been inspired by so-called new biography research methods. The approach is helpful for my research question for two major reasons. First, new biography research offers examples of studying processes of individuals’ formations of identities and selves and how to understand these processes and relate them to more general historical circumstances and developments. Second, the approach offers possibilities to study more complex formations of the self, identity or, in my case, persona than would studying larger groups of people. These biographical methods do not release historians from working with categorisations and generalisations of their objects of study, but they do help to identify multiple overlapping elements in action in persona formation. For example, this dissertation does not need to limit its scope to one or a few large categories, such as sex and class, but can include, as Liz Stanley puts it, “the multiple other categories of likeness and difference from others [that] make up the social identities of individuals.” In my study, I search for accounts of how Enäjärvi and Haavio reflected and acted within the frames and resources that they disposed over. Many of these were connected to gendered structures, which I in part observed as expressed directly or indirectly in the sources, in part identified by contextualizing and by relating them to previous research. In other situations, the categories man/woman or masculine/feminine do not appear to be the primary factors in action, but other elements emerge as having more impact on the protagonists’ situation, strategies and reflections. By approaching the research question through deep readings of only two individuals, I thus reach for a higher sensitivity for intersecting factors and processes that together contribute to Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s persona formations.

Using only two individuals can be argued to have the drawback of not telling us anything beyond the two individuals’ cases, thus remaining on an anecdotal level instead of illuminating anything more general. A common and rational (and necessary?) coping strategy with this problem is to

---

contextualise the analyses of the single cases. Jo Burr Margadant and Stanley respond to this argued drawback by challenging the path of thought. Margadant argues that in addition to contextualising the biographical analysis, the biographical research should be used for contextualisation. Correspondingly, Stanley argues that if the results of biographical research of a single case conflicts with a general theory, it proves that the theory (not the individual life or the study of it) is problematic and should be elaborated and improved.

Although I use biographical methods for my analysis, I should warn readers who potentially are expecting to read a couple biography of Enäjärvi and Haavio: This is not written as a biography. As I discussed in the chapter section on previous research, there are already thorough and insightful biographical and autobiographical works written to satisfy such interest. The timeframe limits itself to only 14 years of their lives and I omit many matters of personal life as well as work beyond academia.

The structure of the dissertation is thus designed partly to diminish expectations of a life narrative as an explaining approach to the processes that I study. The main reason for choosing this structure of the book is, however, that it serves as a methodological tool to illuminate persona formation from different angles. As mentioned before, in my reading of the sources, I have identified six particularly interesting arenas for persona formation and in which different elements of a Finnish folklorist’s persona were formed: 1) the university, 2) the city of Helsinki, 3) the field, 4) Estonia, 5) Western Europe, 6) the scholarly household. When reading Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s documents, I ask how they described what was perceived as scholarly or academic and scholarly credible within the contexts of these arenas and how they wrote about acting in order to embody or negotiate these perceptions. I emphasise that I study the descriptions in part because they illuminate for us what the author wished to express as academically relevant for their intended readers. These accounts give us information about perceptions of expectations, practices and requirements in the folklorist community and how Enäjärvi and Haavio responded to them. In addition to the informative value of the accounts, I also read the writing of the accounts as performative practices in Judith Butler’s sense of the term. By vocalizing their seeking of acknowledged ways of presenting themselves, behaviour, body, and so on, Enäjärvi and Haavio also formed themselves, confirming and sometimes contesting disciplinary frameworks.

129 Butler, Gender Trouble. Feminism and the Subversion of Identity, 42–44; compare e.g. Bosch, ‘Persona and the Performance of Identity Parallel Developments in the Biographical Historiography of Science and Gender, and the Related Uses of Self Narrative’, 17.
2. University: Navigating institutional frameworks and expectations

In the perhaps most frequently cited sentence in studies in scholarly persona, Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum explain persona as: “[i]ntermediate between the individual biography and the social institution lies the persona: a cultural identity that simultaneously shapes the individual in body and mind and creates a collective with a shared and recognizable physiognomy.”

In this chapter, I discuss folklore studies at the University of Helsinki as an institutional framework that posed certain expectations and requirements on the individual scholars in order to become a part of its collective. I ask how individuals were to be shaped “in body and mind” within the academic and disciplinary setting. This question consists of several layers of questions. What kinds of formal and informal, explicit and implicit expectations and requirements did the discipline have, and what kinds of studies, research and researchers were valued or desired? How did Enäjärvi and Haavio obtain information about these requirements and expectations? How did they respond to these requirements and expectations? Many of these issues can be understood in the terms of Herman Paul’s division of scholarly persona into skills, virtues and goods.

I begin by giving a short overview over the field of folklore studies and the University of Helsinki. The university sets the scene for this chapter, although much of the academic life and work took place outside the university walls. Indeed, it was not much more than the lectures and doctoral defences that took place in the university buildings. Research, studies, seminars, oral exams and

meeting professors occurred at societies, libraries, archives and in homes. Therefore, I understand university as the institutional setting of the discipline, rather than a particular building.

After the overview, I discuss how Enäjärvi and Haavio structured their studies and what motivated them. I then move on to introduce the historic-geographic method, or the so-called Finnish school, which had a great influence on folklore studies both in Finland and internationally. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s research were no exceptions, and I use their dissertations to discuss how they wrote themselves into the scholarly community by working in this particular methodological school. I also use Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s private documents and their dissertations to discuss how working within the methodological school, adapting to its aims and using its methods were practices that formed them as scholars.

Working within the historic-geographic school had consequences both on the practices and personal qualities of the scholars, but Enäjärvi and Haavio reflected upon and evaluated more general character traits of scholars, and committed themselves to develop as persons in desirable directions. After discussing the methodological school, I thereafter study what personal qualities Enäjärvi and Haavio pursued and how they obtained and responded to information regarding these qualities. Lastly, I discuss how Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s ways of presenting themselves as scholars were received in the assessments of Haavio’s professorship and docentship applications and in the press reporting of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s doctoral defences and participation in their doctoral commencement ceremonies. As previous research on gender and academia has shown, many of the notions of being scholarly or scientific corresponded with what was considered masculine. Studying Haavio’s, and in particular Enäjärvi’s writings shows that these were associations that they were both affected by and aware of gendered associations as exemplified in the articles on Enäjärvi’s doctoral defence.

The University of Helsinki, the national disciplines and folkloristics

The University of Helsinki was founded as the Royal Academy of Turku in 1640, during the Swedish time in the city of Turku in southwestern Finland. After Sweden ceded its eastern half of the kingdom to Russia and subsequent to the establishment of the Grand Duchy of Finland, Helsinki was made the administrative centre of the Duchy. After most of Turku was destroyed in a fire, the university was moved to Helsinki in 1828. The name was changed to the Imperial Alexander University after tsar Alexander I (1777–1825). Following Finland’s declaration of independence in 1917, the university was
named the University of Helsinki. After a few years of rapid growth in the number of students during the first decade of the twentieth century, the turmoil after the Russian Revolution and the declaration of independency resulted in a fall in the number of students from 3,476 students in 1916 to 2,385 students in 1919. Until the late 1920s, the number of students increased only slowly, but was followed by a rapid growth again. By 1931, the number had increased to 6,204 students.

Finnish universities were at the centre of the time’s national political movements and controversies. One of the contested issues was the language question from the mid-nineteenth century to the earlier part of the twentieth century. It was at times a heated debate between those who pursued to make Finnish the primary or only language of administration and education in Finland and those who argued it wiser to keep Swedish as the primary language in these fields. The language debate continued in independent Finland and for example Haavio and Enäjärvi were as students active in the movement demanding the university’s administration and tuition to be in Finnish only. During Haavio’s first years at university, there were two new universities founded in Finland: the Swedish-speaking Åbo Akademi University and the Finnish-speaking University of Turku, both founded in Turku in 1918 and 1919 respectively.

The national disciplines

The language question had a connection to the so-called national awakening in the mid-nineteenth century, although national romanticism and constructions of the nation were embraced by people from both sides of the language question. Due to the past as part of the Swedish kingdom, the educated elite in Finland mainly consisted of Swedish speakers. For this reason, the people involved in the national awakening and the early promotion of the Finnish language were mainly Swedish speakers. The Imperial Alexander University served as the central arena for national awakening activities, as well as for the counter-movement against Russification politics in the late nineteenth century. The national awakening movement was, as in other European countries and regions, to a large extent driven further by

134 The university was named after, but should not be confused with, the Royal Academy of Turku, both being in Swedish Åbo Akademi.
people involved in what in Finland became to be referred to as the national disciplines or national sciences (kansalliset tieteet). These were disciplines that studied national culture and heritage, primarily Finnish language and literature, Finnish history, archaeology, ethnology and folklore.\textsuperscript{135}

Finnish national identity-formation built to a large degree on language development and language politics, for example on studying and developing the Finnish language which had scarcely been used in administration and publishing. A special interest was also directed to the other Finno-Ugric languages, which constitute a language family separate from the Indo-European languages, among which English, Swedish, French, Russian, Persian and Hindi, to name a few, belong. Particularly the speakers of Finnic languages or Baltic Finnic languages, such as Estonian, Karelian and Veps, were often referred to as “kindred peoples” (sukulaiskansat, heimokansat).\textsuperscript{136}

Moreover, other newly independent states in the early twentieth century, such as Estonia, Norway and Ireland, established early and rather strong academic traditions in folklore studies, and all of them likewise developed a close connection between language studies and folklore. The disciplines in themselves were small, but they had a proportionally high status thanks to their service to nation building projects.\textsuperscript{137}

The field of folklore studies

Folklore studies emerged as an academic discipline during the nineteenth century, influenced by and influencing the Romanticist search for national spirit.\textsuperscript{138} In Finland, the greatest inspiration was the scholar and medical doctor Elias Lönnrot’s (1802–1884) folk poetry collection journeys in Karelia and eastern Finland, the region furthest east and beyond the territory of the Finnish Grand Duchy. Lönnrot edited his and other, earlier collector’s collections into the poetic epic \textit{Kalevala}, which was labelled Finland’s national epic soon after

\textsuperscript{135} Ó Giolláin, ‘Province, Nation and Empire: The Remit of Folklore Studies’, 211.
\textsuperscript{136} The term has no immediate English translation, but I will use in this dissertation the translation kindred peoples, as do, for example, folklorists Ülo Valk and Irma-Riitta Järvinen. Often, authors appear to avoid a direct translation by circumscriptions. There are also other possible ways of translating the term. For example, Anssi Paasi uses the translation “kinship” and Pertti Anttonen uses the translation “tribe”. One exception in my usage of this translation will be the association ‘Heimoklubi’, for which I will use the translation Kinship Club, because it sounds less awkward than “the club for kindred peoples”. Valk, ‘Folkloristic Contributions towards Religious Studies in Estonia: A Historical Outline’, 143; Irma-Riitta Järvinen, ‘Perspectives to the Relations between the Estonian Folklore Archives and the Folklore Archives of the Finnish Literature Society’, \textit{Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics}, 2/2 (2011), 61; Anssi Paasi, ‘The Rise and Fall of Finnish Geopolitics’, \textit{Political Geography Quarterly}, 9/1 (1990), 59; Anttonen, \textit{Tradition through Modernity}, 167.
\textsuperscript{137} Nygård, \textit{Suur-Suomi vai lähizeimolaisten auttaminen}, 21–24; Ó Giolláin, ‘Province, Nation and Empire: The Remit of Folklore Studies’, 211.
\textsuperscript{138} Bjarne Rogan, ‘The Institutionalization of Folklore’, in Regina Bendix and Galit Hasan-Rokem eds., \textit{A Companion to Folklore} (Malden, MA, 2012), 611.
its first publication in 1835. A second, reworked and expanded edition was published in 1849, and this is the version that is typically meant to when referring to *Kalevala*. The epic received massive interest in national and international romanticist circles. It was a great inspiration of *karelianism*, an admiring interest in Karelian culture and landscapes that engaged scholars, travellers, amateur collectors and artists.

The folk poetry in *Kalevala* followed a metre that became named Kalevala metre, and the poems were performed by singing. The study of Kalevala metre folk poetry remained at the core of Finnish folklore research for a long time. The particular interest in studying folk poetry is also reflected in the original name of the professor’s chair at the University of Helsinki, “Finnish and Comparative Folk Poetry”. Enäjärvi and Haavio also used the term folk poetry scholars (*kansanrunoutentutkija*) about themselves and their colleagues, although they also used the word folklorist at times.

Folklore studies evolved into a discipline of its own during the late nineteenth century, but research interests between neighbouring disciplines could often overlap. For example, the books published in the series *Folklore Fellows Communications*, FFC, included authors affiliated or to be affiliated with departments of folklore, Finnish language and literature, ethnoLOGY and sociology. The one affiliated with sociology, Uno Harva (born Holmberg, 1882–1949), is also an example of how scholars moved over disciplinary borders. Harva had studied theology, held a doctoral degree in folklore, was appointed professor of sociology in 1926, but was primarily recognised as a


140 Fewster, ‘“Braves Step out of the Night of the Barrows”. Regenerating the Heritage of Early Medieval Finland’, 38–39.


142 For folk poetry scholar, see SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 11.9.1927, 8.10.1927. Letters 736:(8:)8:10, 736:(8:)8:17; SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries. (27.5.1934). Case 5; For folklorist, see SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 27.11.1923. Letter 731:(3:)11:8; See also SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Professional activities and press cuttings (Citing from reviews, note about Bolte’s review). Case XI.2.

religion scholar, which also was how he defined himself. A practical reason behind this kind of discipline-crossing employment was that there were no or just a few people trained in the new disciplines who could be appointed professor when establishing a new chair for the discipline. Another example of this kind of mobility is the professor of the world’s first chair in folklore studies, Kaarle Krohn, could obviously not have earned a doctoral degree in that field himself but had his training in literature. Other countries had corresponding situations with their new professorships in folklore but scholars with their degrees from other disciplines similarly could later be appointed professors in folklore.

Overall, university departments were small and offered few permanent positions. For example, in 1925, the University of Helsinki’s teaching staff consisted roughly of one third (99) chair professors and extraordinary professors (that is, professors without a chair), one third were university teachers or similar, and one third were docents. If a scholar continued with research and publishing after her or his doctoral degree, she or he could apply and be appointed docent at the faculty. In contemporary usage, the term docent is often translated into adjunct professor. Docent is an honorary title, not a salaried post. In the early twentieth century, many disciplines, such as folklore, divided the teaching tasks mainly between professors and docents. The former had a permanent position at the university, the latter worked on an hourly basis. Additionally, the University of Helsinki had special scholarships for docents. According to Matti Klinge, the docent scholarships provided during the interwar years an income that corresponded to a university teacher’s yearly salary.

Since the choice of subjects to study was free and students did not enrol for particular programmes in the humanities, there is no exact way of specifically categorising students as folklore students. However, in order to give an indication of the number of students within the discipline, we can count the laudatur theses that were submitted to the Department of Finnish and Comparative Folk Poetry. A laudatur thesis is comparable to today’s master’s thesis and counting them gives us a number of the students that took the advanced courses in folklore. This number is rather indicative, since some, however a small number, students submitted more than one laudatur thesis in folklore and students could also submit laudatur theses in several subjects.

---


145 For example, Walter Anderson in Estonia and Johannes Bolte in Germany had degrees from studies in languages and literature.


147 See e.g. Konrad Teräsvuori’s theses in Lilli Sievänen, ‘Väinämöinen meressä’; Helmi Karjalainen, ‘Kalevanpajo kasken kaadanta’. NB that the laudatur thesis references are to the library database Helka. They are found under the heading “internet” in the bibliography, together with their internet addresses.
At the time, students obtained a bachelor’s degree after finalising their advanced studies and the licentiate degree after defending their doctoral dissertation. The master’s degree and doctoral degree were titles that could be applied for after obtaining the bachelor’s degree or the licentiate degree.148

The Library of the University of Helsinki preserves laudatur theses and master’s theses according to departments. The folklore theses from the first half of the twentieth century are collected into thematical volumes and most lack a more precise dating than “1900–1950”. Within this timeframe, there are 50 volumes consisting of a total of 291 laudatur theses from the folklore department. In total, 114 of the theses have a male author, 121 are written by women and 56 only have initials or no name registered at all.149

The *laudatur* theses thus demonstrate almost equal proportions of male and female students at the department in 1900–1950. The proportions were rather similar at the Faculty of Arts in general. About 45 per cent of the total of 5,723 BA’s at the University of Helsinki in 1914–1950 were obtained by women. The proportion was only slightly smaller for the years 1919–1932: out of 1,833 BA’s, 42 per cent were obtained by women.\(^{150}\)

At the higher levels of academia, the gender proportions were very different. Before Elsa Enäjärvi, no woman had defended a doctoral dissertation in folklore in Finland. For comparison, 10 dissertations on anthropological, ethnographical and folklore topics were defended at the University of Helsinki in 1909–1928. Of these, 7 were within folklore.\(^{151}\)

Within the Faculty of Arts at the University of Helsinki, a total of 689 doctoral degrees were obtained in 1900–1950. Of these, 4 per cent were obtained by women. When Enäjärvi received her doctoral title in 1932, she did so together with one other woman and 52 men at the Faculty of Arts.\(^{152}\) The numbers of *laudatur* theses, bachelor’s degrees and doctoral degrees are illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1. *Laudatur* theses at the Department of Finnish and Comparative Folklore, and bachelor’s degrees and doctoral degrees at the Faculty of Arts at the University of Helsinki, 1900–1950.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Women, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Laudatur</em> theses, 1900–1950</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA’s, 1914–1950</td>
<td>5,723</td>
<td>2,599</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA’s, 1919–1932</td>
<td>1,833</td>
<td>771</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD’s, 1900–1950</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PhD’s, 1932</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Bagge, *Promootiot Helsingin yliopistossa 1832–1967*, appendix 4–6; for *laudatur* theses, see footnote 149.

Another comparison within the field of folklore studies can be made by way of the series *Folklore Fellows Communications*. The series had from its start in 1910 until the end of 1950 a total of 138 publications. Of the 61


\[^{152}\] Bagge, *Promootiot Helsingin yliopistossa 1832–1967*. As will be discussed towards the end of this chapter, the commencement ceremonies were not arranged every year, so these two women and 52 men had not all defended their dissertations the same year, but mainly between 1927 and 1932. Bagge has a separate column for women who obtained their doctoral degrees, but not for those who remained licentiates. Most licentiates were in the interwar years promoted doctors, with only 0–5 persons remaining licentiates. In the commencement ceremony of 1950, 40 out of 266 licentiates did not obtain a doctoral title. Appendix 5–6.
different authors of these publications, 5 were women. When Enäjärvi published her doctoral dissertation in the series in 1932, she was the second female author out of the series’ 47 different authors so far. Enäjärvi was also the first woman to be appointed docent in folklore at the University of Helsinki in 1947. It was not until 1979 that a woman was appointed professor in folklore.

The historic-geographic method

Haavio, Enäjärvi and their peers in Helsinki, as well as folklorists around Europe in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, were working within what Veikko Anttonen has described as a methodological paradigm. Anttonen points out that Kaarle Krohn illustratively named one of his methodological books “Die Folkloristische Arbeitsmethode.” Since the historic-geographic method had such a strong influence on the folklorists’ work, it will be repeatedly discussed in this dissertation. In this chapter, I will discuss how Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s studies and doctoral dissertations were connected to and directed by the historic-geographic school. I argue that the school demanded, in Herman Paul’s terms, certain skills and virtues and that it formed the students who wished to work within folklore studies as well as the practices connected to scholarly work. In chapter 5, the historic-geographic school will be discussed in connection to how Estonian and Finnish scholars worked with the method and developed the methodology. In chapter 6, I will discuss Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s international contacts and networking strategies through the lens of how they worked with their historic-geographic doctoral dissertations.

155 Veikko Anttonen, Uno Harva ja suomalainen uskontotiede (Helsinki, 1987), 83, quote from 45. [Anttonen’s italics]; Kaarle Krohn, Die folkloristische Arbeitsmethode. Begründet von Julius Krohn und weitergeführt von nordischen Forschern, Institutet for sammenlignende kulturforskn. Serie B, Skrifter, 5 (Oslo, 1926) [“The Folklore Methodology”; In the later English translation, the definitive article is left out. Kaarle Krohn, Folklore Methodology, trans. by Roger L. Welsch (Austin & London, 1971)]; The question whether to call the historic-geographic method a paradigm can be answered in various ways. E.g. Seljamaa argues that it responds to the Kuhnian sense of a paradigm. The term highlights the thorough impact that the school had on folklore research. However, since I do not apply here the theoretical package that comes with the term ‘paradigm’, I will not use it in this dissertation, but instead the more theory-neutral term school. Elo-Hanna Seljamaa, ‘Remarks on the Historic-Geographic Method and Structuralism in Folklore Studies: The Puzzle of Chain Letters’, Journal of Ethnology and Folkloristics, 2/1 (2011), 84.
The method goes under several names, usually “the historic-geographic method” (or school), “the Finnish school” or sometimes more generally “the comparative method”. The aim of the historic-geographic method was to map developments of folklore and cultural contacts. The scholars collected as many variants as possible of a particular piece, such as a folk poem. By examining and comparing variants from various ages and geographical locations, they sought to identify how the piece of folklore had developed over time and moved geographically. Another goal was also to trace the most archaic and original variants or parts of variants, often expressed by the German term *Urform*. Although the analysis included interpretations of content and creativity, as will be discussed in connection to Haavio’s assessments, the method was largely influenced by the positivist ideals of its time. Sources were presented and organised, and the analyses of variants were verified according to specific models. Ideally, scholars would use large quantities of variants in order to show empirical evidence of regularities and structures in the developments of folklore.\(^\text{156}\)

The founding of the historic-geographic school is usually ascribed to the Finnish scholars, father and son, Julius Krohn (1835–1888) and Kaarle Krohn (1863–1933). Julius Krohn was professor in Finnish Philology and Literature at the Imperial Alexander University. His son Kaarle Krohn was appointed *docent* in 1888 and professor in folklore when the chair was established at the same university eleven years later.\(^\text{157}\)

Typically, scholars working with the historic-geographic school used both national and international sources for their work, comparing the different variants and mapping how and when they had evolved over space and time. The historic-geographic school was in this sense very internationalist, almost by default, since scholars needed to collaborate across national borders in order to conduct their comparative studies. Usually the variants were collected nationally. The variants were then organised and preserved in archives. Scholars from other countries could visit these archives to collect material for their international comparisons. The work could be done more time-efficiently and with less expense if scholars had good connections with researchers and archivists in various countries. If so, they could ask for information and copies of the variants to be sent by mail, instead of visiting the foreign archives themselves. In addition to personal contacts, comparisons were made easier and more efficient by previously received copies that were preserved in national folklore archives and by articles on national collections that were

\(^\text{156}\) Seljamaa, ‘Remarks on the Historic-Geographic Method and Structuralism in Folklore Studies’, 84–85.
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published in international journals and series, in particular the *Folklore Fellows Communications*.\(^{158}\)

The international practice of the historic-geographic methodology did not, however, prevent the close connection between folklore and nationalism. Historic-geographic studies could still be used for claiming a heroic past and a venerable national culture. Finnish scholars were eager to emphasise a distance from a Russian cultural connection and instead establish a proud national past and highlight a cultural belonging to both the Finno-Ugric peoples and Western Europe.\(^{159}\)

Kaarle Krohn was very influential in promoting the Finnish school, in particular in Helsinki. The tradition was further cemented by Krohn’s function as supervisor for the folklorist doctoral students, including Enäjärvi and Haavio. Working so close to Krohn, and in dependence of his approval, led the students on to particular research questions and ways of working. According to Finnish folklorist Jouko Hautala, Krohn’s strong influence and the nearly unquestioned position of the Finnish method encouraged young folklorists to commit themselves to research, as it offered a safe path to conduct research and reach results that would be acknowledged by the scholarly community.\(^{160}\) This is also confirmed in a letter from Haavio to Hakulinen in the very early stages of his dissertation research: “If Krohn lives, the book will be realised.”\(^{161}\) Enäjärvi made a corresponding comment in her diary when reflecting on her future options: “He [Krohn] would make one a

---

\(^{158}\) See e.g. Axel Olrik, *Dansk Folkemindesamling (DFS). The National Collection of Folklore in Copenhagen* (Helsinki, 1910); Astrid Lunding, *The System of Tales in the Folklore Collection of Copenhagen* (Helsinki, 1910); Oskar Hackman, *Katalog der Märchen der Finnländischen Schweden. Mit Zugrundelegung von Aarnes Verzeichnis der Märchentypen* (Helsinki, 1911); Adolf Schullerus et al., *Verzeichnis der rumänischen Märchen und Märchenvarianten nach dem System der Märchentypen Antti Aarnes* (Helsinki, 1928); Václav Tille, *Verzeichnis der böhmischen Märchen I* (Helsinki, 1921).

\(^{159}\) Fewster, “‘Braves Step out of the Night of the Barrows’”. Regenerating the Heritage of Early Medieval Finland’, 31, 48–49; Satu Apo, Aili Nenola and Laura Stark-Arola, ‘Introduction’, in Satu Apo, Aili Nenola and Laura Stark-Arola eds., *Gender and Folklore. Perspectives on Finnish and Karelian Culture* (Helsinki, 1998), 16; It is notable that there were challenges in interpreting folk poetry in ways that corresponded both with the nationalistic ambitions and scholarly research. Krohn, for example, changed his theoretical interpretation of the age and development of Finnish folk poetry in the late nineteenth century, in order to show that the Finnish sources were of a more original form than would be the case if interpreted from his previous theories. See e.g. Wilson, *Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland*, 68–85; See also e.g. Emily S. Rosenberg, *A World Connecting, 1870–1945* (Cambridge, Mass., 2012), 824–825; Sverker Sörlin, *De lärdas republik. Om vetenskapens internationella tendenser* (Malmö, 1994), 202.


doctor for sure, if one committed to his [Krohn’s] guidance.” If Krohn had suggested or approved a research topic, this could also be used as an argument for why it was relevant to study. However, Krohn’s position was a double-edged sword. Besides being recognised for his encouragement and his methodological and theoretical expertise, his influence was also criticised within the field in the 1920s for restricting alternative interpretations and further theory development.

The historic-geographic method was a crucial building block in a folklorist’s persona during this time, not least when it came to the Finnish scholars. The method’s requirements of the folklorists following it were both of a practical and an ideological character, quite in line with Herman Paul’s analysis and description of scholarly persona, which I presented in the introductory chapter. The historic-geographic method required specific skills from the folklorists, such as extensive language skills and knowledge in the principles of archiving, categorising and referencing. The goods could be to unravel the cultural developments of humanity and situating a national pride in it. In order to reach these goods, folklorists would need to embody virtues such as diligence ad an ability to build and nurture international networks which enabled the development of extensive comparative studies.

Two historic-geographic dissertations

Haavio’s doctoral dissertation Kettenmärchenstudien I from 1929 and Enäjärvi’s The game of rich and poor. A comparative study in traditional singing games from 1932 both mapped the historic and geographic development of a type of a tale (in Haavio’s case) and a singing game (in Enäjärvi’s case). I use these dissertations to study how the methodological school that Enäjärvi and Haavio were part of and how their relationship to this school formed their scholarly work and who they were as scholars.

Both dissertations were published in the Folklore Fellows Communications. Haavio’s dissertation was a little more than 200 pages and Enäjärvi’s covered about 300 pages. Haavio wrote his dissertation in Finnish and then had it translated into German before publication, which was a common practice in his time. Enäjärvi took a less common path, publishing her dissertation in English.


164 Wilson, Folklore and Nationalism in Modern Finland, 92.


166 It is unclear whether Enäjärvi wrote her dissertation in English or in Finnish and had it translated into English, but in her foreword, she only thanks her proofreader and not translator,
Haavio’s dissertation was on the “What should I have said” chain tales ("Was hätte ich sagen sollen" in German). Chain tales or cumulative tales are stories told for amusement in which the narrative repeats the previous steps of the story. Haavio described the “what should I have said” type of chain tales as narratives in which the protagonist is a fool who takes advice literally. The protagonist is sent out to conduct a task but fails and is afterwards told what the right thing to say or do would have been, which he or she then keeps in mind for the next time. However, when circumstances change, following the same advice literally leads to failure again. The protagonist is then advised on how he or she should have acted in that particular situation, which he or she then follows the next time, again under new circumstances, again failing, and so the tale continues to repeat itself but with new situations and new advice.

Kettenmärchenstudien I consists of an extensive introduction and a main part comprising of a presentation, an analysis of empirical data, and 15 pages of conclusions. The introduction consists of a section on previous research on chain tales and one on the origins of the tale type, followed by a longer theoretical presentation of the form of the tale type. The empirical chapter begins with an introduction of the chain tale under investigation and a section in which the sources are listed mainly according to language groups: Celtic, Romanic, Germanic, Baltic, Slavic, Finno-Ugric, Turko-Tatar, Caukasian, Asian and “other European peoples”, which in his material were Greeks. These categories are further divided into sources according to country. Next comes an analysis first of the Asian variants and then the European ones, followed by a long section in which the author categorises the types of the variants according to their contents. The chapter ends with the conclusions that can be drawn on the original form of the tales and their strataums.

In her dissertation, Enäjärvi analysed the singing game of the same name as the title of the book: The game of rich and poor. Like Haavio in his work, she did not only study exact translations of a particular song, but also games that shared the same basic idea. The game of rich and poor thus serves as an umbrella term for games with different names and partly different content (although not as different as in Haavio’s study). The basic content of the game is that there are two lead players among whom the other participants are distributed. One of the players lives in plenty, thus having many participants on his or her side, while the other is poor and has none or few participants on his or her side. The participants repeat a song about the one having much and

---


168 Haavio, Kettenmärchenstudien I, 94.

169 Haavio, Kettenmärchenstudien I, 96–103. Haavio uses the word “Land”, country, in his latter division, although some subcategories also are other than countries, such as the Swedish-speaking Finns. The English translation of Krohn’s method book uses in this context the term “nations”; Krohn, Folklore Methodology, 51.
Figure 1. A page of Haavio’s list of variants in *Kettenmärchenstudien I.*

the other having little while one by one the participants change places from the rich team to the poor team, eventually making the rich poor and the poor rich.\textsuperscript{170}

The dissertation begins with an introductory chapter, mainly discussing previous research, as did the equivalent section in Haavio’s dissertation. Moreover, comparably to Haavio in his dissertation, Enäjärvi structured her dissertation geographically, but her chapters were directly organised according to language: Finnish, Scandinavian (divided into Swedish, Norwegian and Danish), German, Latvian, Estonian, Flemish, French and English. Each national origin chapter begins by listing the sources used, comparable to how Haavio had placed a list at the beginning of the empirical chapter. Enäjärvi’s lists are followed by an analysis based on comparisons primarily within the national context but also to some extent with the variants from other countries. The national origin chapters are followed by a 53-page-long chapter discussing conclusions.

The categorisation of the sources listed followed the Finnish folklorist Antti Aarne’s (1867–1925) folktale classification system, which was first published in 1911.\textsuperscript{171} Aarne was extraordinary professor of Finnish and Comparative Folk Poetry at the University of Helsinki in 1922–1925 and one of the leading figures in the development of the historic-geographic school. He gained international fame for his classification system, which with some modifications is still used today. Aarne’s indexing system was rooted in the practices of conducting research within the school. Aarne began developing his index system for folktales because he had encountered difficulties in getting hold of variants from abroad when he was gathering material for his doctoral dissertation. To make sharing comparable variants easier, he worked out a system that could be used by archives and scholars regardless of national context.\textsuperscript{172}

The source listings are visual markers of a work done within the historic-geographic school. Figure 1 shows a page in Haavio’s dissertation, showing a passage where he lists Slavic and Finno-Ugric variants and other works conducted with the same methods and repeated with the same visual pattern.

The source lists in Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s dissertations were organised by location, from larger entities to smaller ones. For Haavio, this consisted first in a division between Eastern (\textit{morgenländische}) and Western (\textit{abendländische}) sources, then in divisions by ethno-linguistic group (e.g. Romanic), followed by language or nationality (e.g. French). Since Enäjärvi presented her sources at the beginning of each chapter, her lists were only organised by region. The lists further included detailed information on the parish where the variant was recorded, the archive or book in which it was published, the name


\textsuperscript{171} Antti Aarne, \textit{Finnische Märchenvarianten. Verzeichnis der bis 1908 gesammelten Aufzeichnungen} (Hamina, 1911); see also Enäjärvi 1932, p. 33.

\textsuperscript{172} Haase, \textit{The Greenwood Encyclopedia of Folktales and Fairy Tales. Volume 1}, 1.
of the recorder and the year of recording. Organising their dissertations in this manner was a concrete way for Enäjärvi and Haavio to write themselves into the historic-geographic school and its methodology and to fulfil some of its expectations.

The method responded to a positivist aim to conduct research and present results comparable to those found in the natural sciences by creating systems to operationalise, measure and map cultural phenomena. Enäjärvi’s diary entry from 1927 demonstrates that the historic-geographic school, in her view, had been successful in its goal to be perceived as scientific in a positivist sense. In the diary entry, Enäjärvi wrote about her plans to change academic tracks from folklore to literature history. The change, she thought, would be good for her career and match her interests better, but studying and completing a PhD in folklore had an advantage in that it taught her:

a natural scientific method, which is a valid scientific method. It is a training into science. The method of literary history is messy, the method of folklore is educational. Once it is acquired, one can invent methods in the history of literature too.

Here, Enäjärvi described the historic-geographic method as training that folklore students learned in their studies and dissertation work. Understood in Herman Paul’s trinity division of scholarly persona, the historic-geographic school offered a platform to form skills and virtues that made it possible to work within the methodological school. This training meant that the scholars could claim to be scientific in the same way as scholars in natural sciences, but could also be applied for research in other humanities than folklore.

How to be a folklorist

The historic-geographic school established a specific and explicit framework of how to conduct research and what kinds of qualities this work demanded, but Enäjärvi and Haavio also reflected upon more general and implicit expectations of what constituted a folklorist. From a persona-exploring perspective, it is interesting to study what Enäjärvi and Haavio sensed that folklorists were expected to be knowledgeable in and how folklorists should be as persons. In the following chapter section, I will first discuss how Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about the motives and driving forces for choosing


what to study. This illuminates how they as students sought institutionalised merits by choosing courses in an academic context that allowed free subject combinations. Following that, I will discuss how Enäjärvi and Haavio reflected upon the character of the folk culture scholar. This part illuminates even more inexplicit expectations and additionally gives insights into how this kind of information of what it took to be scholar could be obtained despite its obscure nature. In the first part, our primary informant is Haavio, who wrote extensively to his friend Lauri Hakulinen about how to choose subjects. In the second part, the empirical material speaks somewhat more with Enäjärvi’s than with Haavio’s voice.

Choosing subjects of study

Still in the 1920s, the universities in Finland only required a passed matriculation exam from upper secondary school. After this exam, students could register for studies at the university without applying for a particular programme or subject. Students could choose their subjects of study, typically with one major, in which they wrote their above-discussed laudatur thesis, and a few minors.175 In what follows, I will discuss Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s subject choices and how they reflected upon them. The combination of studies was a very concrete situation in which the students had to decide how they wanted to form themselves and when continuing their careers in academia, what kind of direction and expertise they wanted to have as scholars.

After graduating from upper-secondary school, Elsa Enäjärvi registered for studies at the University of Helsinki in mathematics, physics and chemistry, but changed to folkloristics, Finnish history, and Finnish language and literature during her first semester. Martti Haavio registered directly for his future main field, folkloristics, and in addition chose to study Roman literature and Finno-Ugric philology, which included studies in languages such as Veps, Votic, Karelian and Hungarian.176

Enäjärvi reasoned in her diary that she had originally enrolled in mathematics because she had been most fond of her school mathematics teacher, with whom she also had discussed her future academic plans before registering for university. Similarly to many female students both in Finland and internationally, Enäjärvi envisioned her future as a secondary school teacher, or rather, either working as a teacher or getting married.177 Shortly

177 Siivänen-Allen, Tyttö venheessä, 66; Dyhouse, Students, 48–53.
after beginning her studies, Enäjärvi came to the conclusion that she would find mathematics less fun to teach than Finnish, and this was the main reason why she switched her field of study. In 1921, Enäjärvi wrote about her interest in her new field of study and that she “since childhood had held a special interest in ballads.” In 1924, she noted how she found folkloristics to be a “terribly pleasant science.” However, from the mid-1920s until her last diary entries, written in the hospital only months before passing away, she repeatedly wrote how she in fact would want to move over to research in the history of literature.

Haavio’s letters to his close friend and old classmate Lauri Hakulinen (1899–1985) give us insights in how he perceived combinations of study subjects as well as the circumstances of a new student. During Haavio’s first year at the university, Hakulinen worked as a teacher in Turku, but he planned to begin his university studies the following year. Haavio gave Hakulinen opinions and advice on how to plan ahead and what to expect of his studies. He confirmed to Hakulinen that the choice of subjects was entirely free and recommended Hakulinen to choose subjects primarily (and “in the name of God”) with regard to his interests. “[U]nfortunately”, he added, it was also advisable to consider how the prospects of future employment were affected by different combinations of subjects. To optimise one’s prospects, Haavio suggested that one should not choose too many closely related subjects, with the motivation that “modern times require versatile men (although past times did as well)”.

Haavio suspected that Hakulinen’s planned combination of Finnish literature and philology, Finno-Ugric studies, folkloristics, and Roman languages included too many “Finland-subjects”, and that this might narrow his chances of future employment. Instead, Haavio suggested that

---
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he should choose a major in Finnish literature and philology combined with minors in Latin, folkloristics or Finno-Ugric studies, and economics (because he thought that Hakulinen should also nurture his practical dispositions). Enäjärvi did not reflect on her choice of subjects after her shift from the natural sciences to the humanities, but we can see that her combination too was filled with “Finland-subjects”. Supposedly, the choice of Finnish language and literature and Finnish history were motivated by her plans to become a teacher.

Haavio seems to have followed his own recommendation to primarily study subjects according to personal interest. He was “brimming excitement” after browsing through the old folklore collections of the Finnish Literature Society. The folk songs, he told Hakulinen, had “melodies like honey and their thoughts [had] an oddly beautiful lyrical tinge.” Haavio also wrote enthusiastically to Hakulinen how he had realised that he indeed was in the right field of study, describing this insight as an awakening comparable to a religious experience.

Apart from his intellectual interest in subjects, Haavio also wrote about other advantages of particular subjects and subject combinations. Ethnology was a “rather easy” and “exceedingly compelling subject”. An additional benefit was that students who wrote a bachelor’s thesis in ethnology could receive a grant worth 1,000 Finnish marks for fieldwork. He added that combining Finnish literature and philology, aesthetics and folkloristics was convenient, since they were so closely related that even the course literature was partly overlapping. Selecting subjects was, in other words, a combination of interest—even passionate interest—and strategy. However, what strategy to choose was not self-evident, as on the one hand, a diversity

185 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 3.10.1918. Letter 730:(2):2:16; At the University of Helsinki, economics was at the time a subject under the Historical-Linguistic Section and the Faculty of Arts. Filosofiakandidaattitutkinnon vaatimukset Filosofisen Tiedekunnan Historiallis-kielitieteellisessä Osastossa (Helsinki 1923), 14–15.


of subjects could be beneficial for future careers, while on the other hand, disciplinary proximities could be time-efficient for the student.

The character of a scholar

Above, I discussed some of the practices and research approaches that Enäjärvi and Haavio, as members of the folklorists’ community, adapted to and performed, that is, some aspects of what a folklorist should do at university in order to be part of that community. In this chapter section, I will discuss Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s own writings on how scholars should conduct themselves as persons in order to fit into scholarly communities.

When Enäjärvi wrote about her own character and nature, she reasoned both about who she was and what she was not able to change in her character, as well as about what traits she wished to develop in a desired way. She urged herself to work harder, to educate herself by reading during holidays, to not waste her time on futile discussions, to not eat or sleep too much. At other times, she reminded herself to rest enough or in more general terms to become a good person.¹⁹² Both Haavio and Enäjärvi noted in their diaries on how they read books, and how this inspired them to develop themselves. This interest was part of a more general and international trend in personal development of self-discipline and will power, with popularised literature on psychological research and education circulating widely among a middleclass readership.¹⁹³

One of Haavio’s notebooks included little else than literary quotes, for example from the Danish Christian existentialist Søren Kierkegaard (1813–1855), the Finnish nationalist poet and literature scholar V.A. Koskenniemi (1885–1965) and the Finnish language scholar and poet Herman Kellgren (1822–1856).¹⁹⁴ Enäjärvi wrote about reading the educationalist Jules Payot (1859–1939), but reflected also over why she read and let herself be inspired by Payot and similar authors: “Why those Payot’s and others’ life instructions? Why does one need to be so excellent? It is better that way—given that one must live one’s life anyway.”¹⁹⁵ Haavio’s quotes also indicate a pursuit of excellence, for example he quoted: “Every true genius must have

¹⁹⁴ SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Diaries (Small, light brown diary of 1919). Case 5.1. Haavio did not note the first name of Kellgren, but due to the context I assume that it was Herman Kellgren and not, for example, the poet and critic Johan Henric Kellgren (1751–1795).
an original form, it must be itself and nothing more. Kellgren”, “[o]nly the one who gives everything can demand everything”, and “we need poets and proclaimers, who live in a pure, elevated atmosphere with masculine strength, the vastness of the fjelds, the brightness of the snowy spruces, the defiance of a river rapid. Fredrik Klaveness”.

In addition to literature on how to live and develop, Enäjärvi and Haavio also made observations on other people who they considered to be either exemplary scholars or, in other cases, people who exemplified what they held in low esteem. We can see that Haavio quite early, during his student years, wrote about professorships as available and desirable options for the future. Observations on how these professionals were as individuals could therefore very well have been something of a conscious learning process. In the culture journal *Nuori Voima*, Haavio wrote about the Danish folklore professor Axel Olrik (1864–1917) as an example of how to be a good scholar. Haavio stated that had he read about Olrik in his youth, he would have made notes for himself as guidelines to “live like Olrik, be tireless like Olrik, be diligent as Olrik, be devout like Olrik, set yourself a life goal like Olrik, produce a grand idea, and you will die like Olrik—with a life well lived.” According to Haavio, Olrik’s success was explained by his thirst for knowledge, his wide reading and a critical scientific mind. Olrik’s eminence was further due to his ability to successfully balance between ambitions to conduct and write flawless research without killing his imagination, which according to Haavio was required also for scholarly work.

From his “grand idea”, Olrik had developed sophisticated theories, which Haavio also considered important for other scholars. Good scholars developed theories and conducted research that others in academia accepted and followed. In Haavio’s view, this quality needed to be continuously cultivated in order for it to persist. For example, Haavio thought that Kaarle Krohn had possessed this admirable quality in the past but had not been able to keep up with newer research. In the 1920s, Haavio wrote to Hakulinen that he still viewed Krohn as an excellent orator and person, but that Krohn’s esteem “as
a scholar” was diminishing in Haavio’s eyes. Haavio had listened to other scholars, who presented interpretations that differed from Krohn’s, and, in Haavio’s view, Krohn had neither been able to respond to these alternative explanations convincingly nor develop his scholarly views in accordance with the newer interpretations.

Similar to his judgement of Krohn, Haavio regarded the professor of Finnish language and literature and the editor-in-chief of the academic journal *Virittäjä*, E.A. Tunkelo, as a good speaker. However, Haavio also thought that Tunkelo misused his position to decide over every issue that came his way, such as the journal’s policies and the activities of the editorial board of *Virittäjä*. He was, in Haavio’s words, thus a “tyrant”, whose reign was soon to end and give room for a more democratic rule. Haavio also described Tunkelo as slow and thus difficult to cooperate with in the editing process of *Virittäjä*, noting that professors in general were absent-minded. Haavio also wrote critically about scholars who would not stand their ground in an academic discussion but were too humble.

Haavio also wrote critically about scholars who would not stand their ground in an academic discussion but were too humble.

Haavio also directed his most disparaging remarks towards the university staff that spoke Swedish and who were unwilling to comply to making the university Finnish-speaking.

Enäjärvi also reflected upon senior scholars’ presentations and speaking skills. After attending a lecture by the Danish “Professor Andersen”, Enäjärvi wrote in her diary that he was a “perfect actor and yet, by reputation, also an accomplished scholar.” Presumably, the professor was the literary historian Vilhelm Andersen (1864–1953), who beside his academic career also was a celebrated narrator and reciter.

The statement above would suggest that although Enäjärvi had attended the lecture, the impact that Professor Andersen

---


201 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 31.1.1919. Letter 730:(2:)3:2; Compare with e.g. Haavio, ‘Seitsemän kahlehdittua koiraa. Välähdyksiä Axel Orlikista, suuresta tanskalaisesta tiedemiehestä.’, 42.


205 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 31.1.1919, (see also, 22.2.1919). Letter 730:(2:)3:2 (see also 730:(2:)3:5). The political engagement will be discussed further in chapter 3.


had on her was due to his way of rhetorically delivering the lecture and not in the lecture’s content, as she did not add her own view to whether or not he was a good scholar but only stated that he had that reputation. Although Enäjärvi’s description of Andersen was very approving, she also expressed an awareness that his way of being a scholar was non-traditional, and reflected, further, that a professor like him would probably be very much of an exception in Finland.\(^{208}\) This remark demonstrates how the students had much more information at hand than they eventually tried to incorporate into their academic repertoires. Although Enäjärvi found Andersen’s performance positive, she was also cautious that following his example would not necessarily give her academic recognition.

A recurring theme in Enäjärvi’s diaries and letters, and especially those from the second half of the 1920s onward (and for the rest of her adult life), was that she needed to become better at focussing on her larger projects and skipping over the multitude of smaller tasks. These lesser duties, she reasoned, gave quick rewards, but stole time and focus from her main missions, from the dissertation and later other research projects.\(^{209}\) She could also instruct herself to develop in a more fundamental way, for example by stating that “I am ugly, but my soul must become beautiful.”\(^{210}\) For Enäjärvi, personal development was closely connected to self-discipline, to reading more, writing more and focussing better.\(^{211}\)

One difference between Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s accounts about the requirements for a scholar’s development of character was that Enäjärvi’s statements, more often than not, were paired with estimations of how well she was able to meet those requirements. Both described other people and their character, but Haavio did not berate himself for not having particular qualities that he found necessary, while Enäjärvi did so rather frequently. Haavio did not share Enäjärvi’s way of criticising her own character and personality. However, in the case of practical matters, both could criticise themselves: Haavio could, just as Enäjärvi, write that he had been working too little, a state of being that both referred to with the slang word for decay or decadence (\textit{deekis}).\(^{212}\) Enäjärvi’s views on what was desirable are found mainly in her accounts of what features she did not appreciate in herself: she was too shy,

\(^{211}\) SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (22.8.1921). Case 5. The issue of focussing on research or splitting focus into smaller tasks is discussed further in chapter 3.
nervous, and lacking in self-confidence and independence.\textsuperscript{213} Self-mockingly, she established that the only feature she could always count on was her stubbornness.\textsuperscript{214} Enäjärvi also wrote about how her choice of subjects was driven by interest, although she also repeatedly wrote about a plan to change from folklore to literature studies.\textsuperscript{215}

Research on the history of women in academia has shown that women faced both formal and informal difficulties to gain admittance to higher education and acknowledgement as scholars. The resistance against giving women access to higher education was, among other things, based on the argument that women were by nature less rational and logical than men, as well as physically too weak for academic studies and work.\textsuperscript{216} In other words, it was claimed that women did not embody the nature or character—or the persona—that was needed for academia, or that they were only able to manage their studies because of their diligence rather than because of their mental abilities.

Interestingly, Enäjärvi rarely wrote that she lacked abilities such as intelligence or the ability to think logically. Quite the opposite, she once wrote about how a man that had showed romantic interest in her seemed ignorant about her mental capacities. She pondered whether she should make the man aware of “that I have a soul too, that I am an intelligent creature, even intimidatingly intelligent.”\textsuperscript{217} Still, at another point, she asked her diary whether “am I stupid because I am a woman or because my race is stupid”.\textsuperscript{218}

Her abilities were recognised by others too. Lauri Hakulinen described Enäjärvi as intelligent and well-suited for academic work, but he made a distinction between academic fields. In his opinion, Enäjärvi had “natural talents” that suited work in chemistry or mathematics, or for being a surgeon. However, Hakulinen was not convinced that these qualities were as much of


\textsuperscript{216} Rossiter, Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940, xv; Bente Rosenbeck,HVidenskaben køn? Kvinder i forskning (Copenhagen, 2014), 108–109; See also Fara, Newton, 15; Schiebinger, The Mind Has No Sex?, 102, 123–125, 137.


64
an advantage in cultural analysis, adding that he wondered “whether women as a rule at all understand e.g. lyric poetry?”

Regarding the ability to work hard, Enäjärvi did acknowledge that devoted work habits were important for a scholar, but also berated herself for being lazy by nature. Still, Enäjärvi did only doubt more generally whether she had the strength to manage her life ambitions, not specifying which ambitions these were. This does appear to have also been a matter of mental strength rather than physical strength. The summer between her second and third year at university, she wrote in her diary that she had been carrying water to the sauna, and felt that it was wonderful to use her physical strength in a way not required in her academic life. On other occasions, her self-criticism seems to have served as a motivational tool to develop specific qualities, rather than a questioning of her general suitability for academia.

Enäjärvi also wrote that women might be different than men, but that the difference would not necessarily make women less suitable for the same work as men:

No doubt does the intellectual mental structure of a woman differ from that of the man, but it is as certain that this difference does not prevent women in some

---

219 EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:84:1 Letters from Lauri Hakulinen to O. Loorits, 25/27 (20.12.1932). Org. “luonnonlahjojensa [puolesta]”, “[m]ahtavatko naiset yleensäkään ymmärtää esim. lyriikkaa?” The comment was in the context that a newly established journal had appointed Enäjärvi as editor for its literature department. According to Christopher Lawrence, surgeons were perceived as more of a ‘doer rather than a thinker’ in contrast to the physicians, who were portrayed more as scholars, even with artistic qualities, however with the surgeons trying to shift this perception towards a more scholarly image. Christopher Lawrence, ‘Medical Minds, Surgical Bodies. Corporeality and the Doctors’, in Steven Shapin and Christopher Lawrence eds., Science Incarnate. Historical Embodiments of Natural Knowledge (Chicago and London, 1998), quote from 156; Compare also with Enäjärvi’s diary entry from 1950, when she reflected that she would probably have done well as a lawyer, but not as a mathematician, because the latter would not have matched as well her wish to work in public life. SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Diary 1950” 2.4.1950). Case 5.

220 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (7.3.1921, unbound, undated note, assumingly from 1924, see also “VI” 30.6.1922). Case 5.

221 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (7.3.1921, 14.10.1921). Case 5. In 14.10.1921, Enäjärvi uses the word “voimia”, strength (pl.), while e.g. in 7.3.1921, she wrote that she felt that she needed more guidance to find her direction than she wished, and that she was too shy for her own good.


fields complicate—at least not much—the mental work of a woman. Can we not believe that there exists an intellectual, creative field of work in which [...] a woman’s natural qualities do not hinder her from being at least as capable as men.\(^{224}\)

Two years later, she reflected that women and men work with and interpret texts differently, without specifying whether this was a remark about academic texts or texts in general: “[a] woman’s word is an adjective, a man’s a noun”, she wrote, explaining that “[a] woman expresses what something is like, a man what it is.”\(^{225}\) The two approaches to interpretations required different abilities, she reasoned. The female type of interpretation was made possible by sensitive reception and artistic expression. The male type of interpretation built on “a conceptual reconstruction”, which, she added, was more demanding.\(^{226}\) At other times, she made characterisations of women’s and men’s capacities that research has identified as even more typical for the time. In a letter to Haavio, she described herself as more emotional and less independent. In a similar manner, she complimented her good friend Maija Ruuttu for her endurance and for possessing a deeper character, traits that according to her could be compared to a man’s. In contrast, Enäjärvi described herself as compliant, less independent and thus, “unfortunately”, more feminine.\(^{227}\) The two first accounts include a reflection upon a possibility that these qualities are different but equal, while the last one states clearly that the masculine quality was the preferable one.

Although Enäjärvi explicitly described the female mode of interpretation as the sensitive and artistic alternative, her formulation does not seem to contrast a female sensitive mode of interpretation to a male rational or insensitive mode. Rather, it seems to suggest that sensitivity, although not emotionality, was a desirable character trait for a scholar. For example, Enäjärvi described her Estonian acquaintance “Mr Paul” as temperamental as well as sensitive and “Mr Oinas”, as perhaps too shy and soft, but adding that


he probably would become a good scholar.²²⁸ Neither’s sensitive character was described as a negative trait. Moreover, Enäjärvi commented upon Haavio’s emotional register in a variety of ways. According to Enäjärvi, Haavio was, among other things sensitive, emotional, creative and hot-tempered. At best, these character traits could be useful for making original analyses and poems, but they could also come out as jealousy and unsympathetic anger.²²⁹ These qualities were positive for his work as a poet, but negative in his social life. Their impact on his academic work, she did not state directly, but implicitly, the negative social impact was probably a burden. For example, she expressed shock when learning that Haavio could in a state of anger threaten to kill people that stood close to him—Enäjärvi, Hakulinen and Tauno Karilas (1900–1980).²³⁰

Enäjärvi further discussed how some people were by nature better suited for academia than others. At one point, she wrote about this as a gendered issue, when she wrote to Maija Ruuttu that she was critical that women were encouraged to “study science, in cases when they neither have the calling nor propensity for it.”²³¹ The early 1920s was a time when not only the number and proportion of women students increased both nationally and internationally. It was also a time when the number of students in general increased at universities and the social background of students became more diverse. This development lead to criticism and arguments of concern for the status and quality of higher education and scholarship.²³² Apparently, Enäjärvi did not express criticism against the general increase of students or against the democratisation movements at universities, but only against uncritical encouragement of women to attend universities. Nor did she question her own attendance at university. In 1923, Enäjärvi wrote a causerie on the topic in the magazine of the right-wing National Coalition Party’s Women’s organisation. Much of the causerie is satirical, but some remarks also appear to be serious. Among the serious remarks was a suggestion that the university should offer separate educational paths for those students who aimed at an academic career

²²⁸ SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (17.7.1921). Case 5. Org. “Hra Paul”, “Hra Oinas”. These may refer to the linguist and Enäjärvi’s future friend Paul Ariste (1905–1990) and the historian August Oinas (1898–1965), who were active in the student life in Tartu, Estonia, when Enäjärvi wrote the diary note.

²²⁹ SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (26.12.1931). Case 5. SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. For positive accounts, see e.g. letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti on Kaisa’s name day [7.11.]1924, 25.8.1927 [first part of the letter is addressed 17.8.1927]. Letters 736:(8:)5:15, 736:(8:)8:3.


and those with other ambitions—here Enäjärvi emphasised that the latter group also consisted of numerous men.233

Haavio’s accounts of women in academia confirm many of the negative views on women in academia that historical research has identified. For example, Lina Carls argues that there was a widely spread perception in Sweden that female students enrolled at university in order to find a husband rather than due to an interest in studies.234 In particular in his letters to Hakulinen during his first university years, Haavio wrote about the stupidity of the female students that he came in contact with. According to him, women could sweet-talk themselves into lower requirements for passing exams.235 He wrote contemptuously of women who, in his opinion, flirted around and babbled in high-pitch voices over nothing.236 Overall, female students, in his view, lacked intelligence. Only two female students were explicit exceptions: the Estonian student Virve Kallas (1901–1953) and Elsa Enäjärvi. Whereas other women received pejorative and mocking remarks, Kallas and Enäjärvi were praised to the skies for their brilliance, charm and intelligence, which was very much in contrast to Haavio’s descriptions of female students in general.237

If Enäjärvi’s self-critical accounts of her not being fit for the path she chose might have been implicitly gendered, her reflections about women’s alternatives to either combine career and family or pursue a career and remain unmarried certainly were explicitly so. As will be discussed further in chapter 7, she expressed doubts about whether an unmarried woman could be happy or whether it was possible to combine family life with a career. She also reflected upon the low number of women in academia and how it affected hers and other female students’ university life: “The company of an intelligent man is pleasant, but to meet an intelligent woman causes utter joy. Men are currently in a more favourable position at university than women also because the teachers are men.”238

234 Carls, Våp eller nucka?, 160, 175.
236 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 12.7.1919, (see also 7.5.1919, compare with 2.5.1920). Letter 730:(2:)3:17 (see also 730:(2:)3:13, compare with 730:(2:)4:11).
237 See e.g. SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Diaries (1.11.1920, 13.11.1920, 21.1.1923). Case 5.1; Letters from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 7.5.1919, 2.5.1920, 17.2.1921 (Kallas), 20.1.1923 (Enäjärvi), 15.2.1923, 16.7.1923 (Enäjärvi), undated [November/December 1923]. Letters 730:(2:)3:13, 730:(2:)4:11, 731:(3:)1:4, 731:(3:)9:3, 731:(3:)9:10, 758:(23:)6:1, 731:(3:)11:9; Eskola, Kahden, 280, 308, see also 458. Haavio’s dealings with Virve Kallas are discussed further in chapter 5.
In conclusion, Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s accounts on the character of the (folklore) scholar show that they both consciously observed others’—often their seniors’—ways of being scholars. Their accounts further show an awareness of which actions and behaviours were either more conventional or were more esteemed ways of being scholars, that is, there was an awareness of variations of scholarly personae and how successful these various models were expected to be. While Enäjärvi sometimes reflected about whether her personality was suitable for an academic career, both she and Haavio often reflected on how to improve their personalities to better achieve their desired goals.

Outside perspectives on Haavio and Enäjärvi as folklore scholars

The focus of this dissertation is on how Enäjärvi and Haavio acted in order to form a folklorist’s persona, not on the reception of their academic work or judgements of their scholarly credibility. From the viewpoint of the process of persona shaping, it is, however, interesting to mirror their accounts of desired traits in scholars to what was written about them from an outside perspective. For this purpose, I will briefly scrutinise the formal assessments on Haavio’s docent title and professorship applications in folklore in 1932 and the media reporting of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s doctoral defences and their participation in their doctoral commencement ceremony. Such assessments are interesting because they offer an opportunity to compare the merits, skills and scholarly qualities that Enäjärvi and Haavio had written about during their early years at university with formal statements written by authorities in their academic field at the very end of the timeframe of this dissertation. The media reporting illuminates how Haavio, and in particular Enäjärvi, were presented as scholars to the general audience. Unlike the formal documents, these external reviews and commentaries similarly invite to discussions about gender and perceptions of scholars.

Formal assessments of Haavio’s research

The Section for History and Languages at the Faculty of Arts received assessments of Haavio’s work for the docent application from Folklore Professor Emeritus Kaarle Krohn and from Professor Uno Harva. The assessments for the professorship were submitted in late 1932 by Harva and professor, language scholar E.N. Setälä (1864–1935), who also at the time was the chancellor of the University of Turku. In many ways, the evaluations...
echoed the same notions about good scholars that Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about in their private documents.

The first observation of corresponding perceptions of what it took to be a good folklorist was that the assessors confirmed Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s views of good scholars as productive and hard-working. In their professorship assessments, Harva and Setälä both pointed out that considering his young age, Haavio had published a considerable number of scholarly works.

Another recurring notion that appeared in the evaluations was reflected in comments on the craft of working with the historic-geographic method. Setälä found that Haavio’s dissertation proved that he adequately managed the theoretical framework, although Setälä thought it would have been further improved by an even more thorough theoretical examination. Similarly, he thought that Haavio had satisfactory methodological competence, but that he needed further experience to fully master the method. Both assessors confirmed the importance of abundant source material and international comparisons for proper work within the field. To rely on secondary literature for the comparisons was admitted as necessary to some extent, but Harva noted that such practices should be as limited as possible. At best, the folklorist should have extensive experience from fieldwork, like Väinö Salminen, who eventually was appointed professor. Good research should also fulfil the formal requirements of scholarly writing. For example, Setälä remarked that he had found incorrect references in Haavio’s work. Moreover, Setälä pointed out that Haavio’s dissertation contained imperfections in the division into language groups. He motivated his critique by stating that “[t]he remark is formal, yet of principal importance.”

The assessors were not convinced by all of the results and conclusions presented in Haavio’s scholarship, but still considered the work to be a positive contribution to the research field. Similarly, Harva expressed positive opinions about the professorship applicant Väinö Salminen’s book on Ancient Finnish poetry. In Harva’s view, Salminen had not been able to answer many of his research questions, but the book still showed an informed critical

approach and offered new outlooks and inspiration to the field. Like Enäjärvi, Setälä and Harva also wrote about how scholars could have a certain instinct that made them particularly good in their field. Harva and Setälä also wrote positively about creativity, which enabled the folklorist to interpret their material in new ways and suggest innovative solutions to old, unsolved problems. However, the assessing professors were sceptical about excessively creative interpretations, as they repeatedly dismissed applicants’ research results for lacking enough proof or for making unsubstantiated, far-reaching conclusions.

As with creativity, a folklorist had to master the right balance between breadth and depth in research topics. As discussed above, Haavio had advised Hakulinen to choose subjects of study that were close enough to create synergy effects but also different enough to not make his field of expertise too narrow. A similar balance appears to have been considered crucial within the field of folklore studies. On the one hand, the assessors found it important that the applicants had conducted research on folklore both within and outside Finland. In other words, the applicants should demonstrate an ability to research in both Finnish folklore and comparative folklore, as the discipline’s name was a compound of these two parts. The assessors also described mastery of a wide range of research topics as an indication of productiveness and diligence. On the other hand, they warned that a large range of research topics risked a shallow scattering of scholarly focus at the cost of deeper investigation and analysis. Similarly, each research topic called for a similar balancing act between wide international comparisons and thorough qualitative analysis. In Herman Paul’s terms of persona, we could see creativity and diligence as virtues of the folklore scholar, and retrieving information of the ancient past of the Finns as a good.

The assessors had a gatekeeper role in the academic system. Without their recognition of the applicants’ work and person, the applicants could not gain the form of formal acknowledgement that a permanent position or a title could offer. In terms of persona, the assessors had power to affect what would be what Daston and Sibum calls “a collective with a shared and recognizable physiognomy”, as quoted in the beginning of the chapter. In part, this was achieved by explicitly promoting the applicants that they favoured. At the

same time, they also affected what kind of people the students and junior scholars would observe to obtain information of what was expected of them, as discussed in the previous chapter sections.

Doctoral defences and commencement ceremony in media

When Enäjärvi obtained her doctoral degree, it was given nationwide attention. Despite Haavio being as much of a celebrity as Enäjärvi at the time of his doctoral defence, news coverage of his doctoral defence was meagre. When comparing the articles reporting about Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s defences, the difference appears to have been at least in part due to the relative rarity of women obtaining a doctoral degree, which was reflected in how the articles emphasised the contrasts between Enäjärvi’s femininity and academia’s masculine features.

In the Finnish academic system, the finalised doctoral dissertation is examined in a public defence. Colleagues, family and friends, as well as anyone else who is interested can join the audience. The examination is conducted by a so-called opponent, who is a senior scholar in the same or in a related field. Today, the opponent is chosen among scholars who have not been closely connected to the dissertation project. In contrast to this, in the early twentieth century, custom had it that the doctoral candidate’s supervisor acted as the opponent.

After obtaining their degree, newly minted masters and doctoral graduates could attend the university’s commencement ceremony. The doctors’ graduate ceremonial symbols were a draped top hat with the faculty’s emblem and a sword and both men and women were dressed in formal black attire. The masters’ graduate symbol was a laurel wreath. For the ceremony, masters-to-be graduates asked a significant friend, typically of the opposite sex, to bind them a laurel-wreath. The wreath-binders participated in the ceremony, and in a traditional setting, the ceremony hall was filled with male students and scholars dressed in black tailcoats and female wreath-binders dressed in white. The dress codes were based on gender and not on roles in the ceremony, so when women began to participate in the ceremony as master graduates (first in 1882) and men as wreath-binders, women still wore white and men black. In the visual scenery of the ceremony, the colour-coding highlighted the increasing mixing of sexes in these roles.251

---

251 For images, see e.g. ‘Eiliset promotsionijuhlallisuudet,’ Helsingin Sanomat (1 June 1927), 8–9; ‘Kuvasatoa H:gin Yliopiston promotionijuhlallisuuksista’, Suomen Kuvalehti, 24, 1927, 916–917; See also E. E-vi., ‘Promotsionipakinaa. Vastavihitty maisteri, jonka laakeri viheriöi...’, 139.
The doctoral defences were announced in newspapers.\footnote{252} Newspapers could also publish articles about defences.\footnote{253} Haavio’s defence was noted in two newspapers in short inserts, with details about the title, date and opponent.\footnote{254} Journals of organisations that Haavio had close connections to published congratulatory notices.\footnote{255}

Enäjärvi’s defence gained more media attention. There were at least six articles on Enäjärvi’s doctoral defence, and one interview about her research later the same year. Two of the articles on the defence are almost exact copies.\footnote{256} According to the articles, the auditorium where the defence took place was so filled with people that even after extra chairs had been carried in, some of the audience had to observe the defence from outside the auditorium.\footnote{257} It seems that there was a mixture of reasons for the great interest in Enäjärvi’s defence. The articles pointed out that Enäjärvi was a public figure, known to a wider audience for her cultural reviews, articles and her travel book on England, which was published in 1928.\footnote{258} As mentioned above, another reason was probably that there was still a more general public interest in the uncommon occasions when women attained doctoral degrees.

Whether or not the articles were published due to an interest in the rare event of a women defending her doctoral dissertation, it is at least clear that all the articles highlighted feminine features of the doctoral candidate. There were positive descriptions of Enäjärvi’s dress and hair, as well as remarks on that she would now be able to wear “the less becoming but all the more awe-inspiring doctoral hat”.\footnote{259} The descriptions of Enäjärvi’s behaviour during the defence framed her as a fragile and feminine participant in a hard, masculine

\footnote{252} See e.g. ‘– Helsingin yliopisto.’, \textit{Uusi Suomi} (20 May 1928), 7; ‘Helsingin yliopisto.’, \textit{Karjala} (24 May 1929), 2; ‘Helsingin Yliopisto.’, \textit{Helsingin Sanomat} (11 May 1929), 3; ‘Helsingin Yliopisto.’, \textit{Helsingin Sanomat} (1 May 1929), 7.

\footnote{253} Annajoeli, ‘Uusi tri.’, \textit{Turun Sanomat} (8 December 1929), 5; ‘Kolme väitöstitaisuutta eilen yliopistossa.’, \textit{Uusi Suomi} (26 May 1927), 6; It was not always the doctoral candidate that gained most attention. For example, when Olof Sievert defended his dissertation, Uusi Suomi reported about the occasion that this was the first time a woman, Dr Elsa Ryti, acted as an opponent. Terttu, ‘Nainen vastaväittäjänä.’, \textit{Uusi Suomi} (26 May 1927), 11; The reports could also address defences held abroad: ‘Tohtoriväitös Norjan maatalouskorkeakoulussa’, \textit{Kouvolan Sanomat} (29 January 1927), 1.

\footnote{254} ‘Uusi fil. tohtori.’, \textit{Lahti} (28 September 1929), 1; ‘Uusi fil. tohtori’, \textit{Etelä-Saimaa} (1 October 1929).


\footnote{256} ‘Leikki-Tohtori’, \textit{Heinolan Sanomat} (4 June 1932), 2; ‘Tohtori.’, \textit{Turun Sanomat} (29 May 1932), 2.


\footnote{258} Enäjärvi’s book \textit{Vanha iloinen Englanti} is further discussed in chapter 6.

setting. She was described as looking pale, but it was also noted that she was calm and held her introductory lecture in a pleasant tone. Salminen added that it was impressive that Enäjärvi “had managed to gather so much knowledge and wisdom in her feminine head”. Krohn was described as a kind opponent, who had begun his comments by stating that he was pleased with Enäjärvi’s dissertation. Krohn “with his gentle character”, could not make Enäjärvi afraid, Salminen wrote, while the pen name Väkä stated that even when there was more of a debate, “the sweet respondent asserted herself well.”

The word “sweet” (herttainen) emphasises an endearing quality and appears to carry a feminine connotation. However, similar endearing characterisations were also used in the media for men, whose academic credibility was definitely not contested. For example, the newspaper *Uusi Suomi* published a congratulatory article on Kaarle Krohn’s sixtieth birthday, in which Krohn was described as a “sweet and humble professor”. Similarly, Salminen described the Professor of Aesthetics Yrjö Hirn (1870–1952) in the article on Enäjärvi’s defence as “beautiful”. A similar narrative about the discrepancy between femininity and academic success was told in the weekly journal *Allas Krönika*. The journal published a three-page-long interview with Enäjärvi and Aune Lindström (1901–1984), who had obtained her doctoral title at the commencement ceremony together with Enäjärvi. The journalist summarised her impression of her visit to Enäjärvi:

Imagine that it is possible to be both a lady and a PhD, I am wondering, deeply sunk in a comfortable armchair in Dr Enäjärvi-Haavio’s peaceful study. In my naiveté, I had imagined that the appearance of scientific women more or less bear marks of their studies and now I feel pleasantly surprised by the sight of my fresh, young interviewee. She presides in the sofa with a little smile on her face, dressed in a beautiful embroidered Russian blouse and does not look like her studies would have affected her the slightest.

---

263 Salminen, ‘Leikkitohtori’, 7. Org. “kaunis”. To be precise, Salminen described Hirn’s head to be beautiful: “eventually, Professor Hirn’s beautiful, grey head rise and he asked whether someone had something to remark.” [“Lopuksi nousi prof. Hirnin kaunis, harmaa pää ja hän kysyi, oliko kenelläkään mitään muistuttamista.”].
The article continued with gendered remarks about Enäjärvi as “the little doctor” who was “at the same time so cute and learned and vivid.” The doctoral symbols, the top hat and the sword, were also repeatedly mentioned in the interviews. Moreover, the journalist found it relevant to emphasise the young age of the interviewees. At Lindström’s, von Schoultz wrote that she had difficulties to remember to address her as “doctor” instead of “miss”. Apparently, Enäjärvi did not give the same impression, although she was the same age as Lindström (and six years older than von Schoultz). Enäjärvi, who unlike Lindström was married at the time, was addressed both “Mrs” and “doctor” in the article. Another discursive trope that both Enäjärvi’s responses and von Schoultz’s comments repeated was to downplay the seriousness and burdens of Enäjärvi’s work and success. According to the article, Enäjärvi emphasised that Haavio was much more successful than she was and suggested that von Schoultz perhaps found Enäjärvi’s research topic to be childish. The journalist denied this, and the article repeatedly described Enäjärvi’s work as interesting and fun. Enäjärvi also showed her dissertation to the journalist, regretting that it looked so “unnecessarily long and grand, but it is only due to the thick paper—I grieved for that for two days” (the dissertation comprised about 300 pages no matter the thickness of the paper).

The doctoral defence as an academic tradition and the doctoral degree were in these articles portrayed as contrasting to feminine character traits. The hat did not look flattering on the light curls of a female doctor, but nonetheless, or perhaps for that same reason, it commanded respect from the people in attendance. Enäjärvi’s opponent was apparently expected to intimidate the doctoral candidate, but he was fortunately gentle and kind. In other words, the female doctoral candidate had in many ways obtained her degree despite her feminine character. In the examples above, it was women who made the remarks that diminished the achievements or emphasised the softer character of women in academia. The contrast of seeing a woman in a male dominated field as academia was further visualised by the concluding remark of the pen name Väkä. The article ended by congratulating “the new doctor, ‘woman of

dr. Enäjärvi-Haavios fridfulla arbetsrum. I min naivitet hade jag föreställt mig att vetenskapliga kvinnor mer eller mindre skulle bära prägel av sin lärdom i det yttre och känner mig nu angenämt överraskad vid äsyrnen av mitt fräsha unga intervjuoffer, som iförd en vacker broderad rysk blus småleende presiderar i soffan och ser ut som om allt studerande inte bekommits henne det minsta.” According to Eskola, “Priffe” was the pen name of Solveig von Schoultz. Eskola Yhdessä, 282.


science’ and culture person”, with inverted commas for the possibility of making a new term for women as scientists.267

Two of the articles used the wordplay “leikkitohtori” to describe Enäjärvi’s dissertation on singing games.268 The word is a compound of leikki, which means game or play, and tohtori, which means doctor. However, leikki in the initial position of a compound word can also mean that something is make-believe, in particular as in children’s play: in this case as playing or pretending to be a PhD. A corresponding wordplay was also used by a Swedish tabloid *Aftonbladet* that published an interview with Enäjärvi half a year later. Unlike the Finnish articles and columns, the Swedish article also began by continuing the same children’s play theme as was referred to in its title. One would think, it stated, that writing a doctoral dissertation on children’s games could be managed by a schoolgirl after third grade. The article then continued by letting Enäjärvi explain that quite the opposite from such an assumption, singing games could give insights about culture on a much larger scale. Moreover, the article explained for the reader that folk games were not only a Finnish field of interest, although the Finnish folklore archives had the world’s most extensive collections on the topic. It was also of international interest and even Swedish scholars worked in the field.269

How should we understand the appearance of such wordplay in the titles of articles? None of the articles had the character of news reporting. Instead they were more entertaining in nature, like some opinion columns, causeries and interviews that were conducted to popularise a research topic. Humour was not uncommon in these types of texts. Although the wordplay mocks Enäjärvi’s dissertation and degree, she appears to have been expected to find it amusing or at least not to be offended by it. Seere Salminen, who was the author of the first of the articles that used the wordplay, had become Enäjärvi’s friend when both lived in London in 1927, and they continued a friendly correspondence after Enäjärvi had returned home. It is, however, notable that no similar wordplay was constructed for Haavio’s defence. In his case, it would have been possible to make a similar, although not as common, construct by calling him a “satutohtori”, a (fairy)tale doctor, but not even the congratulatory media notices, which had a humorous tone, did this.

After Enäjärvi’s defence, she and Haavio participated together in the doctoral degree commencement ceremony in the summer of 1932. Like Enäjärvi’s defence, their attendance in the commencement ceremony was noted in newspapers and journals. The commencement ceremonies were in the early twentieth century arranged about every five years and were reported

---

267 Väkä, ‘Tohtori…’, 4. Org. “uutta tohtoria, ‘tiedenaista’ ja kulttuurikilöää.” The Finnish word for scientist, “tiedemies”, consists of the parts “tiede” (science) and “mies” (man). In the quote, “man” was replaced by the partitive case of “nainen” (woman).
in newspapers nationwide. Unlike the articles on Enäjärvi’s defence, the articles on the 1932 commencement ceremony did not focus on her or Haavio, but on the 50-year masters’ jubilees of the first female university graduate Emma Irene Åström (1847–1934) and president Per Eivind Svinhufvud (1861–1944). Haavio and/or Enäjärvi were only briefly mentioned in a couple of articles. Three authors wrote that the event was special because it was the first time that a married couple was officially honoured and recognised as doctors at the same time, adding a few words or lines about the fact that Haavio and Enäjärvi shared a research field and that they were known to the general audience as authors. The exception was the weekly journal *Kansan Kuvalehti*, which published a photo collage from the commencement ceremony, filling their entire front cover with the commencement photo of Enäjärvi and Haavio. By this time, Enäjärvi and Haavio were definitely celebrities, both as individuals and as a couple.

**Concluding comments**

Studying Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts about university studies and academic work shows that they identified formal and informal expectations and models for what a folklore scholar should study, how the research should be conducted and how the folklorist should be as a person. The status of...
folklore as a national discipline and the dominating historic-geographic school shaped many of these expectations and models.

For young Finnish folklore scholars, the method to work with was by default the historic-geographic method, which set their research questions and the practices for obtaining source material. The method required a delicate balance between, on the one hand, a wide range of knowledge and sources and, on the other hand, skills in in-depth analysis. A combination of breadth and depth was present in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts regarding which subjects a student should study as well as which subjects should be present within their individual research projects. Their accounts show that studies and research to a large extent were motivated by interest, even passionate interest in the topics. Mostly, this interest was anchored to the ideological dimension of the national disciplines.

Enäjärvi and Haavio also sensed that there were certain requirements regarding scholars’ personal qualities. These personal qualities correspond both to Herman Paul’s category of virtues and skills, and to the personal traits that Mineke Bosch identifies as building blocks of scholarly persona. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts illuminate that students obtained information about what these requirements were through literature and observations of peers and senior scholars. Some were skills that were specifically required for a folklorist and could be acquired through training, such as proficiency in languages and a set system for how to use and refer to sources. Moreover, both Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about certain personal qualities or character traits (comparable to Paul’s concept of virtues) that they strived to pursue and develop. For example, they tried to become more hard-working, focussed and well-read. Both were occupied with writing about these issues, but Enäjärvi was harsher on herself for not meeting her standards. In addition, Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about a third category of qualities, which people possessed by nature. They could be intelligent, delightful, inspirational, creative and have an instinct that guided them in research.

The newspaper articles on Enäjärvi’s doctoral defence as well as Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s private documents show that personal qualities that were required for success in academia were perceived as more typical for men than for women. In particular, during his student years, Haavio was scornful of female students in general, claiming that they were unintelligent and unsuitable for university studies. Only a few individual women, including Enäjärvi, were exceptions in his view. Enäjärvi’s view of women in academia was not as restrictive, but she considered it rarer to come across women in academia with as high academic qualities as among men in academia. However, she also discussed the possibility that this was due to nurture rather than nature. The rarity of women who advanced in academia was also visible in the media attention given to Enäjärvi’s doctoral defence, in which the reporting markedly emphasised the femininity of the newly minted doctor in contrast to the masculine academic environment she was entering. Here, Enäjärvi’s femininity was emphasised by discussing her feminine appearance,
expressing surprise by her academic qualities and person, and by using belittling descriptions of her research topic, work and person. In one of the interviews, Enäjärvi, too, toned down her effort and excellence.

It is interesting that the various sources not only demonstrate a perception of the rarity of women with qualities and skills that were held in high esteem in academia, but also that the descriptions of the rare women who did succeed were written in positive terms. In other words, they described women as naturally or commonly less suitable for academia in the same way as historical research on gender and academia has shown. However, they did not include comments about the women who were exceptions to this as unnatural, unfeminine or morally questionable women, which are perceptions that for example Swedish historian Lina Carls has shown to have been used to claim women to be less suitable for academia.275

The historic-geographic school was connected to the more general ideological, nationalist aims of the national disciplines. This fixed method and ideological aim set the framework for the folklorist’s persona and, as a consequence, what knowledge in folklore was produced. The ideological framework and the folklorists’ general interest in culture were also mirrored in students’ and scholars’ interests outside academia. Moreover, academic work and academic discussions also “leaked” outside the university walls, taking place at societies, archives and in scholars’ homes. In the next chapter, I will discuss how Helsinki offered an arena for an academic public intelligentsia.

275 Carls, Våp eller nucka?, 160, 175.
3. Helsinki: Academic public intellectuals in an entangled sphere of scholarship, politics and culture

“Studying nothing but chain tales is probably not the purpose of life”, Haavio wrote to his Estonian colleague Oskar Loorits in 1931. While Haavio’s point, in this case, was that he was planning to expand his research interests within folklore, his engagements in a variety of spheres outside academia demonstrates that his life indeed consisted of many activities other than research. Both Haavio and Enäjärvi were engaged in a variety of associations: semi-academic societies for folk culture studies, political organisations and student organisations. Moreover, they were both known as writers and editors of articles, reviews, poetry, essays, causeries and political statements. Unlike Haavio, Enäjärvi was frequently self-critical for giving into the temptation of writing shorter works at the expense of her research time. However, neither she nor Haavio mentioned that their various engagements would have encroached on their credibility as scholars. Rather, they appear to have found the various spheres combinable.

Participating in various public spheres was common among early twentieth century Finnish academics. Finnish historian Jouni Ahmajärvi uses the term “academic public intellectuals” for this group of scholars. According to Ahmajärvi, these academic public intellectuals could use their academic authority also when arguing for their cause outside academia. Enäjärvi and Haavio were not yet in the 1920s and early 1930s established academics, and it is interesting to examine how they acted and made themselves known in public debate parallel to their early academic years. This chapter is divided into three main parts: Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s participation in societies, politics and culture. I ask how Enäjärvi and Haavio navigated through these three fields and incorporated them into their scholarly repertoires. In a fourth part of the chapter, I discuss compatibilities and conflicts of involvement in these three fields. I argue that rather than jeopardizing scholarly credibility, it was rational, and even expected, both in regard to income and an academic career to intertwine a folklorist’s persona with more general participation in

277 Ahmajärvi, Ihmisluonto, yhteiskuntaevoluutio ja rauhanomaisen kehityksen mahdollisuudet, 214. I use here “culture” in a very narrow sense, referring to literature, theatre and alike.
public life. Here, persona can be understood in Mineke Bosch’s usage of the concept as a compilation of building blocks, where some blocks are comprised by engagement in public life beyond academia. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts of competing and coexisting public engagements also open discussions of persona formation in regard to Herman Paul’s view of virtues and goods as building blocks of persona. Especially Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s political interests open discussions of ideals that direct scholarly work, such as objectivity and serving the state.\textsuperscript{278}

Two groups of associations are left out from this chapter, namely the student associations and the associations for female academics. The reason is that Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts offer few reflections that would illuminate these associations’ role in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s persona formation. In the cases where the sources do illuminate these issues, I have found it more fruitful to discuss them in other chapters, as these instances have typically been connected to other arenas of academic life, in particular to the Estonian-Finnish academic exchange (chapter 5) and the international community of academic women (chapter 6). Although Enäjärvi and Haavio did not reflect upon the impact of student associations in the 1920s and early 1930s, they did acknowledge this impact retrospectively. For example, Enäjärvi reasoned in a letter to Haavio in 1942 that ethnologist Kustaa Vilkuna’s (1902–1980) lack of sensitivity and balanced views in political and academic debates was because he had “slept” during his student years. In Enäjärvi’s view, Vilkuna’s character, visions and networks would have been refined by activity in student associations during these early years.\textsuperscript{279}

**Societies for folk culture studies**

Since folkloristics had only a small department at the University of Helsinki, much of the scholarship in the field was conducted in connection to a variety of societies. The societies gathered a mixture of established scholars and people with more or less direct links to the university, as well as scholars from other disciplines than the national sciences. They organised lectures and social gatherings and financed research and also played an important role in maintaining the main archives of folklore, philology and cultural history. In the following section, I will give an overview of some of the main societies for folk culture studies and their connection to some of the political landscape in nineteenth and early twentieth century Finland. I will then discuss how the documents of Enäjärvi and Haavio portray the societies as arenas for students for networking, scholarships and integration into the academic community.

\textsuperscript{278} See e.g. Lorraine Daston and Peter Galison, *Objectivity* (New York, 2007), 16–17; Carson, ‘Objectivity and the Scientist: Heisenberg Rethinks’.

The oldest and largest society was the Finnish Literature Society (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, SKS), founded in 1831. Its aim was to support contemporary writing and publishing in Finnish as well as promote collections and research on literature, language and other cultural issues. Much of its earliest efforts were directed toward supporting writing and publishing of the epic poem Kalevala. The SKS also established a folklore archive in Helsinki. It contained the material that Elias Lönnrot had collected in the regions Kainuu and Karelia, some of which had laid the foundation of Kalevala. The archive also contained other folklore material that both amateur collectors and scholars had collected in and outside Finland, and became, and it still is, one of the largest folklore collections in the world.

For the SKS, it was not only important to publish literature on Finnish culture and language. It was also important that it was published in Finnish. Although the national romanticists had been in pursuit of finding the national spirit of the Finns, at the outset it had not been essential that this would occur in Finnish. As was discussed in chapter 2, the administrative language had been, without much reservation, Swedish until 1809. During the first decades under Russian rule, more and more voices were raised for making the majority of the inhabitants’ mother tongue, Finnish, the principal language also in the public sphere. At the time, little was written in Finnish, and thus a prime aim for the supporters of the project was to expand the usage of the Finnish language to official contexts as well as the arts.

The language question affected also the founding and practices of other cultural societies in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. One of the largest was the Society of Swedish Literature in Finland (Svenska Litteratursällskapet i Finland, SLS). It was founded in 1885 as a counter initiative to the SKS, with the aim of supporting the publishing of new literature and funding collections and research on the oral and literary traditions of the Swedish speaking Finns. Other societies with interests in folk culture were the Kalevala Society (Kalevalaseura) founded in 1911, the Finno-Ugrian Association (Suomalais-Ugrilainen Seura) founded in 1883 and the Society for the Study of Finnish (Kotikielen Seura) established in 1876. While these were tightly connected to typical language questions and nationalist projects by studying the Finnish and Finnish related languages and cultures, these organisations usually kept a moderate stance in the public debate on language issues and nationalist questions. Instead, these groups mainly confined themselves to the academic sphere and scholarly questions.

---

This did not, however, keep individual members and board members from participating in the public debate. Since the community of scholars in the national sciences was small, disputes between scholars became particularly concrete within the small research fields. Associations had the positive effect of offering income sources when academic positions were scarce. Typically, scholars were members of several associations with similar profiles. However, political and academic disagreements could cause career barriers, which can be illustrated by the circumstances leading up to the establishment of the Dictionary Foundation (Sanakirjasäätiö). The foundation’s aim was to collect, organise and publish a complete dictionary on Finnish dialects. The foundation was established by multiple organisations, among others the Finnish Literature Society, the Kalevala Society, the University of Helsinki and the Finnish Ministry of Education. According to Finnish historian Kristiina Kalleinen, Lauri Hakulinen was considered the most merited candidate for director of the foundation, but was dismissed by Professor Emil Nestor Setälä, who, among other affiliations, was the chair of the Kalevala Society. Hakulinen had criticised Setälä’s research methods and theories to be old-fashioned, but there was also a political issue at stake, namely that Hakulinen was in the inner circle of the Academic Karelia Society, while Setälä promoted more moderate policies.

The societies played a significant role in academic life. They were so present in academic life that it is difficult to separate the two from each other. Students were early on integrated into the domain of these associations. The scholars of national disciplines were not unique for their involvement in a variety of associations, as were other scholars too. However, the national disciplines had strikingly entangled connections between academia and society. Lectures were given at university, but the folklore seminars took place at the folklore archive of the SKS. The societies also arranged evening events with lectures, to which students, scholars and people without direct affiliation to university were welcome. Some of the lectures were given by foreign guests, others by Finnish scholars. Students, too, could be invited to

---

285 Kinnunen, Sata vuotta suomalaista folkloristiiikkaa, 2.
give presentations: Martti Haavio gave his first presentation on a folklore topic at the Finnish Literature Society in 1920.287

The societies, and in particular the SKS, were also places where students and scholars met, either at events held there or more casually. Through these informal meetings, students became introduced to senior scholars. They were also important information channels for students, as is demonstrated in Haavio’s letter to Hakulinen in September 1918, at the beginning of his university studies. Haavio told Hakulinen that obtaining information about what he as a new student was expected to study, when and how the studies in practice were realised, was an exhausting process. After seeking information from various persons and places, he eventually went to meet Professor Eemil Aukusti Tunkelo:

I will tell you about my visit to Dr. Tunkelo, Tunkelo, who now-a-days is the head of [the department of] Finnish Language and Literature. I am at the house of the Finnish Literature Society, the third floor, to the right is Tunkelo 12-1. —I ring the bell like crazy and a smallish, friendly-looking, rather old gentleman emerges and announces himself to be Dr. T. ‘Prof. Krohn is here visiting, please wait a while!’ and he thrusts me into the Finn. Literature Society’s festive hall, where everything is pell-mell after the summer: The chairs are upside down, there are boxes of word cards on and behind the chairs, I sit and wonder and look at the statue of Lönrot and at Dr. Granfeldt, who also sits there and calls on the telephone every half-a-minute. The time is 12.30, 12.45, 1.00, 1.15—Oh Lord, has he forgotten me in his absent-mindedness? At 1.35, Tunkelo steps in and begins explaining to me in a friendly voice: [...]288

The visit was like a rite of passage for Haavio. He had gone to visit Tunkelo nervously, without knowing what to expect from the visit and apparently without even knowing what the professor looked like. Because of a more important visitor, he had been ushered away to a sort of backstage of the Literature Society: the festive hall which normally served as a place of official receptions. The festive hall was a mess and the archive cards, which visitors only saw in absolute order, were lying around as they had arrived from field collections. Haavio sat there for more than an hour, staring at the statue of a

legendary folklore collector, without knowing how long he would have to wait and what would happen next. What happened was a friendly reception and information on exactly what Haavio should do for his studies. He was “in Seventh Heaven, even in the Seventeenth Heaven” and the letters to Hakulinen that followed during the rest of the autumn semester were full of excited accounts of student life at university, student organisations and societies for folk culture studies.289

The associations for folk culture studies played a crucial role as funders of research and collection journeys. They offered physical locations where informal information about how the funding and collection journeys functioned was spread to students. As will be discussed in chapter 4, Haavio wrote about how he at the associations met scholars who instructed him in how to obtain grants for collection journeys. Tunkelo was not the only more prominent scholar that Haavio met in connection to an association. Shortly after the encounter with Tunkelo, Haavio was at the folklore archive, where folklorist Väinö Salminen (1880–1947) had shown him precious old manuscripts. Without notice, Professor Kaarle Krohn had stepped in, started talking and commented that the manuscripts indeed were “fun material.”290 Once, Krohn asked the young Haavio to come to the Literature Society, where it turned out that he wished to introduce him to a young Norwegian guest, Nils Lid (1890–1958), who was working on a doctoral dissertation, and whom Haavio corresponded with long after Lid left Helsinki.291

Haavio’s account on his first meeting with Tunkelo also illuminates how fluid the borders between university, societies and homes of scholars were. In particular, professors in the humanities could still in the early twentieth century choose to arrange seminars in their homes. Even more commonly, professors arranged oral exams in their homes. While we can expect that there could be gender biases in which students were or felt welcome for more informal visits, the oral exams included female and male students alike. Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s accounts differ in their way of describing these meetings. Enäjärvi was briefer in her accounts, for example noting in her diary that she had had “an audience at Tunkelo”, apparently to discuss her bachelor’s thesis. Haavio wrote in particular to Hakulinen in greater detail about his meeting with senior scholars, including visits to their homes. For example, he had visited Antti Aarne under very casual circumstances. Aarne, he wrote “welcomed me warmly. I was taking off my second galosh, when he entered, lumbering and trotting slowly in his slippers... He had me sitting in a

rocking chair. We talked, of course, about the dissertation. A pure joy was alive in his eyes.”

Later, as mature scholars, Enäjärvi and Haavio could frequently be found at the associations, both in formal and indeed in informal situations. They were members of a variety of associations and also members of their boards. Haavio became a part-time archivist at SKS’s folklore archive, which gave him a small, yet helpful income when working on his doctoral dissertation.

Similar to Haavio’s story about his encounter with Tunkelo, Enäjärvi and Haavio also became figures in academic anecdotes. Folklore professor Matti Kuusi (1914–1998), for instance, wrote in his autobiography how he, then a young and nervous master student, had visited Enäjärvi and Haavio to discuss a dissertation topic. Like in Haavio’s account of his first visit to Tunkelo, Kuusi wrote that he had entered nervously, fearing that his encounter had failed, but had eventually been warmly welcomed to the scholarly home and exciting discussions.

In the same chapter, Kuusi wrote how he years later, only a month before Enäjärvi passed away, had thought that he had been alone at the folklore archive on Boxing Day, when the archive was closed. To his surprise, he had found Enäjärvi there, immersed in her research on Shrovetide traditions.

Politics

In February 1923, Martti Haavio wrote a passionate passage, with exclamation marks, underlining and a concluding powerful curse word:

> When the wind of national awakening is blowing, one must not retreat to a rat hole. Must not!!! We must, for once, contribute with an oar, so that the project can take off from shore. Just believe me. And if [the students and scholars of] Turku do not stand by our side; Perkele.

---


Haavio had become member of the nationalist Academic Karelia Society, which was becoming an influential organisation for Finnish language politics, pan-nationalist ideologies and the expansive pursuits of a Greater Finland. Presumably, Haavio’s “We” referred to academics. In Haavio’s passage, Helsinki stood at the centre, and he was urging the students and scholars in the country’s other university town, Turku, to participate in the nationalist project. Scholarship and politics were far from separated in this conviction.

In terms of political convictions, Elsa Enäjärvi and Martti Haavio represent typical examples of scholars in the national disciplines. Like most of their colleagues at university at large, they sympathised with right wing politics. For Enäjärvi and Haavio, this meant in practice engagement in language politics, nationalist politics and kindred people politics. In this chapter section, I will examine Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s political engagement during the 1920s and early 1930s through examples from some of the forums they used for voicing their views. First, I discuss some of the organisations with political agendas that Enäjärvi and Haavio participated in, followed by a section on how they presented their opinions through publishing.

The Academic Karelia Society and other political organisations

As was the case with semi-academic societies, Enäjärvi and Haavio participated in or were members of several political organisations simultaneously. In most of these, Enäjärvi and Haavio were not particularly actively engaged, but two associations make a notable exception: the Estonian-Finnish student club/the Kinship club and the Academic Karelia Society. The former will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5, while the latter will be discussed below in this chapter section after a short comment on Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s affiliation to party politics.

During the period under investigation here, Enäjärvi and Haavio were not actively involved in political parties. Haavio was for a couple of years in the 1920s a member of the right-wing National Coalition Party. In the late 1940s, Enäjärvi participated more actively in the National Coalition Party. She was elected member of the Helsinki city council in 1949 and elector in the president elections in 1950, and both Enäjärvi and Haavio were on the apuun, jotta päästään rannasta irti. Usko nyt minua. Ja ellei Turku seiso rinnallamme; Perkele [my italics].” Perkele is a swearword.

297 Aalto, Medisiinarit, ammattiin kasvaminen ja hiljainen tieto, 44, 78–82.

298 As is the case with this dissertation as a whole, the main focus is on how Enäjärvi and Haavio presented themselves and how they wrote about navigating various arenas connected to their academic life, not on how their presentations of themselves were received.

National Coalition Party’s lists. At the time, Enäjärvi was asked to run for parliament for the party but eventually declined due to health problems.

The Academic Karelia Society, AKS, was established in 1922. As the name suggests, it was founded by and initially for students and scholars. The organisation’s original aim was to raise awareness of the political situation in Karelia and to support Karelians who sought refuge in Finland after fights for independence on the Russian side of the border subsequent the Russian revolutions. The support of a Karelian uprising and promotion of Karelian national identity building was a karelianist ideology of promoting Finnish-related peoples. The organisation also promoted irredentist ideas of a Greater Finland, which would have covered much more or all of the territories with Finnish or Finnish-related populations. The AKS was also promoting Finnish language politics, stating that the Swedish language was a remnant of oppressive Swedish rule. The organisation also articulated a hostile attitude towards all things Russian.

The AKS’s agenda was predominantly rightist, but the organisation was not bound to party politics. In particular the language question did not follow a left-right division in Finnish politics, and the AKS prioritised the Finnish language question and nationalistic aims. After the Civil War in 1918, there was a sore gap between socialists and conservatives. During the first half of the 1920s, the AKS proclaimed a wish to bridge this gap, stating that they were open for collaboration with social democrats if these established a strict distance from communists.

The AKS accepted members on invitation. The new members swore an oath, promising their lives for the cause of a Greater Finland. Only men were accepted as members, while women organised themselves in the sister organisation Women’s Academic Karelia Society. The AKS went through a crisis in 1932, when the more radical members, including the leadership of the AKS, supported the extreme-right Lapua Movement’s (Lapuan liitto) coup...

---


301 Sievänen-Allen, Tytö venheessä, 385.
303 Eskelinen, Me tahdoimme suureksi Suomenmaan, 120–121.
304 Klinge, Vihan veljet ja kansallinen identiteetti, 154–155, 158–159; Eskelinen, Me tahdoimme suureksi Suomenmaan, 121–123, 242–243; According to Ville Laamanen and Ville Kokkonen, it was symptomatic for the Finnish nationalist-rightist movements in general to claim that they worked beyond a party-political level and stood for a broader mindset of the “people”. Ville Laamanen and Ville Okkonen, ‘Kansallisoikeistolainen itseymmärrys 1929–1932’, Historiallinen Aikakauskirja, 117/2 (2019), 199.
305 Initially, the AKS had a women’s section as a sub-part, but it was separated to a society of its own after the first year. Eskelinen, Me tahdoimme suureksi Suomenmaan, 31, 109.
attempt. After this, the more moderate members of the AKS, including Haavio, made a public exit from the organisation.\textsuperscript{306}

The inner circle of the AKS was comprised of people from various sectors of society and its influence stretched broadly and deeply into national politics, publishing, the military and academia.\textsuperscript{307} After attending a meeting of Vihan Veljet (“brothers of hate”), a group characterised as AKS’s inner circle or an intersecting group, Haavio tersely characterised this diversity and impact in a letter to Hakulinen: “We know everything that concerns the country.”\textsuperscript{308} Haavio further told Hakulinen that his role in the AKS was to participate in its propaganda section. Haavio participated in establishing the organisation’s journal, Suomen Heimo (“The Finnish Clan”), for which he also wrote articles. He also organised and participated in festivities of the AKS, and represented the association on other occasions, such as at the Finno-Ugric student meeting in Tallinn in 1924. He argued for the Finnish people to rise against Swedish-speaking oppression and to fight for the Finnic kindred peoples. The tone in the speeches was passionate, unambiguous and agitating.\textsuperscript{309} Still in 1929, he spoke in sympathy for the rising Lapua Movement’s aims to defeat communism and in support of methods beyond democracy that were used in Europe, such as by the Italian fascists. However, in Haavio’s view, Finnish politics were not (yet) in a state that required these methods but could be led with democratic methods in a desirable direction (to elect a Finnish-speaking and Finnish-language activist majority in parliament).\textsuperscript{310}

Political engagement through publishing

The most visible part of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s political activities were seen in the articles that they wrote for journals and newspapers. As discussed already above about Suomen Heimo, these articles were mainly on language questions and nationalist visions.

The largest share of these political articles, from 1918 to 1932, was written by Haavio, who was particularly active in writing for the student journal

\textsuperscript{306} Eskelinen, \textit{Me tahdoimme suareksi Suomenmaan}, 301–323, in particular 301, 316, 322.
\textsuperscript{310} ‘Kansallinen enemmistö eduskuntaan’, 241.
Ylioppilaslehti. Enäjärvi wrote for the same journal too, but her articles were mainly reviews on literature and theatre. During this time, most of Enäjärvi’s articles with a political agenda were on Estonia. On the language question, Enäjärvi’s most significant text was a booklet on language education in schools, arguing that students in high schools should be taught English instead of Swedish. The booklet was advertised and discussed in newspapers nationally.311 Enäjärvi’s writing on political topics became more frequent somewhat later, during the 1930s and 1940s. Beside nationalist issues, and in particular agitating patriotic articles during World War II, she started writing about women’s issues and family planning.

There were two student journals published by and for University of Helsinki students. Studentbladet was founded in 1911 and published in Swedish, and the Finnish Ylioppilaslehti was founded in 1913. Both journals were published by student nations.312 Student nations were fraternities based on the students’ home regions. For example, Enäjärvi was a member of the Finnish-speaking student nation for Southern Finland and Haavio was a member of the Finnish-speaking student nation for Southwestern Finland. On paper, Ylioppilaslehti was politically independent. However, most content on political matters leaned mainly to the right. On the language question, Ylioppilaslehti originally held a rather neutral standpoint. It acknowledged, for example, that a large share of the Swedish-speaking population had fought on the winning conservative side in the Civil War, which in a right-leaning journal was held as a sign of patriotism.313 This policy shifted in the early 1920s. The journal took a more radical position both on the language question and on promoting nationalism and ideas of a Greater Finland. The journal continued, however, to publish articles with contrasting political opinions, although at times with added editorial remarks or responses.314 Martti Haavio was directly connected to this shift. Haavio started working as Ylioppilaslehti’s editorial secretary in 1920, on the request of his good friend, editor and Finnish language activist Niilo Kärki, who at the same time became Ylioppilaslehti’s editor-in-chief.315

311 For advertisements, see e.g. ‘Englanti ruotsin tilalle.’, Rauman Lehti (21 March 1929), 1; ‘Englanti ruotsin tilalle.’, Savo (27 March 1929), 5; ‘Englanti ruotsin tilalle.’ Riitimmän Sanomat (20 March 1929), 3; ‘Englanti ruotsin tilalle.’ Sosialisti (20 March 1929), 7; ‘Englanti ruotsin tilalle.’, Seinäjoen Sanomat (2 April 1929), 3; ‘Englanti ruotsin tilalle.’, Toijalan Sanomat (30 March 1929), 4; Enäjärvi was referred to in the language debate for example in ‘Ruotsinkielii koulujen opetusohjelmissa’, Forssan Lehti (19 July 1929), 1; ‘Ruotsinkielii koulujen opetusohjelmissa.’, Seinäjoen Sanomat (6 September 1929), 3; ‘Kielten asema kouluopetuksessamme.’, Itälähti (22 April 1929), 3–4; Enäjärvi also wrote an article for Helsingin Sanomat on the issue Elsa Enäjärvi, ‘Ruotsin kieli kouluiissamme’, Helsingin Sanomat (6 April 1929), 12.

312 Matti Klinge and Maunu Harmo, Ylioppilaslehti 1913–1963 (Helsinki, 1983), 14, 16–18.
Haavio gained visibility for his opinions in several ways in *Ylioppilaslehti*, and to some degree, he kept separate the genres of his writing by using various pen names. Like Enäjärvi, he frequently wrote book reviews. While Enäjärvi predominantly reviewed fiction, Haavio reviewed both fiction and works in folk culture studies. For the reviews, he used the signature M. H-o. or M. Ho. The reviews could also be politically permeated with approving evaluations of books with political agendas responding to Haavio’s or books with topics that could be combined with presentations of political opinions. Haavio also wrote causeries for *Ylioppilaslehti*, mainly under the pen names Aapelus, Mongooli and Polyfemos. These causeries were on topics concerning student life and *Ylioppilaslehti*’s editorial choices, at times clearly exposing the author’s political viewpoints. Moreover, Haavio wrote opinion pieces under the signature Mr. For example, these articles were on topics regarding the circumstances of conscripts or whether a researcher should primarily serve society or science. The question of a researcher’s role was a topic of debate between Haavio and Ensio Hiitonen (1900–1970, writing under the pen name K.E.P.H.) Hiitonen argued that researchers primarily should serve society, while Haavio was opposed to this, claiming that researchers primarily served

---


When Haavio in 1923 became editor-in-chief of Ylioppilaslehti, he also wrote feature opinion pieces. However, as custom had it, feature opinion pieces were without a signature and some of them may also have been written by others than Haavio.

In addition to writing reviews and opinion pieces, Haavio also gained visibility in the journal without figuring as the author of the article. In one article, he had responded to a questionnaire sent to some folklore scholars about the discipline. Other articles cited speeches that Haavio had given at events and at demonstrations in favour of Finnish language reforms and nationalism. His rhetorical style held an agitating, sharp and at times exaggerated tone, for example encouraging the Finnish people to finally rise from Swedish enslavement. His phrasings provoked multiple articles that expressed either criticism or support in newspapers around the country. These contrasting reactions show that Haavio’s views and rhetorical style were not accepted by all, but also that he had a large audience.

As editors, Enäjärvi and Haavio had an impact on the content and ideological direction of Ylioppilaslehti. Editors could add comments to articles that they disagreed with and write the feature articles.

As editors, Enäjärvi and Haavio had an impact on the content and ideological direction of Ylioppilaslehti. Editors could add comments to articles that they disagreed with and write the feature articles. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s time at Ylioppilaslehti was, however, mainly limited to their time as students and a couple of years past graduation. In the 1930s, they became engaged in a new publishing project, which was helping to establish the journal Suomalainen Suomi (“Finnish Finland”, 1933–1968), a journal name that was fully in line with their political aims.


323 Klinge and Harmo, Ylioppilaslehti 1913–1963, 126, 129.

324 See e.g. Haavio telling about the project to Oskar Loorits in EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits 28/40 (13.12.32).
Finnish historian Jouni Ahmajärvi uses the term “academic public intellectual” when he describes the Finnish sociologist and anthropologist Gunnar Landtman’s (1878–1940) role in the public debate of the time. Ahmajärvi shows that Landtman, particularly in his earlier political texts, did not use research for his arguments—sociology should, as he saw it, describe and explain society, not suggest how society should be. However, Ahmajärvi argues that Landtman’s academic affiliation was significant for his public role, as it gave him authority in the political debate.325 Enäjärvi and Haavio appear to have worked in a similar way. Before World War II, they typically separated texts of immediate political content from academic and popularised texts on folklore. However, the spheres of politics and academia could be combined. The political core of the national disciplines together with a social context where the university had been at the centre of political changes, meant that folklorists were expected to be politically involved rather than not. The discipline’s special relation to nation building made this connection explicit, but as, for example, Cathryn Carson has shown for physics, serving the nation could become a desired part of a scholarly persona also in other disciplines. Talking in Herman Paul’s terms, serving a right-wing, national and Fennoman cause was a scholar’s good.326 In Mineke Bosch’s terms, we could say that fashioning oneself or building one’s identity as a nationalist political debater was a common and idealised piece of the folklorist’s persona.

Culture

By the time Enäjärvi and Haavio were awarded their doctorate degrees, they were already known as cultural figures to a wider audience. Both wrote book reviews on fiction and scholarly literature. Moreover, Enäjärvi was also known as a theatre reviewer. Both were also editing and writing books. Enäjärvi’s travel book Vanha iloinen Enganti, which is discussed in more detail in chapter 6, was praised by most reviewers and sold out immediately. Haavio was a widely recognised poet. Both were also affiliated with the influential modernist cultural group Tulenkantajat (“the torchbearers”). Partly due to Tulenkantajat, partly due to their work at the publishing house Werner Söderströms OY, Enäjärvi and Haavio were friends with a broad spectrum of Finnish authors, and in the inner circles of the cultural sphere of Helsinki. In the following section, I discuss how Enäjärvi and Haavio participated in this sphere of contemporary culture, a topic which will then lead the way to a discussion about the implications of combining participation in politics, culture and academia.

325 Ahmajärvi, Ihmisluonto, yhteiskuntaevolutio ja rauhanomaisen kehityksen mahdollisuudet, 214.
326 Fennomans promoted politics for increasing the usage and highering the formal status of Finnish.
Elsa Enäjärvi as a reviewer and cultural writer

In addition to writing about folk culture for both academic and popular publications and on nationalist politics, as discussed above, Elsa Enäjärvi also made herself a name as a reviewer in the cultural scenes of theatre and literature in Finland. She combined her interest in Estonia with her literary interest, becoming known also as a reviewer of Estonian culture for a Finnish audience. During her stay in London in 1927, Enäjärvi expanded her travel budget by sending articles about English cultural life to a variety of Finnish newspapers and journals. Likewise, she wrote articles from her other journeys, for example about Riga and Stockholm.

Enäjärvi’s articles were published in a variety of newspapers, such as Helsingin Sanomat and Uusi Suomi, and journals such as Panu, Suomen Kuvalehti, Ylioppilaslehti and Nuori Voima. For the last two, she wrote frequently enough to be described by the journals as their collaborator. She was also a member of the editorial team of Ylioppilaslehti in 1922–1923. Politically, these publications either held a neutral stance or leaned to the right. Many of the newspapers and journals had a nation-wide readership. From Enäjärvi’s point of view, her connection to journals and newspapers was even more closely affiliated with Helsinki, as Helsinki was the platform of most of her work and community related to her article writing.

Usually, Enäjärvi’s cultural articles do not seem to have evoked much critique, at least not in print. However, we can see that Enäjärvi’s reviews were read and that it mattered for the publishers how their books were reviewed in the journals that Enäjärvi wrote for. For example, Enäjärvi’s first book review for Ylioppilaslehti, the publishing house quoted Enäjärvi’s review in their advertisement of the book. Enäjärvi’s review was on the celebrated poet Aarni Kouta’s Rakkauden temppeli. What is surprising with the publishing house’s choice to cite Enäjärvi is that the review was highly critical. She had only described positively a few short sections of the book, and it was these that were picked for the advertisement blurb. “[O]h, the skills of that editor!”, Enäjärvi commented in her diary, continuing that “[a]t least from now on, I will make sure that I no longer attack old and ‘established’ men.”

328 Advertisement “Aarni Kouta. Rakkauden temppeli”, Uusi Suomi (18 November 1920), 8; See also e.g. ‘Musta Runotar’, Helsingin Sanomat (13 December 1932), 3.
329 Aarni Kouta, Rakkauden temppeli: Runoja (Helsinki, 1920).
Apart from reviewing, Enäjärvi also worked as a literary editor and translator. Her editing projects followed the same genres as her articles: a book with Finnish translations of novels by young Estonian authors and a volume of modernist literature by young Finnish writers. The latter was compiled by Nuoren Voiman Liitto (“The League of Young Force”, NVL), an association gathering (primarily) young people involved in various cultural sectors, mainly in fine arts and literature. The volume was called Tulenkantajat and contained poems, impressions, essays and novels.

The authors of the volume Tulenkantajat formed a group with the same name. It soon expanded to include other authors as well as other artists and reviewers, including Elsa Enäjärvi. After the first album, Nuoren Voiman Liitto started publishing a periodical carrying the same name, including poems, impressions, short stories, reviews and manifestos. The group became an influential platform for modernist art, especially literature. It idealised Continental European, in particular French, culture, and held as its watchword “Windows open to Europe”. In this sense, the interest in contemporary culture was different from Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s political engagement, one promoting increasing international influence and the other emphasising national pride and particularity.

P. Mustapää

As with the first Tulenkantajat volume, Enäjärvi was also involved in the publishing of other collections without having her name on a title page. One of these was the poem collection Nuoret runoilijat (“Young poets”) from 1924. The collection was edited by Martti Haavio, who asked Enäjärvi to give feedback on it before publishing. After reading the manuscript, Enäjärvi responded that she had enjoyed the collection as a whole, but gave particular praise to one of the contributors, the pseudonym P. Mustapää, stating that:

Mustapää is phenomenal, bravo, bravo, bravo! I enjoyed, enjoyed, enjoyed. Of course, one does not know how competent and consistent this poetic talent is and what world view lies behind it, but all these samples stand on their own, every last one of them. Moreover, this Mustapää is also skilled with language, and seems to be from western Finland, which in my eyes is only a positive feature.

---

332 Elsa Enäjärvi, ed., Ihmisen varjo ynnä muita virolaisia novelleja (Porvoo, 1924); Tulenkantajat (Porvo, 1924).
334 Nuoret runoilijat (Porvoo, 1924) With foreword by ‘M. Ho.’ (Martti Haavio).
Only a year later, P. Mustapää published a whole volume of poems, Laulu ihanista silmistä: Runoja (“A song about beautiful eyes: Poems”, 1925). Like Nuoret runoilijat, this too was received positively in the press. The identity behind the pen name was revealed to Enäjärvi by her friend and Tulenkantajat author Olavi Paavolainen (1903–1964). He informed her that the love poems were written to her by Haavio. Haavio published one more collection of poems and a couple of contributions in other collections in the 1920s. He then took a pause of nearly 20 years before returning to poetry.

From a gender point of view, it is interesting how Haavio’s different genres included different emotions that have been ascribed to men and masculinities. His academic writing emphasised a rational voice, one of the qualities that gender historians have showed that was argued to be a masculine quality and the reason why women were not viewed as suitable for academia as men were. Haavio’s political writing could be harsh and aggressive, a behaviour or character trait that was ambivalently ascribed to men. Aggression and violence were acceptable, even to some degree idealised for working-class men and young middle-class men and boys, while deemed a negative character trait among older middle-class men, who were instead expected to demonstrate self-discipline. Haavio’s poetic writing demonstrates yet a third type of emotional character. His poetry included expressed sentimental love (to the

Mustapää, osaa sitäpaitsi kieltäkin, ja näkyy olevan länsi-Suomesta kotoisin, mikä minun kirjoissani merkitsee avua.”

337 For reviews on Nuoret runoilijat, see e.g. Rafael Forsman, ‘Nuoria runoilijoita.’, Uusi Suomi (1 October 1924), 6; Elmer Dictonius, ‘Litteratur. Ung finsk lyrisk.’, Arbetarbladet (7 November 1924), 5; Viljo Helkka, ‘Nuoret runoilijat.’, Uudenkaupungin Sanomat (20 December 1924), 4; S-n., ‘Nuoret runoilijat.’, Aamulehti (2 November 1924), 11; For reviews on ‘Laulu ihanista silmistä’, see e.g. Sulka, ‘Runoilija.’, Sisä-Suomi (31 October 1925), 7; Lauri Viljanen, ‘Kaksi nuorta runoilijaa.’, Aamulehti (14 November 1925), 6; U.W.W., ‘Runoutta’, Tampereen Sanomat (1 November 1925), 7; For less positive or ambivalent reviews, see e.g. Uuno Kailas, ‘Naamiot ja kasvot’, Suomen Sosialidemokraatti (23 October 1925), 4–5; H.L., ‘Runoutta, kotoista ja kiinalaista’, Satakunnan Kansa (24 November 1925), 5; L.L., ‘Kirjallisuus ja taide. Kaksi uutta runoteosta.’, Vaasa (21 November 1925), 6.
338 Hurmerinta, ‘P. Mustapää = Martti Haavio’.
degree that Enäjärvi in 1927 remarked that his new manuscript would generally be better, “the less complaints of unhappy love your book has, since the last one included so much of them.”) The similarity between the poetic and political Haavio was that both genres included passion, even fierce passion.

Werner Söderströms OY

Elsa Enäjärvi and Martti Haavio both worked for the publishing house Werner Söderströms OY. Haavio began his employment there in 1924, first as a publishing editor, and eventually as editor-in-chief of the section for fiction. Enäjärvi was not as constantly affiliated with WSOY, but she edited books that were published by WSOY during the 1920s. She also translated some works from Estonian to Finnish, which were later published by the same publishing house. As will be discussed in more detail in chapter 7, Enäjärvi began her employment at WSOY in 1931 as a stand-in for Haavio when he was on a sick leave and when he took a research leave in order to increase his publication merits for a professorship, and she continued working there on a part-time basis after Haavio returned.

The work at WSOY was primarily a means to financially make ends meet when scholarly work did not give that possibility. It was also what Haavio’s father had advised his son to do when faced with economic hardship in 1924 after working on his doctoral dissertation for a few years. That did not mean that Enäjärvi and Haavio would have experienced publishing house work as unenjoyable. Over the years, the publishing house became a part of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s life. The familiarity and closeness of the publishing house in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s life is, for example, demonstrated in Enäjärvi’s way of referring to it in her diaries and letters simply as “the firm.”


Despite Haavio’s reason to work for WSOY was to secure his income while he still had goals within academia, the work at the publishing house could also intertwine with his interests in scholarship and engagement in semi-academic societies. For example, Haavio was involved in negotiations on publishing a collection of Finnish folktales. He wrote to Enäjärvi how he had proposed to folklore professor and chair of the Finnish Literature Society, Kaarle Krohn, that WSOY would edit the collection. According to Haavio, the editing of the folktale collection had taken years due to problems in finding a good editor for it. Haavio was convinced that publishing it would be much more efficient if done with WSOY, which could also pay a proper compensation to the editor. Krohn had responded that this was an impossible arrangement, because the publication was a matter of status for the SKS. Instead, Krohn had suggested that Haavio would edit the collection for the SKS. For Haavio, in turn, this was impossible, since he could not work with the same kind of work for the SKS as he was employed to do at WSOY.

Haavio expressed frustration about this attitude of the older generation of scholars, who in his view did not understand the value of working within a modern publishing industry. Instead of bringing the folktale collection to print, the older scholars prioritised to keep to their principles:

There are, for sure, wrong kinds of ambitions in this world. When the old men do not manage to get something done themselves, then no one shall, regardless of their ability to do so. [...] I hope that this business, which would be so enjoyable and lucrative, will not slip away due to the dustiness of some old men.

The account shows that the publishing industry judged that there was a general interest in folklore, and it would have been profitable for them to publish a collection of folktales that was preserved at the Finnish Literature Society’s folklore archives. Moreover, Haavio’s account shows how he perceived the publishing house’s way of working as agile and rational. The SKS’s agency was weighed down by pride and tradition. Haavio’s employment at the publishing house did not hinder him from research or from participating in associations. Based on the quote above, it can be assumed that Haavio saw the various affiliations advantageous. He was familiar and skilled both with the world of publishing and folklore. In his view, the folktale collection would gain from his connections to the publishing house with its resources and effective publication procedures and distribution channels and his links to the reputable SKS with its extensive folklore collections and acknowledged scholars. However, these complementary affiliations presented a challenge.

---

347 Eskola, Kahden, 560 (Haavio to Enäjärvi 23.9.1927).
when Krohn wanted Haavio to edit the collection and let the Literature Society publish it. Alongside the synergies that came from insights in publishing, literature and folklore, Enäjärvi and Haavio also appear to have moved effortlessly between these fields with few complications due to mixing the roles and employments they held in these fields. Finnish historian Julia Dahlberg has shown that scholars and artists performed similar personae as geniuses in their respective fields and as members of an educated elite. Artists would further take inspiration from scholarship and include repertoires of scholarly personae in their artistic persona. As in their political participation, Enäjärvi and Haavio kept the content of their writings on scholarship separate from the contemporary scene of art and literature. Both these interests were on culture, but the academic interest concerned a search for the old and archaic while the cultural interest concerned primarily modernity and innovation. Moreover, the academic focus was on the “folk”, while the cultural focus was on an (avantgarde) elite. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s fashioning of their character and authority were merged, although also here, there could be differences between roles. The most explicit difference was Haavio’s different ways of showing emotions in his political and poetic texts, and typically a lack of emotions in his academic texts.

Conflict and compatibility of research, culture and political engagement

In the early twentieth century, it was common, even expected, that scholars participated in political debate. Together with authors and artists, scholars constituted an elite or an intelligentsia. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s

\[\text{Dahlberg, } \textit{Konstnär, kvinna, medborgare, 32, 37–41, 175–181, 252, 254. Dahlberg uses the term educated elite, arguing (on page 32) that the term intellectuals/intelligentsia was not used in the context and time she studies, why her sources do not include any of the self-identifying and self-aware dimension of the concept of intelligentsia.}\]

\[\text{Dahlberg, } \textit{Konstnär, kvinna, medborgare, 20–22, 32; Pertti Karkama and Hanne Koivisto, eds., } \textit{Älymystön jäljillä. Kirjoituksia suomalaisesta sivistyneistöstä ja älymystöstä} \textit{(Helsinki, 1997), 12, 23; }\]
simultaneous involvement in academia, politics and culture was, in this sense, typical rather than exceptional. In Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts, these three fields appear mainly as compatible and even beneficial to each other. The only, yet crucial conflict was that activities in the various fields were time-consuming.

Haavio’s accounts demonstrate several positive effects of combined interests in culture, academia and politics. Access to the inner circles of Academic Karelia Society meant inside information about one of the most influential, but also formally most closed, national political movements of his time. Through *Ylioppilaslehti* and articles published in other journals, he could promote his political agenda among a larger audience. At the same time, he made his name known to a wide readership. Haavio used his travel experiences as inspiration and as the foundation for some of his political articles. For example, in *Suomen Heimo*, he wrote about the Livonians’ situation in Latvia and how Finns should support the work aimed at increasing the autonomy and language politics of the diminishing Livonian language group. He had become familiar with the Livonians’ situation during his stay in Estonia the same year, and it was an issue that his good friend and colleague Oskar Looris was also engaged in. Another article was about an old man, a sage, knowledgeable in Finnish folk tales and folk songs. These articles would not have become published and circulated without Haavio’s folklore interest and the travels and knowledge that it generated. However, this interweaving of academic interests and political engagement was relatively infrequent in comparison to how Haavio and Enäjärvi used their knowledge in folklore and affiliation to the discipline during World War II.

When publishing as a poet, Haavio used a pseudonym. His documents from the 1920s and early 1930s do not give a reason for this choice, whether it was to remain anonymous because of the risk of failing with his lyrical work, or because of a reluctance to reveal his identity to Enäjärvi or to keep separate an academic Haavio from an artistic P. Mustapää. One pragmatic reason could also have been that Haavio had proposed a manuscript of poems to WSOY
but was rejected shortly after. In any case, Haavio maintained a low and even indifferent profile about his pseudonym in all his preserved documents. He neither wrote about his choice to use a pseudonym, nor about his emotions when his identity behind the pen name was revealed. In later interviews, he described the choice of pseudonym as what came to his mind at the last minute before submitting the manuscript. The usage of a pseudonym did not, however, mean that the poet P. Mustapää would have been kept in a strictly separate sphere from the political activist and scholar M. Haavio. Instead, P. Mustapää (or only Mustapää) figured as the author in the AKS’s journal *Suomen Heimo*, with articles on literature, an agitating poem and a language activist column.

Enäjärvi’s articles combined her interests in various fields, such as Estonia, literature and nationalist politics. In comparison with Haavio, Enäjärvi’s articles were more strictly divided between those on contemporary culture (or culture critique), folk culture and academic essays. However, in regard to Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s studies, this separation into academic and cultural interests is not as sharp. While Haavio mainly studied folklore and Finnic languages, Enäjärvi combined her folklore studies with history and literature. While writing her doctoral dissertation, she was, however, planning to enter the field of literary history after completing her doctoral degree in folklore. In this light, her continuous work with editing and reviewing literature was not that far from her academic interests.

Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s participation in the public life of politics and culture definitely gave them public recognition even before they became familiar names within an academic context. Since engagement in public discussions was a conscious choice, Enäjärvi and Haavio presumably perceived it as a promising strategy. However, the actual advantage this brought to their careers is not measurable. It is also not a topic that Enäjärvi or Haavio wrote about, meaning that they also never mentioned that they would have found this public recognition a problem for their academic careers. Since both continued publishing cultural and political pieces, they presumably found it a legitimate practice. The absence of discussion about advantages or
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challenges with public recognition from other fields would suggest that it was unproblematic or even expected from scholars. Enäjärvi and Haavio were not alone in their practices. For example, Professor Lauri Kettunen (1885–1963) participated in formal negotiations regarding Finnish and Estonian economic relationships after the Estonian independency in 1919, and wrote a collection of poems and published fiction under the pen name Toivo Hovi. The language scholar, Professor Emil Nestor Setälä (1864–1935), alongside his academic work, made a significant political career. These extra-academic engagements do not appear to have constituted any substantial obstacles for either Kettunen or Setälä.

The only conflict between scholarship and engagement in culture and politics that Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about was that working with smaller tasks stole time from research. In particular, Enäjärvi wrote that she felt that these tasks lured her from her studies and dissertation work. Haavio did not write about the problems of balancing various tasks, but he sometimes mentioned how much time a particular task could take. A letter from Enäjärvi to Haavio in 1927 also confirms that he had many affiliations that consumed much time. Enäjärvi reproached Haavio for being critical about her multiple engagements in organisations, while he used at least as much time for comparable interests. However, in 1931 and 1932, Haavio focussed all his time and effort on research, prior to the deadline of his first professorship application. According to Enäjärvi, this meant that Haavio had taken a leave from WSOY and was working intensely every day from dawn to dusk.

Although Enäjärvi and Haavio did not write about principal problems of being affiliated with various public sectors separate from academia, we can see in the accounts that they, and in particular Enäjärvi, did not view work tasks from their multiple affiliations to have equal priority. Usually, this is manifest when Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about their efforts to devote enough time to work on their dissertations, time usually reduced due to the working on minor articles. Enäjärvi expressed the value difference more directly when she in 1925 commented sharply on Haavio’s engagement in various journals and his workload at WSOY:


What the hell do you benefit from slipping into the newspaper business.

If by talking to [WSOY’s executive director Jalmari] Jäntti you meant that you would announce your interest in staying at Söderström’s, then obviously you will not in any case do that. *You will be ruined by the strain, you will lose your health.* Start studying, for God’s sake. It is an activity worthy of your nature.

Rise from the abasement of the editorial work of [the journals] *Valo* and *Panu*, in which it is shameful to be for the character of a person with your qualifications and get to work and life with human dignity.363

No doubt is Enäjärvi’s comment spiced with exaggeration, but it was not the only time when she wrote critically about Haavio’s decision to concentrate on the publishing industry instead of research. She urged him to make more ambitious plans and to act according to them. As in the quote above, Enäjärvi stated that Haavio had qualities that would take him further than publishing, namely to an academic career.364

Accounts on engagement in political questions or in semi-academic societies differed from those of cultural writing and publishing in the sense that the former were not written about as intruding on research time to the same degree as the latter. Correspondingly, politics and societies for folk culture and folk-cultural research were never written about in terms of being inferior to scholarship.

Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s multiple and simultaneous affiliations show that it was acceptable, even commendable, for folklorists to be public intellectuals both in politics and art. It is also apparent that Haavio and Enäjärvi were engaged in fields that interested them, and which also were closely related to their academic interests. At the same time, it was not easy to maintain balance between engagement in the various fields. The political dimension was an inherent feature of folklore research, and seems also to have carried a higher status for Enäjärvi and Haavio than did cultural work. Yet, in contrast to scholarship, writing articles and working as editors for journals, newspapers and publishing houses gave, in addition to public recognition, quicker rewards—including pay checks.


Concluding comments

Did Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s movement between an academic, a political and an artistic/cultural field come with separate persona formations? If not, was this because the persona of a cultural opinion producer was so similar to the persona of a folklorist, or was it because they were rather compatible features that could be worked into the same persona?

The answer requires a more comprehensive definition of persona. In Mineke Bosch’s usage of the concept, where persona is a *bricolage* of features that constitutes identities, Enäjärvi and Haavio formed individual personae, which were compounds of cultural, political and academic actors. If, instead, approaching persona from Conal Condren, Stephen Gaukroner and Ian Hunter’s usage of the concept, persona as a chair or position, Enäjärvi and Haavio formed separate personae for the three fields. However, these three fields were not in conflict with each other—apart from practical issues of time usage. Moreover, in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s cases, political participation was an inherent component of the folklorist’s persona. Herman Paul’s approach to persona appears to give a similar, non-conflicting division as does the approach of Condren, Gaukroner and Hunter.

The preferability of either approach depends on the target of the study. Bosch’s approach works better when studying individual processes of persona formation, while Gaukroner, Hunter, Condren and Paul offer better tools for studying specific disciplinary personae. Thus, it is more interesting to reason about the persona concept less as what it essentially could be, but rather what it can be used for. This highlights the function of the persona concept more as an analytical tool rather than an empirical or theoretical object of study. The concept of persona provides richer significances when we ask the question what we want to use it for, rather than what it essentially is.

It is interesting that there are so few notes on gender in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts on organisations outside academia. According to Margaret Rossiter, it was particularly the social practices and organisations outside university that had the most durable effect of excluding women from academic advancement. As I described in the beginning of the chapter, student life and its impact were something that Enäjärvi wrote more about retrospectively, and the same is true for an account about the student organisations’ exclusion of women. For example, Enäjärvi’s archive collection includes a draft of a speech from a dinner for former leading persons at the student union in 1946. In it, Enäjärvi spoke, with the help of humour, about the small number of women in the higher positions of the student union and the excluding practices that she had encountered during her time at the organisation. These reflections follow a very similar line found in Rossiter’s arguments: women were few, they were expected to leave after the dinner, and both men and women could
confirm that participation in the higher positions of the organisation had offered experiences that had proved important for later careers.\footnote{Skins KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Speeches, presentations and radio performances (draft of speech at the dinner of former leading members of the student union, written down 3.2.1946). Case III; Rossiter, \textit{Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940}, 75–99.}
4. The field: Practical socialisation and a scholarly gaze on the objects of study

In the previous chapters, we followed Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s studies and work at university and I discussed how these activities were entangled with semi-academic and cultural societies. Now, we move out from the university halls and capital city to follow Enäjärvi and Haavio on their journeys into the Finnish countryside from 1919 to 1924. Typically for students in their field, Enäjärvi and Haavio had received scholarships from organisations for spending a part or a whole summer collecting folklore and various dialect vocabulary to be archived.

In the first part of this chapter, I briefly discuss the concepts “field” and “fieldwork”, as well as introduce the sources used in the chapter. I also give a background and an overview of the Karelia region, which played a significant role in early Finnish folkloristics and folklore collections and is also the setting for most of the accounts used as sources here. This is followed by two empirical sections. The first section considers questions regarding the practicalities of fieldwork: how did Enäjärvi and Haavio prepare for it, what did they do during their fieldwork, and how did they travel and live while in the field? After a mapping of the practicalities, I examine the impact of gender on Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts from the field and on their practical circumstances, and suggest that these shed light on a built-in gender dimension in persona formation. In the second empirical chapter section, I examine how the students described in their private documents what they saw during their field journeys and their relationship to the locals and the localities they visited. I suggest that the descriptions were a means of adapting to a disciplinary tradition and a means to establish scholarly authority.

Collection and fieldwork

The collection journeys of Enäjärvi and Haavio were part of a larger movement that aimed at collecting, recording and archiving Finnish and Finnish-related folk culture. The journeys were directed to the countryside, because the rural population was considered to carry traces of an old, even pre-Christian, folk culture, which was feared to eventually disappear due to modernisation and urbanisation. This collecting project engaged both urban people, including many nationally minded students, and people living...
in the countryside. Students in folklore, ethnology, cultural history, and Finnish literature and philology were in most cases not obliged but nevertheless expected to spend at least one summer holiday as collectors. In the countryside, a significant share of the collectors were people with higher education, such as priests and teachers. However, this group did not outnumber the large amount of literate common people, who participated in the collection project.\footnote{366 Kai Häggman, *Sanojen talossa. Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura 1890-luvulta talvisotaan* (Helsinki, 2012), 74–76, 91–96, 367; Kalleinen, *Kansallisen tieteen ja taiteen puolesta*, 43–46; Tommila and Tiitta, *Suomen tieteen historia 2. Humanistiset ja yhteiskuntatieteet*, 147–148.}

Societies for folk culture could offer money or books to collectors as a form of compensation, but the main motivation given to people was based on nationalistic arguments.\footnote{367 Jyrki Pöysä and Senni Timonen, ‘Kuinka ahkerat muurahaiset saivat kasvot? Henkilökohtaisen tiedon paikka arkiston keruuohjeissa’, in Tuulikki Kurki ed., *Kansanrunousarkisto, lukijat ja tulkinnat*, (Helsinki, 2004), 225; Kristin Kuutma, ‘Matthias Johann Eisen: A Collector and Publisher of Narratives’, in Kristin Kuutma and Tiitu Jaago eds., *Studies in Estonian Folkloristics and Ethnology. A Reader and Reflexive History* (Tartu, 2005), 86–87; Tiitu Jaago, ‘Jacob Hurt: The Birth of Estonian-Language Folklore Research’, in Kristin Kuutma and Tiitu Jaago eds., *Studies in Estonian Folkloristics and Ethnology. A Reader and Reflexive History* (Tartu, 2005), 58–59; Briody, *The Irish Folklore Commission 1935–1970*, 260.} It was established that an inventory of all folklore and Finnish dialect variants was a way of mapping the heritage of the nation. Without proper collection, preservation and examination, the national heritage of Finland was argued to appear diffuse and heterogeneous, as well as becoming lost in society’s modernisation.\footnote{368 Skott, *Folkets minnen*, 22–23.}

In this dissertation, I use the term fieldwork for a wide range of practices within folkloristics and for a variety of situations, for which Enäjärvi and Haavio did not necessarily use the term themselves. Instead, Enäjärvi, Haavio and their peers primarily used the word “collecting” (in Finnish *kerääminen* or *keräys*). Generally, this consisted of collecting dialect words, proverbs and oral poetry. According to Finnish folklorist Outi Lehtipuro, the term “fieldwork” became more frequently used in the 1960s and 1970s.\footnote{369 Outi Lehtipuro, ‘Voiko perinnettä kerätä? “Maailman suurin Kansanrunousarkisto” ja kansanrunoudentutkimus toistensa haastajina’, in Pekka Laaksonen, Seppo Knuuttila, and Ulla Piela eds., *Tutkijat kentällä* (Helsinki, 2003), 15; Hanna Snellman, ‘Kansa tietää!’, in Pekka Laaksonen, Seppo Knuuttila, and Ulla Piela eds., *Tutkijat kentällä* (Helsinki, 2003), 44–45.} The dialect collections were part of a massive project, which aim was to publish a dialect dictionary with a comprehensive list of Finnish dialect words. The project was first directed by the Finnish Literature Society, and in 1924 the Dictionary foundation was founded to oversee the collected material. These words were collected to a large extent by students and amateurs.\footnote{370 Kustaa Vilkuna, ‘Myrskyä ja menestystä’, in Tuomo Tuomi ed., *Sanojen taivalta. Puoli vuosisataa Sanakirjasäätiön toimintaa*, 121/2 (Helsinki, 1976), 14–19; Raimo Jussila, ‘Uutta järjestysmuotoa etsimässä’, in Tuomo Tuomi ed., *Sanojen taivalta. Puoli vuosisataa*
Although I focus on two students’ collection journeys that geographically took place outside Helsinki, fieldwork implies more than a practice of travelling outside the university to record words and folklore. Rather, I view this activity in terms of how Finnish folklorist Jyrki Pöysä interpreted fieldwork: “essentially, the field is not a place, but the relationship between the researcher and the people who are made objects of study.” Pöysä’s approach is particularly inspirational for me in the last part of this chapter, as the chapter section is devoted to the relationship between the student collectors and their informants and other local people in their areas of collection. Consequently, I examine how folklorists described the locals to themselves and their peers and examine how they, in these descriptions, situated their informants and other locals as their Others in order to emphasise their authority in their research field. Thus, I argue that the othering should be interpreted as an adjustment to and formation of the contemporary folklorist’s persona.

In addition, fieldwork journeys are also interesting from a persona forming perspective as an experience that offers scholarly authority and integration into a scholarly community. According to Thomas F. Gieryn “[s]cientists return from the field with specimens and data, but also with an authority won by ‘being there’”. At the time when Enäjärvi and Haavio were students, the Finnish archives already held exceptionally large folklore collections. Demonstrating an ability to conduct fieldwork and participating in the nationalist project of collecting folklore and dialect material bore more significance to Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s becoming of folklorists than only instrumental significance.

In addition, although the collection journeys did not constitute a compulsory part of the folklorists’ training, they filled a function comparable to the mandatory trainee periods of other disciplines. Ethnologist Leena Paaskoski shows, for example, how forestry students in the mid-twentieth century obtained their theoretical disciplinary knowledge from university while practical skills and knowledge were gained from exercises and trainee periods. According to Paaskoski, the practical experiences of the forestry education had a deep impact on its students. The shared experiences gave a sense of community, as well as internalised the profession’s self-perceptions and values within the students. Historian Sari Aalto argues that medical studies included more formalised and extensive practical sequences.
Nevertheless, they had a similar impact on the professional identity of physicians as did external training for forestry students.\(^373\) Aalto further notes that the shared experiences from these practical elements of these disciplines’ educational programmes can be viewed from the perspective of education scholar Tony Becher’s work on academic tribes and Oili-Helena Ylijoki’s work on academic novices. From their viewpoint, practical exercises and trainee periods were stepping stones on a path that socialised students into the scholarly community.\(^374\) In forestry and medical programmes, much of the practical exercises were conducted in groups or cohorts of students. Enäjärvi and Haavio conducted their collections and field journeys either alone or in very small groups. While the forestry and medical students shared their socialising experiences together, the folklorists’ formative experiences were primarily communicated via mail correspondence.

The analysis in this chapter is based primarily on Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s diaries and letters written during journeys in the countryside from 1919 to 1924. Most of the letters were written between Haavio and Enäjärvi or to their friends Lauri Hakulinen and Maija Ruuttu. The earliest of the collection journeys discussed in this chapter was conducted by Haavio in 1919, when he collected dialect words in his home municipality of Yläne.\(^375\) Two years later, he made a collection journey to South Karelia and Ladoga Karelia sponsored by a month-long scholarship from the Kalevala Society.\(^376\) In 1924, Enäjärvi spent five weeks in her childhood municipality of Vihti, where she collected dialect words for the Society for the Study of Finnish.\(^377\) One field journey is left out. This is a journey that Enäjärvi and Haavio took together in the autumn of 1932 to Estonia. I have omitted this journey because I have not found any documents that would give comparable insights to the sources from 1919–1924. The only private documents concerning this journey is a diary entry by Enäjärvi, in which she states “[w]e were a week in Estonia with Martti: 24/9–1/10. Fun and interesting.”\(^378\)

\(^{373}\) Aalto, Medisiinarit, ammattiin kasvaminen ja hiljainen tieto, 22; Leena Paaskoski, Herrana metsässä. Kansatieteellinen tutkimus metsänhoitajuudesta (Helsinki, 2008), 9–13, 78–79.


\(^{375}\) Haavio did not mention the funding organisation in CVs or letters, but according to his memoirs, it was either for Sanakirjasäätiö or the SKS. Haavio, Nuorussa vuodesta, 266, 271.

\(^{376}\) Arkki. Archive of the Consistory 1925–1991. Minutes of the Consistory (Ca). Minutes of the Consistory 1931 (Ca 105), (received 7.4.1931, no 321), Haavio’s attached CV.

\(^{377}\) SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Ruuttu, Maija 21.8.1924. Letter 785:(13:)10:26; Personalia (draft for CV), Case V.

In addition, I use accounts from the summer of 1923, when Haavio and Enäjärvi both took a long journey to the Finnish province of North Karelia, with some additional destinations in the provinces of Kainuu in central-northern Finland, Savo in the central-east of Finland and North Ostrobothnia in western Finland. These journeys were sponsored by the right-wing nationalistic Academic Karelia Society in 1923, with the aim to raise awareness of AKS’s programme, the situation in Karelia and Karelian refugees. During the tour, the students also took short outdoor excursions, swam and held festive parties. These excursions were not directly related to their collection journeys, but they are interesting and relevant to read in the light of how the students wrote about locals in the countryside and in Karelia. Noteworthily, the descriptions are rather similar to the descriptions from the actual collection journeys. It also seems that the students recognised that their views of the locals were affected by their involvement in folk culture studies. For example, Enäjärvi wrote to Hakulinen from North Karelia that there was so much dialect material of interest “that it would make a certain E.A.T. emotional.” Presumably the initials E.A.T. referred to linguist E.A. Tunkelo.

Figure 3 on page 113 illustrates the stops and routes on the journeys in 1921 and 1923, which can be found in Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s letters and diaries from that time. The location of Yläne and Vihti, as well as the Karelian provinces, can be viewed in figure 2 on page 112.

**Karelia as the treasury of Finnish heritage**

Most of the texts under investigation in this chapter were written in and described Karelia. Thus, a brief overview of the region should be helpful in preparation for the forthcoming discussions about the sources.

Karelia was a region of extremely high interest for Finnish folk culture scholars and nationalists, two categories that commonly shared members in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Partly, and most outspokenly, this interest was based on a view of Karelia as a region where traces of archaic Finnishness could be found, and partly because the region’s geo-political location triggered nationalistic and irredentist pursuits.

Karelia lies on both sides of the Russian-Finnish border, both today and in the 1920s. Karelia is further divided into several smaller regions. The division and naming of the parts of Karelia to the east of the border varies, but one established division is to divide it into Ladoga Karelia in the southwest, Olonets Karelia (in Finnish “Aunus”) in the central-east and Archangel

---


Figure 2. Map of Finland and Karelian administrative regions, languages and dialects, 1920.

Sources: The map is my simplification of information from three sources. The state borders (thick black lines) in the map are based on Pentti Haapala and Raisa Maria Toivo, eds., *Suomen historian kartasto* (Helsinki, 2007), 255; the district division (thin lines) and places of localities are based on Matti Sarmela, *Suomen kansankulttuurin kartasto. 2, Suomen perinneatlas* (Helsinki, 1994), 252; the dialect and language division outside the districts (dashed lines 1a–b, 4a–c, 5a, and 6) are based on ‘Karjalat-Kartta’.
Karelia or White Sea Karelia (in Finnish “Viena”) in the north. To the southwest of today’s Russian Republic of Karelia, between Lake Ladoga and the Gulf of Finland, is the Karelian Isthmus. Since the end of World War II, it has been part of the Leningrad District of the Russian SFSR/Russia. Both the Isthmus and parts of Karelia now on the Russian side were Finnish territory prior to the World War II. On the Finnish side of the border, Karelia is divided into the regions South Karelia and North Karelia.\footnote{‘Karjalat–Karjtta’, \textit{Institute for the Languages of Finland} \url{<https://www.kotus.fi/files/3179/karjalat-kartta.JPG>} [accessed 13 June 2017]; Mauno Jokipii and Heinike Heinsoo, eds., \textit{Itämerensuomalaiset. Heimokansojen historiaa ja kohtaloita} (Jyväskylä, 1995), 345–346.}

The northern and central parts of Karelia on both sides of the border were in the 1920s mainly agrarian and scarcely populated, while the southernmost part, especially the Karelian Isthmus, had a denser population, relying more heavily on industries and trade. The majority of the Karelians on the Russian/Soviet side are currently and were in the 1920s of Orthodox\footnote{I use here the term “Orthodox” for Greek, Russian and Finnish Orthodox.} faith. Compared to the Finnish population in general, the Orthodox faith was, and is still, proportionally high also in North and South Karelia. Karelian is the language most closely related to Finnish, but it has dialects and branches that differ significantly. These distinctions are most notable in Livvi (Olonets Karelian) and Ludic (spoken west of Lake Onega). Livvi and Ludic are categorised as separate languages today, while they were usually referred to as dialects of Karelian in the 1920s.\footnote{‘Karjala’, \textit{Institute for the Languages of Finland}, 2015 \url{<https://www.kotus.fi/kielitieto/kielet/karjala>} [accessed 10 April 2017].}

Karelia has been of interest for Finnish folk culture scholars since the early nineteenth century. Interest was further increased with the publication of Lönnrot’s \textit{Kalevala}. Karelia was viewed as a region where genuine Finnish heritage had been transferred over generations and unspoiled by alien influences. In particular, the middle northern parts of Karelia on both sides of the border were supposed to have been so isolated that the culture had survived hundreds of years protected from Western and Eastern influences. Scholars, students and amateur collectors headed to Karelia to collect verses, songs, proverbs and dialect words, all in order to gather and preserve as much as possible of what was feared to be a dying genuine Finnish culture.\footnote{Fewster, “‘Braves Step out of the Night of the Barrows’. Regenerating the Heritage of Early Medieval Finland’, 38–39.}

The field of folklore studies was entangled with artist associations and political organisations and their corresponding pursuits. While studies in other Finnic cultures were to a large extent used for understanding the Finnish culture, the shared cultural features of these areas were also used as propaganda for “protecting” or for annexing Soviet areas of Karelian to the Finnish state. One of the most influential political organisations involved in this project was the Academic Karelia Society, which worked mainly through
lobbying, but also by spreading irredentist propaganda outside the political arena. An example of such activities were summer travel tours, one of which Enäjärvi and Haavio participated in the summer of 1923. It was in this context of ideological, political and scholarly excitement over Karelia that much of the sources were written, sources which, as I will now discuss, influenced the formations of a folklorist’s persona.

Conducting fieldwork

In the early twentieth century, venturing out to collect folklore was commonly called making collection journeys or expeditions. According to the Swedish ethnologist Karin Gustavsson, this choice of wording was not only a calculating act to ride the wave of popular interest in tropical or polar expeditions. Similar to exploratory journeys to foreign continents, the collectors saw the collections in the nation’s rural areas as a noble adventure and comparable to expeditions further away. While the arrangements for a collection journey obviously were of a smaller magnitude than those for an arctic expedition, the two did share many of the same concerns that needed to be addressed, such as how to fund the journey, how to find and collect the information desired, how to communicate with the local inhabitants, and where to stay and how to travel under conditions different from an urban academic life. In this section, I will discuss these kinds of practical matters for conducting research, and how the practices and circumstances of fieldwork affected what was expected of and valued in collectors.

Getting started

The collection of folklore was mainly organised by societies and the archive institutions for folklore, ethnology and philology, which, in turn, were to a large extent directed by academic authorities at the universities. The organisations offered compensation for example in the form of books, journal subscriptions or small sums of money to collectors for sending dialect words, proverbs and songs. The relationship between the societies and the university was close, as was demonstrated in chapter 3. Outi Lehtipuro states that the Department of Finnish and Comparative Folkloristics and the Folklore

---

The archive of the SKS “belonged together”.

The symbiosis between societies and the university was upheld by the scholars’ engagement both in the societies and academic teaching and research, and by the university’s expectation that students undertake a form of trainee period as collectors as part of their studies.

The preparations for fieldwork started by securing the funds for the project. Martti Haavio could, after his first year as a student in Helsinki, inform Lauri Hakulinen that he had been invited to the SKS, where he had been talking with the philologist Emil Aukusti Tunkelo. Tunkelo had encouraged Haavio to do language collecting and introduced him “to MA Toivonen, the head of collection work.”

One result of Haavio’s visits to SKS was that he was promised a scholarship for dialect collecting. His commentary on the up-coming collection radiates excitement. Toivonen had promised Haavio 300 Finnish marks for a month’s work, with an additional 15–25 pennies per word. By way of comparison, a worker was paid on average three Finnish marks per hour at the time, and a kilo of potatoes cost about one Finnish mark. Haavio calculated this was more than adequate wages, especially since not only distinct dialect words counted, but also any common word, such as “knife” or “night” were included. Even better, he noted, his home village was barely discovered when it came to collecting dialects, offering an amazing opportunity for him to be the one to do it. In an excited tone, he wrote to Hakulinen that this would be an opportunity to write a laudatur thesis (comparable to a master’s thesis) on the dialect of Yläne. He further suggested to Hakulinen that they would be collecting together in the same area, and so they also could reveal the “ancient

388 Lehtipuro, ‘Voiko perinnettä kerätä?’, 15.
389 It is unclear to me whether this was a particular requirement within the disciplines. Outi Lehtipuro states that the discipline of folkloristics had in Finland a strong tradition of expecting students to collect folklore and Hanna Snellman argues that the folkcultural disciplines did not include such mandatory elements in their curriculum prior to 1965. However, in a letter to Hakulinen, Haavio mentions that a cum laude thesis (roughly comparable to a bachelor’s thesis) in folkloristics required a “work obligation” (työvelvollisuus). This does not necessarily pose a contradiction, as Snellman’s and Lehtipuro’s articles are on folkloristics in the mid-twentieth century, whereas early twentieth century requirements or unwritten expectations might have fallen outside their frame. Lehtipuro, ‘Voiko perinnettä kerätä?’; Snellman, ‘Kansa tietää!’; Presumably philologist Yrjö Toivonen ‘Toivonen, Yrjö Henrik (1890–1956)’, Kansallisbiografia <https://kansallisbiografia.fi/kansallisbiografia/henkilo/7040> [accessed 31 October 2017].
past” of the neighbouring and “mysterious” municipality Säkylä. His excited tone continued further in the only letter preserved from this collection period.

Enäjärvi, in turn, expressed less excitement than Haavio over the collection project beforehand. Rather, she was not convinced by the methods and the added value of the ambitious word-collecting project. The project was organised by the Dictionary Foundation and the Society for the Study of Finnish and was fuelled by an ambition to collect the entirety of dialectal and formal Finnish words and produce a comprehensive dictionary. In 1920, Enäjärvi wrote in her diary that she was not convinced that the importance of the project stood in proportion to the amount of money and effort invested. Although finding the project commendable, she also described it as a waste of time and the people mobilised to conduct it as redundant when considering the lack of workforce for other, more essential tasks. It was only later, when she was collecting in the field, that she switched from hesitation to idealisation and engagement. Despite her revised sentiment, she added that it probably was fortunate that her collection period was short enough not to become boring.

The accounts on preparations for collection work and inspirational statements regarding Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s upcoming journey into the field tell us much about the discipline’s frames and conditions and how these institutional parameters affected students and aspiring scholars. Being active in the societies opened opportunities to discuss collection journeys with the people who were administratively in charge of the expeditions and who were funding them. Though it was an arena to which students were introduced to by their seniors, students, once in this arena, could also help each other by sharing the advantages of their networks. Haavio, for example, wrote to Hakulinen that he had talked warmly about him to Toivonen, who had asked Haavio to encourage Hakulinen to contact him for further details of funding possibilities. Similarly, Enäjärvi shared her knowledge with her peers, sometimes insider knowledge, in grant application procedures.

In Haavio’s case, it appears as if the interaction with senior researchers helped fuel inspiration and resulted in heightened excitement for the collection task in the young student Haavio (and apparently less so in Enäjärvi). Active

participation in the societies’ programmes could be seen as an early integration into the field, offering insider information about how students should proceed in order to take their first steps in fieldwork. While we can assume that university lectures and seminars introduced students to the discipline’s formal requirements and the nature of collection projects, the societies seem to have had a welcoming and integrating function within the field, inspiring students and offering them personal advice from their seniors.

Collecting

When the preparations for fieldwork were completed, the collectors could enter into the field. The collecting work included a variety of practices and ideas about how to find suitable informants and how to approach them as well as how to conduct the interviews in a way that best served scholarship.

When in the field, collectors could use lists found in booklets as a guide when asking the informant whether the informant was acquainted with specific words, concepts or proverbs. This method was soon criticised. For example, this can be seen in Lauri Hakulinen’s 1924 manual for dialect collectors, which he wrote in his role as the secretary of the Society for the study of Finnish. Booklets with lists of words were accused of being exhausting both for informants and collectors, which diminished people’s concentration and missed discovering relevant words. The booklets listed words in alphabetical order and the lack of context was argued to risk a decrease in accuracy and amount of collectable words. Partly, it was assumed that informants tended to answer that they knew a word if it was directly asked of them. At the same time, the lists were criticised for directing the informants’ thoughts away from any additional knowledge they possessed, including knowledge of words that were not listed in the catalogues. As a response to this critique, the interview manuals were soon organised according to context, advising the collector to ask about words related to, for example, specified holidays, and to work or life situations. This method was more open to collecting words unknown for the listing staff at the societies and produced more specific and contextualised examples of word and proverb usage. This method allowed informants to consider speech closer to everyday talk. According to Hakulinen, the challenge of the more open method was that it usually resulted in fewer words than the alphabetical lists. This, he continued, meant that it required more knowledge in regional dialects, language and folk culture studies. He recommended that while the more open method was to be preferred, it could very well be supplemented with alphabetical lists. The collectors should thus double check and complement the results found in the common speech of the community.399

399 Lauri Hakulinen, Opas suomen kielen marsteiden sanavarain kerääjille (Helsinki, 1927), 7–13; Compare also e.g. Bo G. Nilsson, ‘Frågor, svar—och vad mer?’, in Bo G. Nilsson, Dan
The instruction to double check sources corresponds also to the dominant ideal of recording as much information as possible, including variants that differed a little from each other and the exact same words or phrases. In part, the variants were used for mapping vernacular culture and in part, larger quantities were considered to add scientific credibility to folk culture research.\textsuperscript{400} Haavio and Enäjärvi did not specify interview methods or word lists in their personal documents, but they did give some hints as to the practicalities in their collecting work.

Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s collecting journeys exemplify two major types of students’ folklore collecting, a stationary and a touring one, which lead to variation in how the collecting was done. Enäjärvi was stationed in her home village Vihti, where she interviewed a matron of a farmstead. In a letter to Maija Ruutu, Enäjärvi wrote that she biked three kilometres every day from her accommodation to her informant, or “language master”, as she called her.\textsuperscript{401} In conducting her collecting in a familiar setting and an accustomed regional dialect, Enäjärvi was a typical collecting student. Students were commonly advised to spend a summer in their childhood surroundings, where they could speak the same dialect as their informants and therefore both understand them better and make their informants feel more comfortable during the interview situation.\textsuperscript{402} Haavio’s first fieldwork experience was also a stationary one. There are almost no contemporary accounts preserved in the archive to confirm Haavio’s memoirs, where he states that he also had a “language master”, a middle-aged, unmarried man.\textsuperscript{403}

For his second collection journey, Haavio received a scholarship from the Kalevala Society. This grant allowed him to travel to South Karelia in Southeast Finland in the summer of 1921. In addition to being considered a treasure trove of Finnish folk culture, Karelia had a second advantage for folklore and language collectors at the time. From 1919 to 1921, South Karelia hosted a large number of immigrants from the Soviet side of the border who spoke Finnish or Finnish-related languages. These immigrants had fled the Russian Civil War, World War I or left their homes in fear of consequences for participating in their regions’ fight for independence. These fights had involved also Finnish volunteers, who were fighting for the ideological kindred people cause. Thus, these Finnish speaking immigrants had the status of refugees in Finland.\textsuperscript{404} Haavio travelled close to the Soviet border, interviewing both inhabitants and immigrants who had crossed the border and

---

\textsuperscript{400} Gustavsson, \textit{Expeditioner i det förflutna}, 44.
\textsuperscript{402} Hakulinen, \textit{Opas suomen kielen murteiden sanavarain keräätjille}, 4, 6-7; Skott, \textit{Folkets minnen}, 128, 147.
\textsuperscript{403} Haavio, \textit{Nuoruusvuodet}, 271.
\textsuperscript{404} Nygård, \textit{Suur-Suomi vai lähiheimolaisten auttaminen}, 94–95.
were waiting for the next step in their immigration process. Through the immigrants, collectors could gather information from the other side of the border, which was much more difficult to cross after Finland’s independence from Russia in 1917.

The difference between the two collection methods affected the practices of interviewing and note-taking. Enäjärvi described the sedentary practice as “I chat with the old lady of Mäkelä for about three hours”. The same procedure was repeated daily during the five weeks she stayed in Vihti, and according to Enäjärvi, the work could have continued much longer. After each session, she biked back to her lodgings, where she ate lunch and copied her notes onto vocabulary cards that she later would send to the Dictionary association’s archives. For this task, she used a typewriter, which she seems to have bought in connection with her collection work. The typing took at least an hour in the afternoon, and after a break of swimming and coffee, at around five o’ clock, Enäjärvi would continue for a while with the copying. In his first collection summer in 1919, Haavio wrote to Hakulinen that he talked with his informant for three hours per day and then copied his words in the evenings. In his view, that was not particularly demanding. In a letter to Ruuttu, Enäjärvi stated that during her collecting in Vihti, she did not have time for any other activity outside collecting, recording and socialising with her relatives.

Haavio’s accounts from South Karelia give a picture of days with less routine and structure. Moving across the Karellean lands, staying only short periods at each location. He met a large variety of people, who could offer him a “catch” of various sizes. The quantity of information varied, from a couple of proverbs to hours of singing. Haavio also visited local inhabitants in their homes. After a day at an elderly man’s home, he reported that he, if nothing else, had now learned the skill of drinking immense amounts of tea. Between songs, the man had served tea, and the length of the session had, according to Haavio, resulted in extensive notes and six large glasses of tea. He later spoke with another man, who found Haavio’s struggle to drink so much tea amusing.

---

and told Haavio that a long interview could lead to the consumption of up to 18 cups of tea.410 Contrary to Enäjärvi, Haavio did not carry along a typewriter, which would have been rather inconvenient as he frequently moved around. Instead, he copied his notes at home after the journey. Apparently, he felt it was neither a very small nor a particularly enjoyable task, as he called it “cleaning the Augean stables”.411

Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s choices of words when describing their way of gathering information provides interesting insights about their work and their approach to informants. Enäjärvi described her interviews as “we chatted” or “I chat”, which emphasise a mutuality and interaction between the interviewer and the interviewee.412 Haavio used various expressions, such as “I catch”, “I made sing” and “I pried”.413 The tone in these expressions emphasise much more Haavio’s agency in the situation and also imply that the informants might have been unwilling to contribute. Further, the word choices imply that Haavio found it appropriate to persuade informants to yield information. More substantial than an implication, he also told Enäjärvi and Hakulinen how he interviewed the immigrants at the border and moved from one person to the next. In this context, he mentioned mainly women informants, whom he would make sing while they were waiting in line to be processed for border passage. Some of these women, he admitted, were at first reluctant to sing for him, but they could be coaxed to do so anyway. In one case, this was done “with the help of the civil guard”.414

What do these examples from collecting and note-taking practices tell us about the persona of a folklorist? One observation is that the two main branches of collecting, stationary and touring, are marked by different practices and approaches regarding informants. While the touring collections inherently meant rapid changes between informants, stationary collecting made it possible, but not necessarily required, for the collector to use one informant for a longer period. These two alternatives gravitated toward different approaches when engaging informants. Enäjärvi had to make an agreement with her informant about the interview already at the planning stage.

of her fieldwork. The month-long relationship between interviewer and interviewee evolved in Enäjärvi’s case and indicates a sincere respect for her “language master”. Since Enäjärvi had arranged the interview beforehand, she does not seem to have had any need to further motivate her informant to give her information. The collection could thus take the form of relaxed “chatting”. Haavio, on the other hand, selected informants along his way. Some of his informants might have been in contact with other collectors before. One of his informants had participated in the filming of a folklore-themed movie. Others, however, were probably less prepared for collectors, for example, encountered while waiting in an immigration registration line. When Haavio described his interviewing method as “have singing” and the fact that he used the civil guard to pressure people to offer information, he expressed quite a different attitude to his interactions with—or different way of exercising power over—the informants than did Enäjärvi.

Karin Gustavsson has identified similar variations in how Swedish collectors described the act of obtaining information. For example, Gustafsson notes how Swedish ethnology and folklore collectors could describe their collection methods as a “hunt” and the material collected a “catch”. Susanne Österlund-Pötzsch has written about how Finnish folklore collectors in the Swedish-speaking regions of Finland referred to collecting as “harvesting”. These word choices tell us about the collectors’ view of their role in their knowledge-production and the character of the knowledge they sought. When using these kinds of expressions, collectors emphasised a search for information hidden from him or her—and by extension what was still hidden from the scholarly world. The informant was in these cases seen as a challenge to overcome through the proper mixture of authority, persistence and social skills that would motivate the informant and project the interviewing collector as a reliable person. Similarly, “harvesting” also indicates a sense of the sought information as something existing on its own, waiting for scholars to collect. The difference here is that the informant’s role is even more passive than when viewing an informant as a reluctant provider of information. An informant from a harvesting view only provides information to the collector.

Both the stationary and touring collector would have needed to encounter their informants in a way that encouraged them to deliver information, but in different settings. Enäjärvi had to find a proper informant before arriving, and a qualified guess might be that she arranged it with the help of her relatives, who lived nearby the informant. She had to thus maintain a trusting and respectful relationship for five weeks, otherwise she would not have been able to continue her collecting. For Haavio, trust and respect had to be gained
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repeatedly with new people all the time. However, there was less at stake for a single failed collector-informant relationship. In Haavio’s case, his documents do not reveal enough information to make comparative observations. However, it is reasonable to assume that the stationary and touring collectors had different starting points for how to approach their informants. To some degree, some of the differences resulted from differences in personal attitudes or personal ways of expressing the interviewing situation, or from different interviewees. Nonetheless, the words that were chosen to describe the interaction with informants give us insights about the type of character the collectors ascribed to folklore knowledge.

The two types of fieldwork journeys differed further in the way that Enäjärvi travelled to her childhood region, while there are almost no accounts preserved of Haavio’s collections in his home region. For the collectors, this was not without significance, since dialects were key factors in the material collected—not only in the dialect word collections that Enäjärvi was occupied with in Vihti and Haavio in Yläne, but also in the folk poems and proverbs that Haavio collected in South Karelia. Enäjärvi’s choice of collecting material from the rural region of her childhood was the ideal method as described in collector guides.

Haavio did not travel a great distance from his home county to do his fieldwork (about 400 km separate Yläne from Wyborg), but he crossed a major dialect border. Finnish is still today considered to be divided into two main dialect branches, the eastern and the western. Similarly, material culture and folklore have also been considered to predominantly be divided between a Western and Eastern culture. In this sense, Haavio worked outside his “native” dialect and folk culture zone during his time in Karelia. Instead, he had to learn the dialects and backgrounds of the region’s folk culture. Although he did not on his second collection journey follow the recommendation to collect in familiar areas, his example is a rather typical one, since he travelled to the extensively researched and folk-culturally idealised Karelia. Since he was not nurtured in the culture and language by growing up in the region, he needed to be trained to acquire the knowledge and social skills that would create trusting informant relationships. While this cannot be observed as an explicit ideal for the collectors, we can assume that in cases when a collector did manage to carry out the task in an approved way, it might have been made possible because they had obtained those social skills through training. In other words, it was quite possible both to embody the required knowledge through being raised in a culture and to obtain social skills through training. While the collector in the first case followed the
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recommended way for students to do their practical training and thus supply
the archives with what they desired, the latter was more in line with how
students would be expected to work later in their academic careers.

Living and moving in the field

The stationary and touring collection projects also differed notably in how
travel and housing arrangements were made. For Enäjärvi, the distance to her
informant was relatively short, as it was only some 50 kilometres west of
Helsinki and the municipality easily accessible by bus. She could stay at her
relatives’ farm in the neighbouring village and travel some three kilometres
between the farm and the informant’s croft by bike. She described this route
as “the most wonderful, I am tempted to say the most beautiful forest road in
Finland, and past a couple of fields as well as some idyllic crofts.”420 For
Haavio, the available modes of transportation were about the same, but the
distances longer. Haavio covered the lengthy first and the last leg by train.421
The shorter legs he traveled by bike, except for the journey between Sortavala
and Salmi, for which he used a ferry.422

Susann Österlund-Pötzsch has studied the physical dimension of folklore
collecting through the practice of walking. She argues that practices of moving
in the field had a performativ function for collectors. She states that walking
was an integral part of the image of a folklore collector, who made long,
demanding journeys to uncover the nation’s heritage. This image placed
physical demands on the collectors and affected the physical circumstances
of folklore collections. Österlund-Pötzsch focuses mainly on the practice of
walking, but she also discusses other modes of transportation, such as
bicycles. Although the bike made it possible to make longer journeys than
walking, Österlund-Pötzsch shows that it by no means necessarily was an easy
way of travelling. The bikes were often heavily loaded with luggage and
collecting equipment and the roads on the rural peripheries were rarely easy
to bike on. When the conditions of the roads allowed it, bicycles were quite
practical, as they made it possible not only to transport collectors but also
equipment, which was a convenience but added more weight. In the 1910s,
collectors could take with them cameras with glass plates, weighing about 20
kg. With rapid advances in technology, cameras got lighter but travel was still

420 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio,
kauneninta metsätietä plus parin pellon ynnä parin idyllisen torpan ohi.”
421 Diaries, notes and memoirs (“Diary 15.5–15.6.1921” letter concept from Haavio to Enäjärvi
15.6.1921). Case 5.1; Compare with Eskola, Kahden, 179.
422 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letters from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri
22.5.1921. Letters 731:(3):2:2; Diaries, notes and memoirs (“Diary 15.5–15.6.1921” letter
concept from Haavio to Enäjärvi 15.6.1921). Case 5.1; Compare with Eskola, Kahden, 179.
physically demanding at the time. While the landscapes were idyllic, they also added to the hardships of travel. In Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s texts, we can read about roads in poor condition and hilly landscapes, making the journeys physically demanding. The weather added to a traveller’s hardships. Heavy rains and chilly nights as well as a baking hot sunshine were conditions to endure. Other unexpected situations could be disruptive too; Haavio’s train was left standing for hours due to problems with the track and Enäjärvi was driving a horse-pulled wagon in a thunder storm, when the horse suddenly bolted and threw Enäjärvi, her friend and their bikes off the wagon.

Both the accounts of Enäjärvi and Haavio and Österlund-Pötzsch’s research shows that the practices of getting around in the field had several functions. According to Österlund-Pötzsch, walking was a symbolic and an instrumental performance. I would add that the practice had a feature of inclusion and exclusion. This is especially the case with the practice of walking from one village to another. Österlund-Pötzsch describes walking not only as a matter of covering a distance, it is also a performance that follows in the path of great collectors and disciplinary icons such as Elias Lönnrot. In this way, walking through heritage landscapes became a statement of patriotism, a devotion to a national legacy. However, walking was time consuming and led to a form of exclusion. As Österlund-Pötzsch notes, due to the time it took to walk, most of the collectors preferred travelling by bicycle, and could in this way cover longer distances during their collection work. We could assume that the possibility to complete these longer distances in shorter time extended the opportunities for women to collect folklore. Although we know of women who slept under the bare sky during their collecting journeys, this was certainly stretching the norms of what was acceptable for respectable women during the time. Thanks to the bicycle, collectors could in most cases make the journey from one village to another within a day, and thus find more conventional accommodations. They could also make daytrips from a centrally located village or farm to more peripheral ones. Although there still were locations that could not be reached within a

427 Österlund-Pötzsch, ‘Bodies in Motion’, 262.
day by bicycle, and although the vehicle did not undo other normative restrictions that prevented women from conducting research, efficient modes of transportation widened the accepted frames for women to work in. At the same time, the symbolic performance of walking through heritage landscapes was time consuming and probably excluded many collectors, women and men, who were unable to be in the field for longer periods of time.

Österlund-Pötzsch continues by stating that the practice of walking and bicycling long distances lead to the ideal that collectors were in good physical shape. She notes that not all collectors embodied this ideal, but concludes that collectors could manage their tasks by being sufficiently determined. As an example, Österlund-Pötzsch uses the limp Edward Wefvar, who collected a vast folklore collection from large areas despite his need of a crutch for walking.

There is no doubt that determination was a crucial factor for collectors, in particular when they did not meet the typical physical measures of collectors. However, the practices of collecting and of fieldwork framed the possibilities to participate in the project in other ways too. Gender, social belonging and other intersecting categories, too, had an impact on who could be a collector and thus have influence on what kind of knowledge was preserved and produced. Undertaking a tour in the summer fit well most students and teachers, because their most timebound and concentrated workload fell on the rest of the year. In contrast to students and teachers, people making a living from agriculture could in most cases not make such long tours, since their most timebound workload fell on the summer. Then again, many of the people living from agriculture would be the objects of study rather than collectors themselves. Moreover, equipment and vehicles came with costs. We might also presume that the long collecting journeys affected men and women with children differently. It might not be too far-fetched to assume that having children was more of an obstacle for women than for men. Some, however, found solutions to combine family life and collecting. When Enäjärvi and Haavio went on a collection journey to Estonian Ingria in 1936, they arranged childcare for their three children at the family’s summer house in Sammatti near Helsinki. After the journey, Enäjärvi wrote that they had made the trip as short as possible, as she felt that already the two weeks away was a long time to be apart from the children.

429 According to Carol Dyhouse, the bicycle also opened greater possibilities for women to participate in higher education and paid work, once it became socially acceptable for them to bike. Dyhouse, *No Distinction of Sex?*, 205; According to Emma Hilborn, bicycling women had been perceived ambivalently in the late nineteenth century, but became less problematic and more accepted during the first decade of the twentieth century. Emma Hilborn, ‘Den eleganta cyklisten. Cykling, mode och kvinnlighet i sekelskiftets svenska och danska damtidningar’, *Historisk Tidskrift* (Sweden), 138/1 (2018), 4–5, 28–31.

430 Österlund-Pötzsch, ‘Bodies in Motion’, 264.

431 Eskola, *Yhdestä*, 504.

The fitness of collectors and scholars was embedded in a wider context of nationalism and ideas of what characterised good scholars. Physical strength and health were in the early twentieth century closely connected to national pursuits of building a strong nation with strong, healthy citizens, which further affected the view on the bodies of individuals. Scholars’ bodies mattered too. Female scholars had an interest in proving their physical health and ability in order to counter arguments claiming that women were physically too weak for higher education. The appearance and body of a scholar have also been pointed out as inherent features of the scholarly persona. For example, Herman Paul and Janet Browne suggest that scholars have tried to improve others’ perception of them as scholars by matching their appearances according to expectations of what scholars should look like. Kaat Wils and Pieter Huistra have further shown that health and fitness also made a difference in persona formation. In their research on scientific persona in the exchange program of the Belgian-American Educational Foundation in the interwar years, Wils and Huistra state that the funding agency participated in persona formation by admitting certain types of candidates into the exchange program. They claim that by requiring good health and fit bodies, the scholarly persona of successful Belgian scholars also developed a concrete bodily dimension.

Although Enäjärvi and Haavio described their journeys as fun, we can also observe in some letters how they sensed that the recipient of their letters would not necessarily find all their experiences in the field fully appropriate. Enäjärvi could, for example, write to her brother that he should “calm Mother down and tell there are neither bandits nor cockroaches out here”. She further explained that she had bicycled a long distance in bad weather conditions, adding that she had done it on her own, as her travel companion, miss Mustonen, was not as used to biking as she was. Mustonen would wait for Enäjärvi in the village of Mekinjärvi, where Enäjärvi said she intended to continue by horse. Here, Enäjärvi assured that she was not exposing herself to adventures or dangers, but practiced perfectly familiar and safe ways of
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435 See e.g. Browne, ‘Charles Darwin as a Celebrity’, 186; Paul, ‘What Is a Scholarly Persona?’, 357.


travelling. Her letters to the family did not mention anything more about the horse rides, including the above-mentioned bolting horse accident, which only Haavio got a report of.\textsuperscript{439} Instead, Enäjärvi wrote to her family about appropriate accommodation solutions, such as staying at vicarages.\textsuperscript{440} In contrast, Haavio does not seem to have made such a division of information. He could write both home and to his friends about spending the night in a barn with a cow and a sheep or sleeping outside (his letters also give us competing information about cockroach observations).\textsuperscript{441} Nonetheless, Haavio also anticipated that Hakulinen would condemn how he “travelled around the world like a gypsy in the company of some women”.\textsuperscript{442} Apparently, this did not concern Haavio too much, as he added that he indeed enjoyed travelling in general and travelling in good company in particular, which is why he could “cope with this scorn of yours too [reference to Hakulinen]”.\textsuperscript{443} Several of Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s letters include information that they had arranged accommodations in local homes. As Enäjärvi, Haavio also stayed at a vicarage. Other times, he mentioned that he stayed at a local elementary school teacher’s home.\textsuperscript{444} Although the summer days were warm, the nights could be very cold, and Haavio wrote about sometimes waking up shivering if he had not found indoor accommodations.\textsuperscript{445} On hot days, Haavio wrote that he could take a nap in a barn a little remote from the nearest hamlet, and then continue his journey when the evening came with chillier air.\textsuperscript{446}
collection journey in South Karelia, Haavio stayed in a hospital, assuring Hakulinen that he was not ill, but was provided accommodation among the staff. Enäjärvi reported that when she and her friend were leaving North Karelia, they took the night train to the town of Kajaani. Upon arrival, they freshened up in a public bath and took a rest outside in the grass.

According to Irma-Riitta Järvinen, female folklore collectors could face disapproving opinions about the appropriateness of their collection journeys. This was especially the case when it came to travelling alone and when lacking accommodation during the nights. Enäjärvi’s travel accounts indicate that she either arranged her accommodations in more conventional ways than Haavio or did not write about times when she did not have a prearranged place to stay. The difference between Haavio’s boastful anecdotes about his nights outside and Enäjärvi’s recurrent notes about appropriate accommodation can similarly be observed in their accounts from journeys in Estonia and Western Europe, which will be discussed in the next two chapters.

Establishing a relationship to the objects of study

The students’ accounts of the locals portray a relationship between aspiring scholars and their objects of study. In the following, I discuss the students’ descriptions of the locals as, on the one hand, carriers of a culture shared with the student and, on the other hand, as distinct from the folklorist. I argue that this alternation between idealising identification and distancing or othering as well as authenticity labelling, were means by which the students marked their positions as academics, and as such became key elements in the students’ construction of a folklorist’s persona.

Idealisations of the landscape and people

Haavio and Enäjärvi often wrote about their surroundings and the people in the countryside as idyllic and admirable, which is unsurprising in regard to their field’s national romantic background. Traditional songs, beliefs and proverbs were used as cultural artefacts for identifying that heritage. The
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450 Much of the empirical material and discussions of this chapter section are published in Lisa Svanfeldt-Winter, ‘Writing a Folklorist’s Persona in the Field: How Defining the Object of Study Defines the Scholar’, Persona Studies, 4/1 (2018), 18–31.
educated classes collected, studied and idealised what they considered traditional to their national heritage.451

Similar to their peers around Europe, Enäjärvi and Haavio addressed typical nineteenth and early twentieth century features of a national romanticist imaging of a national landscape. In the Finnish case, this included birch trees, forested hills, lakes, domestic animals such as cows and sheep and villages with old cottages.452 The same types of cultural references appeared in contemporary fine art and literature—which mirrored the tendencies around Europe.453 Tricia Cusack, who has studied imaging of “authentic” Irishness, argues that painters and travel letter writers in search of folk roots reinforced each other’s picturesque imaging of a national landscape.454 Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote of an idyllic landscape experienced in ideal weather conditions. This is not to say that they excluded accounts of rain, cold and thunder storms, which made their collection journeys more difficult.455 However, through almost exclusively placing the national landscape in the light of perfect weather conditions, the students reinforced its idyllic aura, filling what was popularly considered their “own” landscape solely with idealising content. Corresponding to previous research on folk culture portrayals of the landscape, Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s imaginings also included both nature in and of itself and human influence on it. Domestic animals, cultivation, roads and buildings were described together with accounts of natural vegetation, occasional hills and wild animals.456

In comparison to the imaging of landscapes, the descriptions of people were more varied. The most common, general positive descriptions of the people


noted that they were friendly and kind.\textsuperscript{457} For the travelling collectors, it was naturally a great advantage when the local people were generous and hospitable, helping them with their work and providing transportation, repairing shoes and offering food and accommodation.\textsuperscript{458} Other positive features that people were ascribed were “resilient” and “vivacious”.\textsuperscript{459} The positive characterisations were typically used for persons who Enäjärvi and Haavio deemed as having some form of higher status in the community. This could be the patron or matron (\textit{isäntä/emäntä}) of a house, a priest or a local leader. Still, no characterisations were exclusively used for people with higher status, and any of the people in the documents could be described as friendly, generous or vivacious. The main difference was that when the social rank of an individual was mentioned, the descriptions were almost exclusively positive. Consequently, the people with relatively higher social status received comparatively more positive descriptions than did the others.\textsuperscript{460}

People of higher status were also more often than others portrayed as smart and sophisticated. This is rather unsurprising, as the people in question more often had at least some education. With sophistication, the collectors apparently referred to a (pan-)nationalistic conviction, usually connected to the issue of helping arriving Karelian and Ingrian immigrants who were leaving the Soviet Union. Such a perspective aided the promotion of irredentist pursuits to annex especially Soviet Karelian territory to Finland.\textsuperscript{461}

This view was mainly promoted via newspapers, journals and travelling propagandists, such as Haavio and Enäjärvi during their journey in Karelia in 1923.\textsuperscript{462} The educated people, who were convinced by ideas promoted by the AKS, probably offered more grounds for identification among the collectors and might therefore be the motive behind more positive accounts. In addition


\textsuperscript{461} SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 4.7.1923. Letter 758:(23:)4:1; Eskola, \textit{Kahden}, 322 (2.7.1923).

\textsuperscript{462} Nygård, \textit{Suur-Suomi vai lähiheimolaisten auttaminen}, 128–133.
to a shared political conviction, they also shared a similar background. The division between urban, scholarly collectors and rural amateurs should not be made too sharp. In proportion to other disciplines, a large share of scholars and students in the national disciplines came, like Haavio, from the educated rural population, such as teachers and priests or, like Enäjärvi, from the landowning farmer households, with at least some degree of education. Of the students at the University of Helsinki in 1921–1925, 12 per cent were from farmer families and 32 per cent had fathers who were educated lower-middle class, such as elementary school teachers, craftsmen or foremen.463

Probably, when Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote favourably about the educated people in the countryside, they did not refer to them as informants. Collectors were advised to primarily interview illiterate people, since unschooled informants would be less influenced by modern and urban culture, language and convictions.464 Against this background, we might exercise critical caution when reading the positive accounts of “educated” people.

In addition to social background or class, there are several other intersecting categories involved in the value-laden descriptions of the locals and informants, not least age, which was an inherent component of informants and collectors. Finnish folklorist Sinikka Vakimo has argued that early folklorists’ frequent use of old women as informants has falsely been interpreted as proof of the high status of old women in the eyes of their society and the folklorists. Vakimo states that, quite the opposite, old women are in these collection practices reduced to remnants from the past and tools to acquire information of something other than the women themselves are or are part of. This, Vakimo argues, cannot be interpreted as an appreciation of the informants as individuals, but only as carriers of memory.465

Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts correspond well to Vakimo’s thesis. Enäjärvi’s judgement of her informant in Vihti mirrored for example Lauri Hakulinen’s 1924 guidebook for language collectors. In the book, Hakulinen
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464 Sinikka Vakimo, Paljon kokeva, vähän näkyvä. Tutkimus vanhaa naista koskevista kulttuurisista käsitteistä ja vanhan naisen elämänkäytännöstä (Helsinki, 2001), 26. In the case of the AKS tour, this is, of course, far from surprising, since the aim of the journey was not to interview informants.

465 Vakimo further argues that it is problematic, but symptomatic for folkcultural research, that scholars tend to find old people’s experiences interesting only as keyholes to look through and see glimpses of the past, rather than to understand the old people’s contemporary culture. The old people’s memories or knowledge in traditions should, in her view, not be considered as a link to the past, but as the peoples’ living culture. Vakimo, Paljon kokeva, vähän näkyvä, 23, 27–29.
advised the collectors to search for elderly people with clear thoughts and good memory. Ideally, the informants would not only be illiterate, but also have lived their whole lives as isolated as possible from input from the world outside the local community. In practice, he added, such ideal informants would more often be women than men, since the men tended to travel more and relocate for work. Further, the collector should search for a person with a good vocabulary and an authentic dialect, as well as useful insights in a variety of areas of life, which would further widen the vocabulary of specific terms. These also characterised the ideal informant in the field of ethnology, as established by history of ethnology. Enäjärvi described her informant in a similar manner:

She was ideal as such [informant]: Despite her 73 years of age, she was both mentally and physically quite alert, always quick-tongued, enthusiastic about the work, doing her best. She has in her prime been active and enterprising, and, it seems, represented the croft both out- and inwards. Thus, she had a lot of knowledge about and interest in a variety of topics and a language that is both rich and typical of the Vihti area.

By stating that the informant had been active in the household management of the croft she inhabited, Enäjärvi could manoeuvre around one of the challenges that Hakulinen, in his book, considered to be a drawback when using women as informants: their lack of vocabulary for the more masculine parts of the household and community traditions. Furthermore, Hakulinen advised the collector to be aware that women often had difficulties with abstract thinking. Compatible with Vakimo’s statement, Enäjärvi connected her informant’s old age with her value as an informant, adding a positive remark about the clarity of the informant’s thought and memory as a guarantee for the accuracy of her information.

Haavio, on the other hand, does not give us any direct opinions regarding ideal informants, but he did point out old age as a factor in his letters. In them, he did not deliver direct praise or criticism. Rather, their tone was poetic, which can be exemplified by his description to Enäjärvi of a walk that he made with his informant Iivana Djänis in Moisenvaara in 1921:
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I now walk with Livana Djänis away from the old woman Määränen’s house—he is old, he leans on his stick. And he recites Metsämiehen laulu as we walk there, I tired, he decrepitly dragging... along the steep road, lined by a roundpole fence. Beautiful houses built in Karelian style rise up around us...

My miss, I am nearly crying when I say goodbye to everything beautiful, to everything good, that will perhaps never return.

Stay for a while! Through the window the view of Karelia opens up, dimming into dusk, partly sinking down into mist...

As in Haavio’s account of Iivana Djänis, folklore students recurrently marked old age by using a word for an old person, without further specifying how old the person was. Such words could be eukko, akka, muori (granny) and emäntä (matron) for women and isäntä (patron) or ukko for men. Enäjärvi could use for her informant in Vihti the respectful kielimestari (language master) or


471 For eukko, see Eskola, Kahden, 177 (5.6.1921); SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Diaries, notes and memoirs (“Diary 15.5–15.6.1921” 15.6.1921—here also baaba: granny); For akka, see SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 16.6.1921. letter 731:(3:)3:1; Diaries, notes and memoirs (“Diary 15.5–15.6.1921” 15.6.1921); For muori, see SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Enäjärv-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 4.8.1924. Letter 736:(8:)5:6; For emäntä, see SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 4.8.1924. Letter 736:(8:)5:6; SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärv-Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Rajainen, Maija 21.8.1924. Letter 785:(13:)10:26; For isäntä, see Eskola, Kahden, 175 (2.6.1921); For ukko, see SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 22.5.1921. Letter 731:(3:)2:2; Eskola, Kahden, 178 (5.6.1921).
rakastettava kielimestarittareni (my lovable female language master), but also the much less respectful kielimuija.²⁷²

The portrayals of locals or informants are surprisingly seldom gendered in ways pointed out by previous research. Similar to research on gender and nationalism in other disciplines, Kaija Heikkinen argues that women were considered to be the main carriers of national heritage. This view emphasised the importance of women’s moral standards, while simultaneously it diminished their role to passively transmitting tradition and information.²⁷³ Male informants, on the other hand, were, according to Lotte Tarkka, portrayed as part of nature, often described with words from the forest and landscape.²⁷⁴ Emphasising the (landowning farmer) men’s independence was also a way of imaging a grand and modern nation with deep roots in democracy.²⁷⁵ Interestingly, I cannot find such comments in Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s field accounts. The closest we come to such descriptions is Haavio’s description of Djänis, which further shows how the informants were rhetorically placed in the national romantic landscape.

The positive accounts of the landscape and people portray an image of enthusiastic students in a new role of folklore collectors, who travelled in an idyllic landscape and who encountered mainly friendly and pleasant people. These accounts confirmed a typical narrative form used by collectors to describe their surroundings in the field. In this narrative form, idyllic landscapes and idealised oral traditions and heritage were intertwined. The ultra-positive accounts also radiated the folklorists’ bliss and enthusiasm for their task. In this way, the student collectors confirmed to each other their positive attachment to their shared field of study, as well as to its methods and objects of study. The student collector’s persona is here a joyful projection, composed through shared experiences in the field, which to a large degree responds to (or is written to respond to) the idealising nationalistic view of the countryside and especially to Karelia. However, as will be discussed in the...
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²⁷³ Nira Yuval-Davis, Gender and Nation, 11th, first published 1997 edn (London, 2008), 45; Kaija Heikkinen, ‘Naiset, miehet ja sukupuoli etnologiatietyissä’, in Pia Olsson and Terhi Willman eds., Sukupuolen kohdaaminen etnologiatiessa (Helsinki, 2007), 32; However, also male informants, and more generally the Karelians at large, were widely viewed as only preserving the folk poetry rather than being the producers of it. Hautala, Suomalainen kansanrunoudentutkimus, 259.


following section, the collectors did not exclusively write in positive terms about these communities.

Celebrated Finnishness and deleterious Russian influences

While Haavio and Enäjärvi gave positive comments about people that they, on the basis of their background, could have identified themselves with more than with the illiterate and non-landowning people, they also had reason for identification based on shared ethnicity. A recurring feature in the portrayals of both immigrants and Finnish Karelians was the frequency of positive statements that could be attributed the degree to which folklorist writers could identify ethnically with the people they met. A particularly visible contrast could be read, for instance, in folklorist accounts regarding the “Russianness” in relation to “Finnishness” of the encountered local people. I use here the term ethnicity in a broad sense to elaborate on the various conceptualisations of folk-cultural belonging. All informants and collectors discussed in this chapter would probably have been defined by the folk culture scholars ethnically as Finnish or Finnic. In addition to Finnishness or Finnicness, the informants were, for example, labelled with more particular markers for their regional or linguistic belonging.

Most of the descriptions of people in the material were noted as Karelians, some of who were from Soviet/Russian Karelia and most from Finnish Karelia. Both groups were usually referred to simply as Karelians, but usually the context revealed the individual’s nationality. As the Finnish Karelians were the largest group described in the source material, the descriptions of them were understandably the most varied, and thus most often occurring in this analysis. Haavio came in contact with some other Finnic people while interviewing the immigrants in 1921.

The Finnish ethnic Self had its primary Other in Russian influenced areas, which, to judge from the letters and diaries, could be sensed in how people’s lifestyles and behaviour in these areas were described. The proximity to Russian territory, together with the writers’ antipathy towards it, was visible for example in Enäjärvi referring to the area as “those poor borders!”, or in Haavio’s locating his place of writing as “the most distant corner, where civilised social structure extends to the east”. The border region in North Karelia, where Haavio and Enäjärvi made these statements, had indeed poor inhabitants and a low level of industrialisation in comparison to, for example, South Karelia. However, this was true for several other Finnish regions too. Beside a low living standard, Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s statements of the border

---
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regions appear to be referring directly to the closeness to Russia. According to Pertti Anttonen, there was in Finland and the Baltic states a discourse of these states to be “the last resort of Europe against ‘the evil forces of the East.’” The eastern negative influence close to the border could also be seen in the homes: according to Enäjärvi, the Russian influence could be observed in the lack of orderliness of the house or in the language spoken in the home.

When Haavio came across Ingrian immigrants, he praised them as “one the best ones of the Finnish people”. The Ingrians were without evaluative remarks labelled as Finnish, while the Karelians received fewer approving notes due to the degree of Russian influence. The Olonets Karelians from the north of Lake Ladoga, were in Haavio’s descriptions less Finnish than the others. The difference was particularly visible in language distinctions. The Olonets Karelian dialect, Livvi, is a branch of the Karelian language, which Haavio admitted having difficulties understanding. He stated that when among the Olonets Karelian, he felt “like a stranger” because they “prattle a most peculiar language”.

In some cases, however, the negative tone used against people under Russian influence is less obvious. Should, for example, Haavio’s account about going to an Orthodox priest as going “to a Karelian Russkie priest” be read as a negative marker for all Eastern influence or is it merely the writer’s choice to innocently use the derogative word Russkie (“ryssä”) universally, without conscious judgment? Enäjärvi used the term “Greek Catholic Church”, which in the beginning of the twentieth century still referred to the Orthodox Church in Finnish, before the meaning later shifted to refer to Catholic churches in Eastern Europe. The more correct term did not necessarily mean that it was deliberately used as a positive qualifier; Enäjärvi used it to specify the character of the Hattuvaara parish, which in her words was a “primitive Greek Catholic village”.

Haavio’s accounts about the people of Sosnovo (in Finnish Rautu), reflected to a large degree the students’ general antipathy against most things
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Russian rather than an academic quest detached from political conviction. Sosnovo was a Finnish locality close to the Russian/Soviet border until it was ceded to the Soviet Union in 1944. Haavio called the people of Sosnovo “traitors, reptiles, beggars, smugglers, gulashe.485 The term gulashe referred to black-marketeers but could be used for anyone who was occupied in shady business.486 In the Finnish Civil War between socialists and conservatives, the socialist side in Sosnovo had been heavily backed by Russians, and the battles there had been particularly bloody. Eventually, the conservatives whom Haavio had been fighting for in Southwest Finland, won both in Sosnovo and the entire war.487 Haavio’s critical stance toward Sosnovo, as exemplified by the quote above, seems to have been coloured by bitter feelings that lingered after the war. At least, he did not specify any other reason for holding these hostile opinions. If this was the case, ethnic characterisations were not based on folk-cultural factors, but instead on political beliefs and political party allegiances, which, as has been argued in previous chapters, were inherently connected to the discipline of folkloristics. In this light, Haavio’s anti-Russian and anti-socialist statements illustrate how these kinds of political views were commonly combined to help shape a Finnish folklorist’s persona.

Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s descriptions and statements portrayed a civilised West in contrast to an uncivilised East, manifesting how the folklorist’s persona was bound to a nationalistic conviction. Finland had announced its independence from the Russian empire in 1917, and there was an established perception of Russia as an enemy and oppressor.488 In the national disciplines, the primary research object was the researchers’ “own” national heritage. In order to study (and by studying, construct) a Finnish national heritage and identity, it was crucial for scholars to frame what was familiar and what was alien to their heritage, both outside of and within their national borders.489 This did not, however, mean that foreign influence was ignored or unrecognised. Quite the opposite, identifying cultural transmissions of folklore was an integrated part of a folklorist’s research domain, especially within the widely spread historical-geographical school.490 The significance of repeated efforts

487 Lähteenmäki, Maailmojen rajalla, 120–121.
to make distinctions between Russian and Finnish influence is that this division was not only a product of a common discourse that regarded Russia as anti-Finnish, but this cultural distinction was also a means by which the students performed their scholarly persona. By making remarks of what was Russian and what was Finnish or Finnic, the students could step into their roles as experts when identifying varying influences in the entangled cultures.

Primitive informants carrying civilisation’s heritage

In the previous section, I discussed how the collectors framed their object of study—a national cultural heritage—by identifying and contrasting it to Russian cultural influences. Here, I shift the focus to another dichotomy between Self and Other, namely in the relationship between the collectors and their informants.

Pertti Anttonen argues that in the institutionalising phase of folkloristics, the discipline’s core was manifested in a contrasting between the traditional, rural, uneducated object of study and the modern, urban and educated folklore scholars.\(^{491}\) In anthropology, theoretical attention has been drawn to how their disciplines approach their informants, that is, they have examined their own scholarly gaze on people who have been considered to inhabit a lower stage of civilizational development. Anthropologists started criticising their own approach to their informants in the late 1970s, arguing that scholars in Western academia created their informants as Others who were located in distant societies. Typically inspired by Edward Said’s work on Orientalism, critics demonstrated how the understanding and the representation of the assumed primitive peoples were offered as counter images of themselves.\(^{492}\) The anthropologist Johannes Fabian established that dichotomies between primitivism and civilisation do not need to be based on a spatial distance only. Fabian claims that scholars also create a distance in time between themselves and their objects of study. The scholar does so by observing the objects of study as living in an earlier time period and as less developed than the observer.\(^{493}\)

Fabian’s approach is productively useful for a reading of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s descriptions of the locals’ cultivation or lack of it. In their accounts, there is a difference between how individuals and communities are described. When Haavio and Enäjärvi wrote about the degree of development of specific

\(^{491}\) Anttonen, *Tradition through Modernity*, 28, 49.


individuals, they used the word “sophisticated”. When using the words “primitive” or “uncivilised”, they referred to localities, such as the above-mentioned village Hattuvaara, or to more or less vague groups of people. Another example would be when Haavio told Hakulinen that he was travelling to the municipality of Salmi and its surroundings, and that it “almost scares me to go there, being among those barbarians, so very far from the civilised”.

Haavio wrote the account while in Sortavala, a town on the northern shore of Lake Ladoga. Salmi lies some 80 kilometres east of the town, next to the Soviet border. The geographical distance between Sortavala and Salmi is rather short, but the cultural distance, in Haavio’s view, might very well have been greater. The former was a more bustling town with upper-secondary schools and a seminar for teachers’ education, shops and a Lutheran majority, while the latter was a small municipality, with few possibilities for education and an Orthodox majority. According to the Finnish historian Maria Lähteenmäki, the localities closest to the Russian border on the Karelian Isthmus were commonly considered exotic by Finnish visitors. Maybe Salmi, which was located next to the border, albeit north of Lake Ladoga, had a similar exotic connotation for Haavio.

Enäjärvi and Haavio rarely described localities in less positive terms, but when they did, it was a place, more often than not, on the outskirts of their travels, usually located in the easternmost places of their journeys, such as Salmi and Suovaara in South Karelia, and Hattuvaara, Tuupovaara and Ilomantsi in North Karelia. During the AKS tour, these were trips to the northernmost localities Hyrynsalmi, Ristijärvi and Suomussalmi, which were located outside Karelia.

Haavio’s difference-making between civilised towns and a primitive countryside can also be read in his accounts of rural people when he was in Helsinki. For example, in letters to Hakulinen, he made fun of countryside schoolboys and schoolgirls visiting a student association where he held presentations for them. He mocked them for the way the “ideological
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countryside youth clopped in as a wonderfully ordered fold, following a fat-tailed black ram through the fence opening, into the university hall, and sat there so bashfully and stood so adorably on ceremony [...] The description of these students as wonderful, bashful and adorably, has a condescending, even demeaning tone. Haavio elaborated further with a similar derisive humour on the shyness and ignorance of the countryside students:

You know, monsieur, shyness is in most cases a sign of stupidity. At least it is a sign of underdevelopment. Oh, how we wished to approach the adorable youth of this countryside! [...] We love you, you fools! How wonderful is the smell of the cowshed! How we wish to civilise you oh you fellow creatures living of turf, created to conduct the original work. So that you would learn to understand that there is something better, so that you would learn to despise yourself and your work. So that you would become pale and wax-coloured by your books like us, or that you would go to the deepest depths of Hell due to your lack of intelligence and other incapability ...

The descriptions followed the labyrinthine and sometimes boastful style that Hakulinen and Haavio used when writing to each other. The passage should probably not be read literally as revealing Haavio’s inner feelings towards the countryside youth. Yet, in their exaggeration they do reveal a model of thinking in terms of an educated, active student teaching an ignorant and passive rural youth in a nationalistic project. The descriptions further offer a viewpoint to how the fellow students applied their education to their humour, positioning themselves as the experts or observers of the rural people (the “folk” in folklore). For example, Haavio continued the letter by telling Hakulinen that he and a fellow student had later in the evening entertained themselves by making “ethnological observations” of the people attending. This included noting the “dark skin colour typical of Hungarians” and that
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they further “divided the citizens in stupid and smart people on the basis of their facial traits.”

Rural people, on the other hand, could also be described as sophisticated, as exemplified in Enäjärvi’s account about Taipale in North Karelia. The people there, she explained, were “the cleverest that we have visited.” She reasoned that it was due to a relatively high standard of living, based on good farming. Moreover, Taipale “for the time [is] still protected from smugness and arrogance by the status of the local area, which is not yet a village.”

Still, there is probably reason to pay attention to two issues in Enäjärvi’s statement. First, it only referred to the people they visited during the journey, implying that she did not necessarily find them as clever as people she met in Helsinki or anywhere else outside her route for that matter. Second, there is no evidence that she would have considered the Taipale people’s way of being clever of an equal kind to that of urban people’s mode of being. Quite the opposite, by pointing out that the place so far had been protected from corrupted forms of character by being small and isolated not even to register as a village, she rather indicates an ambivalent view of the rural inhabitants. Anthropologists, folklorists and ethnologists in other countries used a similar rhetoric when arguing that local dialects and traditions were disappearing as industrialisation and expanding infrastructure brought modernity to the countryside. While the change was considered inescapable and predominantly a positive development, society and scholarship were urged to preserve as much of the “original” heritage accounts as possible. In other words, Enäjärvi’s description of the Taipale people as clever in their rural ways could be interpreted as an account that positioned them on another level of development than her own.

As was discussed above, Haavio’s accounts of people’s lack of education or civil behaviour correlated with him judging them to have low interest in


503 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Diary of 1923” 8.7.1923). Case 5. Org. “fiksuin, missä olemme olleet.”; “varjelee toistaiseksi omahväisyydestä ja ylimielisyydestä paikkakunnan asema, joka ei vielä ole kirkonkylä.” NB The locality should not be confused with the municipality Taipale in South Karelia. It is not to be found in Sarmela’s atlas, but should be in this region, as Enäjärvi wrote in her diary that she was in Taipale and that she just had been in Rääkkylä. Only one day later, she dated her note in Pielisjärvi, both of which are municipalities in North Karelia. “Kirkonkylä” refers to a village by a church and was a centre in a rural municipality.

Karelianism. Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s descriptions of people’s level of social sophistication should be read in the context of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s engagement in the Academic Karelia Society. Haavio’s accounts of the level of peoples’ developmental level were often given in proximity to his reflections over how eagerly the people had responded to Karelianist propaganda during his work as an AKS promoter. He could, for example, report to the AKS that fewer local associations than expected had been founded due to the peoples’ low level of sophistication.505

The scholars’ distancing from the locals on a time-civilization basis seems to have had a similar function as the observations on Finnishness discussed above. In both cases the students identified traits in locals that highlighted the difference between the observer and the observed. By labelling the locals as people living in a more distant time, the students emphasised the locals’ value as objects of study and their own expertise in evaluating that value. Since folk culture was considered to be transmitted in its most original form among the rural elderly, due to their closer connection to the past, the scholars needed to identify archaic cultural features from a distant past.506 At the same time, the scholars were not idealising all old cultural features. According to Ulrike Spring, the search for heritage needed to resonate with contemporary ideals, such as the virtue of equality or independence. Features that did not fit into in the national self-image were toned down. Spring calls the informants’ relationship to the collectors as the “internal other”, in which the collectors searched for modern ideals in a national archaic past through studies in what was considered a more primitive culture of the nation.507

The use of words such as “primitive”, “barbarian” or “uncivilised” can be read as explicit expressions of a widely spread view that the locals in rural areas lived closer to and were in touch with a more archaic life and culture than the scholars.508 They can also be read as the student collectors’ way of marking their position in academia and among each other. By stating that some communities were “primitive” or “uncivilised”, the student making such a statement automatically marks a contrasting position from where the civilised person can make that judgement. The position to deem some communities more primitive than others acquires an additional function in the next chapter section. I discuss below how the collectors formed their scholarly personae by putting themselves in a position to deem what information was worthy of preservation and of value to research.

506 Skott, Folkets minnen, 142–145.
508 Anttonen, Tradition through Modernity, 139.
Authority to evaluate information

According to Regina Bendix, authenticity has a legitimizing function in folkloristics. When something is declared authentic, it gains the status of something worthy of preservation and analysis. At the same time, declaring folklore information authentic constitutes a claim of scholarly authority by the person declaring it.\textsuperscript{509} In the following, I will discuss how collectors’ hierarchal distancing from their informants was made visible in the collectors’ statements of authenticity. I further discuss how the students formed a folklorist’s persona and a scholarly authority by taking a position from where they could evaluate the developmental level of their objects of study.

One group of people who were given special attention in the students’ descriptions were the people acknowledged for having knowledge in folklore and speaking distinct, “archaic” dialects. These two qualities were always characterised in positive terms, although Haavio once interposed that “when one crone sang 9 hours without a break, happiness was no longer the only feeling of mine.”\textsuperscript{510} These types of individuals were naturally valued for their possession of the kind of information that the collectors searched. In particular, Haavio announced excitement over finding informants with distinct dialects. His way of expressing his excitement followed a typical jargon for ethnographers, who were, at the time, in search of a national heritage and its archaic and pure language and folklore.\textsuperscript{511} In Haavio’s accounts, he was excited by recording material that he considered to be pure and free from interference with other dialects and languages, as well as informants who he saw as living relics from an ancient past or who reminded him of the \textit{Kalevala}.\textsuperscript{512} Applying Bendix’s perspective, Haavio was here giving accounts of the Karelians as bearers of authentic, untainted or archaic lifestyles, language and knowledge. Collecting such material can be interpreted as the pursuit of legitimising himself as a scholar. I would further suggest that the practice of placing oneself in a position to label informants authentic or inauthentic is an integral feature in a folklorist’s persona.

Another way of manifesting a hierarchically superior relationship to the objects of study was to assume the authority to evaluate the informants’ value to the discipline. Folklorists could do so by dismissing informants or some of

\textsuperscript{509} Bendix, \textit{In Search of Authenticity}, 7.
\textsuperscript{511} Ó Giolláin, \textit{Locating Irish Folklore}, 50–51.
their knowledge as not being of scholarly interest. Moreover, Lotte Tarkka argues that folklorists and collectors marked their position by determining the information’s relative value measured in rewards given to the informants. Haavio’s accounts give an example of an encounter and a dismissal of a possible informant. On his collection journey in South Karelia, Haavio met a troubadour. At first sight, the old man gave the impression of Väinämöinen, the hero in the Finnish folklore epic Kalevala, being white-haired, old aged, stiff in posture, wearing birchbark lapti shoes and carrying a kantele-zither. Responding to Haavio’s inquiry, the old man had assured him that he indeed knew traditional folksongs. To Haavio’s disappointment, however, the man turned out not to have anything worthy to record.

Failing to meet the collectors’ expectations, the old man did not match the criteria identified by Tarkka. Though the old man appeared to be a perfect “catch” for the collectors, he lacked—or declined to deliver—the desired knowledge. Possibly, the old man had not acted with an intention to appear as an authentic folklore knower, but had only through chance of circumstances caught Haavio’s attention. However, parallel to chance encounters, rural people were often well informed about the travelling collectors and would actively offer their traditional knowledge and folklore to them. For instance, Karelian rune singers were aware of the popularity of their singing and could perform for larger audiences. According to Tarkka, this undermined the collectors’ authority to determine an informant’s value, which is why scholars tried to counteract informants from making money from their folklore knowledge. There was a consensus about the informants’ right to be compensated for their information, but also about the collectors’ right to assign the value and set the amount of compensation. Singers performing for larger audiences for money could, for example, be met with great suspicion and collectors could publicly claim that such information was

513 Compare e.g. Lilja, Föreställningen om den ideala uppteckningen, 240; The collectors and scholars were also excluding information and informants from the collections based on other perceptions of what the discipline’s object of study was and how this information could be obtained. Marja-Liisa Keinänen has showed how gendered notions of transmission of tradition affected the selection of informants, while Sinikka Vakimo has showed how singers could be dismissed as informants due to young age. She uses one of the most famous rune singers, Larin Paraske, as an example. According to Vakimo, Paraske had a local reputation as a good singer with a wide repertoire already at a rather young age, but she did not gain recognition as an informant before she turned 50. Marja-Liisa Keinänen, ‘Metsäsuomalaisen kulttuurin renessanssi ja suomalaiset tutkijat’, in Pekka Laaksonen, Seppo Knuttila, and Ulla Piela eds., Kenttäkysymyksiä (Helsinki, 2004), 91–110; Vakimo, Paljon kokeva, vähän näkyvä, 25.


In Haavio’s letters, the old man could be seen as a singer, who tried to take an active part in the knowledge production of Karelian folklore but was dismissed as an unfit informant by the collector.

In the case above, Haavio took an active stance in framing his scholarly persona by giving an account of himself as the one judging the information’s or the informant’s value and authenticity. By exercising judgement over authentic forms of folk traditions, the collectors shaped their own authority and had a direct impact on what types of knowledge could be produced and included in the research field. The decision to dismiss information at hand, or the refusal to dig deeper into the information, excluded certain information from the field’s archives and from future scholarship. Consequently, what collectors presumed to be expected from them as good collectors affected what information was recorded, preserved and could be used as sources in future research.

In their letters and diaries, Haavio and Enäjärvi described in detail several individuals who they met in the field, but they only twice wrote down these informants’ names. This can be related to the contemporary scholarly view on the nature of folklore in general and folksongs in particular. According to this view, folksongs were not produced, shaped and created by individuals. Instead, folksongs existed independently and could move and survive across borders and time. Lotte Tarkka observes that since folksongs were considered “echoes from the past” they were not produced by individual singers, but only transmitted by them. Thus, collectors and scholars were not in search of artistic singers, but instead passive performers, through whom “poetry could leak”. The approach is rather similar to the one discussed above in connection to how the collectors described the collection as either “harvesting” information from a passive carrier of tradition or “chatting” with an informant with some form of agency in the collection process.

Research has also identified that informants were further made passive carriers of information when the recordings were sent to archives with only name, age and place of the informants stated, leaving out other personal information and characterisations. These minimal facts were preserved in the archives. In the published works, even these bare facts were normally left out, as the aim was to give an analysis of the collective rather than specific
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developments of folklore. In contrast to this anonymity, the private notes from the collection journeys show that the collectors paid significant attention to the characteristics and personalities of the informants and other locals. Scholarly distance between collector and informant was, in other words, made greater in the archive records and published research than in the more private writing.

The private nature of the texts did not mean that the students in these texts would not have followed conventions when approaching their informants. Instead, the personal accounts of local people exemplify quite well features that researchers have identified as significant for ethnologists’ relationship to their informants in the early years of the discipline. Collectors were instructed to search for the traditional and “unspoiled” livelihoods and people, which can be seen in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts of the landscape and the countryside people. On the other hand, organisers and educated collectors valued the collectors’ ability to fit in as well as possible into the local society in order to establish a trusting relationship with the informant and to understand the information given. Ulrike Spring argues that the collectors held an ideal of belonging to or representing the rural population. This ideal motivated the collectors and activists to sympathise and partly embody the peasantry and rural culture, although they at least to some degree also had connections to urban middle-class values and lifestyles. In the sources examined here, we see how the collectors paid attention to the well-functioning relationships they had with friendly locals. What was not mentioned is in this case highly interesting too: The sources only rarely indicate that there could have been friction, distrust or conflicting interests between the locals and collectors, although conflicts and mistrust, according to Kati Kallio and Fredrik Skott, were far from uncommon.

The letters and diaries of Enäjärvi and Haavio thus follow the general practices of the field. In their personal accounts, they affirmed the expectations of what a folklore collector was to pay attention to, how to encounter informants, and how to evaluate the informants and their knowledge. Consequently, the writing of descriptions does not only fill a function of creating sources for a future historian, but can also be viewed as a performance, shaping the scholarly persona of the writer. The intended readers are naturally also of significance. Especially the correspondence between the student friends Haavio and Hakulinen can be seen as a platform for sharing
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and confirming practices and approaches associated with good folklore scholarship and becoming a good folklorist.

**Concluding comments**

In this chapter, I have discussed how collecting practices and descriptions of locals and informants were inherent parts of forming a young folklorists’ scholarly persona. In comparison to research at universities and archives, fieldwork presented rather different circumstances by which to conduct scholarship and by which to be a scholar. Students were expected to do collection work during their summer vacations and to gain experience from the field. In this sense, undertaking a collection journey can be viewed as a rite of passage for students on their path towards becoming scholars—in Oili-Helena Ylijoki’s vocabulary a socialisation of novices to become full-fledged members of their academic tribe.526

The fieldwork experience also had a physical dimension. The students reflected upon practical matters such as cycling, coping with unfavourable weather conditions, initiating contact with interviewees and local helpers and to nurture the relationship with them. In all these facets, the students needed to consciously embody the expectations of a collector. This process corresponds with the research of, for example, Steven Shapin, Mineke Bosch, Kaat Wils and Pieter Huistra, who argue that it is crucial for the individuals’ process of becoming recognised as scholars to embody certain notions of being a good scholar. Moreover, speaking in Herman Paul’s terms for scholarly persona, the field journeys were also opportunities for the students to train the skills and virtues that their discipline required of them.

The circumstances in the field also allowed for differentiation between the locals as objects of study and the students as observers and analysers. As collectors, the students were either stationed in one area or moving around primarily in rural areas, both very different from the scholarly and academic environment in Helsinki. In Helsinki, the students participated within a group of people with shared interests and education. In the rural areas, they often represented that group alone among rural inhabitants. When Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about the locals in their letters which they sent home or letters to their student friends or in their personal diaries, they simultaneously wrote about themselves in relation to the people they observed. In doing so, they both identified with the locals and emphasised differences. This identification was mainly based on ethnic similarity, in which the Finnish folklorists sought what was considered unspoiled Finnish heritage to study. In this setting, it was important to highlight a shared national belonging between the collector and informant. However, in order to claim scholarly authority, the students
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especially emphasised a civilisational difference between themselves and the locals. By assessing the degree of civilisation and the authenticity of the informants’ information, the students demonstrated their education and theoretical knowledge in the field in the same manner as Johannes Fabian has identified anthropologists’ practices of othering.

The act of writing down the descriptions of locals and informants was also a practice for constructing a scholarly persona. In this practice, the intended reader of the text plays a crucial role. In most cases, the intended reader was a student friend, though some letters were sent to family and some accounts were written in private diaries. The various intended readers can be interpreted as shaping different sides of the persona of the writer. The letters to student friends offered a free zone where students could test and negotiate ways of describing their objects of study within a shared scholarly field. The similar content in the letters sent home show that the students also portrayed themselves and their objects of study in the same way outside the scholarly community. The private diary notes further illustrate how a scholarly persona differs from only a professional role or self-fashioning. The private documents also served as a means by which the folklorists could shape a more personal understanding of themselves as scholars. In this sense, they can be understood to have formed personae in the sense of performances that form identities, as Mineke Bosch perceives persona, or as practices that moulded the scholar from within, to use Herman Paul’s vocabulary.527
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5. Estonia: Shaping a transnational persona with nationalist programmes and long-lasting friendships

Tunkelo has left for his first exploration outside of Finland (if we do not take into account his few journeys to Estonia).\(^{528}\)

From the second half of the nineteenth century until World War II, nationally-minded Estonian and Finnish intellectuals kept in close contact. The quote above was written by Lauri Hakulinen, Martti Haavio’s and Elsa Enäjärvi’s friend, in his letter to the Estonian folklorist Oskar Loorits. The sentence illustrates the close connections between Finnish and Estonian scholars at the beginning of the twentieth century: Estonia was barely considered to be a place abroad. As was mentioned in previous chapters, the (Estonian-speaking) Estonians and (Finnish-speaking) Finns were referred to as “kindred peoples” (in Finnish heimokansat) or as “brothers” (in Finnish e.g. veli, veljekset, veljeskansat). Within academia, the collaboration was particularly close between the scholars in the national disciplines, who also nurtured an academic interest in what constituted kinship, such as the Finnic languages and vernacular culture. The mutual exchange was further motivated by shared language skills, as Finnish folklore students such as Enäjärvi and Haavio studied Estonian at university, and Estonian peers apparently often knew Finnish too.

In this chapter, I will examine the practices and consequences of the Estonian-Finnish collaboration within the field of folklore. I begin by giving a brief overview of Estonian history, the Estonian field of folklore, and the early forms of collaboration between Finnish and Estonian folk culture scholars. I will then discuss the ideas and practices that were manifested in the students’ contacts in the Estonian-Finnish Student Club, the students’ journeys between the countries and their mail-based contacts.

In persona studies, scholarly travel has been viewed as having multiple functions in the persona formation. When encountering new research environments and traditions, scholars do not only acquire new knowledge or

\(^{528}\) EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:84:1 Letters from Lauri Hakulinen to O. Loorits, 21/21 (2.8.1932). Org. “Tunkelo on lähtenyt ensimmäiselle tutkimusmatkalleen Suomen ulkopuolelle (jos emme ota lukuun hänen paria Viron-matkaansa)”. Eemil Aukusti Tunkelo was professor in Finnish at the University of Helsinki.
methods by which to create scholarly knowledge. They also encounter and often adapt, at least to some degree, to new ways of being a scholar. Here, I examine how Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s generation of scholars both reproduced and developed a scholarly persona that was largely shared between the Finnish and Estonian folklorists. I argue that in addition to the political and material reasons for close contacts, the friendships made during joyful exchanges also played an important role in how a folklorist’s persona was formed as well as how and what kind of research was done. From this perspective, scholarly persona is best understood in H. Otto Daston’s and Lorraine Daston’s view of the term as a collective identity that, as Herman Paul puts it, moulds the individual from within. In addition, Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s descriptions and comparisons of the appearance and behaviour of Finnish and Estonian students, not least female students, can be understood in Mineke Bosch’s usage of scholarly persona as self-fashioning and embodiment of modes of being a scholar.

Estonia and the Estonian field of folkloristics

Estonia is the northernmost country of the Baltic states, bordering Latvia in the south and Russia in the east. The western side of Estonia faces the Baltic Sea and in the north the Gulf of Finland separates Estonia from Finland. The region that constitutes today’s Estonia was divided into two parts in the Middle Ages: Estonia in the north and Livonia in the south. Livonia was a region that stretched across the south of today’s Estonia and the north of today’s Latvia. Both entities have been part of many realms, but the division remained although the borders and names changed over time and depending on the rulers. After the Teutonic crusades in the early thirteenth century, the northern part was ruled by Danes for a while, until the it, too, came under the rule of the Teutonic Order. In 1583, the Swedish realm acquired Estonia and Livonia in the Livonian war but ceded them to Russia when losing the Great Northern War in 1721. From the late Middle Ages until the early nineteenth century, most peasants lived in serfdom. While the ruling state varied over time, the local and regional power was held by descendants of German nobility from the time of the Teutonic Crusades until Estonia’s independency in 1918.


The early twentieth century was a time of turmoil. The Russian Revolution of 1905 resulted in many strikes and much political agitation, with many political and cultural actors fleeing the Governorates of Livonia and Estonia. The region was spared neither from wars between Russia and Germany nor from fights between the groups involved in the February and October Revolutions in 1917. The Estonian parliament had a wide range of left and right-wing parties represented, but during Estonia’s first decades of independence, the governments were moderately conservative. As in many other European states, the 1930s brought extreme right-wing movements to Estonia. Above all, the Vaps movement gained a strategic foothold. The Vaps consisted of veterans from the struggle for Estonian independence, and they were critical towards both the right-wing and the left-wing politics. The movement caused a democratic crisis, during which the moderate-conservative head of state came to hold a semi-authoritarian position between 1934 and 1938.531

The time after Estonia’s declaration of independence in 1918 has been referred to as the country’s first period of sovereignty in current historical writing. In World War II, the country was first forced to station Soviet troops and form a Soviet-friendly government in 1940. In 1941, it was occupied by Germany and eventually won back by the Red Army and annexed as a republic of the Soviet Union in 1944.532 Estonia’s “second independence” was claimed in 1991.533

The Russian and German presence have coloured many of the events and circumstances in Estonian history, including its educational system. In 1736, the first elementary school legislation was enacted in Livonia. Children who could not obtain acceptable reading skills at home (in practice, this was verified by knowing the Catechism by heart) were then obliged to attend elementary schools, an obligation that was extended to Estonia in 1786. In reality, however, it was decades before education reached all children. According to a census taken in 1881, 95 per cent of all male farmers were literate.534 Although the majority of the population was Estonian-speaking, even elementary school education was mostly given in German until the mid-nineteenth century, and during the second half of the nineteenth century, instruction was increasingly held in Russian.535 Estonia and Livonia had a long
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history of higher education, which stretched back to the foundation of the University of Tartu in 1632 (although the university was closed in 1710–1802). All higher education was, however, only offered in German or Russian. At the University of Tartu, more than 80 per cent of the teaching faculty were Baltic Germans and during most of the nineteenth century, most teaching was also held in German.

Together with socio-economic differences, the language of educational instruction divided the region into a poorly educated Estonian-speaking majority and a highly educated minority comprised mainly of German-speaking people. In 1881, the German-speaking minority constituted 5.4 per cent and the Russian-speakers 3.6 per cent of the total population of a little less than 900,000 people. By 1922, the proportions had changed between the Germans and Russians, mainly due to how the state borders were redrawn in the treaty of Tartu in 1918. Now, the Estonian population totalled slightly more than 1,100,000. Of this number, a little less than 9 per cent were Russian-speaking and less than 2 per cent were German-speaking. The new political reality brought changes to education, and the university started to teach in Estonian in 1919.

When the so-called national awakening spread over Estonia and Livonia in the middle of the nineteenth century, the town of Tartu and its university hosted much of the movement’s cultural and political activities. Similarly to Finland, the national romanticist and nationalist movements brought the majority language and folk culture into the centre of both academic and popular interest. The two individuals in the nationalist project who received the highest recognition within the field of folklore were Friedrich Reinhold Kreutzwald (1803–1882) and Jacob Hurt (1839–1906). Kreutzwald was born and raised in an Estonian-speaking family of serfs, but moved early and increasingly towards German-speaking environments, the reason being that no higher education was offered in Estonian during the time. Kreutzwald compiled material for the national epic poem of Estonia, the Kalevipoeg. Jacob Hurt was both an active folklore collector and a driving force in the
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organisation of large-scale folklore collection projects, conducted by students and elementary school children as well as for the general newspaper reading audience.\textsuperscript{545}

Initially, the national romanticist movement in Estonia and Livonia was not directed against the Russian rule. However, towards the end of the nineteenth century, when Russian politics took a more pan-Slavic direction including russification policies, the movement raised claims for extended autonomy.\textsuperscript{546} Many of Estonia’s nationalistic movement initiatives corresponded with those of other nations’ and were particularly comparable with the Finnish developments. Like in Finland, there was an increasing emphasis and use of the majority language, production of art with national(ist) themes, and the expansion of studies in national folk culture. A particularly Estonian feature of this nationalist movement can be noted in the organisation of song festivals, which gathered choirs from around the region to perform folk songs.\textsuperscript{547}

As elsewhere, Estonian academic research in folklore began to be more professionalised in the late nineteenth century. The early actors in the field held a wide range of titles and affiliations. Hurt was a priest and Kreutzwald was a physician, similar to his Finnish peer Elias Lönnrot. People supporting the movement of national awakening organised themselves, particularly from the 1860s and onwards. They had a variety of affiliations and connections to groupings, including newspapers, music associations and student organisations. From the end of the century, the University of Tartu and its student union seized a central role in Estonification pursuits.\textsuperscript{548} Similarly to Finland, academic research and teaching in the national majority language, but also other language studies, were intimately bound to folk culture studies. When Estonia’s first department of folklore was established at the University of Tartu in 1919, its first professor, Walter Anderson (1885–1962), was a linguist by training.\textsuperscript{549} In his research in folklore, he worked with extensive historic-geographic research. Anderson had a diverse geographical background, with Baltic German and Estonian parents. He himself was born in Minsk and had studied at the University of Kazan. His academic career was also a very international one, including both travel and work around Europe.\textsuperscript{550}

Before the professorship in folklore was established in Tartu, Estonians could study the subject abroad. The first Estonian to obtain a doctoral degree in folklore was Oskar Kallas (1868–1946), who wrote his doctoral dissertation under Kaarle Krohn’s supervision and defended it at the University of
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Helsinki in 1901. He worked widely in teaching, publishing and folklore before he moved on to a diplomatic career, serving as Estonia’s first official representative in Helsinki and later as ambassador to London.\textsuperscript{551}

World War II brought major and extensive changes into Estonian scholarship and science. As in World War I, Estonia was again caught in the crossfire between fighting alliances. For scholars, the war meant in many cases that they left their research for the battlefield. Towards the end of the war, however, a large share—up to one fourth of the Estonian intelligentsia—fled the country to find a new life abroad. Remaining in Estonia was hazardous. It is estimated that 25,000–30,000 Estonians were executed, sent to labour camps or kept confined in state-run institutions during the years 1945–1953.\textsuperscript{552} Many of those who escaped could at least to some extent continue with academic work in their new residences, as their research followed Western models of scientific inquiry that were practiced internationally in their field. In Soviet-Estonia, folklore research partly held on to the perspectives and methods typical for the time of the annexed state’s first independence and partly developed along the lines of Soviet research trends.\textsuperscript{553}

\textbf{Early Estonian-Finnish collaborations and the Estonian-Finnish Student Club}

Similar political circumstances coupled with a similar kind of national romanticism and a national awakening rooted in language and folklore studies provided a fruitful base for exchanges between Estonian and Finnish intelligentsia. The two countries shared a Russian past which had established a common ground for cooperation and contacts. Up until the end of World War I, both countries were parts of the same empire, making contacts between Estonians and Finns relatively easy. Many Finns and Estonians moved to St. Petersburg, a city that offered more job opportunities for highly educated people. This being the case, St. Petersburg became a meeting place for intellectuals from around the Russian empire.\textsuperscript{554}

Professor Kaarle Krohn was a driving force not only for Finnish folklore, but also in arranging the publishing and archiving of Estonian folklore,
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although not exclusively always to the approval of Estonians. For example, Krohn tried to convince Jacob Hurt to move his extensive private collections to the Finnish Literature Society’s folklore archive. The collections were, however, only moved there after Hurt’s death. One consequence of locating the collection in Helsinki was that when the Estonian folklore archive was founded in 1917, the SKS’s way of organising Hurt’s collection also had the consequence that the Estonian archive was organised in a corresponding fashion.555

The academic and private contacts between Estonian and Finnish scholars were entangled in many ways, as exemplified by Krohn’s central role in scholarly networks as well as by how familial ties developed. The scholars wrote of their relationships as based on friendship and collaboration, but the close contacts also resulted in family relationships. Oskar Kallas, for example, married Julius Krohn’s daughter and Kaarle Krohn’s half-sister Aino Krohn (1878–1956). The daughter of Aino and Oskar Kallas, Virve Kallas (later Kallas-Päss, 1901–1953), married Viktor Päss (1892–1956), who was the brother of the Estonian folklorist Elmar Päss (1901–1970).556 Another daughter of Julius Krohn, Helmi Krohn (1871–1967), married the Finnish language scholar Emil Nestor Setälä.557

Virve Kallas was also one of the driving forces in the founding of the Estonian-Finnish Student Club in Helsinki in 1921. When Martti Haavio in a letter to Lauri Hakulinen wrote about the founding of the club with an enthusiastic tone, he described Virve Kallas as the initiator:

I believe that Virve Kallas’ idea of that new club was well timed. We have been developing it and the boys are very excited—oh, and the girls too. It has been propagated constantly in Ylioppilaslehti. I hope that we can create something modern, something grandiose.558

Haavio had, together with a handful of friends, accompanied Virve Kallas during her visits to Helsinki and expressed quite some excitement over her as a person and her views on student politics. At the time, the main site for the Estonia-oriented students was the North-Ostrobothnian Student Nation, where
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Virve Kallas, too, was active in the spring of 1921 when the Kallas family was living in Helsinki because of Oskar Kallas’ diplomatic tasks.\(^{559}\)

The first Estonian-Finnish Student Club (\(Eesti-Soomi Üliõpilasklubi\)) was founded in Tartu in the autumn of 1920. A sister club was founded in Helsinki the following spring. The club functioned as an informal continuation of an earlier association, the Finnish-Estonian League (\(Suomalais-Virolainen Liitto\)), which had been active between 1906–1911. Later, a branch club was founded in Turku in southwest Finland. The ambition of the clubs was to gather Finnish and Estonian students and promote social contact. The club based in Helsinki also revealed a political dimension, with explicit sympathies for nationalistic and pan-Finnic pursuits. This became even more evident when the club changed its name to Academic Kinship Club (\(Akateeminen Heimoklubi\)) in 1923. In addition to these clubs, other student associations organised collaborations between students on both sides of the Gulf of Finland. The Estonian student union and the \(Korp!\) student organisations for women and men established official friendship agreements with Finnish student organisations, mainly with those for students from North Ostrobothnia and Häme.\(^{560}\)

The Haavio quote above illustrates the links between different people and organisations who shared interests in Finnish language activism, student life and Estonian and Finnish collaborations. In the quote, Haavio explained that the idea of an Estonian-Finnish Student Club was promoted in the student journal \(Ylioppilaslehti\). Getting the journal to promote the club most likely had not faced any obstacles. Haavio himself was the secretary of the journal and a frequent contributing writer. The journal had several staff writers and co-workers who were either involved in the founding of the Club, or were language activists or supporters of nationalistic organisations. The range of these organisations was wide, from student organisations that primarily arranged parties and societies that focused mainly on promoting research in the national disciplines, to the Academic Karelia Society and the extreme right-wing party Patriotic People’s Movement (\(Isänmaallinen kansanliike, IKL\)).\(^{561}\)

A similar range of interests and activities could be found in the Estonian-Finnish Student Club. The clubs organised parties and excursions for visiting students both in Estonia and in Finland, as well as held meetings with political agendas and lectures coloured by politics.\(^{562}\)

---


documents show that these events were partly meant to acquaint the neighbouring countries’ students with the hosts’ culture and history. Some of these student events seem to have been purely social and aimed to promote networking, which is succinctly illustrated by Enäjärvi’s letter to Haavio in September 1922: “There would be plans to throw a party for the Estonians, but we need to come up with an explanation for it, if not for the organisers, so for the Estonian audience.”

In Haavio’s enthusiastic accounts to Hakulinen of the early days of the Club, he emphasised that the Club would not work politically as much as being a social arena for like-minded students, stating that: “And the club will not be made into some committee; but a very free, comradely social sphere.”

While Haavio’s accounts emphasised social initiatives, he also gave the club a more political significance. For example, he argued for the prominence of the club in Helsinki over the sister club in Hakulinen’s home town Turku by stating that:

Watch out for that Kinship Club of Turku, better known by the name Wed Club. A traveller from Turku came here and said:
There is no institution in the world as peculiar as this one.
What do you mean?
Well, when Väisälä speaks, Kukkola’s eyes glow, when Penttilä speaks, Kielo’s eyes glow, when Vilkki speaks, Tyyne Laakso’s eyes glow, when Marjanen speaks, x x’s (I cannot recall her name) eyes glow, and when........... There are only couples. Hakulinen??
The Kinship Club of Helsinki, which is not a wed club, has a meeting tomorrow. Igor Mösšeg and Ilmarinen are coming.

Presumably, “Igor Mösšeg” was the political immigrant Ignati Mösšeg/Mošerov. Mošerov was a Komi, which is a Uralic ethnic group from the north-east of European Russia, and Mošerov had fled to Estonia in 1920. In Estonia he had met Professor Lauri Kettunen and then migrated to Finland, where he did historical research at the University of Helsinki and published


several works where he criticised the Soviet regime and the treatment of ethnic minorities in the USSR. By informing Hakulinen that Mošerov was coming to the meeting, Haavio could emphasise the Club’s Finno-Ugric and political connection. At the same time, he could also mock the club in Turku by stating that it was more social in character and a place for finding partners than it was serious about its political agenda. The political dimension of the Club and its members’ ambitions were also manifested in the imaginary sketching of a Greater Finland and a Greater Estonia and in the arrangement of lectures:

Think about it, in the meeting last Wednesday Russia was divided. And Finland got the northern part all the way to the Ural Mountains! [...] Last Sunday, an Estonian member of parliament gave a presentation on the contemporary history of Estonia at an event arranged by the Marna Club in the University’s assembly hall.

The social and political aspects of the club intertwined at the same events. In Haavio’s retelling of club events, the meetings could revolve around planning parties or excursions, writing articles, discussing politics or how to arrange housing for visiting Estonians. Afterwards, the students would walk home as a group or end up in a bar. Haavio’s vision of a social club instead of an action committee further indicates that the people involved recognised the importance of friendships in addition to formal academic or political connections. Similar to the family and scholarly interconnections, as illustrated by Julius Krohn’s extended family, the students’ political and academic engagements were intertwined with each other on a transnational level.

Visiting Estonia

The Estonian-Finnish Club functioned within an already existing system of exchange between Estonian and Finnish scholars. When reading the students’

---


accounts of how they travelled to and in Estonia, the club often appears to have facilitated and enhanced contacts. In what follows, I will discuss how Haavio and Enäjärvi described their journeys in Estonia, focussing in particular on the practices of the student exchange. These practices were a foundation for the shaping of a collective identity (as Daston and Sibum calls scholarly persona) of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s community of young Estonian and Finnish folk culture scholars.

Haavio’s documents from his journey to Estonia in 1921 give rather detailed information about his travels. The preparations for the journey started in the spring of 1921. In a letter to Hakulinen, Haavio explained that he and his fellow student, the future professor of Finnish language and literature Aarni Penttilä (1899–1971), were planning to study in Tartu the upcoming autumn semester. The decision had been reached during a late evening with friends, who “in a wistful atmosphere” had talked about Estonia and sketched a future “Finnish student settlement” in Tartu. According to Haavio, Penttilä thought the semester abroad would be good for his studies, and Haavio suggested that the same would be true for Hakulinen. For his own part, Haavio was rather indifferent about where he was staying, stating: “ubi bene, ibi patria” (the fatherland is where life is good). He left for Estonia in July, taking the ferry from Helsinki to Tallinn together with Penttilä. In a diary note written on the ferry, he added a pencil-drawing of Penttilä, sitting leaned back with a smile on his face and his student cap on his head. On the pages before and after the drawing, he had written down names and addresses of contacts. Some were Estonian students, such as the chair of the Estonian-Finnish Student Club in Tartu, Ann Tamm (1890–?), others were his friends in Finland, such as Elsa Enäjärvi, and some were addresses to institutions, such as the Finnish consulate. 

Upon arrival in Tallinn, Penttilä and Haavio visited the tax office, where the required administrative paperwork for visitors, in Haavio’s words, was “perfunctory”. The Finnish consulate’s janitor’s wife took care of the friends’ belongings while they toured the city. They then continued their journey, and according to Haavio “the whole of Estonia was to be covered,

---

except Narva”.\textsuperscript{574} Mainly using bicycles, they headed first to the coastal towns of Haapsalu and Pärnu, to Seljaküla a little inland and to the island Vormsi outside Haapsalu. They then continued eastwards to Viljandi and the university town Tartu, to Vööpsu on the southern part of the Estonian-Russian border and then to Petseri in the Setumaa region in the south of Estonia.\textsuperscript{575} Setumaa was of particular interest for folklore scholars because it had the status of a treasure trove of folklore as did the Karelia region in Finland.\textsuperscript{576}

Some of the names of contacts in the beginning of Haavio’s Estonia diary appear later multiple times in the diary, in connections with his journey and stay in Estonia, not least the student Aleks Tiitsman, who helped, accompanied and hosted Haavio and Penttilä during their first visit.\textsuperscript{577} Another contact, Ann Tamm, welcomed Haavio and Penttilä to a large student dormitory. The Club was a gathering point for Finnish students in Tartu, and Haavio could report to Hakulinen about several friends who they had in common and who stayed in Tartu at the same time as he, among whom Elsa Enäjärvi also made an appearance.\textsuperscript{578} In various letters, Haavio named Estonian students, scholars and politicians that he encountered and interacted with during his journeys across the country, such as Virve Kallas and her sister Laine Kallas (later Poska, later Määr 1902–1941), the professor of Uralic Languages Julius Mark (1890–1959) and Minister of Defence August Hanko (1879–1952). As in the case of the Club in Tartu, these excursions also included various groups of Finnish students.\textsuperscript{579}

In content, Haavio’s journey notes from Estonia in 1921 resemble the accounts of Enäjärvi’s trip the same summer, as well as their descriptions of later visits to Estonia in the first years of the 1920s. The network of contacts around the country, including Estonian students and scholars who would accompany the Finnish students on their travels, appears to have been very active during this period. The itinerary typically included Tallinn, which was
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also the point of arrival and departure, the countryside for being of academic interest, some smaller towns for enjoyment, and Tartu as the university town. The contacts that were established during the journeys remained close and helpful later in life too. When the undergraduates became PhD students and researchers, they sometimes offered each other accommodation when visiting each other’s towns or gave advice on how to find a place to stay. Moreover, according to Enäjärvi, the Estonia-interested intellectuals in Helsinki posted positive appeals in the local newspaper, encouraging readers to host visiting Estonian students.

Enäjärvi’s accounts do not give as many details in the practices of travelling as do Haavio’s letters and diaries, but generally she seems to have had similar experiences. One difference is that Haavio often wrote about how he travelled long stretches by bicycle together with a friend, while Enäjärvi did not report on such expeditions. Instead she wrote about where she had stayed or that she had been travelling in a group or with a few companions. For example, when she and her group of students travelled from Helsinki to the southern parts of Estonia in 1921, they would do the first part of the trip together with Aino and Oskar Kallas. In the company of the Kallas couple, they managed much of the first leg of the trip with ease, as they, for example, did not need to queue for customs inspections, because their luggage was transported in the Kallas’ ministry car.

During her stay in Tartu in 1921, Enäjärvi made a list of 59 persons she had met. The list contained the names of students, senior scholars, spouses of professors, authors and other cultural actors. To these names, she included short notes about who they were and what they were like. For example, she
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described Ann Tamm as “[a] powerhouse, tireless. Number one amongst all.” “Prof. Granö” was an “[e]xample of brilliance. Full of superlatives in every aspect.”

It is obvious that the first trip to Estonia greatly expanded networks for Haavio and Enäjärvi. Enäjärvi did not only meet many people of scholarly and cultural importance, but she also kept in touch with many of them through correspondence. Later, she would also work with some individuals she had listed in her notes. For example, she would translate works by the author Friedeberht Tuglas (Enäjärvi wrote of Tuglas in the following note: “Are we trying to get the upper hand on each other? I respect you.”) Another example was professor Lauri Kettunen (“You are excellent to have around. Honour to the scholar”), whom she later was to share research interests with.

Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts of their visits show how the journeys generally brought together Finnish and Estonian students, as well as some senior scholars, who shared similar academic, cultural and political interests. Excursions and student events became shared experiences of these academics, a common ground that helped to form a collective identity or scholarly persona in a comparable way to fieldwork experiences discussed in the previous chapter. In Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s case, the visits appear even to have merged together two groups of friends, who would continue to collaborate and exchange information across the Gulf of Finland after returning from their visits.

In the autumn of 1923, Haavio stayed in Tartu for a longer period. The duration of the visit was not fixed at the time of his departure from Finland, and when in Tartu he wrote to Hakulinen that he would stay until he wanted to return to Finland. His accounts of the stay in Tartu depict an alternative existence that was favourably contrasted to his life in Helsinki. In Tartu, he was, in his words, living in “divine peace” however at the same time staying in the town “to live and spend the eventful years of youth with the Estonian student youth”. The time he spent with the Estonian students was used for social gatherings held in student organisations (where “spirits are drunk, but sparsely”), and probably for some student political activities, café visits and nightly parties.

---


In Haavio’s accounts, Tartu offered an excellent environment for work and focus, without all the distractions of his life in Helsinki. Instead, he could concentrate on his core interests and gather his thoughts, stating to Hakulinen that “a person probably from time to time longs for this kind of change of environment in order to gather his soul, which has been scattered around, and to reform it to one chunk and to get his brain cleansed from unnecessary waste products.” The stay in Tartu was also fruitful for Haavio’s research. He wrote Hakulinen that he got as much work done in a week in Tartu as he did in a month in Helsinki. In Tartu, Haavio was working “surrounded by thousands of books”, several of which were brought to his knowledge by Professor Anderson. Haavio’s accounts also demonstrate how his descriptions of his life as an academic could be emotional and soft, not necessarily competitive, rational or hard, which research often has identified as typical qualities connected to academic masculinities.

Lyrically Haavio told Hakulinen how in Tartu he was:

sitting in wonder that there might be something else in this world than sacred and eternal science. The books are sleeping around me in their quiet, beautiful dream. And it is so awfully good to be. The church bells are ringing somewhere. The wind is shouting. And solitude remains awake and is my best friend. There are no obligations. No digression disturbs me. Yesterday evening, I walked in the moonlight on Toomemägi hill and I saw the most beautiful night in the world. Ruins, church towers, frosty trees, shadows that were like the shadows of giants. Everything was new, as if unprecedented. I woke up to something.

These accounts echo the discourses that Steven Shapin has identified as typical for premodern scholars that describe scholarly insights into
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corresponding terms of divine revelations. Shapin explains that these insights were thought to be reached best in solitude, with a mind purified from mundane distractions.\textsuperscript{591}

Both Haavio and Enäjärvi reflected upon their early visits to Estonia as formative for them, that it changed them as individuals, or, in Herman Paul’s terms, moulded them from within. Enäjärvi pondered in her diary when she was still in Estonia: “Will I return to Finland as a different person—much more experienced in any case, albeit barely noticing the change myself.”\textsuperscript{592} When Haavio described his time in Estonia he wrote that “it is like a new heart and a new soul had been implanted [in a human], and the past minor sorrows and grieves and joys and glees belong to another planet.”\textsuperscript{593} His stay abroad had given him a new sensibility and new perspectives when looking at his home circumstances, stating to Hakulinen that “[t]he world is quite marvellous and peculiar and, seen from this angle, Finland and the student union look the size of a flea and seem excessively trivial.”\textsuperscript{594}

Supposedly, the expansion of networks and new perspectives on studying and the experience of working within academia abroad had quite a formative effect on the Finnish students. However, the accounts of Haavio and Enäjärvi also suggest that personal growth and development was, in part, a result of the social aspects of their journeys abroad. Moreover, Haavio wrote that the journey also gave him a more nuanced perspective on the academic life in Helsinki.\textsuperscript{595} Enäjärvi attributed her personal development, at least in part, to experiences from a romantic relationship, which she described as not being equal to love in the way she understood that concept, since it “had only a physical side. ‘- - and nothing else’”.\textsuperscript{596} She was not alone in experiencing episodes of attraction during the exchange. Haavio wrote in 1921 to Hakulinen about Virve Kallas’ charm and how she had influenced at least him and Niilo Kärki in a most extraordinary manner, from the very first time they came in contact with her:
Precisely at 12 o’clock, Virve Kallas, the Estonian minister’s daughter enters the hall with her entourage all dressed in white, “like a vision from heaven” [...] *Preili* [Miss] Kallas is the muse of the idea. In her person and in her speech, she had such a deep impact on our Kärki that he became her proxy at the student nation. And [she had an impact] on me too. 597

In Haavio’s view, Enäjärvi evoked similar reactions among Estonian students. Moreover, the example of their friend Kerttu Mustonen proves that relationships between Finnish and Estonian students could also lead to marriages. 598

While we can see that the students wrote about attraction between Estonians and Finns during the exchange, the accounts also emphasised restraint as an ideal. This was true for both Enäjärvi and Haavio, but it appears that it had at least partly different implications for them. Haavio’s restraint can, for example, be illustrated by his continuation of his description of Kallas:

> If I now continued my description of the annual celebration of the North-Ostrobothnian student nation, I would be forced to repeat the name *preili* Kallas so many times that you would again howl protests against such tautology and thoughts of the heart and the reasons for talks etc. as once before, although obviously again without any ground. I fall silent. 599

Aarni Penttilä confirmed that Haavio was attempting to maintain a distance from women, by writing in a letter together with Haavio to Hakulinen that “for an hour, 3 *preili* were swarming behind us and then for one hour in front of us etc. etc. Haavio [has] remained cold.” 600 Haavio expressed a similar


sentiment two years later when he wrote from Tartu that he had become acquainted with some Estonian women, stating that he found them annoying, partly because they “cling too easily to one’s neck.” Haavio’s restraint can be understood in a similar way as in Mineke Bosch’s discussions on restraint as an academic (masculine) ideal. According to Bosch, scholars embodied scholarly ideals by emphasising a restraint from or indifference to bodily joys such as good food or sexual relations. This is similar to Steven Shapin’s observations of early modern scholars, who presented their devotion to intellectual work by a bodily discipline, such as a strict and ascetic diet, as both emphasise the scholar’s disembodiment as a path to knowledge.

Haavio’s stated views on Estonian female students reflect a common perception of women entering academic studies in the early twentieth century, which also can be understood as the motivation for Enäjärvi to emphasise a certain restraint, different from Haavio’s. Women studying at universities in Europe and North America were often regarded dubiously. Female students were considered unfeminine and unattractive or seen as simply in pursuit of a husband. Both classifications were inherently negative. The former assumed that university education was unnatural for women, even a threat to their health and character. The later was a belittling accusation that undermined the purpose of women’s desire for higher education.

Enäjärvi expressed a more nuanced image of Estonian academic women. For example, in a journal article about Tartu, she described the Estonian university life in general and academic women in particular. In both instances, Enäjärvi found Estonia to be livelier and more diverse than what could be found in Finland:

It feels like there is more electricity, emotions, eroticism in the air. The Estonian female students strive to be more nubile, fiery than ours. She appears at lectures dressed in a low neckline and colourfully sweet. Of course, there are also much more solemn women. Further, there are women in the student administration boards, something that has occurred here only sometimes in years past.

Of note, Enäjärvi confirmed that from a Finnish point of view, Estonian women in many cases were more daring in their choice of clothing and
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behaviour. Overall, the article and the above-quoted passage were written in a highly positive tone, and Enäjärvi did not directly condemn these female students. Still, her qualifying remark about the presence of “also much more solemn women” helped to distance herself from female students who projected a questionable demeanour.

Haavio’s descriptions of female students around him were not very frequent but essentially, he raised doubt about their intellectual capacities and sincerity in their studies. For example, his description of the Estonian students as quoted above, Haavio added that they “are not intelligent—with some exceptions.” In a previous letter to Hakulinen, however, Haavio stated that the sororities required of its members “beauty, wisdom and wealth”, which is why only “the cream of the local female students” were members of these student associations. Despite their elite status, Haavio wrote, they “smoke tobacco and behave as if they were women of the world and ruin themselves altogether by their tastelessness.” Apparently, Haavio’s view was not unique, but rather exemplified a more widely spread way of describing Estonian academic women. In a journal article, Enäjärvi referred to similar rumour-based talks about these women:

All-women sororities have also been established. Their activities are shrouded in mystery. Have they incorporated the customs of the all-male fraternities? Is there drinking, smoking? Evil tongues are claiming that there are two requirements for membership: beauty and wealth. The reactions vary between curiosity and a disdaining shrug.  

Enäjärvi’s passage does not take a stance on this perception of academic women, as she neither made negative remarks of this group of women, nor did she defend them. The kind of descriptions of academic women that Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts demonstrate, focussing for example on women’s appearance, illuminate the contemporary discourse of women as less serious in their academic pursuits than were men. Yet, suspicions against female students behaving as their male peers was also a reason to question women’s
respectability and social decorum. In Haavio’s descriptions, the women were ruining themselves by their behaviour. Haavio mentions smoking as one of these ruining and tasteless habits, a habit that Margaret Rossiter and Kara W. Swanson point out as a gendered practice that functioned as an excluding mechanism in academia, when men would socialise and network in the smoking rooms, into which women could not enter. The presence and behaviour of Estonian female university students could be belittled when their actions were regarded as feminine as well as when they were regarded as masculine.

It is notable that Haavio’s accounts of female students often included information about their appearance, the presence or absence of intelligence and their (in comparison to Finnish women) sexually less restricted behaviour. Male students, in turn, were never evaluated in corresponding ways. Haavio could mention that he found a specific man particularly intelligent but did not make such observations about Estonian men in general or for a certain category of Estonian men. Enäjärvi reflected upon women in academia on a general level a couple of times, but she described neither men nor women in the same terms as Haavio’s did in the accounts discussed here.

The accounts about romantic relationships in Estonia did not consider Estonian students exclusively. Enäjärvi, too, wrote about her own relationships when visiting Estonia, both romantic and friendly ones. To Virve Kallas, however, she added a qualifying note in the spring of 1922 that

[though I indeed am so delighted by the trip to Estonia, it is a mistake to think that my name would change to an Estonian one [through marriage]. My interest in Estonia is not motivated by private [marital] reasons.

This passage from Enäjärvi’s letter to Kallas reflects the generally held belief that women went to university with the aim of finding a husband. Enäjärvi’s letter to Kallas dismisses such assumptions about her personally but also more generally about women who participated in the student exchanges. The passage further implies an awareness that her reputation might be affected by her actions in Tartu. The diary entry where Enäjärvi mentioned that her
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relationship with a person in Estonia had not been based on love, but only on physical attraction, shows that she was aware that her good reputation was at risk:

Have I lost after all? One should keep for oneself something sacred, something that is only displayed on special occasions. Should I have saved and sanctified this too and for whom? Will I return to Finland old and worn, too experienced too early?

Her conclusion that followed was, however: “I am not convinced, I do not regret anything.”

The passage is interesting in the light of the research on university women of Enäjärvi’s generation and in relation to Haavio’s accounts discussed above. The diary entry illustrates Enäjärvi’s sense of being under a critical gaze and how she recognised that she might have crossed the line of inappropriateness. In the letter to Kallas in 1922, we can further see that she did not wish to be perceived as someone who went on a foreign exchange in pursuit of men. Still, in her concluding remark of not regretting anything, she wrote about herself as an active participant in a romantic affair, although it may have created a need to, later on, defend her own honour.

The accounts on practices of visiting Estonia give us insights especially in two dimensions of scholarly persona. First, they show how Enäjärvi and Haavio were consciously observing and making notes on modes of being an academic in the transnational context of Finnish and Estonian academia. They wrote in their private documents about how others fashioned themselves in academia and as scholars. Through these observations, they obtained information about how other academics embodied modes of being academics. By commenting on these models, Enäjärvi and Haavio could also vocalise their impressions of behaviour, scholarship and appearance that they sensed that their community would find desirable or dismissible. Second, Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts of their visits show how the journeys generally brought together Finnish and Estonian students, as well as some senior scholars, who shared similar academic, cultural and political interests. Excursions and student events became shared experiences of these academics, a common ground that formed a collective identity or scholarly persona in a comparable way to fieldwork experiences discussed in the previous chapter. In Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s case, the visits appear even to have merged together two groups of friends, who would continue to collaborate and exchange information across the Gulf of Finland after returning from their visits, a matter that I will discuss further in the next section.


Friendships and collegial relations at a distance

After the students became acquainted with each other during their respective exchanges, they kept in touch by mail. In part, the letters had the function to keep the correspondents informed of the academic events and developments in Helsinki and Tartu as well as provide current updates about their friends’ personal lives. In part, they were a means of sharing knowledge and a way to ask for help and to help peers with their academic work. In this way, the letters provided a crucial platform to maintain the extended, transnational persona-forming community of peers, similar to the community of Finnish folk culture students and scholars that has been discussed in the previous chapters.

Updating about university life

The letters included various sorts of information about what was happening at the local university and in academic life. They were descriptions of everyday life and updates about research processes and interests. In addition, the updates about what was going on at the university assumed that the recipient was interested in work and study options abroad.615

The practical bits of information could for example contain notes about scholarships and lecture series, which might be interesting for the reader.616 Letter correspondence could also include suggestions for changing visit times to Helsinki, since friends and scholars worth meeting would be away from town.617 These letter correspondences indicate that the scholars saw it as a rather natural thing to participate in the scholarly life of both Tartu and Helsinki.

The young folklorists’ letters were a means of sharing information about academic structures and what it took to be a scholar within the field of folk culture studies. The letters often informed the reader about what different scholars were up to and how they had acted and interacted in scholarly situations. Letters written while their authors were still students or new doctoral students often contained reports about mutual friends who had received a master’s degree or had decided to begin their dissertation work.618 Later, the focus of letters shifted towards reflections on how scholars had
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interacted in various situations and how that reflected the disciplinary principles, preferences, and personal loyalties within academia. In this way, Haavio could for example give Oskar Loorits his interpretation of how the appointment process of a professor was coloured by personal values and loyalties:

The election of expert assessors already clearly showed in which direction the scales would tip: Setälä and Ohrt are in favour of Salminen (Ohrt has declined), Harva is at least not in favour of Mansikka. Note that Krohn was coldly disregarded—the Swedish Hirn mentioned at the faculty meeting that Krohn supposedly would not have been willing to accept an undertaking as expert assessor, although Krohn had informed otherwise. You see that Mansikka’s chances were totally eliminated already in the selection of the assessor. Mansikka filed a complaint about the selection, but the complaint led to neither this nor that. It remains to be seen how the issue of selection is resolved and whether additional assessors will be chosen.619

These types of accounts gave various kinds of information to the reader. They gave insights into which scholars had applied to the position, who participated in the decision-making process and what consequences this had, how the discussions evolved in scholarly circles and what kinds of personal interests and dynamics were present in the field. These kinds of tacit knowledge were important for navigating one’s own way through academia, but also for understanding what implications personal dynamics had for individuals and the research field.620 For the author of the letter, sharing this kind of information was also an opportunity to highlight a persona of a scholar with an insider position and thus authority to speak about the current state of academic affairs.

Loorits’ letters also included some accounts of academic life in Estonia, but much more rarely and briefly than those written by Haavio.621 Still, Loorits seems to have appreciated Haavio’s information about Finnish society, as almost every letter included some notes or discussions about Finnish political,
cultural or academic matters. When Haavio asked Loorits to tell him about his life and life in general in Tartu, Loorits responded that he was not informed about local events. 622

Since the scholarly connections over the Gulf of Finland were numerous, Loorits had sources of information other than only Haavio. Hakulinen, for example, kept Loorits updated about Finnish academic life, including Haavio’s professorship application. 623 Both Hakulinen and Haavio also repeatedly began such accounts by stating that they supposed that Loorits already was familiar with the subject through other sources. 624 Loorits confirmed this, maybe most interestingly after Haavio had revealed what he called a “secret”, namely that his aim was to apply for the professorship. Loorits responded with amusement “[w]ell are You not a funny man: You write as if in great secret about a thing which is already widely and publicly circulated to me!” 625 His source had been the Latvian archivist Anna Bērskalne, whom he had been visiting in Riga and who had gotten the information in a letter sent to her by Krohn. 626

The above-named episode was not exceptional. Rather, it was quite common that information that had been handed over off the record was later forwarded by colleagues. For example, in 1932, Hakulinen gave inside information about Haavio’s career path to Loorits. Haavio had been formally announced competent for a professorship in folkloristics, but he was not appointed professor. Hakulinen’s source in this case was the sociology professor Uno Harva, whom he had talked with on the train from Helsinki to Turku. According to Harva, Haavio’s problem was that his research was of varying quality. His doctoral dissertation and his book Leikarit had been of superior quality. Had Haavio’s other works reached the same level as these,

622 Loorits added that he intentionally had begun to take distance from local events and people, because he had conflicts with people in Tartu, especially at the student associations. SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Loorits, Oskar to Haavio, Martti 28.1.1931. Letter 743:(12:)53:17; See also letter from Loorits, Oskar to Haavio, Martti 20.12.1931. Letter 743:(12:)53:20.

623 EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:84:1 Letters from Lauri Hakulinen to O. Loorits, 23/23 (10.11.1932).
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Harva would have recommended Haavio to be the top candidate for the professorship. Hakulinen’s account can be read as information about a mutual friend and how his friend Haavio’s life and career was evolving. In addition, the passage can be read as information shared by a junior scholar to his peer about how senior researchers viewed academic achievements and strategies. To us, it gives insights into how tacit knowledge could be shared within the academic community. In this case, the knowledge was further shared within a transnational community, and apparently Hakulinen expected it to be relevant for Loorits to know how the evaluations of scholars worked in Finland. In other words, the insights into the Finnish unwritten and implied expectations, realities and practices one needed to become recognised and successful in folklore were supposed to be similar enough to the Estonian situation to be of interest to Loorits.

This kind of rumour-based information illustrates how the transnational field of folklore scholarship fed on various forms of communication. It also shows how academic networks could be built through peer to peer contacts as well as over geographic and disciplinary boundaries. Moreover, Loorits’ information sources in the case of Haavio’s professorship application also sheds light on the informal side of the field. A deep reading of private correspondences allows glimpses of the information channels that scholars used in forming their perception of how to be successful and recognised academics, information that could be obtained within a national and a transnational context. These informal communication forms are interesting in the sense that they give us insights into persona formation as an ongoing process on a personal level, while the more formal communication forms tell us more about how gatekeepers assessed manifestations of persona.

Collegial exchange

In addition to sharing information about university courses and updates about local academic activity, the Finnish and Estonian folklorists utilised mutual research interests and knowledge about their respective national archives and state of current scholarship. With each other’s help, they could both get hold of source material that was not obtainable in their own country and receive fruitful feedback on and suggestions for their research.

In their collegial exchanges, one recurring topic was folklore variants, and which versions folklorists needed to analyse in the context of historical-geographical developments in oral poetry. For example, Enäjärvi could ask Oskar Loorits about Estonian folklore variants that might be relevant to her
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dissertation topic, the “Game of the rich and poor”. She also received information about the singing game from Elmar Päss, who in turn asked Enäjärvi for information that could be helpful for his dissertation on the games of the St. Martin’s and St. Catherine’s day celebrations. For most of the inquiries, the sender seems to have expected the recipient to answer without conducting separate investigations in archive collections or in private folklore collections. A response could include reading suggestions and information about local research and folklore, or tips about whether any local scholar was engaged with a similar research question (and thus might indirectly be advised to keep away from that topic).

Another very concrete form of collegial exchange took place through the numerous books and articles that crossed the Gulf of Finland in both directions, either by mail or in luggage. The local libraries often lacked books that the folklorists needed, or the books were otherwise not available. To solve this absence of locally available texts, Estonian and Finnish friends and colleagues could ask each other to buy or lend books. An additional practice that expanded the bibliographies and private literature collections of Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s circle of peers was that they sent each other offprints of articles and copies of books that they had written. The requests for copies were only on works written by others than the person who was asked to send them, while
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for example Haavio and Loorits had a mutual understanding of sending copies of their own work without the other asking for it.\footnote{EKLA EKM. 24 Collection of Matthias Johann Eisen. 24:3:15 Letters from Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio to M.J. Eisen, 5/6, 132/150 (28.1.1929, post stamp 22.12.1931); EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 13/17, 21/26, 22/27, 27/37 (2.3.1928, undated 1930s, undated 1930s, 27.6.1932).}

Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s affiliation with the publishing house WSOY seems to have been useful for obtaining relevant literature too. In a letter to Loorits, Hakulinen explained that he had negotiated with the people at WSOY to send Loorits a book on Elias Lönnrot and that the book could be paid for in instalments.\footnote{EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:84:1 Letters from Lauri Hakulinen to O. Loorits, 15/15 (5.11.1930).} A letter sent about two weeks later exemplifies another book procurement method that the Estonian and Finnish peers practiced. In the letter, Hakulinen wrote that the publishing house had not sent Loorits the book that was ordered. Instead of directing them to post it to him as soon as possible, he wrote that it now should be sent to the Dictionary Foundation, where Hakulinen worked, and they would try to find someone who was about to travel to Tartu. If no one was travelling there soon enough, he would bring it himself the next time he visited Tartu. In this way, he added, Loorits would also be spared complications with Estonian customs.\footnote{EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 17/21, 19/24 (22.11.1931, 16.12.1931).}

For Haavio (as well as Hakulinen), Loorits seems to have been a particularly close and trusted Estonian peer, which is especially well exemplified in Haavio’s letter to Loorits when he was about to apply for a professorship in folklore in 1932. First, when Haavio was about to tell Loorits that he was planning to apply for the professorship, Haavio asked Loorits not to mention it to anybody. Haavio emphasised that he was not expecting to be appointed professor, but that applying came with the possibility to be judged formally qualified as professor, which, in turn, was a valuable merit when later applying for docent scholarships.\footnote{EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:84:1 Letters from Lauri Hakulinen to O. Loorits, 14/14 (23.10.1930).} In order to be formally qualified, Haavio needed to have more publications, for which he got help from some of his closest colleagues. Enäjärvi gave Haavio her source material that she had intended to use for a book on the folk poem Leikarin runo ("The Minstrel’s poem"), as will be discussed further in chapter 7. Haavio then asked Loorits about details about the poem in Estonia, about whether the celebrated Estonian collector Matthias Johann Eisen’s publications on the topic were scholarly reliable, and further asked Loorits to instruct a particular Estonian student to copy the Estonian variants of it.\footnote{EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 17/21 (22.11.1931). The application for professorship was due in spring 1932, while the preparations already started in late autumn 1931.} Haavio further asked Loorits to read and
comment on his manuscript for the book Leikarit and the longer treatise Lohikäärme ja neito (“The Dragon and the Maid”).

Haavio trusted Loorits for several different reasons. His inquiry about Estonian versions of the folk poem Leikarin runo shows how Haavio assumed Loorits would be helpfully knowledgeable in the matter, although Loorits had not been researching that exact topic. However, Loorits had worked more generally on Estonian and in particular Livonian folklore and he was also the director of the folklore archives in Tartu, a fact which contributed to Haavio’s confidence in Loorits as a well-informed folkloric scholar. He also asked Loorits to comment on his work, emphasising that he highly valued Loorits’ feedback, stating that he turned to him because “we do not have anybody here whose criticism could be trusted in some sense.” Supposedly, Haavio referred to him and Enäjärvi when he wrote that “we” did not have anyone else to rely on at the time when he was applying for a professorship in 1931. The circle of folklorists in Finland was small, and in his letters, Haavio reflected upon how personal support and rivalries among colleagues could affect the outcome of an appointment. In this competitive environment, a friend and colleague outside the immediate national folklorist community was presumably a highly valued commentator.

As discussed above, Haavio trusted Loorits’ assessment of the highly esteemed Eisen and his publications on the folk poem Leikarin runo. Consequently, Haavio allotted Loorits the standing of a well-informed scholar, who could provide him reliable inside information about Estonian scholarship. In the case of Eisen, it was crucial to have such trust, since Eisen had a special status as a celebrated pioneer in the field and hence someone who could not be openly and critically scrutinised, and apparently Haavio had reason to hear Loorits’ view. Moreover, Loorits helped Haavio to find a Tartu student, who could copy material for him at the archive. It was crucial that this archival work was done accurately and Loorits conveyed Haavio’s instructions to the student.


While Loorits was asked to help in his capacity of a friend and well-informed colleague, his location, position and nationality was of significance for his and Haavio’s relationship. Living in the university town of Tartu, Loorits could help Haavio with Estonian material and current research, with the extra advantage that he was also the director of the Estonian folklore archives. In the world of comparative folklore studies, researchers frequently used collections and research abroad for analysis and contextualising purposes. German, Swedish and Norwegian folklore were commonly discussed in networks of students and scholars, but the exchange between Estonian and Finnish research was especially frequent. The Finnish-Estonian collaboration was particularly robust as the cultural and linguistic similarities in folklore compelled the scholars to work closely and become aware of one another’s work. At the same time, the close personal friendships could intensify this collaboration and make similar research interests and knowledge production even more compelling.

Close friendships

Besides accounts of academia, the letters exchanged by folklorists included discussions about private, everyday life. Haavio, Loorits and Hakulinen had cultivated a distinctively close friendship, which extended far beyond a collegial relationship. Their letters show how university life and private life were not separate spheres. Writing about private issues brought the friends and future colleagues closer together, which, in turn, probably opened for more candid discussions about work-related issues. Their personal friendship also made it much easier and more familiar to travel to each other’s university towns.

The letters between the Haavio, Hakulinen and Loorits were filled with both humour and serious reflections about life and work, private life and news and gossip about mutual friends. The letters could also be written together with another friend or include short greetings by someone else who was noted at the end of the letter. Some of the letters were also very detailed and showed that the writer had put much effort into the aesthetics of them, for


643 See e.g. EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 1/1 (26.9.1927); EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:84:1 Letters from Lauri Hakulinen to O. Loorits, 4/4 (undated, 1925).
example, by decorating some letters in the style of old manuscripts or making the letter look like a newspaper, as described in the example below.644

Haavio’s and Loorits’ letters could discuss matters that were personal indeed, such as Haavio’s love life. Loorits was aware of Haavio’s complicated relationship with Enäjärvi, and was critical towards Enäjärvi as well as of Haavio’s way of handling the situation. The criticism was for example embedded humorously in a letter written in the style of a newspaper, called “The Heartland News”. The “newspaper” included various short articles and announcements which did not directly contain any accusations against Enäjärvi. But if read together with Haavio’s reply, they can be understood as comments on Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s relationship. For example, a mock version of Enäjärvi’s student nation was announced to organise an event called “FOR EVERYONE, EVERYONE, EVERYONE [but NOT for him]”, and two classified advertisements in which the signature “Elvi” wrote “The signatory confesses publicly that MARTTI IS ALL TOO KIND” and the alias “Elsa” wrote “It is his tactics again”.645 In other sections of the “newspaper” letter, the author wrote about three types of women: those who want everyone to adore them, those who let the former shine and lastly those who lack empathy, play with others’ pain and have fun trampling on them. A third section was “written” by “E. E.-vi”, which was an abbreviation that Enäjärvi sometimes used as a signature in her journal articles.646 In the column, the author wrote to her “friend” that he was completely naive and asks if he understood what a queer position he was in, what an “ugly and egoistic DANCE ON A TIGHTROPE” the author was performing, and how small his chances were.647

Haavio’s response was far from positive. Haavio claimed that Loorits did not have the slightest understanding of Enäjärvi’s character nor about the complexity of their situation. He acknowledged that Loorits had communicated his critical thoughts with the best of intentions, but added that the message luckily had arrived too late to change his mind.648 He further told

---


645 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Loorits, Oskar to Haavio, Martti 23.2.1925. Letter 743:(12:)53:2. Org. “Sydamaa Sõnumid”; “KAIKILLE, KAIKILLE, KAIKILLE [mutta EI hänelle]” [brackets in original]; “Allekirjoittanut tunnustaa sen julkisesti, että MARTTI ON LIIANKIN KILTTI”; “Se on taas hänen taktiikkansa”. Elvi Enäjärvi was Elsa Enäjärvi’s sister and was in the same student circles as Haavio, Hakulinen and Loorits.


648 EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 1/1 (undated, early-mid 1920s).
Loorits most severely not to criticise Enäjärvi again. Loorits replied to Haavio that the “newspaper” had been a joke and he advised Haavio not to take it too seriously or let it anger him. Loorits did, however, not apologise for his views on Enäjärvi.

Although Haavio did not approve of Loorits’ assumptions and criticism, he did not seem to disapprove of Loorits’ concerns over his personal life. After reproaching Loorits for being derisive of Enäjärvi, Haavio explained rather in detail about his and Enäjärvi’s relationship and situation. He further confessed: “As a sign of Final Reconciliation, I have bought earrings for Elsa”, to which he immediately added: “(Do not laugh! Also do not tell anyone! This is a serious matter)”.

The trust between the two men, in other words, probably had not diminished, and Haavio could confide in Loorits with information that could have caused him to be mocked by others.

**Peer fellowship and cross-generational assistance**

During the 1920s and early 1930s, Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s position in academia changed, and the significance of the Estonian relations evolved with them. The group of students who began their transnational exchange in the early 1920s remained close and kept a certain generational identification. Further, the exchange proved formative for their understanding and portrayal of themselves as scholars.

The group of Estonian and Finnish folk culture scholars, including Enäjärvi and Haavio and their peers, was tightly knit and with frequent interactions. Several of the friends managed to pursue academic careers. This group included Lauri Hakulinen and Aarni Penttilä in Finland and Oskar Loorits, folklorist and literary scholar August Annist (1899–1972, from 1936 Anni) and language scholars Paul Ariste (1905–1990) and Julius Mägiste (1900–1978) in Estonia.

In addition to mainly consisting of people with similar scholarly and literary interests, the group of Finnish and Estonian friends was also of very similar age, with only Ariste born outside a span of three years. While we can assume that the students also had acquaintances and friends who were

---

649 Else, Haavio stated, Loorits should prepare to get in his throat an object with the inscription “AGAINST THE DEVIL AND THE RUSSIAN”, which was an AKS catch word. EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 9/13 (undated mid-1920s). Org. “PIRUA JA RYSSÄÄ VASTAAN”.

650 Instead of apologising for his writings about Enäjärvi, he used in the same letter the rather unflattering reference of Enäjärvi and her sister as the two “handfuls” (in Estonian käbarad) SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Loorits, Oskar to Haavio, Martti 14.7.1923. Letter 743:(12.:)53:3.
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younger, it seems that this specific cohort bonded particularly deeply. Also, the friends did not appear to expect their peers in the neighbouring country to know students who were a few years younger. For example, Hakulinen introduced the Finnish historian and folklore and ethnology collector Helmi Helminen (1905–1976) to Oskar Loorits in a letter prior to Helminen’s trip to Tartu, where she planned to work on her doctoral dissertation.652 Apparently, Hakulinen did not expect Loorits to know who the five years younger Helminen was, although she by the time already was well-known in Finland as an experienced and efficient collector.653

Similarly, Enäjärvi and Haavio were in contact with senior scholars, but here, too, either less frequently or by using an intermediate. For example, Enäjärvi sent a few letters to Matthias Johann Eisen, letters in which she thanked him both for his hospitality when she was in Tartu and more specifically for when he helped her with requests about folklore variants in the Estonian collections.654 The Kallas family was also important for Enäjärvi, as has been mentioned earlier and will be discussed further in chapter 6. However, these kinds of cross-generational bonds do not seem to have yielded the same tightly knitted web of friends as was the case with the peers of their own age. Instead of approaching the older or younger Estonians, the Finns could often use the help of a coeval friend. For example, Haavio and Enäjärvi could ask Loorits to act as a mediator between them and Professor Anderson when Haavio wanted to acquire bibliographical references from him, and Loorits could also report that he had been discussing Haavio’s dissertation with Anderson.655 Similarly, Enäjärvi, asked Loorits to accompany her when she wanted to visit Anderson when he was at his country home in Elva.656 She also turned to Loorits with an inquiry to the younger scholar Herbert Tampere (1909–1975), when she needed copies of folklore variants from him.657

652 EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:84:1 Letters from Lauri Hakulinen to O. Loorits, 9/9 (4.11.1929).
When the cohort grew older, the connections between the former student friends remained, but as their roles in academia altered, their ways of using their network did too. One illustrative example was how Loorits arranged an Estonian student’s visit to the University of Helsinki in 1931 together with Haavio and Enäjärvi. Due to the internal politics of the student union in Tartu, it seemed difficult for the student, Alma Haavamäe (Espenberg), to get to Helsinki. Loorits asked Hakulinen and Haavio to help with the matter. Haavio promised to do so together with Enäjärvi (according to Hakulinen she was “the expert on scholarships”\(^\text{658}\)). He warned, however, that they no longer had close ties with the local student union. Several administrative turns later, Haavio could conclude that Haavamäe had indeed received a travel scholarship from the student union at the University of Helsinki.\(^\text{659}\)

Haavamäe’s case sheds some light on the undercurrents between the Finnish and Estonian academic relationships as well as on the generational circumstances. According to historian Helena Sepp, the student union in Helsinki had as a policy to grant scholarships according to the applicants’ academic achievements. The student union in Tartu, in turn, had an unofficial policy to promote their board members, whose study records apparently were not as meriting as many other candidates’. This, together with other aspects of student politics in Tartu, had resulted in a decision in 1931 that the Tartu student union make a first-round selection of candidates before sending the applications to Helsinki, where the final decisions were made. When Haavamäe applied for a scholarship in 1932, her application did not pass the first selection round. Sepp states that the rejection of Haavamäe’s application lead to a critical article in the Tartu student newspaper as well as in the student newspaper in Helsinki. The case was eventually discussed in the leading bodies of the two student unions.\(^\text{660}\)

The letters that Enäjärvi and Haavio sent to Loorits in December 1931 show that they played an active role behind the scenes in the Haavamäe case. Haavio had told Loorits that he was no longer part of the inner circles of the student union in Helsinki. According to Sepp, when Haavio and Annist stepped aside from their leading positions in the Estonian-Finnish student exchange at the end of the 1920s, the agenda and selection processes of student exchange collaborations had changed.\(^\text{661}\) However, Enäjärvi and Haavio still must have maintained good contact within the student union and the scholarship


\(^{661}\) Sepp, ‘Kultuursild või kaitsele?’, 202.
committee, because directly after the application deadline, Enäjärvi was informed that the student union in Helsinki had not received Haavamäe’s application. She and Haavio wrote a letter to Loorits the same day, and they asked why Haavamäe had not sent her application to Helsinki. They also told Loorits that they had made a phone call to their friend Julius Mägiste in Tartu to ask about it. Since Mägiste had not been at home, they had asked his wife to immediately try to find out what had happened. According to Haavio, the chair of the student union’s board had already confirmed to him that Haavamäe would receive a scholarship if she applied for it. As it turned out, the student union in Helsinki had not received her application. Haavio had still been able to negotiate the possibility to maybe find her some other scholarship outside the normal exchange program. 662 Twelve days later, Haavio wrote a new letter to Loorits. Among other more personal issues, he wrote that the information about the student union’s new practice in Tartu had reached Helsinki and caused serious discussions and debates between the two student unions. He wrote that the union in Tartu had successfully hid their new policy from the union in Helsinki until Haavamäe’s case brought it out in the open. Before this happened, the people in Helsinki had only noticed a decrease in applications and wondered why there had been such a drop of interest in the Finnish-Estonian exchange. 663

Haavio, Enäjärvi, Loorits and Mägiste had all moved away from student life and student politics as they developed along their academic paths from students to scholars during the 1920s. However, the friendships that they had initiated in the exchanges between Estonians and Finns ten years earlier were still strong. They used their network of contacts in private and professional situations, but it can be said that they were apparently also instrumental in assisting exchanges among a younger generation of students. The 1931 revisions to the Tartu student union’s exchange scholarship application practices would probably not have been revealed without Haavio’s, Enäjärvi’s and Mägiste’s intervention, at least not at this point. It is also interesting that the friends found themselves to be in a position from which they could lobby for particular younger students’ grant applications and also use their contacts in order to expose anomalies in the application process.

The three groups discussed above had different approaches to what it took to be successful in receiving scholarships. The student union in Helsinki emphasised academic achievement as their first priority, the student union in Tartu prioritised how well the applicants’ political engagement correlated with the political agenda of the student union board members, while the older generation, outside the formal negotiations, based their priorities on recommendations given to applicants from their friends. The Tartu student

---

union altered their selection process in order to subjectively control which students received scholarships, and did not want to be transparent about it. According to Enäjärvi, the student union in Helsinki was aware that the union in Tartu preferred to recommend students on other grounds than academic merits, which instead were based mainly on political activity or membership in the student union. As the Helsinki student union’s policy was to rank applicants solely based on academic achievement, they had intended to ask the union in Tartu not to provide any recommendations at all. However, Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s letters clearly show that the Helsinki student union could be approached and their decision-making affected from the outside.

None of the three groups had, in other words, officially rejected academic achievement as a priority when granting stipends to students. At the same time, all of them found it more or less acceptable to try to influence the selection process in accordance with other values. In this case, the Tartu student union’s strategy failed when they favoured candidates other than the students who were preferred by the older generation (apparently both groups were unaware of each other’s clashing interests and interventions in the process). Although the older generation was no longer officially involved in the exchange program, the results of their engagement in the Estonian-Finnish student collaboration and exchange a decade earlier was still influential when ranking a new cohort of students and their suitability for scholarships.

Unravelling the procedural twists found in Haavamäe’s grant application process is relevant for examining the constituted nature of scholarly personae. In studies of academic persona, it is common to review scholarship applications and the decisions made by the granting organisations because they shed light both on what applicants listed as positive character traits or merits and on what was favoured or dismissed by the funding agencies. As this chapter has shown, we can find information about subtleties such as politics and informal connections operating in the background and embedded in private correspondences between people whose names will not necessarily be found in the scholarship records.

Haavamäe’s eventual success with her scholarship application was not ultimately due to her academic merits (although they might have been sufficient had the Estonian student union followed the Helsinki student union’s directives), nor was it based on her political stance (which would probably have weighed against her, at least informally, had the issue come to the light of day). Nor was it due to how the funding agency—the student union in Helsinki—judged her character. Instead, what was decisive was that Loorits found Haavamäe to be a student worthy to promote, and due to Loorits’

recommendation of Haavamäe, Enäjärvi and Haavio were also in favour of her. Haavamäe’s grant case exemplifies how success in scholarship applications depended to a large extent on matching the merits announced officially, but that the final outcome in practice was not solely decided by the funding agency. Enäjärvi and Haavio’s generation had formed bonds that affected what came to be regarded as achievements in academia, all anchored in political, cultural and social contexts.

The older generation’s influence was not limited to promoting specific applicants. Younger students were also under the senior academics’ watchful eyes when in Helsinki. To continue with the example of Alma Haavamäe, Haavio and Enäjärvi repeatedly reported to Loorits about her life in Helsinki, conveying that she was in good health, had found accommodations and enjoyed her studies. Moreover, they also added notes about her character and conduct. In this context, Haavio would repeat his younger sister’s verdict that Haavamäe was considered the best scholarship fellow in a long time and was known for good behaviour and diligence. Appropriate character and conduct seem to have been of extra importance, at least for Haavio, as can be noted when he discussed Haavamäe’s housing situation:

I have however heard from another source that she would not be fully satisfied with her lodgings, where people are too keen to keep track on where she has been and where she has lingered.[...] When a young lady is on foreign ground, I do think it is better that she is looked after a little: there’s no harm in it, even if it concerns a young lady as nice as Miss Haavamäe.[...] As long as she does not move into the singer Alma Kuula’s place, which Haltsonen is trying to arrange—It is far away, it is a restless artist home, and I think it is totally inappropriate.

Based on this correspondence, it seems that Haavio considered it his and his peers’ responsibility to keep a watchful eye on Haavamäe. The above quote as well as Haavio’s note about his sister’s impression of Haavamäe indicates that several people were involved in taking care of the Estonian visitor. Haavio’s view on the extra need for looking after young women living abroad is interesting in connection to his writings about female students from his

---

666 EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 24/33, 27/39, 23/32, 16/20 (undated, 27.6.1932, 12.2.1932, 25.1.1932). The account from January was written by Enäjärvi in an addition to Haavio’s letter to Loorits. Haavio’s account from February also included information that according to him was from Enäjärvi.

student years. In his telling, it was better even for “a young lady as nice as Miss Haavamäe”, that she was looked after while living abroad. In this view, young women risked tarnishing their reputation when they travelled or lived abroad. While Haavio’s accounts from his student days suggest that he only observed the conduct of female students and privately shared his opinions about women’s appropriate behaviour, the above passage can be read as evidence of his more active role in safeguarding the reputation of female students.

Long-lasting friendships and the consequences of the Estonian-Finnish exchange

Thanks to personal contacts, scholars could make their research much more efficient. They could ask each other for reading recommendations, archive references and folklore variants from their colleagues’ country. They could also ask each other for help with contacting established scholars in their field, who they did not know personally, or to read and comment on article and book manuscripts they were preparing for publication. By collaborating over national borders, they created a shared research field, within which a partly shared scholarly persona was cultivated.

The Estonian-Finnish Student Club played an important role in forming the early friendship bonds between Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s student generations in Tartu and Helsinki. The Club offered a joyful and comradely forum for students with similar interests. Bonds of friendship grew strong and survived to a remarkable degree, also during challenging periods, when formalised collaborations declined or became dormant. The official relationship between Finnish student nations and the Estonian student union, for example, became cooler in the 1930s. The main reason was the student nations’, and especially the North-Ostrobotian student nation’s, close relationship to the Patriotic People’s Movement and their meddling in Estonian domestic politics. Another contributing factor was that the popular interest in Finns and Estonians as kindred peoples was in a period of decline, which lead to a diminishing interest in Estonian-Finnish cooperation. Simultaneously, we can see that the personal contacts between folklorists, who had been active in the club in the 1920s, continued corresponding with their Estonian colleagues long after their early contacts with them.

An even more radical decline in the contacts between Finnish and Estonian folk culture scholars was seen during World War II, and a yet more radical one in the post-war era. In the Communist People’s Republic of Estonia, research collaborations were quickly oriented towards the other communist republics, and in Finnish research, the era has been described in terms of a total break in the contacts between Finnish and Estonian folklorists.\(^{670}\) However, if we look at the personal correspondence of Enäjärvi and Haavio, we can see that they continued to stay in contact with Estonian colleagues, especially during World War II.\(^{671}\) After the war, the received letters were

almost exclusively from those Estonians who had escaped the country during or immediately after the end of the war, such as Oskar Loorits, Gustav Ränk and Walter Anderson.\textsuperscript{672}

The exceptions were August Annist and Paul Ariste, from whom Enäjärvi received one letter and Haavio at least two.\textsuperscript{673} Both were friends of Enäjärvi and Haavio since their student years and were in the country when the two had visited Estonia. Both had also been in close contact with other Finnish colleagues, and Annist was a noted spokesperson for an Estonian orientation to and collaboration with Finnish academic and cultural circles.\textsuperscript{674} Enäjärvi also translated one of Annist’s books into Finnish during the war, when his works were published by WSOY under his own name and the pen-names Jaan Siiras and A. Varmas.

The few letters from Annist, preserved in Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s archive collections seem to bear witness of a wider network of scholars outside the Soviet Union, which Annist managed to retain during the post-war era.\textsuperscript{675} Paul Ariste also had some contacts with Finnish folklore scholars in the early 1960s, when the official contacts between Finnish and Estonian scholars opened up a little.\textsuperscript{676}

\begin{flushright}


\textsuperscript{676} Irma-Riitta Järvinen, ‘Perspectives to the Relations between the Estonian Folklore Archives and the Folklore Archives of the Finnish Literature Society’, 61.
Concluding comments

Student exchange and scholarly collaboration were in the early twentieth century driven by kinship politics and nationalist ideas. Additionally, travel from southern Finland to Estonia was easy and cheap in comparison to other countries. However, when the general political and student political interest in kinship politics decreased, Enäjärvi, Haavio and their peers continued their frequent exchange and collaboration. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s travel accounts tell of experiences that were both joyful and formative on an individual level, and helped them build a strong and tight network of friends in folk culture studies and contemporary literature.

The close collaboration between Finnish and Estonian folk culture scholars expanded the national disciplinary context into a transnational one, with shared research interests and work opportunities. The students also shared information that they had obtained about the academic structures and what it took to be a folk culture scholar. In this way, they both confirmed that there were comparable practices and structures in Estonian and Finnish folk culture studies, and cemented them by repeating and sharing them with each other. Enäjärvi, Haavio and their colleagues also continued to consciously affect academic structures by utilising their transnational network, as was demonstrated in their correspondence with Oskar Loorits about Alma Haavamäe’s student exchange and grant procedure.

The field of folk culture studies’ collaboration in general and Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s friendship-based network of Finnish and Estonian peers in particular had several other far-reaching formative consequences. While personal contacts were important for individual scholars, tightly knit bonds also produced broader consequences for the research field. Like many of their colleagues, Haavio and Enäjärvi used the historic-geographic method in their research on folk poetry. As will be discussed in the next chapter, the method required well-functioning international networks with archivists and scholars. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s correspondences with their Estonian colleagues show that there were many practical advantages gained through having functioning networks, one of which was the existence of warm and friendly connections abroad. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s devotion to Estonian-Finnish exchange was in line with a common trend and practices in folklore studies. In this sense, they were acting in ways that fitted well a folklorist’s persona of the time. Through their involvement, they did not, however, only adapt to a pre-existing folklorist’s persona. Their actions made also a long-lasting impact on the scholarly field and the evolving ways of being folklorists.
6. Western Europe: An international folklorist’s persona and a cross-disciplinary female academic’s persona

In the previous chapter, I discussed Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s earliest visits abroad and the transnational exchange between Estonian and Finnish students and scholars. While the Estonian connection remained the single most frequent foreign exchange during the 1920s and 1930s, Enäjärvi and Haavio also travelled to and formed contacts with other scholars in Western Europe. In this chapter, I explore two international scholarly communities. The first is the networks within the folk culture disciplines, which I study through the practices required by the historic-geographic method. The second is the cross-disciplinary community of academic women that Enäjärvi encountered during her research journey to England.

Both parts examine journeys that had an impact on how Enäjärvi and Haavio developed as and into folklorists, but these trips abroad illuminate different contexts and different dimensions of persona formation. Like fieldwork, the international contacts between and travel to other folk culture scholars had an instrumental function, and was a practice that folklorists were expected to participate in. Both the methodological school and the community of academic women can be understood to have formed the individual scholars towards a context-bound collective identity, as H. Otto Sibum and Lorraine Daston describe scholarly persona. Moreover, the community of academic women can be understood as offering alternative repertoires for Enäjärvi to embody, in the sense of how Elisabeth Wesseling and Mineke Bosch approach scholarly persona. Enäjärvi was positively surprised when she encountered new ways of being a scholar in London. The international community of academic women offered new models of how to be both academically credible and feminine. She embraced these models and promoted them among a larger, Finnish audience.

The chapter title refers to this emphasis on West European travel and contacts, mainly British, German and Scandinavian. Hopefully the reader will be forbearing of the lack of theoretical discussion of the term “Western”, as well as the occasional inclusion of a few countries outside Europe or what usually is covered under “Western Europe”. A separate chapter is dedicated to the Estonian context, not to mark Estonia’s separation from Western Europe, but to highlight the proximity and particularities of the Finnish and Estonian exchange.
Travelling scholars, knowledge and personae

Research on the history of science and knowledge has repeatedly shown how international exchange for a long time has been an integral part of academic work. One approach to this has been to study how knowledge-production has been concentrated to certain academic centres and transmitted from there to peripheries. During the second half of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the twentieth century, Germany held a position as an academic centre, but the situation changed during World War I. The emphasis began to shift towards the U.S., and was rapidly completed after World War II. Research fields could also have their own, more specific, academic centres. According to Petra Garberding, international exchange within folklore and ethnology was predominantly dependent on individual connections until the 1930s. These exchanges remained frequent also during the interwar years, for example between German and Swedish ethnologists and folklorists, who Garberding studies.

In persona studies, international exchanges have been perceived as carrying formative functions for the travelling scholars. For example, Mineke Bosch and Rozemarijn van de Wal have studied how individual scholars, their careers and research were affected by their early academic journeys abroad. Kirsti Niskanen, Kaat Wils and Pieter Huistra discuss how funding organisations were key for enabling academic travel, especially and increasingly from the late nineteenth century onwards. People who fulfilled the agencies’ perceptions of desirable grantees were able to access to academically beneficial environments and to make valuable contacts. Thus, the organisations’ ideals had a major impact on which scholars later would launch into good careers after they returned home.

The tradition of studying transitions of knowledge and practices of knowledge production from academic centres towards academic peripheries has been challenged by historians claiming that it would be more fruitful to explore how knowledge circulates. One of the advantages of the circulation approach is that it sheds more light on the agency of scholars and institutions in what is traditionally viewed as the peripheries of scholarship. Instead of viewing knowledge and knowledge production practices as something that is...


679 Garberding, Vetenskap mellan dikta tur och demokrati, 50–51.

first and foremost developed in the academic centres and then transmitted to the peripheries, studies in knowledge circulation emphasise a more continuous interaction between centre and periphery. This approach can further be combined with a postcolonial perspective, as demonstrated, for example, by Kapil Raj who has studied the production and circulation of knowledge between India and Britain in the nineteenth century.

The research on circulation of knowledge and postcolonial approaches to it has been inspirational in my reading of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s international correspondence and journeys. These approaches help to critically rethink how knowledge or ways of being a scholar are transmitted, not only as models imported from centres abroad to peripheries, but also how they are shaped in interaction and practices between scholars internationally. The central role that Finnish scholars and scholarship played in the field of folklore studies adds a further dimension when exploring influences between the relationship between academic centres and peripheries.

**An international folklorist’s persona**

The field of folklore studies was a national discipline used for nationalist purposes, yet it was an inherently international field too, with its emphasis mapping international developments of folklore. In what follows, I will discuss how Finnish folklore scholars interacted with peers in Europe, with an emphasis on Western Europe. I begin by looking at how Finnish scholars reached out from home by mail. Subsequently, I discuss how Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s doctoral dissertation required international contacts. I argue that the historic-geographic school urged folklorists to form personae of internationally travelling and networking scholars. From there, I move on to discuss the practices of travelling and what implications it had on Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s persona formation processes.

---


683 Stefan Nygård, Johan Strang and Marja Jalava have an enlightening discussion about the problems and advantages of postcolonial approaches when studying European academic peripheries and semi-peripheries. Jalava, Nygård and Strang, *Decentering European Intellectual Space*, 2–6.
International correspondences

In order to gain an overview of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s international contacts, let us begin by looking at their correspondence. International correspondences had several functions for the scholars. It was crucial for the folklorists to obtain information and source material from archives abroad by mail. In addition, mail correspondence was a prerequisite for international travel. Scholars needed to arrange their travel plans and establish contact persons at their destination. Once contacts were formed abroad, they could be nurtured for future use.

While the accounts from Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s travels give us information about who they met and worked with abroad, their correspondences further show whom they continued to be in contact with as well as which international peers and colleagues they might have come in contact when in Finland. These could be people associated with archives or scholarly societies or people who visited Finland. This was for example the case with Haavio’s Norwegian colleague Nils Lid, who he met in September 1920, when both were folklore students and Lid was visiting Helsinki.\(^{684}\) Later, Lid and Haavio continued to keep in touch by mail correspondence, in which they both wrote about their personal lives and shared knowledge about literature and sources in their research field.\(^{685}\)

Tables 2 and 3 show the number of letters sent by foreign scholars and preserved in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s personal archives from when the first international letter from an academic contact was sent in 1920 to 1932. I have separated the letters received between 1920–1926 and 1927–1932 to better illustrate the great difference in international contacts that can be traced to Enäjärvi’s 1927 stay in London. For Haavio, there is no particular pivot point, although we can see that the number of international letters increased over time in his case too.

Before moving on to discuss observations from the tables, there is reason to dwell on what the tables do not show. Firstly, I have only included letters from people who were engaged with either studies, research or other work directly related to Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s field of study. It does therefore not, for example, show Estonian friends studying in other disciplines, nor authors with whom both Haavio and Enäjärvi corresponded.

Secondly, the table does obviously not show the letters that are not preserved in the archive collection, and there are signs that some letters indeed have been lost. One such sign is that Haavio in a letter to Loorits in 1932 responded to a question, which does not appear to be preserved in Haavio’s


Table 2. International scholars’ and folk culture students’ letters in Enäjärvi’s letter collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zeeland</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>7</strong></td>
<td><strong>201</strong></td>
<td><strong>53</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Table 3. International scholars’ and folk culture students’ letters in Haavio’s letter collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>6</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Comments: Of Loorits’ 17 letters from 1927–1932 in Haavio’s collection, four are addressed to Enäjärvi and included in this table, and one letter from Julius Mägiste from 1924 is addressed to Niilo Kärki, which I have not included. A letter from Loorits to Haavio, with the signum 743:(12:)53:12 is probably sent in 1930 or 1931, but it was in spring 2019 missing from the archive case and is thus not in this table. When possible, undated letters have been placed into the columns based on the letters’ contents. I have not included in the table letters which were not sent to Haavio, but are found in his letter collection, mainly the correspondences of Niilo Kärki and Uuno Johannes Vuorijoki: Letters 764:(28:)37–50 and Niilo Kärki’s archive collection. Case 756.
In Enäjärvi’s collection, there are no preserved letters either from Virve or Aino Kallas until 1932, although there are in Virve Kallas’s collection 16 letters and in Aino Kallas’s collection 11 letters written by Enäjärvi between 1917 and 1932. Furthermore, the content of these letters suggests that they were part of a dialogue. It is further surprising that Enäjärvi’s collection does not include any letters from Ann Tamm, who was the chair of the Estonian Finnish Student Club at the time when Enäjärvi was most active in it and whom she mentioned in her diary in connection to her first journey to Estonia in 1921. It is thus very possible there are other letters missing from the collections.

Thirdly, the tables only include letters which were addressed directly to Enäjärvi and Haavio and saved by them in their private collections. Consequently, not all written messages sent to the two are visible in the tables. As was discussed in the chapter on Estonia, many issues were not discussed directly with the person immediately concerned, but via a close friend. Enäjärvi sent letters and passages to Oskar Loorits in attachment to Haavio’s letter to him, which Loorits then answered in his response to Haavio. Enäjärvi and Haavio could also ask Loorits to pose a request to Professor Walter Anderson, whom they seem to have rarely contacted in person. In these cases, Loorits’s response to Enäjärvi’s inquiries in Haavio’s letters and Anderson’s response to Haavio are both to be placed in the table cell of Estonian letters to Haavio. Moreover, the letter collections of Enäjärvi and Haavio include some and seem to exclude other letters sent to them in official administrative roles, for example when working for WSOY or the Finnish

---


688 Sepp, ‘Kultuursild või kaitseiliin?’, 181; SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri the day after Midsummer [25.6.]1921. Letter 731:(3:)3:2; SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (17.7.1921). Case 5. The absence of Aino Kallas’s letters only exemplifies the possibility that there are other letters missing. Such letters would not have been included in the table even if they had been preserved, since she was not a peer or senior colleague, but an author. This said, I have not separated letters with academic content from those without, but only included them in the table when the sender can be considered a peer student or scholar. For example, the letters between Ann Tamm and Haavio and Virve Kallas and Haavio have no content that would suggest that their contact had any other connection to academia than that they all were participating in student clubs and politics.


Literature Society. For example, a letter sent by August Annist to Haavio via the Finnish Literature Society in 1927 is not preserved in his personal archive. Similarly, documents sent to Haavio via others are not necessarily in the letter collection, which can be exemplified by a letter in which Kaarle Krohn informed Haavio that he had received Norwegian variants intended for Haavio’s usage.

Shifting our gaze from what we cannot see in the tables to what we can see, our first observation could be that both Enäjärvi and Haavio had most frequent contact with Estonian and Scandinavian colleagues and peers during the whole time period. In comparison with the rest of the table, one might want to note that the Estonian correspondences did not only result in the largest absolute numbers of letters, but also represent the largest number of senders. However, in proportion to the number of Estonian letters, there were rather few senders. The reason is that Haavio and Enäjärvi had a few close Estonian friends with whom they corresponded very frequently. In Haavio’s collection, there is a total of 23 letters sent by Loorits in 1920–1932, which means that half of all his letters from Estonia were sent by one person. In Enäjärvi’s collection, there are 23 letters sent by Linda Leeman (later Raun), which makes up one fourth of all the Estonian letters. The large number of Swedish letters in Enäjärvi’s collection is also partly due to a frequent correspondence with the folklorist and archive director Johan Götlind, from whom Enäjärvi received 27 letters between 1927 and 1932. Their correspondence comprised, in other words, nearly half of Enäjärvi’s Swedish letters.

A second observation is that, until 1932, Enäjärvi’s collection holds a strikingly larger amount of received internationally posted letters than Haavio’s. To some extent, the difference is due to Enäjärvi’s new network of university women, whom she met when she stayed at the International Federation of University Women’s lodging Crosby Hall in London. These contacts represent many of the table’s Anglophone senders. The difference between Haavio’s rather small number and Enäjärvi’s large number of international letters should be interpreted cautiously. Haavio was in Berlin in late autumn 1926 and the summer of 1927, when he, according to his letters and diaries, interacted with German scholars, but all his correspondence with German scholars are from the time after 1932. However, we can note a scarcity of German letters also in Enäjärvi’s collection. As discussed in more detail below, Enäjärvi made two journeys to Germany in the 1920s, but there are only two letters sent by German residents.

693 The definition of national belonging is not clear-cut in some cases. One of the senders that I have counted in the table as German, wrote to Enäjärvi in English and had probably some family or extended family relations to Finland. On the other hand, defining German here as German
As I discuss in more detail in the next chapter, Enäjärvi and Haavio could expand each other’s academic networks by introducing friends to each other. Of the senders in the table, eight had sent letters to both Enäjärvi and Haavio: August Annist, Paul Ariste, Oskar Loorits, Julius Mägiste and Ants Oras from Estonia, Anna Bērzkalne from Latvia, Nils Lid from Norway and Archer Taylor from the United States. Judging on the contents and frequencies of correspondences, Loorits and Lid could be described as primarily Haavio’s friends, while Enäjärvi had come in contact with Bērzkalne before Haavio and was also later in closer contact with her than he was. Professor Taylor became acquainted with both when he visited Helsinki in 1932. Out of the 13 senders in Haavio’s collection, only 5 were people who Enäjärvi did not correspond with, while she, in comparison, had 45 correspondents who did not send letters to Haavio.

The historic-geographic method as an international research practice

In chapter 2, I discussed how Enäjärvi and Haavio worked within the historic-geographic school and how they wrote themselves into particular practices and ideals of being a researcher. In the following section, I will continue to use their work, in particular their dissertation work, to study how they turned residents, excludes for example the Baltic German Walter Anderson, who moved to Germany in 1939.

to international connections in their research. I argue that working within the school inherently also meant, at least to some degree, a synchronisation of scholarly personae among folklorists internationally, as it required practices and contacts across national borders.

As the historic-geographic method’s aim was to map the developments of folklore over time and location, it required researchers to manage a wide range of international literature and sources. To some degree, sources and literature were obtained by travelling. International networks were a crucial resource in this matter, as contacts abroad could help by giving information to localise relevant sources and previous research, translating and interpreting sources, as well as assisting with travel arrangements. Moreover, well-functioning networks could reduce the need for travelling, as information and sources could be sent by mail. Scholars sent inquiries to archives about possible variants of particular songs or tales. Usually the scholar requested information about whether the archive’s collections included records of a certain type of tale or song, or certain topics. The archivists responded by sending relevant information about their collections and at times they would send copies of the variants upon request. We can thus see traces of these conversations in the research results when they appeared in the footnotes of the published works. For example, Haavio made in his work *Leikarit* references such as “information given by O. Loorits.”

Presumably, obtaining archive contact information and sending inquiries about an archive’s collections would not usually have required particularly large and well-functioning international networks. Still, having good contacts and friends abroad came with advantages in this context too. One reason was that requests between friends could be more affordable, as for example a letter from Haavio to Oskar Loorits shows: Haavio asked Loorits, who at the time was director of the folklore archive in Tartu, to charge the regular fee instead of sending copies for free, as the archive had earlier done for him and Enäjärvi.

Good connections were even more important when scholars needed records from archives without permanent staff. When Haavio’s Norwegian folklorist friend Nils Lid in 1921 needed variants and translations of variants from the Finnish Literature Society’s folklore archive, he contacted Haavio, who further asked Hakulinen for assistance:


Would you consider being charitable while also making some money by translating into Swedish the attached cattle-killing words. The translation does not need to be literal. These are for MA Lid for his doctoral dissertation. He pays Norwegian crowns for each piece of information. Since I am aware of your excellent Swedish skills and my own stupidity, I assume that you will not be intractable.

The Finnish archive did not have a permanent staff before Haavio was appointed to the task on a part-time basis in 1931. Lid had visited Helsinki and the folklore archives in 1920, and Professor Kaarle Krohn had introduced him to Haavio. Lid was, in other words, familiar with the archive, its collections and Finnish folklorists before he reached out for Haavio’s help in the matter. The collaboration worked both ways: In May 1921, Lid’s delivery of copies of Norwegian records “fell like from the heavens” to Haavio’s help.

Close contact with one of the founders of the historic-geographic school, Kaarle Krohn, meant not only writing the dissertation within the school, but also provided access to valuable contacts in Europe. Shortly after Haavio had begun his dissertation work, he told Hakulinen that he could obtain sources via Krohn. Haavio stated: “Krohn [has] written in his own name to Anderson in Tartu and to Bolte in Berlin etc who surely will send all materials from their countries, as they always do for Krohn.”

Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s dissertation forewords further give us more insights in how they got hold of their sources. Enäjärvi thanked Dr. Reidar Thoralf Christiansen from Norway, Professor Matthias Johann Eisen, Professor Walter Anderson, Elmar Päss, Oskar Looarts and Paul Ariste in Estonia for sending her source material. She further thanked the Swedes Dr. Johan Götling, Professor Herman Geijer and Laura Strindberg, the Dane Søren Tvermose Thyregod and the Brits Lady Alice Gomme, Professor Alfred Cort Haddon and Barbara Aitken, as well as the German Professor Johannes Bolte.
for showing interest for her research and assisting her with literature and archive material. She further addressed an extensive gratitude to the Latvian archivist Anna Bērkalne for her “untiring assistance in the use of the records of traditional games in the Folk-lore Archives of Latvia, in translating Lettish texts and in supplying information on Lettish folk-lore in general.” Haavio also thanked Anderson, Bolte and Eisen for helping him with advice and details about sources as well as Bērkalne, Loorits and Nils Lid for helping him collect his variants.

Journeys to archives and libraries

The folklorists’ international networks made it possible for them to get hold of material and literature from abroad via mail. Why, then, did scholars still travel to the extent they did if so much literature and source material could be obtained by mail and networks shared with others? All contacts did not need to be directly personal, as friends, colleagues and senior scholars could approach their acquaintances on behalf of someone else. If Professor Bolte and Professor Anderson would, as Haavio told Hakulinen, send “all material in their countries” upon Professor Krohn’s request, why did he travel to Estonia and Germany and work in the archives and libraries there? The reason was, in part, that the journeys were crucial for forming and updating the networks, and in part that work could sometimes still be more affordable and efficient if the researcher travelled to the archives. In the following section, I will discuss how travel had the function of socialising folklore scholars within an international community and how the journeys contributed to their persona formation.

In their travel grant applications, Haavio and Enäjärvi argued for the importance of academic travel as serving a disciplinary and national good. Haavio argued that Finnish folklore had gained a recognised status internationally, but that the legacy required scholars to continue to materially expand the work. Enäjärvi pointed out that she in her dissertation work had collected source material both through visits to archives abroad, by mail and by questionnaires in journals. Apart from contributing to her research, these records were going to be an addition to the Finnish folklore archives’ world-famously extensive collections. She further argued for a travel grant by emphasising how research in her field shed light on the nation’s ancient past and its cultural connections with other peoples. In addition to contributing to these greater goods, Enäjärvi and Haavio stated that their work demanded
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702 Enäjärvi-Haavio, The Game of Rich and Poor, foreword. The passage is a direct quote, as Enäjärvi’s dissertation was in English. Lettish is synonymous to Latvian.
703 Haavio, Kettenmärchenstudien 1, foreword.
704 Arkki. Archive of the Consistory 1925–1991. Ec (received 2.12.1929, no. 872; see also received 7.4.1931 no. 321).
705 Arkki. Archive of the Consistory 1925–1991. Ec (received 17.2.1926, no. 102); Compare also with Ahmajärvi, 64–66.
travel abroad, since there was so much literature and archive material that could not be obtained in Finland.\footnote{Arkki. Archive of the Consistory 1925–1991. Ec (received 17.2.1926, no 102; received 7.4.1931, no 321; received 5.12.1929, no 872); See also Arkki. Archive of the Consistory 1925–1991. Minutes of the Consistory 1928 (Ca 101), (received 16.2.1928, no 131), Enäjärvi’s travel account.}

Where, then, should these materials be obtained? Enäjärvi made a half-year-long visit to London and shorter journeys to Latvia, France, Germany and Sweden.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Personalia (drafts from CV:s and a copy of minutes of the Consistory of the Historic-Linguistic Section 27.9.1947). Case V.} For Haavio’s part, the documents tell of two journeys abroad and outside Estonia during his student years prior to 1932. Both research trips had their end destination in Germany, with stops in Sweden and Denmark along the way. Unfortunately, Haavio’s archive contains very few details about these journeys.

Haavio’s passport shows that his first journey took place in October 1926 via the Baltic countries and through Szczecin (Stettin) in today’s Poland.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Personalia (passport issued 9.11.1923). Case 6.1; Letter from Haavio, Kaarlo and Hilja to Haavio, Martti 18.10.1926. Letter 729a:(1:)2:13.} In a letter from October 14\textsuperscript{th}, Haavio told Hakulinen that he had arrived in Berlin, “where milk and honey flows, that is, the Promised Land” and where “[t]he local Staatsbibliotek is a prime example among libraries.”\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 14.10.1926. Letter 737:(9:)4:11.} In Berlin, he worked a month in the National Library and with Professor Bolte’s private collections. Haavio wrote that he expected Hakulinen to understand that almost all his time was spent working. The little spare time Haavio had, he used for visiting museums, walking around the city and meeting Finns who were staying in the city. A visit to the theatre had made a similar impression on him as did the National Library. Compared to the Finnish National Theatre, the Berlin National Theatre was costlier to attend and showcased superior productions, with performances that made the Finnish Theatre seem like a children’s play at a Christmas party.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 14.10.1926. Letter 737:(9:)4:11.}

During his stay in Berlin, Haavio visited the Swedish Embassy where he applied for a Swedish transit visa. Presumably, he travelled to Sweden by ferry directly from Germany. After having his passport stamped in the coastal town of Trelleborg in southeastern Sweden, he must have then travelled without much delay northwards to Stockholm. According to a letter sent to his brother, Haavio had spent some time in Stockholm to collect material for his dissertation. We may reasonably assume that Haavio visited the National Library of Sweden and/or Stockholm’s Nordic Museum with its large ethnographic collections. From Stockholm, he left by ferry bound for Finland,
where he, according to the passport stamps, arrived on the third of November. After his stays in Berlin and Stockholm, Haavo told his brother that he had obtained all the material he needed to complete his doctoral dissertation.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Personalia. Grades, CV:s etc (Passport issued on 9.11.1923). Case 6.1; Letter from Haavio, Martti to Haavio, Jaakko 11.11.1926. Letter 729a:(1:)9:14.}

There are even fewer documents preserved that provide details about Haavio’s second journey to Germany in 1927. Apparently, Haavio travelled in the opposite direction when compared to his first trip, this time via Scandinavia to Berlin and from Berlin via the Baltic countries back to Finland.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Personalia. Grades, CV:s etc (Passport issued on 9.11.1923). Case 6.1.} In a letter to Hakulinen, Haavio sent him greetings from Copenhagen where he had stopped on the way to Germany. In Copenhagen, he met with the Finnish language scholar E.N. Setälä and the Danish folklore scholar Ferdinand Ohrt (1873–1938). The letter also tells us that Haavio was travelling with Elsa Enäjärvi’s sister Elvi Enäjärvi, but he did not mention what her aim was with the trip. Haavio and Elvi Enäjärvi had walked around in the city, visited the Tivoli and met with a group of young poets. They had also visited an outdoor ethnographic museum.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 22.6.1927. Letter 737:(9:)4:12.}

Similar to Haavio, Elsa Enäjärvi also made two journeys to Germany in the 1920s. The first was an excursion to Kiel, arranged by student organisations in the summer of 1921, and the second was a research journey to Berlin in late autumn of 1927.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Va 15.11.20–9.5.1922” 28.9.1921). Case 5; Personalia (undated draft of CV, written after 1932). Case V.} When staying in England, Enäjärvi also made a journey to Paris, where she worked at a library, but there are almost no more details about this journey in her documents.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (29.11.1927). Case 5; SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 29.8.1927. Letter 736:(8:)8:7.}

Enäjärvi’s collection does not contain any documents revealing more than a few short details about the first trip. What is known is that Enäjärvi joined a group of 137 Finnish students, who travelled by ferry to Germany, where they were hosted by the local students during the \textit{Kieler Woche}—a week-long event of sailing competitions and festivities. The Finnish guests were accommodated in homes, something that Enäjärvi wrote somewhat nervously about, since she was unsure whether her language skills would allow her to be “polite and soulful” enough.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Va 15.11.20–9.5.1922” 8.9.1921). Case 5. Org. “kohtelias ja henkevä”.} This she wrote on September 3rd, the day before departure. In that note she wrote about looking forward to how the trip would broaden her perspectives and develop her as a person. After seeing the
Estonian conditions, poor in comparison to the Finnish, she now envisioned a visit to an “old culture nation”, with higher material living standards than Finland. When returning home twenty days later, she wrote, while on the ferry, that her diary note before departure “was so brilliant that it was never extended.” Five days later, she wrote that the aim of the journey was for the host nation to present a grandiose nation and its quick restoration after the last war. The visitors had been divided into small groups that were guided during the whole stay by local students.

In proportion to the amount of material regarding Enäjärvi’s stay in London or the several journeys she made to Estonia, there is a scarcity of documents about her second trip to Germany in 1927. What the documents do reveal is that Enäjärvi went to Germany after her stay in Britain, travelling by train through Belgium and eastward across Germany to Berlin. Like Haavio, she worked in a library, going through literature and copying source material. Like Haavio, she, too, was in contact with Professor Bolte, whose address she had asked to get from Haavio before she left London. She had arranged the practicalities of the trip, with the help of the Finnish correspondent, MA Ada Norna (1896–1976), who secured housing arrangements prior to Enäjärvi’s arrival in Berlin. Similar to asking for Bolte’s address, Enäjärvi asked Haavio for Norna’s contact information. Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s documents show intersecting paths, in which Professor Krohn first contacted Professor Bolte on Haavio’s behalf. Soon after that, Haavio travelled to Berlin, where he, possibly together with some of the other Finns, met Bolte personally. When Enäjärvi visited Germany the following year, she was able to obtain Bolte’s contact information from Haavio.

In addition to the trips to the period’s scholarly centres Germany, France and Britain, Enäjärvi also made a separate journey to Uppsala and Stockholm in Sweden and one trip to Riga, in connection to one of her multiple visits to Estonia. Like Haavio, Enäjärvi conducted research in the Swedish National Library and the Nordic Museum in Stockholm but had more time at her disposal than did Haavio. She also travelled to the old university town Uppsala north of Stockholm, where she met with the archivist and the language scholar Herman Geijer and folklore scholar Johan Götlind at the
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local folklore archives, both of whom she continued to correspond with for the rest of their lives.

Enäjärvi’s correspondences with Geijer and particularly with Götlind shed light on how much a personal meeting with a colleague can do for the relationship. Unlike the other contacts that Enäjärvi made on her journeys abroad, she corresponded with Geijer and Götlind already before meeting them personally. The contents of the letters changed after they met in person. Before her visit to Sweden, the letters were purely formal inquiries and responses about folklore variants. After her visit, the letters shifted to include both private and scholarly content. Although the proportion of scholarly content decreased in the later letters, the amount of scholarly discussion increased, as the letters notably became longer and more frequent. During World War II, when Finland was at war with the Soviet Union, the Götlinds and folklore professor Carl Wilhelm von Sydow’s family also sent material aid and gifts to Enäjärvi’s family, as well as offered to host Enäjärvi and her children in Sweden if they decided to flee Soviet bombings of Finland.722

Prior to her stay in Riga, Professor Krohn had given Enäjärvi the address of a Riga contact, who Enäjärvi could ask to help with arranging housing.723 When in Riga, she, again, worked in the archives and was further shown around by “a Latvian lady graduate”, who then accompanied her to Helsinki, where Enäjärvi, in turn, showed her around. Enäjärvi did not give the name of this female Latvian graduate, but we can assume it was Anna Bērskalne, whom Enäjärvi had some correspondence later with. Bērskalne was a driving force behind the founding of the folklore archives in Riga, and Bērskalne was in contact with several folklorists and archivists in neighbouring countries in order to organise the archive professionally and according to modern standards. Bērskalne was also networking later with international folklorists and archivists, who were sharing information from their archives.724 This case illustrates in a very straightforward way what personal contacts could look like on a concrete level: The initial contact between a visiting scholar and her hosting colleague could evolve into continued contact through correspondence between the two as well as reciprocal scholarly visits, providing further opportunities to discuss personal and work-related matters.

The difference between Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s writing about the outcome of their journeys abroad is that Haavio, unlike Enäjärvi, barely mentioned any

other than instrumental advantages derived from the journey. This is probably partly due to the much greater number of documents from Enäjärvi’s travels in Western Europe, especially in England, than Haavio’s. In comparison to Haavio, Enäjärvi wrote more broadly about how her scholarly trips widened her perspectives and her meetings with colleagues both mentally enriched her as well as benefited her research, firstly by adding to her book collection, and secondly through scholarly discussions, comments and the acquisition of notes from senior researchers in her field. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s travel accounts were, however, similar in the sense that neither cast greater attention to their new networks as useful for a future career.

To return to the initial question of this chapter section, why did the folklorists travel if they could circulate large numbers of variants by mail and order books from abroad? From a personal point of view, travelling was pleasurable and broadened the views of the traveller. Enäjärvi and Haavio both wrote happily about good libraries in the big cities, where they could work hard to examine and read as many important books as possible during their scholarly visit in a particular city. At least some of the books were also rare and highly valuable examples, not necessarily possible for libraries to purchase, or were held in private collections.725 Contacts via senior scholars such as Kaarle Krohn were vital for the junior scholars, but new scholarly networks were established and grew stronger and closer after personal meetings. Undoubtedly beneficial, networks are also perishable and thus need to be nurtured to keep them functional over longer time periods. For the national scholarly community, travelling colleagues added to the shared networks, which could be used when the next person travelled or needed information from abroad. It was also important for the national reputation of Finland to continue to be internationally recognised within the field of folklore studies. Finnish folklorists who copied sources in foreign archives could give the copies to Finnish archives and in this way contribute to the prestige issue of hosting the largest folklore collections. While there does not seem to have been any immediate need for Haavio or Enäjärvi to travel abroad before their doctoral degrees, they do appear to have been expected to do so. Travelling added both instrumental and inspirational value to the traveller’s research and way of being a scholar, and in extension also to the whole international scholarly community that they were part of.

725 See e.g. SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 11.9.1927. Letter 736:(8:)8:10.
An international and cross-disciplinary persona of a modern academic woman

In May 1927, Enäjärvi travelled to England on a university scholarship, a journey that became formative for her scholarly persona. Her stay in London opened the door to an international community of academic women, who, like she, stayed at the International Federation of University Women’s (IFUW) lodging Crosby Hall. This encounter made her write extensively about how to be a woman in academia. The community of international academic women at Crosby Hall had no equivalent in the small Finnish academic circles. Finding a larger community of academic women was valuable for Enäjärvi. Already a year before, Enäjärvi had written to her friend Maija Ruutu that there were so few women academics in Finland that there was no room for envy and internal conflicts between them, but that they instead should support each other.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Rajainen, Maija 2.5.1926. Letter 785:(13:)10:31.}

The journey lasted for six and a half months, and she stayed mostly in London, where she did archival research and used libraries for her dissertation. During her stay, she also attended a language course, paid tourist visits to nearby towns, and took part in cultural events. In the report that she handed in to the university, from where she had received the travel grant, she stated very concisely that the journey had proven valuable for improving her language skills, as well as becoming familiar with British scholarly societies. These benefits could be added to her work in the British Library with sources and literature for her dissertation.\footnote{Arkki. Archive of the Consistory 1925–1991. Minutes of the Consistory 1928 (Ca 101), (16.2.1928, no. 131).} Enäjärvi travelled to England together with Aino and Oskar Kallas, with whom she also stayed for the first weeks. In addition to enjoyable company and appropriate travel companions for an otherwise solo travelling young woman, the Kallases also provided a beneficial link to the social circles of London. Through Aino Kallas, Enäjärvi was introduced to authors and the activities of the PEN club. Oskar Kallas, in turn, introduced Enäjärvi to local folklore and anthropology scholars.\footnote{See e.g. SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries ("Lontoo 1927" letter concept to Moses Gaster). Case 5; SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 15.5.1927 and 16.5.1927, 1.11.1927. Letters 736:(8:)8:1, 736:(8:)8:27.}

Similar to her trips to Estonia and Karelia, Enäjärvi kept a diary and wrote several letters to her friends and family. Based on her diary notes, Enäjärvi also wrote a book on England. The book was published a year after her stay and became a bestseller in Finland. The first edition came out in time for the Christmas holidays, and the book sold out in a month. A second edition was published directly after that.\footnote{Ritva Hapuli, Ulkomailla. Maailmansotien välinen maailma suomalaisnaisten silmin (Helsinki, 2003), 55.} The book, \textit{Vanha iloinen Englanti} ("Merry old
England”, 1928) could be considered Enäjärvı’s literary contribution to the cultural group Tulenkantajat, where she otherwise had more the role of a reviewer and commentator.³⁰ Although Vanha iloinen Englanti was non-fictional, and most of the other Tulenkantajat members wrote poetry and novels, the style of Enäjärvı’s book is similar in many ways to the novels written by the other authors of the group. In this section, I have used both the letters and diaries of Enäjärvı during the trip, but also the book and the reviews of the book.

The book is interesting to study as a part of Enäjärvı’s formation of a public persona, or her self-fashioning as an academic and public person, as it was written for a much wider readership than her letters. As Finnish historian Ritva Hapuli puts it, “travel situates women in the public sphere of travelling, while travel writing is a means for producing a public persona through text.” Hapuli continues by arguing that travel literature further was a means for women to offer role models and give inspiration to their readers to dream higher.³¹ Enäjärvı’s writing has indeed content that implies that she wanted to share her experiences and new role models of how to be a woman in academia and the world.

Most topics in Enärjävi’s book were on leisure and culture, for example greyhound races, theatre, contemporary literature, and the PEN club. However, the topics varied a lot. For example, the Salvation Army and the poverty in East End received their share of attention in the book. Two chapters were related to academia: one on the “joyful professor” A.C. Haddon, and one on Crosby Hall. It is mainly in these chapters, together with Enäjärvı’s diaries and letters, that I base my analysis of persona on in this chapter section. I discuss first how Enäjärvı wrote about the character of British scholars and intelligentsia in general and the women academics she met during her stay in particular. Second, I discuss how she wrote about the appearance of these groups, and third I will discuss how the book was received and how the reviewers wrote about Enäjärvı as an author, scholar and woman.

Character

Scholarly selves or scholarly personae have often been studied through investigating what kinds of character traits have been dominating, idealised or dismissed in descriptions of scholars during particular times and in specific disciplines. For example, Steven Shapin has studied the character of the Early
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³⁰ Elsa Enäjärvi, Vanha iloinen Englanti, 1st edn (Porvoo, 1928); In this chapter, the references are to the second edition Elsa Enäjärvi, Vanha iloinen Englanti, 2nd edn (Porvoo, 1929). My translation of the title; Sievänen-Allen, Tyttö venheessä, 113; for an example on the opinion former’s role, see i.e. Pidot tornissa, where Enäjärvi is under the pseudonyme “Rouva Tohtori” (Madame Doctor). Yrjö Kivimies, ed., Pidot tornissa (Jyväskylä, 1937).
³¹ Hapuli, Ulkomailla, 17. Org. “matkaaminen sijoittaa naisen matkustamisen julkiseen maailmaan, ja matkakirjallisuus vuorostaan tuottaa julkisen minän teksteissä.”
Modern English scholar as a gentleman. Herman Paul claims that the nineteenth century German archival historian’s character was connected to a stance of always being true to the sources. Cathryn Carson argues that the scientist after World War II was expected to be politically engaged. As we shall see in the following, the modern academic woman was, according to Elsa Enäjärvi’s accounts, at best as witty, intelligent, deeply read, and charming as the best academic men, but at the same time also feminine.

One of the public persons that Enäjärvi admired most was Bernard Shaw, whose body and mind she described as follows:

His face was perhaps the most intelligent and lively I have ever seen. The face lives every second. One could see that the mind was working constantly, flexibly, vigorously, happily; it was his nature. It was something incredibly fresh and healthy. [...] His entire being was like a mental master gymnast’s; healthy, controlled, effortless [...] And Shaw, who radiates healthy vitality. His spirit functions more intensely, widely, flexibly, and faster than others”. These qualities were, according to Enäjärvi, why Shaw “wins everyone else” above all other academic intellectuals. Notably, Enäjärvi could describe female academics similarly to Shaw as individuals who were vital and effervescent. This was, however, only the case among an older generation of academics. Young intellectuals and academics could instead share with their elders the quality of being able to give clever and quick answers. This was true for both men and women, and for example at Crosby Hall, Enäjärvi wrote that she had met quite a few witty and smart female scholars. In Enäjärvi’s descriptions, admirable scholars could radiate intelligence and wisdom. A related quality to wittiness was humour, which was a quality that Enäjärvi wrote admiringly both in her private texts and in her book. Enäjärvi also discussed how English culture allowed for humour in a variety of social situations, for example, at the theatre as well as in university settings. Modern academic women were thus merry and had a good sense of humour, although, according to Enäjärvi, this did not seem to be conceivable among the general

Finnish public. She was conscious about suspicions and stereotypes about how academic women made for poor company. In a candid manner, Enäjärvi describes her surprise over how natural and jolly the female academics, of all nationalities, could be at the Crosby Hall:

Forty-five academic women in one house! What a horrifying thought! A scary cave of four-eyes! I admit myself that it was with mixed expectations that I prepared for the stay. But now I can assure that I never had as much fun in any lodging.

Enäjärvi’s point of departure was that there was a general image of academic women, but argued that this image did not correspond with reality. Despite a commonly shared picture of academic women, the Crosby Hall women were neither abnormalities nor dangerous. The female residents of Crosby Hall did not spread odd behaviour. Instead, the accommodation for women provided a possibility to talk with others with similar interests, to learn from each other both about research results and about other countries and continents. The interests were, according to Enäjärvi, naturally similar among the women at Crosby Hall, since they all shared their interest in scholarship and science and had mutual experiences from university. Inspired by Mary Louise Pratt, Ritva Hapuli reads Enäjärvi’s chapter on Crosby Hall as a depiction of a “femtopia”, an autonomic space for and by women. When reading Enäjärvi’s texts about women in academia during and after her stay in Crosby Hall in regard to notions of what it took to be a scholar, it appears to me that the stay at Crosby Hall had its greatest impact on Enäjärvi by its concentration of a larger number of university women. This demonstrated to Enäjärvi that there was such a category as women in academia, instead of only a few individual female anomalies within (or perhaps at times outside?) a scholarly community of male scholars, as they could have appeared to her in Finland.

Mineke Bosch argues that scholarly persona should be understood in terms of how scholars should conduct themselves in order to be recognised as credible scholars. This was an issue that Enäjärvi also discussed in her diaries and in her book. Because Enäjärvi also made a trip from England to Germany, she at times made comparisons between the two countries. The difference between scholarly trustworthiness in the two countries was, in Enäjärvi’s view, that the British did not strive for exhaustingly conducted experiments and redundant amounts of evidence. “In England”, she wrote, “there are good ideas and inventions, but we [Finns] cannot believe them
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736 Enäjärvi, Vanha iloinen Englanti, 27.
739 Hapuli, Ulkomailla, 226.
740 Bosch, ‘Scholarly Personae and Twentieth-Century Historians’, 25.
before a German has examined the issue. The German examines the case a thousand times, and then we see it is correct.” The British approach, she confessed to Haavio, suited her temperament better than the German, which she thought was similar to the Finnish way of conducting research. Enäjärvi’s account demonstrates how perceptions of good scholarship were context bound, in this case that Finnish scholarship valued German academic traditions higher than British academic traditions. Travel widened Enäjärvi’s understanding of alternative ways of being academically credible, but she also recognised that she could not choose freely which of these she would integrate into her academic repertoires.

In her published book, however, Enäjärvi was more cautious than in her letters which more clearly expressed her sympathies with the British approach to science. In her book, she told the readers about the British fascination for the supernatural. She gave thorough descriptions not only of the ghost stories, magic performances, and spiritual societies, but also mentioned the critical dismissal and rational explanations of the phenomena. She described how photos of ghosts had been proven to be fakes and how the magic in the performances was masterful tricks. Here, she balanced between portraying the appeal of the supernatural without condemning it while making sure no reader would consider her to be a believer of the supernatural. In her diary, Enäjärvi wrote about her surprise when well-read people she met told stories about being able to speak with fairies or their conviction that the English population originated from the ten lost tribes of Israel. This kind of accepting belief, she added, was probably only possible in England.

For her public image, Enäjärvi seems to have toned down sympathies with issues that could have reduced her audience’s view on her as a trustworthy scholar. Finnish academia was, as she wrote to Haavio, German-oriented, and it might have been a strategy not to emphasise the British, seemingly less exhaustive approach to scholarship and their attraction to the supernatural. In her private documents, she did not need to distance herself so much from her British colleagues, and at times she even favourably acknowledged them. At the same time as she wished to be viewed as a credible scholar, a position that carried strong masculine connotations, Enäjärvi wished to be included into a category of merry, intellectual and internationally oriented female academics. Her book reviewers did not necessarily acknowledge that there was such a category, but their descriptions of Enäjärvi were in line with those same traits, as I will discuss in the following chapter section.

741 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Lontoo 1927” 1.11.1927). Case 5; The same argument can be found in Enäjärvi, Vanha iloinen Englanti, 33.


Appearance

Depending on time and context, there have been differences in what was considered acceptable attire and appearance among university students and scholars. Glasses and a bald head or grey hair were typical attributes of an academic at the end of the nineteenth century and during the twentieth century. In other words, the image of a professor or a prominent figure at a university was that of an older, white man.745

American historian Margaret Lowe has argued that people’s bodies and the clothes they wore stood at the centre of discussion when female students’ possibilities and women’s rights to higher education were debated at the beginning of the twentieth century. For white female students in the U.S., it became important to refute the image of female students and academics as ugly and masculine in appearance. For these young women, attributes such as glasses were therefore not coveted, since they were associated with the image of ugly female students. As was discussed in chapter 2, Swedish female academics faced a dilemma of either being dismissed as non-serious about their studies if they presented as feminine. However, when dressing in a more masculine manner or not caring much about their physical appearance, they were deemed manly, unnatural, and encroaching on men’s space.746

Elsa Enäjärvi recognised this dilemma. In her diary, she wrote a long pondering note about why women were not expected to be both hard working and good-looking at the same time:

**Clever women need not be dowdy.** Why is it that smart clothes are regarded by most people as the outward and visible sign of an empty mind and an impoverished soul? [...] most people have a single-track mind: a woman who lives for clothes they can understand. A woman who lives for her work they can understand. But they cannot understand a woman who works eight or ten hours a day and spends another hour or two in an endeavour to make the best of her appearance.747

Enäjärvi’s accounts from England included quite a few notes on dressing and hairstyle, such as on how she updated her wardrobe in the city and tried for the first time to wear her hair in a permanent wave style. Presumably, she
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746 Lowe, *Looking Good*, 13, 30, 65. Lowe also discusses how black female students were considered to be physically strong by nature, and how they rather needed to disprove perceptions of them as indecent; Carls, *Våp eller nucka?*, 160, 175; See also e.g. Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940*, xv–xvi; Compare also e.g. Florin on the Swedish suffrage activists Christina Florin, *Kvinnor får röst. Kön, känslor och politisk kultur i kvinnornas rösträttsrörelse* (Stockholm, 2006), 177–182.
747 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Lontoo 1927” undated, page 16). Case 5. Enäjärvi wrote some of her notes in her London diary, like here, in English. (This diary entry appears to be left out from Eskola, *Kahden.*)
considered herself to be one of the women who both worked hard and wanted to look good.\textsuperscript{748}

Many of Enäjärvi’s descriptions of her female colleagues also highlighted that these academic women were individuals. In the published book, she often reminded the reader that academic women were not cast in the same mould and did not necessarily correspond to the stereotypes held by the public. For example, she wrote about the view over the sitting room in Crosby Hall where:

Even the most searching eye could not find any caricatures among these women: currently in the group sitting at the middle table: a small, beautiful-faced doctor of literature from Oxford, who is so petit and sweet, as if not even the dust of the libraries ever had touched her and all the sitting had not stiffened her; the American woman professor, who beams a silent spirituality, and the Australian doctor, always witty and cheery, always smartly dressed.\textsuperscript{749}

One of the stereotypes that Enäjärvi seemed to oppose was that of women risking the loss of their femininity by going to university. However, as she also wrote about less flattering sides of London, she also gave less complimentary descriptions of some of the university women, such as the “grotesquely ugly American theologian girl”.\textsuperscript{750}

Enäjärvi also admitted that the masculine academic woman was not a mere myth:

When twenty-five female engineers arrived to have their meeting, one could observe quite a few of those abhorred, manly types of women, with their ragged clothing. But their work also requires a special nature, and many of the older ones were some of the brave pioneers of their field.\textsuperscript{751}

The masculinity of the engineers was excused by the fact that they were from the first generation of academic women, who had a different starting point.

\textsuperscript{748} SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. On the permanently waved hair, see letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 18.9.1927. Letter 736:(8:)8:5; on buying clothes, see e.g. letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 27.5.1927, 25.8.1927 (first part of the letter 21.8.1927), 17.11.1927. Letters 736:(8:)8:2, 736:(8:)8:4, 736:(8:)8:33; see also SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Eklund, Mimmi 15.8.1927, 10.11.1927. Letters 775:(9:)6:4, 764:(1:)23:1.


\textsuperscript{750} Enäjärvi, \textit{Vanha iloinen Englanti}, 169. Org. “Groteskin ruma amerikkalainen teologityttö”.

than the modern academic woman. Enäjärvi also pointed out that masculinity was bound more tightly to some fields than others, engineering being an example. It is interesting that Enäjärvi, with a background as a mathematics undergraduate, found herself suitable for natural science, but described that the field of engineering required a “special nature”, which was much different from the image of the personality she wanted to project.

Researchers on women in academia have discussed a similar division between pioneers and later generations, as did Enäjärvi. Carol Dyhouse argues that the pioneers faced, in many aspects, different difficulties than the subsequent generations of university women. For example, the pioneers had to fight separately for formal rights to attend universities, to graduate on the same terms as men, and to gain access to jobs that would at least slightly correspond to their education. For the later generations, Dyhouse argues, some of the difficulties remained, and it could still be hard or impossible to continue working after marriage, to be acknowledged as a scholar, or to advance in one’s career. The later generations, Dyhouse adds, often expressed a gratitude for the pioneers’ advance work.752

As the writings of Enäjärvi demonstrate, she did not want to be inevitably affiliated with the image of the pioneers. Nor did she want to be affiliated with the image of the New Woman. The New Woman was a term taken into use in the late nineteenth century to refer to middle-class women, who demanded access to and took her place in the public sphere. Women who gained access to higher education constituted one of the more visible manifestations of the New Woman.753 Enäjärvi made a distinction between her generation and the pioneer generation of academic women. Likewise, her generation differed from the New Woman generation, who in her texts could be both academic women and other intellectuals in the public sphere. These female academics and public intellectuals were in Enäjärvi’s view typically the masculine women sort, who she could admire for their intellect and work for women’s rights, but not for their looks. For example, the author Radclyffe Hall, who Enäjärvi met at the PEN club, was “of her appearance a total New Woman, that is, a man.”754

The good scholar should in Enäjärvi’s view also lead a healthy life and keep him- or herself in good physical condition. Bernard Shaw, who Enäjärvi admired more than any other member of the intelligentsia she met in London,

752 Dyhouse, No Distinction of Sex?, 100, 223, 242; According to Pohls and Husu and Peltonen, the gratitude could in Finland for example be shown by university women by writing biographies, name scholarship funds or arrange festivities in honour of the pioneers. One of the most celebrated “firsts” was the first woman to obtain a master’s degree in Finland, Emma Irene Åström, of whom Enäjärvi wrote a biography. Emma Irene Åström and Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elämäni ja ystävän. Muistelmateos (1933); Pohls, Korkeasti koulutetut naiset, 25, 33–36.
was the prime example. As she stated in the earlier quote on Shaw, his strength was of both a physical and a mental kind, and these two supported each other. For Shaw, she noted, activity and exercise were an inherent part of his nature. According to Margaret Lowe, sports were an important way for female students in the U.S. to prove that they were not physically weak for higher education. Instead, female students tried to demonstrate how positively the college environment affected their bodies. In Enäjärvi’s opinion, sports were important as a means for scholars to stay healthy, especially since they worked most of the time sitting. She reminded Haavio of the importance of sports and suggested that he should attend the male students’ sports activities, and pointed out that several of their mutually known postgraduate friends participated in sport activities. Enäjärvi stated that she would go back to the habit of regular exercise as soon as she returned to Helsinki. In her book, she described that the modern academic women had “bodies shaped by plasticity and sport”.

Similar to Enäjärvi’s earlier accounts from her field excursions, she was keen to assure her mother that she was healthy during her journey in England. From England, she wrote to her mother about how the lodgings were warm, clean, and safe. She assured her that she was in good health, but that she was concerned about her mother’s condition. Enäjärvi’s mother’s illness, she reflected, was much due to her worry about her oldest daughter being far away from home for such a long time. Enäjärvi also confessed to Haavio that her mother’s worrying was taxing, and she felt pressure to return home ahead of time, and she asked him to soothe her mother’s worries.

In conclusion, feminine traits and good looks should, in Enäjärvi’s opinion, not be a hindrance for women to be recognised as worthy participants in academic debates. This did not mean, however, that she would have found appearance unimportant for scholars. The modern scholars, male or female, should live healthy lives and be in good physical condition. As was discussed in connection to character, people could also radiate an aura of intelligence. Indeed, it was possible to see who were good scholars.
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755 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Lontoo 1927” 19.10.1927, 28.10.1927). Case 5. (These diary entries appear to be left out from Eskola, Kahden). According to Michael Cowan, the link between a strong, vital mind and a healthy body was also present in early twentieth century social debate and popular science literature, see Michael Cowan, Cult of the Will. Nervousness and German Modernity (University Park, 2008), 111–115.
756 Lowe, Looking Good, 51.
The reviews of *Vanha iloinen Englanti*

In Enäjärvi’s letters and in her travel book, we can see how she wished to portray herself to friends and relatives as well as to a larger audience. Through the reviews of the book, we can further see how these portrayals were received, as the reviewers often wrote almost as much about the author as about the book’s content.

The book received at least 52 reviews.\(^{761}\) In correspondence with the scarce discussions on academia in the book, the reviewers mostly wrote about the book’s chapters on culture. The academic connection was usually only visible when the reviewers referred to the author as “MA Elsa Enäjärvi”.\(^{762}\) This was also how the publishing house’s announcement of the book titled *Enäjärvi*.\(^{763}\) Four reviewers mentioned the reason for Enäjärvi’s trip to England, four noted the chapters on Crosby Hall and two mentioned the chapter on professor Haddon.\(^{764}\) In those reviews the reviewers clearly emphasised international and social themes rather than academic matters. For example, one review that showed interest in the chapter on Crosby Hall, wrote about its:
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\(^{761}\) When counting the Enäjärvi’s review, see press cuttings in: SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Press cuttings. Case X.


tea-drinking female students from all over the world, junketing by the fireplace, and being occupied with doctoral dissertations of all kinds of ‘exciting’ topics, such as spiders, the theatre costumes during Shakespeare’s time, authorities in religion, or the history of the Fiji island [sic].

Some reviewers introduced Enäjärvi as someone known for her connection to the modernist cultural group *Tulenkantajat*. They could either directly state it or do so more implicitly by describing the contribution of Enäjärvi’s book as “opening the window to” England, referring to the group’s catch-phrase “windows open to Europe”. One reviewer stated that Enäjärvi described her experiences in London “as an aesthete, author and traveller.”

The reviewers were keen to bring up the fact that the book was written by a woman. Usually it was done in connection to the many praises of the delightful style that the book was written in. The book was appreciated for being easy to read and for a tone that was cheery and effervescent. One of the reviewers thanked the female authors of travel books in general for making the genre more reader-friendly. A large share of the reviewers described the book and/or the author as lively (in Finnish *pirteä*).

One reviewer wrote that “the authoress makes boyishly fearless expeditions” all over London.

Another expressed surprise that she had “alone (!) let herself hazard all the dangers of the gloomy and smoky East End, boldy taking photos of interesting people in Chinatown and in shipyards.”

According to Ritva...
Hapuli, it is surprising that so few—only three in total—reviewers commented upon Enäjärvi’s solo explorations of London. She suggests that the photographs that Enäjärvi took and published as illustrations for her texts could serve as tools for stretching the acceptable behaviour for a woman in her situation. Enäjärvi’s camera and aim to publish her photos and travel observations functioned as appropriate reasons to access places that otherwise would not have been socially approved for as a woman; thanks to her camera, Enäjärvi was able to maintain an honourable reputation.772

The reviewers of Vanha iloinen Englanti did not take much notice of Enäjärvi’s descriptions of the appearances of other academic women. Instead, one of the reviewers reflected at length about the author’s looks and claimed that it now was proven that women could be both beautiful and intelligent. The same reviewer wrote a long speculative reflection about Enäjärvi’s marital status.773 Other reviewers were less occupied with Enäjärvi’s appearance and instead commented on the intelligence of the author and her book.774

While Enäjärvi worried about not having worked hard enough and accomplished enough during her London stay, it was not something that the reviewers would have considered a problem.775 Three reviewers established that Enäjärvi had made good use of her scholarship. To support this claim, one reviewer wrote that Enäjärvi “had stuck her nose into all possible and impossible—and especially for women unusual—places” and “had snapped the most illuminating pictures with her camera”.776

Even though the reviews wrote in positive words about Enäjärvi and her book, the descriptions of her were recurring belittling, such as “courageous for a woman” or the inverted commas in “‘exciting’ topics”. In some of the articles, the book was reviewed alongside other travel books. It was also often compared to previously published books in the same genre and was especially often compared with the book Helsinkiläinen Lontoossa (“A Helsinkian in London”, 1927) by Jaakko Tuomikoski.777 One of the comparisons stated that Enäjärvi had written “a cheerful book, based on personal experiences, quite

772 Hapuli, Ulkomailla, 181.
777 Jaakko Tuomikoski, Helsinkiläinen Lontoossa (Helsinki, 1927).
an enlightening description”, but it had not “internalised the essence and spirit of England as well as MA W. J. Tuomikoski’s [...] work”. 778 In another review, Enäjärvi’s book was reviewed alongside the Finnish archaeologist and ethnologist Sakari Pälsi’s Päivänpaisten mailla (“On the Lands of Sunshine”). Comparing the two, the reviewer stated that Enäjärvi’s book was not as good and original as Pälsi’s, but that hers, “too, is an exhilarating accomplishment within the genre.” 779

Concluding comments

As has been stated multiple times in this dissertation, folkloristics was closely connected to nationalism and nation-building during the early twentieth century. In this chapter, I discussed more closely how such a nation-bound discipline was still inherently international in its character. Partly, a nationalistically-motivated presentation of the greatness of a nation requires to some degree an international audience. 780 Additionally, as highlighted in this chapter, the conventional ways of conducting folklore research required good international contacts, which, in turn, had consequences for what constituted the personas of credible folklorists.

In many respects, we can assume folkloristics to have shared conventions of how to do research with other disciplines in the humanities, as well as maybe even research in general during the time. For this chapter, a point of departure was to examine the historic-geographic method’s impact on folkloristics. This method aimed to map the developments of folklore over time and space, and required extensive knowledge as well as access to source material and literature both within and outside the researchers’ national context. The common usage of the method had a homogenising impact on how archives were arranged and led to frequent correspondences between folklore colleagues abroad, who could assist with information and copies of needed sources and literature. A special advantage for Enäjärvi and Haavio was that their supervisor was Professor Kaarle Krohn, who was one of the founders of and authorities on that particular method. Both Enäjärvi and Haavio could get started with their international source material and contacts through Krohn. At the same time, the Krohn connection also seems to have largely frame the contacts within the historic-geographic school: When Enäjärvi travelled to England to meet with authorities within the folklore of games, she

could state that few in Britain seemed to even have heard of Krohn. When junior folklorists travelled to places that senior scholars like Krohn already had established exchange with, they were socialised into certain scholarly practices. In this sense, these journeys reproduced the collective identity or scholarly persona that was dominant in Finland at the time.

One consequence of following the historic-geographic method was that the scholars made good use of corresponding with colleagues abroad. Not all inquiries and information needed to move between the original questioner and respondent. A closer reading of the private documents of the folklorists shows that they could contact a friend or close colleague, who in turn could contact their friends further away.

Contacts and friends’ contacts were also helpful and activated when Enäjärvi and Haavio travelled abroad. Addresses of contacts were shared between the students and scholars before travelling. The separate journeys were in this way placed in a chain of contacts: After one person had made a journey and established contacts, the following scholar could use the same contact and in turn widen the shared networks with his or her travels elsewhere. Contact per mail was more or less necessary before travelling, but after meeting scholars personally, the correspondences could become much richer and more frequent. For Enäjärvi, the possibility to travel to England together with Aino and Oskar Kallas was important. Their company provided an appropriate solution for a young, woman travelling otherwise solo abroad to a place where she apparently was not able to rely on any scholarly contacts via the senior scholars of her field at her university. In addition to respectability, the Kallases offered fruitful companionship for Enäjärvi, as they could introduce her both to the scholarly and literary communities in and outside London.

At the same time as the scholarly community of folk culture scholars in many ways cultivated a shared persona with their corresponding research approaches, practices and collaborations, the journeys abroad also widened the travelling students’ perspectives more generally. The new places provided new examples of what libraries, archives, institutions and societies could be like in addition to the already known ones. Enäjärvi wrote about observations of differences between German, Finnish and British scholars and cultures and, although there are no such notes in Haavio’s collections, we can assume that he made similar observations.

Enäjärvi’s stay at Crosby Hall introduced her to an interdisciplinary community. The number of women in her own and neighbouring fields was very limited, Enäjärvi being eventually the first woman to achieve a doctorate in folkloristics in Finland. Staying at Crosby Hall did not only give Enäjärvi insights into British academia and the women academics there. Crosby Hall’s international atmosphere also formed Enäjärvi’s picture of academic women
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in general. Simultaneously, as she was convinced that there did not exist a single type of academic woman, she also recognised mutual interests and experiences. For Lorraine Daston and Otto Sibum, it is significant for a scientific persona that the individuals of a group can relate to the particular persona and that also outsiders recognise it. Enäjärvi recognised herself as a member of the international group of academic women, making a distinction between her generation and the pioneering generation of academic women. Enäjärvi also acted to promote acknowledgement of this scholarly group in Finland. She contested the common perception of academic women as either feminine and unserious about their academic work or as repulsively masculine and scholarly. In this context, Mineke Bosch’s and Elisabeth Wesseling’s perspective on scholarly persona is helpful for pin-pointing Enäjärvi’s promotion of this new way of being a scholar. Instead of acting to change one exclusive set of repertoires of how to be a scholar, Enäjärvi tried to add a new building block to the pool of acknowledged ways of being a scholar in Finland, that is, that of being a feminine, credible scholar.

Like other international academic women’s residences and meeting points, Crosby Hall was also a place for forming friendships, some of which lasted for a lifetime and included academic, social and monetary help and exchange. For Enäjärvi, the international and inspiring community at Crosby Hall was directly linked to the difference between her and Haavio’s international mail correspondence. Enäjärvi’s was numerically and geographically much larger than Haavio’s especially after 1927. After her time at Crosby Hall, Enäjärvi became active in the Finnish Federation of University Women and represented Finland in the International Federation’s conferences. She continued being committed to the question of female academics for the rest of her life, and in 1950 she travelled to the IFUW meeting in Zürich, less than a year after her first cancer surgery. Six months after the Geneva meeting, Enäjärvi passed away. In the wake of her death, Haavio received dozens of condolences from her international colleagues. The ones sent from fellow members of the IFUW all had in common the reflections over how inspiring Enäjärvi had been to them personally and to the Federation as a group.

The journey to England had offered Enäjärvi a larger community of academic women and new alternatives and role models of how to be a woman in academia. However, many structural challenges remained. In the next chapter, I will discuss how Enäjärvi and Haavio reflected upon finding and committing to a partner and combining family life with an academic career—

a particularly delicate issue for women. However, as was the case with international scholarly contacts, a scholarly household could also be a place of helpful sharing of knowledge, networks, literature and source material.
The chapters of this book have so far moved from smaller and closer arenas of scholarly work to larger and more distant points from the place of departure. From the university to the circles of intelligentsia in Helsinki, to the “field” in the Finnish countryside, further to the neighbouring country and from there even further abroad. Now it is time to come home.

In this chapter, I take a chronological approach to how Martti Haavio and Elsa Enäjärvi came to form a scholarly household together. Ever since the two met in 1920, there were hopes and intentions to become a couple. However, the path to their marriage in 1929 and forming a family was in no way a simple and straightforward one. They were at various times close friends, in love, at a distance and seeing other people. Eventually, they wrote and signed an “engagement contract” in which they agreed on practical and principal points for their marriage and life together. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s personal documents show that they, in accordance with the engagement contract, helped and supported each other both materially and intellectually.

I use Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts about this process to study how strategies and feelings were intertwined and affected the scholars’ life choices. The choice whether or not to marry, as well as the choice of spouse was important for the career and academic life of both male and female scholars. However, women faced a particular dilemma: marriage was a big risk that could endanger a future career, while remaining unmarried meant a certain break against social norms. For the first generation of university women, a combination of an academic career and a family was generally impossible. For the second (Enäjärvi’s) generation, there were slightly more possibilities. In this chapter, I discuss how Enäjärvi and Haavio reflected upon finding, choosing and marrying a partner, and how Enäjärvi and Haavio could act in prevailing circumstances. What were the advantages or drawbacks of various alternatives, how were decisions made and relationships negotiated, and how were these issues connected to career outlooks? The reflections upon relationships on the path towards forming a scholarly home are at least as interesting as studying the structures and practices of an already established...

household. The path illuminates the variety of alternatives and their respective prospects, as well as the individuals’ anticipated room for manoeuvre.

This perspective on scholarly life sheds light on scholarly persona in a very private context, yet as in all other contexts, it happens in dialogue with social norms and academic repertoires. If we view persona as an individual formation of the self in response to collective models, then Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s persona formations were two separate, but interacting, processes. In that case, the outcome was two personae, in which being a part of a scholarly couple was an integral building block.

Strategies and feelings
Many of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s personal documents included discussions about romantic relationships, both between the two of them and others. In Haavio’s case, these passages were mainly about his fondness for Enäjärvi and their relationship. Enäjärvi’s writings on the topic were more varied, including both a larger variety of people and reflections about her own character and reasons both for and against marriage. In 1924, she wrote this motivational imperative in her diary: “Write a dissertation! Search for the person you want to and can marry!”786 The quote illustrates how Enäjärvi had an ambition to combine research and love, but also that the latter came with limitations of what was possible. Although unique, Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s cases are also illustrative for some of the gender dynamics previously identified by research on gender in academia. Their cases illustrate how family and marriage were of importance for male scholars’ careers, while family and marriage could both make or break careers for aspiring women scholars. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s private reflections and correspondence offer insight in how gender dynamics operated and affected students and junior scholars. Particularly, Enäjärvi’s personal documents further show how feelings and strategies both intertwined and clashed and how these issues could be managed.

The history of science has described the nineteenth century as the period when scientific research moved from gentlemen’s homes to institutes. The humanities followed a similar development. This shift had consequences on the role of the researcher’s household. The household was no longer the place where experiments took place and instead of primarily using family members as assistants, assisting tasks were to a larger extent assigned to people educated at academic institutions.787 However, while this shift changed the function of the researcher’s household, it did not make the household unimportant. It was not uncommon for a male scholar to marry an educated

787 Bergwik, Kunskapens Osynliga Scener, 22; Schiebinger, The Mind Has No Sex?, 8.
woman, who then worked as a skilled and low-cost assistant. Female students were also more often from well-established academic families than male students, which is why marriage with such a woman could give access to valuable networks. In addition, the social side of research included expectations of attending social events together with a spouse, which is why a suitable marriage could bring scholars into better light in the scholarly community.

For female scholars, the question of whether to marry at all and in that case with whom was a critical question. For women, it was challenging to combine marriage with a structure that built on the expectation that the scholar was a (married) man. Middle- and upper-class women were widely expected to quit paid work when getting married in Finland as it was in the rest of the Western world until World War II. For the first generation of academic women, those who entered the universities in the mid and late nineteenth century, combining family and academic life was extremely uncommon. The situation began to change during the early twentieth century, but in practice the two roles could often be difficult to combine. In Finland, half of the women with higher education remained unmarried in the 1930s and 1940s. Having children was another aspect of private life that easily and often blocked women from continuing a career. Of the Finnish academic women, one fourth had children in the 1930s and 1940s. The most common path for women who obtained degrees in higher education in the early twentieth century was to work for a couple of years as a teacher, then marry and often, but not always, to stay at home after marriage.
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788 Donald L. Opitz, Annette Lykknes and Brigitte van Tiggelen, ‘Introduction’, in Donald L. Opitz, Annette Lykknes and Brigitte van Tiggelen eds., For Better or for Worse? Collaborative Couples in the Sciences (Basel, 2012), 7–9; Opitz, “‘Not Merely Wifely Devotion’”, 34; As Margaret Rossiter shows, also unmarried women with higher education were often hired to assisting tasks, while men with corresponding education were hired higher up the professional ladder. Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940, 53–54, 58–60.
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While marriage was for women an almost certain path leading away from academic or other public careers, remaining unmarried was no simple solution either. A woman was already crossing conventions when entering and pursuing a career in academia and staying unmarried was further pushing expectations on middle class women. Tone Hellesund has argued that the expanded alternatives of remaining unmarried in the late nineteenth century and at the turn of the century 1900 did not mean a diminishing of the general conception that middle-class women ought to marry. Rather, Hellesund claims, according to modernist ideologies, women’s moral esteem was connected to being wives and mothers.\footnote{Hellesund, *Den norske peppermø*, 14, 20, 36; See also Niskanen, ‘Den intellektuella parrerelationens politik och praktik’, 350–351.} In addition, both marriage and staying single were used as arguments to keep women from higher education. When married, it was argued that women did not benefit as much from higher education: either they entered academia only to find a husband there, or they had no use for their education after marriage or after having children because they stayed (or were expected to stay) at home. When not marrying, it was argued that higher education was unnatural for women, thus only masculine women, who no-one wished to marry, would academically excel.\footnote{Carls, *Våp eller nucka?*, 160, 175; Or there was an argued risk that women would become masculine: Rossiter, *Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940*, 2; See also partly opposing conclusions in Henrika Tandefelt, ‘Yliopistokaupunki ja naisten yliopisto’ in Anna Biström, Rita Paqvalén, Hedvig Rask, and Riie Heikkilä eds., *Naisten Helsinki. Kulttuurihistoriallinen opas* (Helsinki 2010), 50.}

There are no indications in Enäjärvi’s texts that she would have rejected marriage as an alternative. More than whether or not to marry, she reflected upon the timing, which was more dependent on a compromise between two competing goals. On the one hand, she expressed a wish to complete work before getting married, sometimes specifying that work meant her dissertation, other times writing more generally about “getting the work done”.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“1923–1924” quote from 4.10.1924, see also e.g. same diary 16.11.1924). Case 5. Org. “hoitaa työt pois alta”.} On the other hand, she reasoned that the longer she waited, the more meagre her options would become. At the age of 23, Enäjärvi stated that “[a]s a 30-year-old, a person takes whatever he or she can get anymore at that point.” The sentence that followed this indicates that she still regarded herself to have good possibilities to choose a man, as she continued: “my ‘flaksikausi’ will not last forever either.”\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries. (“1923–1924” 16.11.1924). Case 5. Org. ”30-vuotiaana ihminen ottaa sen minkä silloin enää saa”; “[e]i minunkaan ‘flaksikauttani’ iankaiken kestä.” [My italics.]} The untranslated word is a compound of *kausi*, which means phase, and the slang word *flaksi*, which means lucky or being successful, usually in finding a partner, often with a connotation of a
brief affair.\footnote{Flaksi’, Kielitoimiston Sanakirja <https://www.kielitoimistonsanakirja.fi/netmot.exe/ListWord=flaksi&SearchWord=flaksi&dict=1&page=results&UI=fi80&Opt=1> [accessed 27 February 2018].} Enäjärvi’s other diary notes confirm that she found it reasonable that she had several options for finding a partner.\footnote{See e.g. SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Imatran Hotellissa yms. 7.–10.1.1925 ja 5.12.1925 [Ennustus]” 9.1.1925). Case 5.}

Correspondingly, Haavio also described Enäjärvi as an attractive woman with choices. According to Haavio and his friend Oskar Loorits, Enäjärvi tended to charm a variety of men around her, although Haavio and Loorits had opposite views on whether it was a positive or a negative trait. Haavio wrote to Loorits that he admired him, because Loorits had shielded himself from “going into ecstasy, which all Estonian (and quite a few Finnish) graduates fall into when seeing Elsa”.\footnote{EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 2/3 (undated). Org. “vastustaa hurmoitumista, johon kaikki virolaiset (ja perin monet suomalaiset) maisterit joutuvat Elsan nähdessäin”.} This was in response to Loorits, who in a previous letter had hinted, in a negative tone, that Enäjärvi was sprinkling her interest for men around her.\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Loorits, Oskar to Haavio, Martti 23.2.1925. Letter 743:(12):53:2.}

Returning to Enäjärvi’s diary entry about finishing her dissertation and finding a partner, we can observe that her first urge was to write a dissertation and that the search of a person to marry came second. The second part of the quote demonstrates the challenge of combining marriage with academic life goals. Even for a woman who regarded herself as being in demand on the marriage market, the challenge was to find a man who she both wanted and could marry. Enäjärvi recognised that not all potential partners equally matched her academic and societal interests and plans for the future. The first issue was that a good match should not consider her intellectual capacity and interests a problem. This concern can be exemplified by her diary note from 1921 in which she wrote about a man that she had met in Estonia: “I could show him that I, too, have a soul, reveal my brain. But then I would not know whether we would be a match.”\footnote{SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries. (“Vb Kesä 1921” 16.8.1921). Case 5. Org. “Voisin näyttää häänelle, että minullakin on sielu, paljastaa aivoni. Mutta silloin tiedän, sopisimmekö yhteen.”} The statement illustrates the above-discussed common perception that women could not be both academically successful and desirable for men. Even Enäjärvi wrote ambiguously about women’s natural suitability for intellectual work. Eventually, she concluded that at least some women, including herself, had what it took for higher education and could manage the related work that followed. It appears unlikely that Enäjärvi after acknowledging this point would have considered
men who perceived women as incapable of intellectual endeavours as preferred long-term partners.⁸⁰²

Despite that women’s intellectual capacities were commonly regarded lower than those of men, and despite that women with academic pursuits widely were considered unnatural and problematic, Enäjärvi’s requirement that a partner accepted her intellectual endeavours did not automatically disqualify all potential partners.⁸⁰³ Even men like Haavio, who frequently described women as intellectually less capable than men, made exceptions. As was discussed in chapter 2, Haavio repeatedly scoffed at women, who he, especially during his earliest years at university, generally described as unintelligent or unsuitable for academia. The few times when he did describe the exceptional, intelligent women, intelligence was a positive feature.⁸⁰⁴ Moreover, Haavio did apparently not believe that intelligence necessarily conflicted with femininity, conceding that Enäjärvi was “exceedingly feminine.”⁸⁰⁵ In another personal note, he expressed his interest in Enäjärvi through a rhetorically self-addressed question: “Have you not merely fallen in love with the brilliance of her eyes and brightness of her brains.”⁸⁰⁶

An additional demand on a partner was that he should accept that Enäjärvi planned to continue working after marriage. Although Enäjärvi in the early 1920s saw her future in rather traditional terms: a few years working as a teacher and after marriage withdrawing from paid work to be a housewife, she soon reframed that vision.⁸⁰⁷ The pursuit to continue working after marriage appears to have restricted the possible partners much more than the demand to accept a wife with intellectual capacities. The challenge was most immediately demonstrated by Enäjärvi’s separation from Kalle Väisälä (1893–1968), with whom she had a relationship from late spring 1922 to the beginning of 1923. Both Enäjärvi and Haavio described the separation as very painful for Enäjärvi and with long-lasting emotional consequences.⁸⁰⁸
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⁸⁰³ Rossiter, Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940, 102.
⁸⁰⁴ SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letters from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 7.3.1920, 2.5.1920, undated [November/December 1923], (for positive accounts, see) 17.2.1921, 20.1.1923, 16.7.1923. Letters 730:(2:)4:8, 730:(2:)4:11, 731:(3:)11:9 (for positive accounts, see) 731:(3:)1:4, 731:(3:)9:3, 758:(23:)6:1; Diaries (1.11.1920, 13.11.1920, 21.1.1923). Case 5.1.
⁸⁰⁸ SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Haavio, Martti to Hakulinen, Lauri 3.2.1923, 6.2.1923, undated [February/March 1923], (see also 20.3.1923). Letters 731:(3:)9:7–9, (see also 731:(3:)9:11); Letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 9–10.2.1923, 14.10.1927. Letters 736:(8:)4:1, 736:(8:)8:20; SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio.
had strong feelings for Väisälä, but Väisälä’s vision of his future wife’s role did not seem to match Enäjärvi’s. To Enäjärvi’s surprise, Väisälä ended their relationship and quickly announced his engagement with another woman. Enäjärvi explained to Haavio that she had wished the relationship to continue, but “on the other hand: Väisälä longed for a home; for me, marriage was no hyperutopia (Alma Mater, the National Theatre etc—delectant [they charm]).”

Väisälä had received a professorship in mathematics at the newly established University of Turku in southwestern Finland. Presumably, his view of a professor’s wife was of a more traditional kind, while Enäjärvi was, as she put it in the parenthetical note in the quote above, more attracted to roles of a scholar and cultural reviewer than that of a housewife. Enäjärvi also told Haavio that she had not had “the astonishing courage” of Väisälä’s eventual wife, Eeva Kukkola, to become a professor’s wife, adding that the “[w]ife of a professor is a beautiful title, but one should think carefully before accepting even the most brilliant jewellery.”

In addition, the parenthetical quote includes a specific location: Enäjärvi’s Alma Mater, the University of Helsinki, and the Finnish National Theatre were located in Helsinki. Väisälä’s professorship was in Turku, about 170 kilometres from Helsinki. Thus, the passage can be read as explaining that Enäjärvi considered a marriage to Väisälä to jeopardise her possibilities to continue to be engaged in academia and cultural life, as well as it would take her from the town she wanted to live in—the capital city Helsinki, which offered a much larger quantity of high culture and scholarly opportunities than the venerable but small Turku.

Enäjärvi’s reflections on different candidates for a husband show that she could consider it beneficial if the future husband was from a similar academic field as she, a common strategy among women of her time to try to ensure future possibilities to continue with academic work after marriage. For example, Enäjärvi compared two men in her diary from 1925: Haavio and “Y.K.”, the to-be psychiatrist Yrjö K. Suominen (1900–1991).

Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Rajainen, Maija 7.3.1923. Letter 785:(13:)10:20; Diaries (“1923–1924”) 1.2.1923, 15.2.1923 (these two diary entries appears to be left out from Eskola, Kahden), 1.1.1924). Case 5; Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Väisälä, Kalle 1.2.1923, 2.6.1923. Letters 764:(1:)10:1, 764:(1:)10:5.
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advantage of choosing Haavio would be their shared disciplinary interests. With Suominen, she had much in common when it came to personality, but “theoretically i.e. rationally thinking, our fields of interest are very different and even adverse in the sense that we cannot help each other.”

Enäjärvi concluded by stating that “with Haavio there could be a shared office but separate bedrooms. With YK, again, a shared bedroom but separate offices.” Ideally, she stated, both rooms could be shared.

While Enäjärvi’s eventual choice points to her preference for sharing work-related interests with her spouse, there is reason to add that she also, particularly in her later documents, frequently wrote affectionately about Haavio. Enäjärvi’s note about the contrasting advantages that Suominen and Haavio had as potential partners also informs us that she thought about the decision as driven by both emotional and rational factors.

Haavio’s documents do not reveal if he too found it an advantage to have the same research interests as his partner, but he seems to have found it plausible that at least Enäjärvi thought he did. In a letter from 1925, he demanded a decision from her whether they would be a couple or not. He tried to convince her about the advantages of being together and offered such an argument when he asked her “[w]ould it not be splendid to work together in the same field of folk poetry?” He pointed out, however, that this argument was of a different category than the others, which were based on love and his declarations of his willingness to treating her more than fairly.

In the same letter, Haavio also emphasised that Enäjärvi did not have to get engaged to him if he only knew that she chose him. Enäjärvi’s indecisiveness was a recurring theme in Haavio’s diaries and private correspondence as it was something he described as causing him much pain. For example, writing in his diary in 1925, he wished Enäjärvi to “please be so kind and kill me directly, not through torture.” Haavio admitted to Enäjärvi and himself that he was jealous and “suspicious of 99% of all the men you have dealings with”.

At the same time, he explained to Oskar Loorits that he

---


understood that she was reluctant to commit because she felt that her family was pushing her to get engaged. Enäjärvi, in turn, wrote agonisingly about how her family could not understand why she was hesitant about committing to “such a good man” as Haavio.

There was also a certain push towards an early engagement from Haavio’s family. Haavio had repeatedly asked to bring Enäjärvi to visit his family, but his parents were reluctant. In a letter from 1925, his father, Kaarlo Haavio, explained that the parents found it rather unsuitable to invite Enäjärvi, since the stepmother, Hilja Haavio, was not feeling well and because Enäjärvi and Haavio were not engaged. Despite this, Haavio’s parents later decided to invite them for a couple of days, an invitation which they withdrew a month later, suggesting to postpone the visit to the summer. In the latter letter, Kaarlo Haavio added that he indeed did want to “meet our future daughter-in-law.”

The parents seemed to have hesitated also after the couple got engaged, because Haavio wrote to his brother in 1928 that they had rejected a visit then too, and that “Elsa’s family is horrified because the future daughter-in-law is not received to greet at the house of her future parents-in-laws.” However, as we can see, it was not Enäjärvi herself who expressed worry or horror about Haavio’s parents’ actions. Instead, this was how the people around her reacted and acted in regard to her relationship and future marriage to Haavio. While not expressing strong emotions about it, Enäjärvi, too, commented on the attitude that she sensed Haavio’s family had towards her, writing to Haavio in 1929: “If your family brings up the question of why I did not come there, you can, if you want, tell them directly that I did not feel that I was really welcome. Your father will not be offended by it.”

A legal issue that Enäjärvi also needed to take into consideration was that, until 1930, married women in Finland came under the guardianship of their husbands. For spouses married from 1930 onwards, the spouses had more equal legal rights. The new law was not applied fully to spouses married before 1930, but it stated a retrospective right that permitted the wives to dispose over the property they owned before marriage as well as property that they obtained as gifts, inheritance or that which was endowed to them. The

---
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Marriage Act also confirmed the law from 1889, which gave the married couple the right to state in a prenuptial agreement the wife’s legal authority to dispose over her property and income. Unmarried women had gained legal authority earlier: in 1864 for women older than 25 years and in 1898 the age limit was lowered to 21, which was the same age as for men.  

Interestingly, Enäjärvi’s documents from the time before her engagement with Haavio include no reflections on the legal consequences of getting married. Enäjärvi’s letter to her friend Maija Ruutu in December 1932, in which she advised Ruutu about prenuptial agreements, shows that she at least at the time of her wedding was well aware of legal matters concerning marriage. Enäjärvi explained to Ruutu that before the wedding she had consulted her brother Jaakko Enäjärvi, who had studied law. Enäjärvi continued that she and Haavio chose not to have a prenuptial agreement drawn up, because they got married only nine days before the new Marriage Act came into power. Because this new law would also cover couples married before 1930, “we found it unnecessary to make one”. Using the first-person plural form “we”, Enäjärvi portrayed the decision-making as a process done in mutual understanding together with Haavio. Yet, from an economic point of view, Enäjärvi must have had a stronger incentive for securing her legal rights to dispose of her property and income. Considering how clear Enäjärvi was to Haavio about her plans to continue with work after marriage, Haavio presumably expected Enäjärvi to require agreements to secure means of independence for her part. Such an expectation is also visible in Enäjärvi’s choice of words when writing to Ruutu, explaining that they “discovered” that a prenuptial agreement was “unnecessary”.

After 1930, Enäjärvi could independently manage control over her income and property, but the new Marriage Act did not retrospectively remove the husband’s guardianship over the wife. Since Enäjärvi and Haavio decided to marry less than two weeks before the new law, the question of guardianship did not seem to have been a particularly big issue for Enäjärvi. According to her, the couple had originally planned to marry earlier, but due to Enäjärvi’s mother’s frail health, they had postponed it, although eventually accelerated wedding plans when her mother’s health condition quickly worsened. Nevertheless, had Enäjärvi judged the new legislation granting wives control over their income and property to be exceptionally much better for her too, she presumably would have been able to postpone her marriage by nine days.

At her doctoral commencement festivities, Enäjärvi gave an illustrative statement for which kinds of independence Enäjärvi had negotiated for her marriage with Haavio. According to the second of two women participating in the commencement for their doctoral titles, Aune Lindström (1901–1984), Enäjärvi had been asked how she and Haavio had divided the two privileges that were symbolised by the doctor’s attributes, the sword (power) and the hat (independence). Enäjärvi responded: “We both have freedom but only one has the power, and that is my husband.”

Enäjärvi’s advise to Ruuttu further gives us indications about what she and Haavio would not have included in their contract, had they found it reasonable to draw up one. One such issue was that of sharing property. Enäjärvi told Ruuttu that the law stated that in the event of divorce, the spouses would divide the shared property in half if there was no prenuptial agreement stating differently. Correspondingly, in the event of a spouse’s death, the widow or widower inherited half of the property. If Ruuttu wished to secure this part of her property for her relatives, children or—in the event of divorce—herself, Enäjärvi advised her to hire a lawyer to draw up a prenuptial agreement. Apparently, Enäjärvi and Haavio had not agreed on inheritance and marital property rights according to the principle of equal division. The tone of Enäjärvi’s advice was neutral, only stating legal matters. She expressly stated that she did not want to influence Ruuttu’s decision with personal opinions or with the example of her case. Still, writing about legal matters with such awareness and length would suggest that she found it important for Ruuttu (and presumably for women in general) to know about them.

Many other countries had similar legislation regarding women’s rights (or rather limited rights) to manage their property and income, as well as their possibilities to act as a legal person. Eva Hemmungs Wirtén makes an interesting observation in her research on Marie Curie’s persona formation and states that the French legislation of women being under their husband’s guardianship covered material property, including grants, wages and any possibility to speak independently in court in cases, for example, regarding patent issues. What this legislation at the time did not cover was intellectual property, which is why Hemmungs Wirtén argues that it was rational for Marie Curie not to patent her and the couple’s discoveries. The acknowledgement of her discovery and work was not without obstacles, but it could at least be done in her name (or together with her collaborators and co-

828 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Rajainen, Majja 3.12.1932. Letter 785:(13:)10:50; See also SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 6.7.1929. Letter 736:(8:)10:6. In the letter, Enäjärvi told Haavio that her brother had brought documents concerning the new Marriage Act from town, which he had to read for other reasons too than only for her case. Here, she wrote about the marriage legislation as an issue that primarily concerned her rather than both of them.
829 Hemmungs Wirtén, Making Marie Curie, 17.
Moreover, Marie Curie could govern control over her personal and professional image as a scientist, or as Hemmungs Wirtén so elegantly puts it: “while the law did not allow her to be a person, she was becoming very good at cultivating her persona.”

Enäjärvi’s diary notes demonstrate that she faced expectations both in favour and against marriage. Enäjärvi’s diary notes from the early 1920s correspond to the general expectation that middle-class women were to get married and take care of the household after being wed. “Only exceptionally gifted women can be happily unmarried—maybe not even they”, she stated in July 1920. At the same time, there was a counter-pressure in Enäjärvi’s circles for the opposite. In a diary note from 1931, Enäjärvi wrote about an event where she had sensed that there was a strong expectation that women like her should remain unmarried. Enäjärvi had been sitting in a park reading when a school teacher from her childhood had sat next to her on the bench. The teacher was Lucina Hagman (1853–1946), a prominent women’s rights activist, who had worked for co-educational instruction, as well as women’s rights to higher education and universal suffrage. They started discussing Enäjärvi’s dissertation:

[…] and its delay. It seems to be a difficult topic, Lucina said apparently kindly, although it felt for me that she was a little disappointed and disdainful that nothing had become of it. I got the feeling that someone might have spoken to her in such a tone. Who knows what people are saying about it among themselves. Anni Collan told me that she had talked badly about me to everyone for me marrying and leaving my dissertation at that.

In the example cited above, Enäjärvi’s decision to marry was not only portrayed as a hazard against Enäjärvi’s personal career and her possibility of completing a doctoral degree. It was also a disappointment to an activist, who
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Enäjärvi admired and who had fought for women’s rights to higher education, and could be perceived as a withdrawal in the context of that bigger cause.\textsuperscript{834} Internationally, there were examples of famous collaborating couples, both those in which wives had managed to continue successful careers, and those in which they had not. The most evident example was Marie Curie, who by the time of Enäjärvi’s student years already was a celebrity, but of whom Enäjärvi’s private documents include no accounts.\textsuperscript{835} Many of the other famous collaborative couples may not have offered much motivation to marry. For example, the marriage of Dora Black and Bertrand Russell offered an example of how the wife’s education and work could fall in the shadow of a successful husband both when they collaborated and worked independently.\textsuperscript{836} Examples such as the Swedish social scientists Alva and Gunnar Myrdal or the marriages of Margaret Mead were, in turn, more or less contemporaneous with Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s. Therefore, they probably did not offer much inspiration for Enäjärvi in the years preceding her marriage. In Finnish folklore studies, the best-known couple was the teachers Jenny and Samuli Paulaharju, but they were not in the inner circle of academia.\textsuperscript{837} The folklorists Aili and Lauri Laiho (later Simonsuuri) were, as Mead and the Myrdals, not active early enough to be of any greater inspiration before Enäjärvi’s decision to marry Haavio.

Two scholars who Enäjärvi was personally acquainted with and whom she could relate to on a scholarly level were Lady Alice Gomme (1852–1938, born Merck) and Barbara Freire-Marreco Aitken (1879–1967). Lady Gomme was a founding member of the Folk-Lore Society in Great Britain and published numerous works especially on folklore connected to children and women. She had married the folklorist Sir George Laurence Gomme (1853–1916) and was a mother of seven sons. Lady Gomme published works under her own name and on topics differing from her husband’s primary research interests. At the same time, it was the husband who established an institutionally and more widely recognised career, while she divided her time between household work and academic work.\textsuperscript{838} Freire-Marreco Aitken was an anthropologist who

\textsuperscript{834} For Enäjärvi on Hagman, see e.g. SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (5.6.1923); ‘Lucina Hagman’, \textit{Suomen Punaisen Ristin joulutervehdys}, 1947.
\textsuperscript{835} See also Rossiter on the complex impact of Marie Curie’s success for women in academia Rossiter, \textit{Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940}, 125–130.
travelled extensively around the world doing fieldwork. She married shortly after World War I but continued her research and engagement in academia and scholarly societies, such as the Folk-Lore Society. However, her scholarly travels became much less frequent and the destinations closer to home after her marriage.\footnote{Interesting to note in the cases of both Lady Gomme and Freire-Marreco Aitken, as well as later Enäjärvi, is that a common denominator in the slowing down of their academic careers appears to be marriage, regardless for example of social class.}

Enäjärvi met Lady Gomme, at the time already a widow, and Freire-Marreco Aitken in England in 1927, and she was pleased to have the opportunity to discuss their shared research interests in singing games and children’s folklore.\footnote{However, Enäjärvi did not directly mention that these scholars would have inspired her in thoughts about how to successfully combine marriage and academic work. Neither did Enäjärvi write anything about a third woman from an earlier generation in her field, Margaret Murray (1863–1963). Murray was an Egyptologist and folklorist active in Britain at the time Enäjärvi was visiting. Murray’s case is interesting in comparison especially to Freire-Marreco Aitken. Unlike Freire-Marreco Aitken, Murray never married, and she also continued with her fieldwork journeys, particularly to Egypt, during her entire career.}

Enäjärvi’s documents imply that she was ambivalent about postponing the final decision for a partner. On the one hand, she admitted to her diary that the difficulty of settling her mind delighted her. On the other hand, she added immediately that she found it wrong towards everyone involved. She also stated that the decision-making process was tearing her apart mentally. While she for example stated that “some progress has indeed been made” in learning to love Haavio, comparing him to Suominen caused her deep anguish: “I became so anxious and I missed YK so much that I have tears in my eyes and could do nothing but call for God’s help in my distress.”\footnote{We can further gain...}
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glimpses of Enäjärvi’s reasoning about making decisions in difficult questions about the future through the marital-work advice that she gave Maija Ruuttu:

The main thing is that one, as you have said yourself, must choose to marry the person one loves, as one must devote oneself to the work one loves. However, both in the former and in the latter case it may happen that one feels that one does not love anything enough, or that there are several that one loves equally much. If one finds oneself in this situation, and a decision still must be made, one must arrive at a decision on the basis of reason and deliberation. One must write down—mentally or on paper—the qualities of both alternatives neatly side by side to be conveniently compared, and then arrive to a conclusion to the best of one’s ability.843

When Enäjärvi wrote this advice to Ruuttu in 1926, she was in a relationship with Haavio. Still, she could also envision other future options than marriage with Haavio, concluding her short report to Ruuttu by admitting the circumstances of her relationship with Haavio: “Messy it is.”844 She wrote the advice in a passive voice, which would suggest that she considered the advice more generally applicable than only for Ruuttu’s unique situation. Together with the other reflections about the advantages and disadvantages of various men, Enäjärvi’s advice largely mirrored how she reasoned about her own life too.

Although Haavio wrote much more exclusively about his wish to settle with Enäjärvi as a matter of love, he, too, expressed other reasons. At least indirectly, getting engaged was connected to possibilities to conduct work, as he expressed in his diary note about their engagement: “So this is the end of the adventurous time of secret engagement. Arrival at a steadier phase. How much could have been won if we had immediately announced our engagement. Two years of work in peace!”845

YK:ta, että kyyneleet nousivat silmiini, enkä tiennyt muuta neuvoa kuin huutaa hädässäni Jumalaa.”


In addition to emotional ambivalence, Enäjärvi’s hesitance to settle for one man should also be seen in the light of her ambitious goal to combine family life and a career. This was an endeavour that required a careful consideration of potential partners that would allow such a future. It is interesting that many of the character traits that apparently contributed to Enäjärvi’s possibilities to be selective in her choice of partner, were also character traits that academic women typically were portrayed as lacking. As was discussed in chapter 6, Enäjärvi was consciously pushing forward a new persona of a feminine, beautiful and charming academic woman. By cultivating this new persona, Enäjärvi also desired to embody a second unconventional combination, namely that of being a wife and recognised scholar, later even a mother and scholar.

Enäjärvi’s goal to combine family life and scholarly life meant that she had to weigh between partly conflicting interests of personal chemistry and more favourable intellectual compounds, as well as to introduce new ways of being a scholar in Finnish folk culture studies. Like Elisabeth Wesseling has shown with Judith Rich Harris’ persona formation, Enäjärvi was not aiming to change the pre-existing ideal, but to add accepted ways of what a credible scholar could be like. When in England in 1927, as well as after this journey, Enäjärvi began to promote a new way of being a scholar, one who was an intelligent, feminine and cheerful female academic. However, her pursuit to change the perception of a good scholar did not end simply by embracing feminine charm and selecting a favourable partner; she also needed to negotiate her marriage to allow her the room for the agency and socialising that were necessary for living a scholarly life, an issue that will be discussed in the following section.

**Negotiating the relationship**

From 1925 to 1928, the correspondence between Haavio and Enäjärvi contains extensive and also heated discussions about their relationship, which by then had gone beyond friendship. The main themes of these discussions were Haavio’s uncertainty of whether they had a future as a couple and Enäjärvi’s uncertainty whether she should commit to him. In her letters to Haavio, Enäjärvi wrote about issues that were crucial for her continuation of her academic career after marriage: to continue with research, to travel and to freely and independently network and participate in professional associations.

Enäjärvi’s personal documents are interesting because they show how she reflected upon this issue and how she took a stance in her situation and actively strived to negotiate her options for combining scholarly, social and family life. In her diary, she further alternated between contemplating her options in choosing a partner on the one hand, and critically examining her appearance

---

and character on the other hand. The diaries, together with the letters to Haavio, suggest that she found it possible to affect her future not only by choosing the best husband candidate but also by negotiating the terms of her marital relationship.

Enäjärvi wrote rather extensively about what she hoped for in her relationships, while there is much less preserved from Haavio’s point of view. There are also fewer letters written by Haavio than by Enäjärvi, in particular from 1927. Enäjärvi’s letters from the same period show that he did send large amounts of letters to her while she was in London, but only few of them are preserved in the archive. The letters from the autumn of 1927 preceded the couple’s engagement and Enäjärvi’s letters include many reflections about how she viewed Haavio as a partner and future husband. Enäjärvi’s responses to Haavio’s letters often take a heated tone and are critical statements of what he had written, suggesting that Haavio’s letters had similar themes and attitudes.

Enäjärvi’s critical points about Haavio changed somewhat over time. In the earliest years, 1920–1921, she wrote in her diary that she found him nice but that he did not stir as strong feelings in her as some other men did. She admired Haavio’s passion for the things he thirsted for but noted that she at times when she wished for support and security felt that Haavio would not be able to offer that. She further insinuated that he might not have been her ideal man physically.847 After knowing Haavio for a couple of years and also having been in some form of a romantic relationship with him, Enäjärvi wrote more about his different qualities. In her diary of 1925, she asked herself whether she was so attached to him because she was so used to being with him.848 Comparably, two years later from London, she wrote to him positively both about his looks and about being attached to him because he was so familiar.849

Another, although earlier, change was that Enäjärvi started to criticise Haavio for being jealous and too possessive.850 Haavio recognised jealousy as part of his personality but did not consider it as merely negative. In his diary from 1925, he stated that love and jealousy were two sides of the same feeling and that he was both much in love and extremely jealous. Therefore, he concluded, jealousy could not be wrong. He also confirmed Enäjärvi’s accusation of him fiercely trying to intervene in her dealings with other men. In his view, however, he was doing no wrong “as I reproach her and rage at

her for having too many cavaliers.851 For example, he wrote that he was devastated to learn that Enäjärvi had such strong feelings and such a serious relationship with Suominen, who in Haavio’s words was his greatest enemy.852 Rather than jealousy, he found his “instability” as one of his “cardinal flaws”.853

From Enäjärvi’s point of view, Haavio tried to limit her social life and career possibilities by insisting that she only went out with him.854 In part, she acknowledged that his behaviour could be due to her ambiguity regarding the status of their relationship and the uncertainty that he thus had to live with. She continued that once their relationship changed to a more stable one, she would “learn to love you [Haavio]”, and she expected Haavio to become less jealous.855 In other instances, she wrote reproachful and angry letters to Haavio about him being possessive, while neither of them would ever expect him to end his social and societal activities for her sake. In one particular case, she was disappointed that he had been against her running for a position on the student union board, something she had been asked to do.856 Enäjärvi argued that she was considering the position out of private interests and as good practice for work within the Finnish Literature Society, the Society for the Study of Finnish and the Finnish Literary Research Society (Kirjallisuudentutkijain seura). She noted that her position as chair of the Estonian-Finnish Student Club had the same advantages. Moreover, she thought that her board membership would be positive for the sake of getting women onto the boards of other organisations.857 When she eventually decided to decline the candidacy, she told Haavio that it was because she had come to the conclusion that she had to direct all her time to her dissertation work, but added that she was not pleased with his opposing attitude to her taking such positions.858

852 Eskola, Kahden, 457 (1.12.1925).
Haavio’s private documents suggest that he acknowledged that she feared that her life would be too tightly bound if she chose a life with him, writing in 1925 that “you would not become a fettered dog, because it does not fit your nature.”\(^859\) Enäjärvi’s letters to Haavio suggest that her experience of the relationship did not respond to his promise for her personal freedom, as exemplified two months later when she wrote:

You drive me out of my mind with your constant pestering, emotional whims and stalking. Your every letter includes some secret reference, some petty or morbid product of your weak nerves. If I am too tired to write you long epistles, which are required more than once a week, if I choose to address you in a way that pleases me, if I travel somewhere, you always have your taut stinging words ready. If I am ill or if I have work to do, still I should always be ready to write to you page after page, for God’s sake, about what and for what good? Could you not let me too have a summer vacation and a couple of weeks of peace?\(^860\)

Enäjärvi also extended the dog simile, adding that “I am not your slave, but you treat me almost as if I was your dog.”\(^861\) She emphasised that she also was ashamed of the way Haavio reacted in public and in front of colleagues.\(^862\) In one of the heated letters, she reproached Haavio for limiting her friendships to only two old schoolmates and one student friend, and told him that his jealousy had hindered her from making and keeping up friendships with other students. She further gave examples to Haavio about times when she thought his behaviour had been unacceptable:

No matter which limited field I move on, You interfere. When I discuss my research with [philologist Artturi] Kannisto, You are angry. You throw


tantrums when I participate in the committee meetings of the Society for the Study of Finnish or if I chat with acquaintances at the Kinship Club. If my Estonian interests bring me in contact with people and not only books, you are ready with abusive words and deeds. Do you remember how you behaved at the Railway Square when [Estonian folklorist August] Anni was with us?863

As the above quotes illustrate, Enäjärvi was very critical towards Haavio’s temper, which she found hard to live with. As late as December 1927, she wrote in her diary that “[t]he most horrible thing that I know in my life at the moment, is the fear that by joining myself to Martti, I also link myself to a temperament, which is manifested in ways that I despise and which consume my nerves and ability to work.”864

Although Enäjärvi did not identify career concerns as a reason for why she was upset about Haavio’s attitude and actions, these critical points can be connected to academic and semi-academic environments and situations. She critisised Haavio for keeping her from making and cultivating friendships among student peers or within the societies with close ties to academia, hindering her from participating in the societies’ inner circles and deterring her from having informal discussions with senior scholars, such as Kannisto, about her research. Enäjärvi further argued that Haavio was keeping her from socializing with older colleagues at parties or cultural events.865

None of Haavio’s preserved letters suggest that he directly expected her to abandon her social and academic endeavours, and Enäjärvi emphasised to him before officially engaging him that “[t]hus we understand that I am going to continue with research also after we get married.”866 This statement is clear about what Enäjärvi demanded from her marriage and that she would continue with her academic interests. However, the way she chose her words still allowed some room for interpretation. I have here translated her “tutkiskelemuksia” to “research”, but the translation does not correspond one to one with the original. The Finnish equivalent for “to conduct research” is


tutkia, while Enäjärvi used a word derived from tutkiskella, which has a more unorganised and informal meaning than tutkia. The difference can be compared to the difference between walking (kävellä) and strolling (käyskennellä), where the latter emphasises an absence of set direction and aim.

Enäjärvi’s choice to use the word tutkiskelemuksia can be read as her toning down a demand to be first and foremost occupied with research and opening the possibility of scaling back on research to an interest among other duties. In this way, she downplayed her own academic ambitions in relation to her partner, thus assigning his academic work a stronger and more institutional and professional status than her future plans. This way of diminishing the importance of the wife’s academic work in relation to the husband’s has also been identified by previous research on collaborating couples.867 Whitney Chadwick and Isabelle de Courtivron suggest that collaboration between spouses clashes with the traditional perception of solitary geniuses. Since the genius usually by default is considered a man, it is further associated with masculinity. Thus, a female partner who is acknowledged in the same field can function as a threat to the image of a genius and the masculinity of the male partner.868 Understood in these terms, Enäjärvi consolidated Haavio’s role as the more prominent figure in academia and in the family by emphasising the professionality of his work in relation to hers. Despite Enäjärvi’s way of toning down her academic ambitions in relation to Haavio’s, she was also constantly negotiating circumstances that would enable her to continue with scholarly work in the future. Enäjärvi emphasised how essential research travel, taking positions in organisations, and networking were to her academic career, which are factors that research on the history of academia has also identified.869

Enäjärvi’s negotiations were, however, not only demands insisting Haavio should not restrict her freedom, but they also emphasised the advantages of a less limiting relationship. In the autumn of 1927, when it was becoming settled that she and Haavio would commit to each other, she suggested that it would be fun to travel together:

And then I have planned all the things we will do together. “My dream” of being able to travel around the world has grown stronger here in cosmopolitan

867 Lykknes, Opitz and van Tiggelen, For Better or For Worse?, 3–4; Pycior, Slack and Abir-Am, Creative Couples in the Sciences; Berg, Florin and Wisselgren, Par i vetenskap och politik, 16–20.
869 See e.g. EKLA EKM. 186 Collection of Aino and Oskar Kallas. 186:175:15 Letters from Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio to Virve Kallas-Päss, 7/19 (20.8.1927); Bergwik, Kunskapens osynliga scener, 78; Pohls, Korkeasti koulutetut naiset, foreword, 19; Sörlin, De lärda republik, 117–118; Rossiter, Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940, 73–76.
England. Will we not do that some day? It will of course be very expensive. But we will write all the time. You will write entire books; I will write smaller and duller things. We will sign contracts with publishers and journals, as is common in the world today, but still rare in Finland. As I now know English and you know German, we can manage anywhere as far as language is concerned. Besides, we can also learn a little French before that.  

Here, Enäjärvi portrayed travelling as a positive thing that would be fruitful for both spouses. Here, too, she downplayed her own research ambitions, finding it advisable not to push her visions too far. Furthermore, she did not here emphasise the importance of being able to travel independently, as she had emphasised before their engagement. Both in the passage above and in her word choice for “conducting research”, Enäjärvi gave space for Haavio to take a more prominent role. While she made sure that he was aware that she would continue with her research, she also confirmed that she knew that he was aiming for a professorship. When she wrote about travelling together, she made sure to point out that Haavio would write books, while she would write “smaller and duller” texts. Although she assured Haavio that she did not turn down the opportunity to run for the board position because of his opposition, her letters nevertheless show that his opinion did affect her decision. All these examples suggest that Enäjärvi gave Haavio assurances that she would not be his rival in academia. This would have the practical consequence of less competition, but it also allowed him to keep the masculine role as the more professional and prominent half of the couple, thus reducing the risk that he was taking by marrying a woman with a promising future in the same field as he.

Enäjärvi and Haavio’s negotiations over their personal and professional relationship are interesting also when viewed in relation to the gendered discourses in society at large and also more specifically in connection to higher education. Science and research were commonly referred to as a domain for men due to their requirement of rational and logical thinking—which were considered to be masculine features. In Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s reflections and discussions about relationships and marriage, Enäjärvi was
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voicing both rational and emotional alternatives, while Haavio rarely used other than emotional arguments. As was discussed in chapter 3, Haavio projected an emotional and sensitive persona in the public sphere as he gained reputation of a poet. Although Enäjärvi was known in literary circles, her role was that of a critic and commentator rather than a sensitive creator of emotion-driven literature.

This differing emphasis on emotional and rational motives can also be understood in the light of Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s gendered positions in academia. Haavio’s more secure and conventional position as a male middle-class scholar can have allowed him more flexibility in shaping his image of a rational scholar, while Enäjärvi had to struggle harder to convince people of her rational qualities. In addition, Enäjärvi had much more at stake. Haavio’s risks with marrying Enäjärvi were connected to his losing masculine credibility if he were not perceived as the inherently and obviously more professional and prominent of the spouses. For Enäjärvi, marriage was a risk to her career and her legal independence. In this sense, it is hardly surprising that she weighed her options very carefully and with rational, rather than emotional, arguments.

**Signing an engagement contract**

When Enäjärvi and Haavio got engaged on the night of January 1st, 1928, they wrote and signed a statement regarding mutually held duties and principles. An engagement contract does not seem to have been very common in their time, and there was no legislation about such contracts. There is no information about the character or seriousness of the document, but its contents repeat many of Enäjärvi’s accusations of Haavio’s jealousy and impetuousness and appears to reflect her scepticism towards their relationship. As such, the contract gives a viewpoint of how Enäjärvi might have tried—literally—to negotiate her agency and independence in private and public life.
Kihlusaagrikes.

Nennesinnad 1.1.28.

kemme me elus ja keelt, sooratavas, kopinele, keeda, koopaam ega heit kusine.

1. Enne kuivad emakas laene keelt.

2. Seda kiivrik ainele keelt.

3. Seda keelt ainele keelt.

4. Seda keelt ainele keelt.

5. Seda keelt ainele keelt.

The contract was a little more than one page in length and written in Enäjärvi’s handwriting. Translated, the contents are as follows:

**Engagement contract**

When we, Elsa and Martti, get engaged on January 1st 1928, we make the following agreement, which we promise to follow in the name of our honour and conscience.

1. We do not lose our temper and we do not say imprudent words in our anger. We count to fifty when a gust of anger is on its way. We will look into things before we judge.
2. Elsa will always conduct herself honestly. Martti as well.
3. Elsa and Martti can be social with their acquaintances without the other one trying to pressure the other or demonstrate dissatisfaction. This socialising does not refer to love relationships, which will not occur in any way outside the engagement.
4. Elsa does not come to Martti’s apartment after theatre or generally after 10 pm.
5. Elsa avoids being late from agreed meetings with Martti.
6. Elsa goes regularly to sleep at 12 pm at the latest to retain her health.

Elsa and Martti merge their destinies together in hope and strive to develop as to as high a level as possible. In this endeavour supporting each other with friendly and cheerful behaviour, mutual understanding, acquiescence and helpfulness.

Elsa and Martti promise to love each other in good times and in bad.

In Helsinki, New Year’s Eve 1927

Elsa Enäjärvi  Martti Haavio

The paragraphs in the contract are partly general and partly directed specifically to Enäjärvi. Two such clauses are connected to Enäjärvi’s habit of staying up late, a topic that Enäjärvi wrote about both before and after her engagement to and marriage with Haavio. The third one is also connected to time management. The preserved documents do not give any practical examples of when this would have been an issue for Haavio. In the original, “Samoin Martti”, that is “Martti as well”, in clause 2, is added in smaller letters. Either it was not originally intended to be there, or maybe it was intended, but forgotten when first written. There is no evidence in the sources of either part acting other than honestly, but it could refer either to Haavio’s
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874 SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries. (“Engagement Contract 1.1.1928”). Case 5. The original text is in Appendix A.
875 See e.g. SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“Va 15.11.20–9.5.22” New Year’s Night 1922, see also “1928–1932” 15.11.1931). Case 5; SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 18.9.1927. Letter 736:(8:)8:5.
experience of uncertainty of the relationship’s status or to a lack of trust connected to his jealousy and possessiveness.

The other clauses are seemingly general in character, but in view of Enäjärvi’s concern about Haavio’s negative traits, they probably were directed more towards him. The first clause has its direct links to Enäjärvi’s critique of Haavio as being hot-tempered and acting inappropriately in bouts of jealousy. Enäjärvi’s texts rarely give any details of how he would have acted out, but, for example, she once after criticising him asked “the notebook thrown at my eye and the slap on the ear. How had I deserved them?” She could also call his reactions as “you throw a tantrum” and “nervous fits” or just “fits”. Enäjärvi’s annoyance about Haavio’s temper was directly connected to jealousy, and clauses 1 and 3 are thus probably directly addressed this issue. The preserved documents written by Haavio do not imply that there would have been a corresponding need from his side to write such clauses in regard to how he experienced Enäjärvi’s behaviour. Against this background, we might assume that the clauses were written as directed to both, but that Enäjärvi had a stronger motive to write them down on paper.

The passage after the sixth and final clause is written in a more general tone than the preceding ones. The paragraph is also general in the sense that it states that the parties should seek to develop as “persons”, without further specifying any particular field in their life. Since it was more common for women to end up as helpmates of their academically successful husbands than the other way around, it is likely that the paragraph was an attempt to protect Enäjärvi’s interests rather than Haavio’s, who presumably could count on support from his wife without such a clause. However, this passage was phrased in a way that did not necessarily secure career plans. The general “developing as a person” could include academic or other work-related pursuits, but it could as well include rather conservative gender roles. In the early 1920s, Enäjärvi from time to time pondered upon her strengths and personal qualifications, observing that she probably had latent skills in household work and nursing. Probably, she continued, she would have “become enthusiastic about kitchen skills or gardening” had her upbringing been different and had she developed


877 SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 8.8.1925 (first part of the letter 7.8.1925), 3.1.1926, 4.4.1927. Letters 736:(8:)6:11; 736:(8:)7:1; 736:(8:)9:5; See also letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 1.10.1927. Letter 736:(8:)8:14. Org. “kiukuttelet”; “hermokohtaus”, “kohtaus” (which also can be translated into “scene”. In the letter from 4.4.1927, she also told Haavio that she hoped that “you will not cause a [theatre] play of some sort tomorrow”. Org. “et huomenna saa aikaan mitään näytelmää.”) See also letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti, undated [1929]. Letter 736:(8:)16:3.

878 See e.g. Harvey, ‘The Mystery of the Nobel Laureate and His Vanishing Wife’, 59.
herself in these spheres more than in the academic ones. Enäjärvi further contemplated whether “[o]ne has to answer to the calling of a woman—to raise children and support a man in great works (haa!).” The closing parenthesis, however, indicates that she was not fully serious.

Despite that the passage on personal development did not provide impermeable possibilities for any development, I would interpret the engagement contract as primarily a negotiation for securing opportunities for Enäjärvi’s future pursuits in public places. We might assume that Haavio felt less need for such assurances, as it was normal for the husband to continue with his career after marriage, while it was a much less obvious choice for the middle-class/academic wife. The clause demanding the right to socialise with others was the strongest one which safeguarded activities that were necessary for making a career, and also something that Enäjärvi had voiced as a serious issue in her relationship with Haavio.

**Acting as a partner and as an individual**

The spouse and household of a scholar played a significant role in academic social interactions. Spouses accompanied scholars to academic festivities and homes which were venues for social gatherings. For example, Staffan Bergwik explains that one consequence of the custom of socialising at home was that male scholars had to consider how well prospective partners were suited to this role and task. Kirsti Niskanen shows how social events were also often formed around the assumption that the participants were couples, a practice that excluded unmarried scholars and public figures. Elsa Enäjärvi’s diaries show that she repeatedly had to review her role as an accompanying and hosting woman and a networking public person.

Based on their private documents, Enäjärvi and Haavio do not appear to have been frequent hosts at gatherings of scholars, and the number of other types of social gatherings appear to have been small. In a diary note from 1931, Enäjärvi wrote that she and Haavio had recently been visited by only a few people, including the author Kersti Bergroth and the lawyer and future politician and president Urho Kekkonen. Enäjärvi had also considered inviting [presumably the author, political activist and scholar Vilho] Helanen, but had
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eventually decided not to invite him, because she did not want to “disrupt the atmosphere of our circle”.883

Enäjärvi’s diaries indicate that one reason for the slight number of invitations and infrequent gatherings of this kind might have been a limited interest in social events from Haavio’s side. This situation caused concern for Enäjärvi, which, in turn, offers interesting insights into her role as wife, a public figure and scholar. As a scholar and cultural figure, she took an active stand in social events, supposedly without much ambivalence while networking with prominent scholars and authors. In her social interactions, she could reflect over tasks that were more connected to those of scholars’ wives, such as representation or socialising with wives or the relatives of scholars. One such example was the American folklorist, Professor Archer Taylor’s (1890–1973) visit to Helsinki in 1932. Enäjärvi met him at the railway station when he already was about to leave. Only then did she find out that Taylor’s wife Alice Jones, who accompanied her husband, did not speak any German, but only English. Enäjärvi stated that had she known about the situation, she would have offered to keep her company during the visit. Instead, Jones had been attended to by the Estonian folklore graduate Linda Hurt, who Enäjärvi regarded as speaking “even worse” English than she did.884 In this case, Enäjärvi had not been asked to keep company with a professor’s wife, a duty that instead had been given to a younger female graduate. Enäjärvi had not been involved enough in organising Taylor’s visit to know about the situation and had also not expected to be the person attending Taylor’s wife. She did, however, feel that the language barrier would have motivated a different arrangement.

Another example of when Enäjärvi felt that she should have acted more in the role of Haavio’s wife was when she and Haavio had been at a theatre premiere in December 1931. In her diary, she described how she during the intermission had been having a discussion with the future Nobel laureate Frans Emil Sillanpää and his wife, and noticed that Haavio was chatting with another couple, supposedly the author Heikki Toppila and his wife Anna Toppila. She wrote that she regretted that she did not join Haavio and talk with the Toppilas for a while and wondered whether they found her absence arrogant of her.885

While, for example, Margaret Rossiter has shown that women often were in one way or another excluded from the informal networking between academic men, Enäjärvi’s description of the evening at the theatre also shows how her position as Haavio’s wife could exclude her from social occasions. She might have had access to these occasions as a woman, but not when in the company of Haavio. In these situations, it was not Haavio’s position as a rising

star in folkloristics, nor his gender or marital status that hindered her, but his personal preferences. For example, after the theatre premiere, Professor Saari and his wife joined Enäjärvi and Haavio and walked with them for a while. In her diary, Enäjärvi wrote that she assumed that the Saaris had hoped to go together somewhere else. Since she knew that Haavio had an “abhorrence” for those kinds of occasions, she had taken the initiative to wish them goodnight. Back home, Enäjärvi wrote that she was sad and dissatisfied with her marital situation. The feeling, she wrote, was familiar to her already from the time when she was engaged with Haavio, when similar situations had “caused [her] many tears”. One reason for her dissatisfaction was that she found it boring to sidestep such social opportunities after cultural events, as it made her feel like she was “buried alive and doomed to be among 60-year-olds since youth.”

In Enäjärvi’s accounts, the problem was not only connected to their private life, but she described evasions from social gatherings would risk them to appear as odd birds in their social community. Not only did she write that the Saaris had expected them to go along with them, she also added that a friend of theirs had made a phone call to their home and expressed great surprise that they had not continued anywhere. “Even Hakulinen”, she stated, “would now-a-days do this kind of thing”. In Enäjärvi’s description of these conflicting interests in social life, Haavio’s wish to avoid these situations set the frames for both partners, thus ruling out Enäjärvi’s participation.

Advantages of sharing a household

The engagement contract stated that Enäjärvi and Haavio should support and help each other in their endeavours, and in the light of their letters and diaries, they seem to have kept their pledges. In the history of sciences, collaborative couples have attracted attention from gender historians, as a way to bring to light the work of women who worked alongside their husbands, but rarely received acknowledgement in proportion to their efforts. These studies have been a way to illuminate dynamics and practices in research that are easily hidden behind a strong tradition of writing about successful scholars and
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886 Presumably, Enäjärvi referred to Eino Saari (1894–1971), who was professor in forestry politics (later forestry economics) at the University of Helsinki and his wife Aino Saari (née Koivisto). ‘Saari, Eino Armas’, Kuka kukin on (Helsinki, 1954), 734–735.
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research results. In the following section, I will discuss practical advantages of sharing a household with a spouse with similar research interests, and then consider some of the collegial collaborations that Haavio and Enäjärvi had during their early years as a couple.

One apparent synergy effect of being a scholarly couple was that it expanded the partners’ social networks, as they could introduce friends and colleagues to each other, as was discussed in the previous chapter. Another networking or social advantage was that the spouses could share their connections and information from associations that they were active in. For Enäjärvi, a concrete impact of being associated and organisations with Haavio was that she gained insights into the inner circles of societies, which did not accept women as their members at all or excluded them for higher status membership. Haavio became, for example, early on a member of the Academic Karelia Society, which did not accept women as members. The AKS had a sister organisation, called Academic Women’s Karelia Society (Naisylioppilaitten Karjala-Seura, from 1938 renamed Akateemisten Naisten Karjala-Seura), but it never gained the same political impact as the AKS had. The Kalevala Society invited its first female member in 1937, but not as the higher-status member of a subdivision of (työjäsen), but as a general member (apujäsen). Haavio had been invited to become general member in the Kalevala Society in 1933, while Enäjärvi received the same invitation 14 years later.

The particular case of the Kalevala Society is interesting, as it also illustrates a less favourable side of the marriage. According to Kristiina Kalleinen, one reason why the Kalevala Society invited the curator of the National Museum, MA Tyyni Vahter, as its first female member, rather than the scholar and PhD Elsa Enäjärvi might have been that Haavio already was a member. Haavio and Enäjärvi were known for their engagement in Finnish(language)-nationalistic politics, and inviting a couple with such a strong profile would have increased the influence of that ideological stance too much.

Enäjärvi’s and Haavios correspondence shows that their relationship also had the material and practical advantage that the spouses could help each other with library studies and archival work, as well as share their private book collection. The collection was also enlarged in collaboration, as they could ask each other to order books back at home when they were abroad or buy books

---

890 Berg, Florin and Wisselgren, Par i vetenskap och politik, 17–21; Lykknes, Opitz and Van Tiggelen, For Better or For Worse?, 2–3; Pycior, Slack and Abir-Am, Creative Couples in the Sciences, 3–4.
892 Kalleinen, Kansallisen tieteen ja taiteen puolesta, 78; Compare with Rossiter, Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940, 78–79.
893 Kalleinen, Kansallisen tieteen ja taiteen puolesta, 78.
from abroad. Both benefitted from sharing books and having them kept them in a shared home. This advantage presumably grew during the marriage. In a journal interview in 1940, the couple was pictured together with their children in their living room, with full bookshelves covering the walls in the background. In the caption, the couple was cited to say that the two most valuable things in their home were their children and their books. The convenience of having their books located at home can be illustrated by the following example. During World War II, Haavio could, in a letter from the war zone, advise his wife that a particular reference would be found in a book that was “bluish, placed in the foreign books’ section next to the dining room door; the books are arranged by country.”

Sharing research interests and a common collection of books did in this way both save time and money for both spouses. Moreover, the shared reference material could make it beneficial for the spouses to develop their research interests towards similar topics and approaches. A synergy that concretely affected Haavio’s work was Enäjärvi’s interest in and travel to England. Her language skills and her stay in London made it possible and favourable for Haavio to include British material in his dissertation. Another synergy effect of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s relationship was the possibility to work closely in a casual setting. There are accounts showing that Haavio and Enäjärvi read and discussed each other’s academic works both before and after their marriage, even discussing analytical breakthroughs in bed. Since the couple wrote fewer letters to each other after moving in together, we can only assume that they read each other’s works more often than there are notes describing this activity. In a scholarly household, it became rational to share research interests, approaches and write oneself into the same research tradition, as well as to share the ways research was conducted.

898 See e.g. Eskola, Itäänn, 28, 198; SKS KIA. Archive of Martti Haavio. Letters from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 5.10.1924, undated [1924]. Letters 736:(8:)5:12, 736:(8:):5:17; Compare also with reflections of other than strictly academic work, e.g. in letter from Haavio, Martti to Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa 14.4.1940. Letter 745:(13:)19:43; Letter from Enäjärvi-Haavio, Elsa to Haavio, Martti 7.12.1941. Letter 760:(25:)7:3; see also EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 24/33 (undated); For Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s discussion of interpretations, see: SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“1928–1932” Boxing Day 1931). Case 5
When it came to books and archives, Enäjärvi and Haavio approached research, at least partly, as a team. In this way, they could utilise each other’s networks in the same way as they shared books and sources. This type of collaboration can be viewed as streamlining their work. At the same time, they were not only cultivating similar academic personae within their relationship, but also interacting with the academic community as a scholarly couple. In addition to gaining from sharing infrastructures of scholarship, such as books and networks, Haavio and Enäjärvi also helped each other with research in its narrower sense. For example, when Enäjärvi was in London in 1927, she wrote to Haavio that she had been in the British Library and copied chain songs for his dissertation, and also found some literature that would be useful to him. This assistance was not a single exception. In an earlier letter she had ensured him that “[s]urely it is obvious that I will do everything you ask me to do at the Br. Museum and in all the libraries that I get access to. This promise is valid forever and everywhere.” Haavio, in turn, supported Enäjärvi’s stay in London economically by transferring money to her during the autumn semester. The preserved letters do not include any notes of conditions for the money that was sent. Instead, Haavio stated to her that the new situation of supporting her made him happy.

There is one particularly interesting decision that Enäjärvi made to support Haavio’s career. In 1931, she gave him the source material that she had collected from various national and international archives. The material covered all the variants that Enäjärvi had identified and found on the folk poem Leikarin runo (“The Minstrel’s poem”) from a large variety of countries. Haavio was at the time planning to apply for a professorship in folkloristics at the University of Helsinki but was one full book and a couple of articles short of being qualified for the position. According to Haavio, it was Enäjärvi who had taken the initiative to offer him the material to enable him to write and publish a book on the topic on time.

Enäjärvi’s diary entries show that she was ambivalent about handing over the material. She stated that she was happy to help her husband in the matter, but also that she felt some disappointment with the circumstances. This, she stated, was because she invested quite a lot of work in collecting the material and had further been looking forward to working with it and writing a book based on the collected material. In a letter to Oskar Loorits, Enäjärvi

901 Eskola, Kahden, 558–559 (23.9.1927).
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minimised her role in the matter, stating that there was no reason for anyone to talk badly or judgmentally about Haavio’s use of the material, since it only was material “which anybody could have collected”. What she did not mention was her disappointment, which she wrote about in her diary, confiding that it was not only about working time lost. As it seems, the disappointment was primarily due to the fact that she no longer could work with the topic as planned, a topic that according to Haavio, the internationally highly acknowledged folklore professor Kaarle Krohn had deemed as very interesting and relevant for folklore research. Enäjärvi’s outward portrayal of her contribution supports what research on collaborative couples in sciences has identified as how the wife’s role often was depicted as a highly (or overly) qualified assistant to the husband. To herself, Enäjärvi still stated that she voluntarily had given Haavio the material, but added that it was a sacrifice that affected her scholarly career.

The only direct credit that Enäjärvi got for her contribution for Haavio’s book Leikarit was a footnote on page 53, early in the second chapter, after a list of variants of the opening lines of the poem. In the note, Haavio clarified where the variants came from: the priest and ethnologist Henrik August Reinholm’s collection at the Finnish National Museum, Toivo Okkola’s collection at the Finnish Literature Society, and concludingly “—A large share of the variants are collected by my wife, MA ELSA ENÄJÄRVI-HAAVIO, in connection with her research on folk games.” In addition to this, he twice referred to “ELSA ENÄJÄRVI-HAAVIO’S collection” a reference system that he did not use anywhere else in the book, and which supposedly marked a private collection, which was not located in any archive.

The couple did not only share work related interests but could also step in for each other in professional situations. At least, this seems to have been the case for Enäjärvi stepping in for Haavio. When Haavio needed to take a six-week-long sick leave from his work as editor at the publishing house, Enäjärvi substituted for him. She continued to work at WSOY with reduced working

909 Haavio, Leikarit, 53. Org. “Suuren osan toisimosta on kansaneikkitutkimustensa yhteydessä keränyt vaimoni maist. ELSA ENÄJÄRVI HAAVIO.” Note that here my translation to “her researches” is a direct translation from “[–]tutkimustensa” and not from the vaguer “tutkiskelemuksia”, a distinction that I previously discussed in this chapter.
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hours for a long time, and the publishing house became an essential part of the couple’s life.910

The workload and tasks at the publishing house were, however, not equally distributed between the two. It was Haavio who had started working there first and who held the permanent and full-time positions. Enäjärvi worked more sporadically and often shorter days than Haavio. Before having children, Enäjärvi wrote only positively about her work at WSOY. Beyond being interesting, the regular half-time work in the mornings gave her days a healthy routine, she stated to Virve Kallas. The six weeks of full-time substituting for Haavio had kept her from working with her dissertation, but that did not seem to cause much worries for her.911 Later, she still kept describing the work in positive words, but she also started writing concerned notes that it was stealing time from her academic work.912 After becoming a mother, Enäjärvi wrote to Kallas about how she had found it exhausting to rush home in-between her working hours at WSOY to breastfeed her baby, who was cared for by a nanny while Enäjärvi was at work.913 Enäjärvi described her work at the WSOY as a temporary replacement for Haavio or with other minor tasks as activities that gave her joy and provided good daily structure on a personal level. In addition, her work effort was adding to the household’s economic situation. Stepping in for Haavio also allowed him to work “from dusk until dawn, every day of the week” to reach his professor’s competence in 1931 and 1932.914 For Enäjärvi to leave paid and intellectual work after marriage was under these circumstances neither in Enäjärvi’s nor Haavio’s interest, at least when it came to material matters. The fact that Enäjärvi had comparable competences to Haavio, made her a flexible labour resource allowing him to both work in his daytime job and with his scholarly interests.


914 Both the quote and Enäjärvi’s writing about her work at the WSOY in SKS KIA. Archive of Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavio. Diaries (“1928–1932” 1.1.1932). Case 5. Org. “aamusta iltaan, arjet ja pyhät.”; See also EKLA EKM. 175 Collection of Oskar Loorits. 175:83:19 Letters from Martti Haavio to O. Loorits, 16/20 (9.10.1931); Klinge and Knapas, Helsingfors universitet 1640–1990. D. 3, Helsingfors universitet 1917–1990, 371. The time stretched over a longer period because Haavio and another applicant had applied for a so-called “respite time”. This meant a prolongation to the application process, during which the applicants could add merits. It was a common procedure in professorship appointment processes, and was usually half a year or one year long, given to all applicants.
Concluding comments

Both Enäjärvi and Haavio seem to have considered marriage as their primary future family alternative, but it called for various negotiations in order to arrive at a mutual agreement. The combination of family and research was at least principally more complex for Enäjärvi, whose academic ambitions were in danger of becoming hindered by marriage. At the same time, she did have models of collaborative couples at hand, although the wives in these marriages rarely reached the same recognition as independent scholars as did their husbands. Her documents demonstrate continuous considerations of suitable husbands, who preferably should be of interest when it came to career and personality. For Haavio, a suitable wife was also of utter importance, but the woman he desired wished to weigh her options and further negotiate the conditions of their relationship.

Scholarly persona is described as a concept in-between the individual and institutions and can be used to shed light on how individuals adapts to or negotiate their place in a particular institution. Consequently, Enäjärvi’s reflections upon relationships with peers give insights in a conscious process of adapting to and negotiating her place and options as a scholar within the institution of marriage. Both Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about love and affection, but Enäjärvi’s accounts have been given more space in this chapter because they include many more reflections about issues related to the combination of marriage and career than Haavio’s accounts.

The empirical material here speaks more with Enäjärvi’s voice. For Haavio, as for most other academic men, marriage and family did not mean risking a career and he had early on set his mind on wishing to marry Enäjärvi. The normality of a married academic man offers fewer personal reflections on strategies, feelings and needs to negotiate a relationship. Added to this circumstance, many of Haavio’s letters to Enäjärvi seem to have been lost. Still, I would suggest that this is a chapter on both Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s path to form a scholarly household and how it functioned to form their scholarly personae. Sharing books, sources, networks and reading each other’s in-progress research were factors that made it favourable to work with similar issues and conduct scholarship in similar ways. Moreover, Enäjärvi’s demand to be able to continue with her research after marriage put Haavio in a different and much less traditional position than many of his male peers. Although it does not seem to have had a negative effect on either his academic reputation or his possibilities to devote himself to research, it did make him a husband of a pioneering, politically and academically active woman. Further, he became part of a celebrity couple, a role that he seems not only to have welcomed voluntarily, but also a role he made efforts to reach when he worked hard and long to convince Enäjärvi to marry him.

For Enäjärvi, it appears to have been economically rational to help Haavio by giving him her research material on Leikarit. Haavio was not putting much hope into getting the professorship position, as there were more senior
scholars competing with him. He explained to Loorits that it rather was because he was hoping to acquire a formal declaration of being competent as professor, as this would better his chances to be granted scholarships later. Enäjärvi had not yet defended her doctoral dissertation and had thus no chance to get such a declaration of competence. At the time, there were only three professorships in folkloristics in all of Finland, and the neighbouring disciplines were also small. Thus, Enäjärvi and Haavio could probably not count on a similar opportunity in the near future. Supposedly, increasing Haavio’s chances for future grants was strategic for bettering the household’s economy, which in extension increased Enäjärvi’s opportunities to work on her research.

Much of the chapter’s focus has been on Enäjärvi’s possibilities and pursuits to negotiate circumstances and a persona of a scholarly wife and an independent researcher. Enäjärvi’s conscious weighing of options illustrates how challenging it was to combine marriage and career for women, or to add a wifely dimension to the scholarly persona. In this pursuit, we see that feelings could, at times, come second to career strategies, although we in no way should perceive Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s eventual marriage as a loveless one. Quite the opposite, the sources tell us of strong feelings, however not exclusively warm and affirming ones. Enäjärvi’s private documents further show that in her negotiations of a rather radical relationship and in the shaping of an academic persona, she also used more conservative discourses, emphasising her future husband’s excellence as a scholar and diminishing her own ambitions.
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8. Conclusions

Folklore studies developed into an academic discipline during the nineteenth century in response to a Romanticist search for a national spirit, followed by nationalist urges to study and construct a national identity. In newly independent Finland, folklore was a small but prominent discipline. It was respected for its research that could illuminate a national heritage to be proud of, when the country’s political history was a history of a province, first as a part of the Swedish realm, then as a Grand Duchy of Russia. Although Finland was a periphery both geographically and academically in general, it held a special status in international folklore studies. It hosted the oldest professorship in the subject, and it was there that the dominating research school, the historic-geographic school, also known as the Finnish school, was established.

In this dissertation, I studied how academic expectations and structures affected who could become acknowledged scholars in the field of folklore studies. I focussed on two folklorists, Elsa Enäjärvi and Martti Haavio, during their early years in academia, and how they reflected upon notions of good scholars and how they formed themselves and their path to academic recognition. I used the concept of scholarly persona to analyse and elaborate on different perspectives on what constituted a good folklorist and how Enäjärvi and Haavio acted in order to negotiate their place in their scholarly community.

The dissertation fills two main gaps in the research field. Firstly, it examines the early phase of academic life, that is, the years from attending university studies until obtaining a doctoral degree. Instead of approaching these early years as a background phase in a study of established scholars, this dissertation highlights how the young folklorists navigated academic structures when these structures were new to them and their future career outlooks were still open and uncertain. Symptomatic for the phase was also that the young folklorists were in acute need of information regarding expectations and requirements in their discipline. Thus, examining this phase offers insights into how the students obtained this kind of knowledge and how they responded to it.

Secondly, this dissertation contributes to the research field by conducting a systematic analysis of arenas or contexts of academic life, where scholarly personae are formed. It examines six arenas of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s academic lives: the university, the capital Helsinki, fieldwork, the
transnational exchange with Estonian academics, international scholarly communities in Western Europe, and the scholarly household. The analysis shows that these arenas activated different dimensions of the folklorists’ persona. Moreover, the analysis shows that the different arenas activated different gendered practices and expectations of scholars and academic life.

In this final chapter, I will discuss my main conclusions in relation to the research questions that I posed in the introduction. Lastly, I will discuss how the analytical concept of scholarly persona can be understood in the light of this study and what contributions the study has to offer to the field of persona studies.

**Notions of a good scholar and how to acquire knowledge of them**

When Herman Paul describes scholarly persona as being cultivated in the categories of skills, virtues and goods, he explains that skills and virtues are gained by practice and imitation, but how did scholars know what exactly to practice and imitate? How did they learn the “rules of the game”, as Heini Hakosalo calls the dynamics and structures that are typically not spelled out, yet affect scholarly careers? The private accounts of Enäjärvi and Haavio show that they did this through formal education, as well as through observing, reading and sharing.

When Enäjärvi and Haavio started out on their academic paths, the dominant research school within Finnish folklore studies was the historic-geographic method. The historic-geographic school aimed at studying cultural developments and connections through mapping how folklore had developed over time and space. Enäjärvi and Haavio’s professor, Kaarle Krohn, was one of the founders of the school and the extraordinary professor, Antti Aarne, had created the internationally applied system for categorising and presenting source material within the school. In chapters 2 and 6, I discussed how Enäjärvi and Haavio were integrated into this disciplinary milieu, impregnating many of the expectations and demands of what to study and how to be a researcher. In Herman Paul’s terms, the school demanded a range of skills such as language skills, correct practices of presenting and using folklore variants, and virtues such as being able to build beneficial networks for obtaining variants from abroad and creativity in suggesting interpretations of research problems.

In chapter 2, I specifically discussed how Enäjärvi and Haavio as students wrote about how they had observed other academics, noting their skills, character, strengths and flaws. They wrote positively about scholars who were good at talking, had a delightful character and could present grand theories,

---

especially if these supported nationalist ideologies. Typically, Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote observations about senior scholars, but a closer reading of their private accounts shows that holding a high position in academia did not necessarily mean that this scholar would serve as a role model in every aspect. For example, Enäjärvi admired Professor Vilhelm Andersen for his presentation skills, but remarked that his style probably would not lead to success in Finnish academia. Haavio wrote respectfully of Professor Kaarle Krohn’s previous achievements, his presentation skills and his delightful character, but remarked that his research was no longer keeping up with modern folk culture studies.

Enäjärvi and Haavio also made notes of reading international literature that emphasised self-discipline and personal development towards excellence. Both urged themselves to become more hard-working, more well-read and pursue excellence, but unlike Haavio, Enäjärvi also wrote about self-doubt of reaching these goals. Both Enäjärvi and Haavio also acknowledged perceptions of women as less likely than men to reach the same level of excellence and ingenuity. Haavio’s accounts corresponded to perceptions of gender differences that, according to for example Margaret Rossiter, were used as arguments to exclude women from higher education. According to these arguments, women were by nature less capable of academic thinking and work than men were. Following this logic, pushing their natural limits was not only potentially dangerous for society, but could also be harmful for women’s health. Enäjärvi’s accounts swung between this perception and a competing one, which was argued by women’s rights movement activists. According to this view, women demonstrated intellectual excellence and gained academic success less frequently than men due to social obstacles rather than natural difference. Enäjärvi’s accounts also show that the perceptions of women as less able to do intellectual work did not only pose external obstacles on women, such as legislation or association traditions that excluded women. These perceptions also affected Enäjärvi’s internal perception of herself and her possibilities. In times when Enäjärvi wrote texts expressing doubts about her possessing the necessary natural qualities for an academic career, also her other accounts concerning her future plans and alternatives followed a traditional and conventional path for middle-class women. In times when she wrote more about the absence of women in academia as a consequence of social factors, she also wrote more about her future that included an academic life or a professional career in public life.

Enäjärvi’s accounts from London in 1927 also show the consequences from a lack of identifiable scholars to observe and interact with. In chapter 6, I discussed how Enäjärvi in London encountered an international community

917 Rossiter, Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940, 2–3, 13; See also e.g. Schiebinger, The Mind Has No Sex?, 4.
918 Rossiter, Women Scientists in America. Struggles and Strategies to 1940, 51, 125–130; Rosenbeck, Har videnskaben køn?, 140.
of female academics. Enäjärvi wrote that she in Finland had not encountered many female academics, and especially not many that she was able to hold in high regard. Thus, there was a lack of compelling models for how to be a female scholar, which became apparent for her in London and by way of the experiences she had there. At Crosby Hall in London, the community of academic women was large enough to offer a variety of examples of how to be a female scholar, including how to be both feminine and scholarly credibly at the same time.

Enäjärvi’s promotion of an alternative way of being a woman in academia also demonstrates how Enäjärvi and Haavio were not only consumers of information of how to be a scholar, but also produced and circulated information about it. Enäjärvi promoted her new model through a popular travel book and through articles in newspapers and journals. Enäjärvi and Haavio also wrote articles about students and academic environments in Helsinki and Tartu, Estonia, which also contributed to a circulation of notions of what academics should or should not be like. In chapters 2 and 4, I discussed how Enäjärvi and Haavio also wrote about these matters in their private letters to peers. In these letters, the students could articulate their impressions of desirable or undesirable behaviour, character or qualities. In chapter 5, I discussed how the correspondences between Haavio and his friends Lauri Hakulinen and Oskar Loorits may illuminate how young scholars gained access to and shared rumour-based information on how senior scholars assessed scholarly merits and qualities.

Folklorists beyond academia

Enäjärvi and Haavio were public figures already during their early years at university, actively participating in cultural life and politics. In chapter 3, I discussed how Enäjärvi and Haavio were engaged in these fields and how they combined them with their academic life. One observation to make was that Enäjärvi and Haavio used similar skills and qualities for their participation in political and cultural life as they used in their academic work. They showed passion for their interests and cause, and their main working tools were reading and writing. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts imply that they did not perceive engagements in politics and culture as problematic for scholarly credibility. As Jouni Ahmajärvi has shown, it was not only acceptable, but even expected from Finnish scholars during this time to participate in the political debate.919 This was not only true for a few particular political convictions or questions. Scholars such as Edward Westermarck and Gunnar Landtman were engaged in political debates that differed from the nationalist politics and Finnish language activism that Enäjärvi and Haavio promoted.

919 Ahmajärvi, Ihmisluonto, yhteiskuntaevolutoio ja rauhanomaisen kehityksen mahdollisuudet, 214; See also Timosaari, Edward Westermarck, in particular 14, 241.
They also represented different academic disciplines and different language groups. Westermarck and Landtman were in the fields of anthropology and sociology, while Enäjärvi and Haavio were in the national disciplines. Arguably, political engagement was even less controversial in relation to the national disciplines, which had developed more or less intertwined with the national awakening and nationalist politics, and were thus easily combinable with a folklorist’s persona in the early twentieth century.

Like politics, cultural engagements appear also to have been easy to combine with academic life. Writing articles and editing journals and books gave publicity and an income, which academic work rarely did. However, although engagement in cultural work seems to have been highly acceptable, its status was seemingly lower than that of politics and academic achievements. Enäjärvi, in particular, wrote frequently about wasting precious time on smaller projects in contemporary culture instead of using it for research.

The public life also included participation in associations and societies. Margaret Rossiter has shown how many associations in the early twentieth century excluded women either categorically from all access and membership or from the activities that had most impact on the members’ careers. In this way, female academics were excluded from crucial networking opportunities, scholarships and meriting positions. An interesting observation from Enäjärvi’s accounts was that she from 1918 to 1932 did not write about any of these excluding practices, although it is evident that she was denied access to several groups that Haavio had access to, some more obviously than others due to her gender. Enäjärvi could not become a member of the Academic Karelia Society, which had a high impact on national politics and could be an entrance to the inner circles of elite networks. Apparently, Haavio was also invited membership to associations such as the Kalevala Society on formal merits that Enäjärvi also had, but which did not grant her access.265 In chapter 7, I discussed that within this excluding framework, it was an advantage for Enäjärvi to be in a relationship with Haavio, as she could gain access to information and networks that the associations offered through him.

However, Enäjärvi also wrote about social disadvantages that came with being Haavio’s partner. In her accounts, Haavio was repeatedly described as possessive and jealous, trying to hinder her from forming and nurturing professional networks in the often male-dominated domains that she was associated with. She also described Haavio as reluctant to participate in social activities that people in their position were expected to participate in. When Haavio and Enäjärvi were a couple, his reluctance to socialise put her at risk at being be marginalised or excluded from the circles that she found it desirable to be a part of.

In chapter 5, I discussed how Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s interest in Estonian-Finnish collaboration was both an ideal and in practice entangled with their
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participation in Finnish nationalist politics, contemporary culture and folk culture studies. As founding members of the Estonian-Finnish Student Club, Enäjärvi and Haavio were at the centre of arranging both political and social events and exchanges between like-minded people on both sides of the Gulf of Finland. These people were authors, academics and politicians. Like Enäjärvi and Haavio, many belonged to more than one of these categories. Exchanges with Estonian peers expanded Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s networks, and could be utilised both within and beyond academic projects. Some of the friendship ties were tight and long-lasting, developing parallel to Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s own career paths.

Establishing a place in the scholarly community

Societies and associations were not only arenas for political and cultural life, but also arenas for scholarly life. Much of the scholarly debate and presentation of research occurred at associations, not least at the Finnish Literature Society. Participating in the associations’ activities was also important for meeting people. For students, they served as gateways of contact with senior scholars and aided students to become members of the community of folk culture scholars.

In this context, thus, no clear-cut distinction can be made between what is in and what is beyond the university. The overlapping proximity between societies, homes and university was also not only a matter of similar practices taking place in these arenas but could also be a matter of location. When Haavio during his first months at university tried to find information about what he was supposed to study, his search lead him to Dr Emil Aukusti Tunkelo’s home door, from where he was ushered into the neighbouring Finnish Literature Society’s festive hall to wait. After his experience of searching, nervously approaching Tunkelo, anxiously waiting for what would happen to him in the festive hall, and eventually being welcomed warmly and given the information he needed, Haavio wrote to his friend Lauri Hakulinen about his knowledge of academic structures with a new authority; that of an insider.

The societies were also important for students as they provided grants to fund collection journeys. In chapter 4, I discussed how collection journeys were important practices of integration into the scholarly community of folklorists. Collection journeys became shared experiences between scholars in the national disciplines and the students told their friends and family about what they encountered and how they overcame challenges during their journeys. As observed in chapter 2, fieldwork was also acknowledged as an explicit merit in folkloristics. The first time Haavio applied for a professorship in 1932, one of the assessors emphasised that Väinö Salminen, the applicant who eventually was appointed professor, had extensive fieldwork experience.
Collection work was also an opportunity for the students to demonstrate or develop the particular skills demanded of a folklorist. Some of these skills were practical, even mechanical, such as writing notes and copying collected material onto cards that could be preserved in the receiving archive. Other skills were more bound to character, such as ways of approaching and interviewing informants that would result in a large amount of high-quality material. The skills and virtues in the field also had a bodily dimension, as the collectors could demonstrate how they bicycled through challenging terrains or carried on with their work despite less conventional accommodation solutions. Irma-Riitta Järvinen has pointed out that female collectors’ travel and travel arrangements made them enter a grey (or red) zone of what was considered appropriate for women. In Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts, this became visible in the two students’ different ways of writing about their travels. Enäjärvi was restrictive about telling her family about these challenges that were associated with travelling, and not least with solo travelling, while Haavio told about his adventures to family and friends alike.

Collection journeys were also opportunities to demonstrate a folklorist’s gaze on the object of study: folk culture and the rural people, who were considered to be the conveyors of folk culture. I discussed this practice in dialogue with the theoretical approaches of Johannes Fabian, Regina Bendix, Lotte Tarkka and Pertti Anttonen. According to them, folklorists and anthropologists claim scholarly authority by establishing a difference between themselves and their informants. In their field accounts, Enäjärvi and Haavio established their place in their scholarly community by positioning themselves as the modern, civilised, scholarly observers of their informants, who, in contrast, were portrayed as traditional and uneducated. At the same time, Enäjärvi and Haavio were students in an academic field that emphasised how it served a national good, why they also had to highlight how they shared the same, honourable heritage as the rural people they met in the field. I argued that Fabian’s, Bendix’s, Tarkka’s and Anttonen’s approaches are also translatable into analyses of persona forming processes, in that one building block of scholarly persona is that of establishing and vocalizing a relationship to the objects of study in a way that corresponds to the scholarly community’s perceptions of their discipline’s role, aim and object of study.

**Formative international connections**

In the history of science and scholarship, academic travel has been studied as a means of accumulating, spreading and circulating knowledge and methods. Studies in scholarly persona have also recognised this knowledge-transferring function of academic travel, in which the travelling scholar transfers knowledge, ideals and practices from one place to another. In addition, academic travel has been emphasised as having a more formative effect on the
individual travelling scholar’s persona. Partly, travel adds to the scholar’s persona as a merit, an experience that as a category has status. Partly, the journey adds impressions, inspiration and expanded skills and knowledge.

In chapter 5, I discussed the special connection between Finnish and Estonian students and scholars. Several factors contributed to the frequent student and researcher exchanges. Some factors were material and practical. The university town Tartu was situated relatively close to Finland, and easily and cost-efficiently accessible. There was also an ideological factor, which had practical implications. Estonians and Finns were considered “kindred peoples” that shared heritage and folk culture. The many similarities and comparisons to be made between Estonian and Finnish folklore encouraged collaboration. Both the (pan)nationalist politics and folk culture studies had emphasised the study of Finnic and Finno-Ugric languages. Besides being ideological and academic, the language training this implied made the exchange between students on both sides of the Baltic Sea easily accessible also regarding language training.

The practical and ideological factors may have motivated and enabled much of the interaction between Finns and Estonians, but the main driving force behind the maintenance of the collaboration was apparently one of personal affections. With continued academic discussions, sharing of literature and sources and student and researcher exchanges between the two countries, the disciplines and research were to a large extent developed together.

From the transnational connection between Estonian and Finnish students and scholars, in chapter 6, I widened my scope of analysis to a broader, international context. The international collaborations and contacts were integrated parts of the field of folklore studies, and many of the practices and dynamics were similar to those observed in the Estonian–Finnish exchange. Senior scholars had established networks and systems to manage the requirements of the historic-geographic method they established. Enäjärvi and Haavio utilised correspondences and intermediating acquaintances for their international collaborations and comparisons, but it was nevertheless crucial to establish and nurture the connections through personal and social interaction. Younger folklorists utilised their seniors’ contacts and networks, but were also actively forming new connections, which contributed to the discipline too. Haavio’s international connections during his early academic years were mainly mediated by Professor Kaarle Krohn, a network that predominantly connected Estonian, Nordic and German scholars. Enäjärvi was also helped by these connections, but in addition to this, she directed her interest towards the English scene of folk culture studies, which was much less common at the time.
The hopes and risks of being a scholarly couple

In chapter 7, I discussed the scholarly household as an arena and a setting that formed scholars. In this part, I was particularly inspired by historical research on couples in academia. This research has highlighted the contributions made by wives who often have not been acknowledged historically, but whose contributions have often been ascribed to their husbands. In addition, focusing on couples offers viewpoints on gendered structures in academia and in society more generally, as well as on the collaborative dimensions of research. Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s cases can be seen to reflect many of the gendered structures that have been identified by previous research. At the same time, the private documents in focus illuminate nuances and particularities in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s personal situation.

Enäjärvi’s accounts illustrate many of the dilemmas of whether or not to marry that women in her time faced. In the early twentieth century, highly educated women were generally expected to abandon their careers after marriage. One strategy to continue with research was to marry a fellow scholar. This could allow future research, but typically also reduced the acknowledgement of one’s contribution to that of a helpmate or qualified assistant. However, remaining unmarried meant challenging social norms of acceptable behaviour for women. Since academic social events were formed around an expectation of the scholar as a married man, unmarried scholars were often excluded from dinners or other social events that expected the participants to join in couples. When Enäjärvi weighed her options, she expressed a conviction that women would be happier as married than unmarried. Thus, she appears to have chosen between either ending her career or to marry a man with whom she could combine family life and a career.

For both Enäjärvi and Haavio, the question of finding a partner and settling for that person was a matter that comprised between rational and emotional elements. However, in regard to future possibilities to exercise control over career and income, Enäjärvi’s decision had more at stake than Haavio’s decision had. Her choice was therefore to a larger extent based on rational deliberations and strategic moves, while Haavio’s writings on the topic show that his choice was predominantly based on emotions. Interestingly, Enäjärvi in this regard ascribed to what at the time was considered masculine character
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traits, such as rational thinking, while emotional decision-making, with its feminine connotations, was left to Haavio.

This apparent reversal of gender roles may be explained by the fact that Haavio faced fewer material or practical risks in getting married. However, Haavio’s choice was not without its own gendered consequences. When he chose a life with Enäjärvi, he also chose a life as a husband to a publicly acknowledged, independent and relatively successful woman, as well as an individual active in the same academic field as himself. Enäjärvi’s letters repeatedly affirmed that Haavio’s role in the marriage would be the more prominent one in terms of academia. They show that Haavio’s choice put him at risk of losing “masculinity points” if his success or prominence was overshadowed by or compared to his wife, and that both Enäjärvi and Haavio were aware of this. However, marriage was not only a matter of risk. As an institution, it also carried advantages. The household became a place for Enäjärvi and Haavio to discuss research and solve problems together. Moreover, both benefitted materially from establishing a bond with a peer, although we can see that many times the career benefits seems to have been more to Haavio’s favour.

The timeframe of this dissertation stretches to the year before Enäjärvi and Haavio had their first child. I did not choose this end point because of disinterest in how family life affected Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s academic lives. Quite the opposite: I set the limit because a wider frame would have expanded the study vastly. I believe future research into ways of combining family and academic careers in scholarly households would offer important insights into the history of science and knowledge. A later timeframe would supposedly also give different results in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s case. One reason for why their early academic phase is interesting to study is that this was a time when both still were on about the same level of academic degrees, merits and recognition. If we measure academic careers in titles, positions and publications, Haavio’s academic career began to develop more quickly than Enäjärvi’s after the early 1930s. Thus, discussing Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s circumstances and accounts in their early phase offered for different comparisons than a later timeframe would have offered. Thanks to the early timeframe, Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts showed reflections of a more corresponding situation between the two of them. At the same time, the accounts illuminated both individual differences and differences that previous research has identified as typically gendered circumstances for women in academia. In the dissertation, I could also show that marriage and family life had an impact on the two folklorists already in this early phase of academic life. Haavio’s, and in particular Enäjärvi’s, accounts about prospective partners and family life outlooks, showed how marriage and family life as categories already affected the junior scholars’ lives and career visions even before they actually married. Similar to Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s career prospects, marriage was during most of this early phase an uncertain factor that they had to take into account when they navigated the academic arenas.
Reflections upon scholarly persona

In this dissertation, I studied how Elsa Enäjärvi and Martti Haavio as students and junior folklorists acted in their pursuit to become recognised as scholars in their academic field. This early phase of academic lives is rarely given dedicated attention in research on scholarly persona, but instead studied more in terms of a background. With my dissertation, I demonstrated that this phase is interesting for the study of on-going processes of persona formation. For the young Enäjärvi and Haavio, this was a delicate phase, as their careers still remained open and uncertain, and they sought how to obtain information about what it took to be a folklorist, how to adapt to the discipline’s models and how they could negotiate alternative career paths when needed.

In my examination of Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts of themselves as scholars, I discussed how different approaches to scholarly persona illuminate different dimensions of scholarly life and the scholars. Most frequently, I discussed how Herman Paul’s and Mineke Bosch’s approaches can be used to understand different aspects of persona in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s reflections of themselves as folklorists. Paul’s identification of skills, virtues and goods as building blocks of persona are helpful tools to identify changes and alternative ways of being scholars within or between contexts. Bosch’s identity-based persona approach proved to be valuable for highlighting processes of shaping the self in relation to influences and the resources that individuals possess. Moreover, using Bosch’s approach illuminated how the scholarly self is a compilation of practices and personal qualities that do not need to be the same for all scholars in a particular context, as long as they become accepted by the community.

In addition to elaborations of different approaches to the concept of scholarly persona, my dissertation also offered new viewpoints on how the process of forming scholarly persona can be illuminated. Analysing Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts of academic life, and in particular their private documents, showed that persona formation can be viewed in terms of establishing relationships. This practice was most visible in Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts of countryside people and field journeys. However, their persona formation can be viewed from the accounts of other relationships too. Enäjärvi and Haavio maintained a distance from certain practices, behaviour, appearances and political convictions, by writing negatively about scholars or students who represented dubious positions. Other modes of behaviour were described in positive, admiring or in identifying terms. When Enäjärvi and Haavio wrote about themselves and others in academia and in the field, they articulated observations and notions of what scholars were like, and could, should or should not be like. These descriptions of others can be understood as more revealing about the authors than those who they described. In their normative accounts about others, Enäjärvi and Haavio did not only describe the observed scholar, but they also positioned themselves in relation to these people and their ways’ of being scholars.
An interesting observation to make from Enäjärvi’s and Haavio’s accounts was that many of the decisions and plans that concerned academic careers were made based on emotional considerations. Haavio argued to his friend Lauri Hakulinen that subjects of study primarily should be chosen according to interest, and his folklore studies were driven by passion for the topic. The study also showed that friendships and joys were driving forces in the students’ decision-making. Enäjärvi also wrote about a keen interest in folklore studies, although she also envisioned a future in literary history. Overall, Enäjärvi wrote more often than Haavio about rational reasoning for career and study choices. This can be understood in relation to previous research on new or minority groups in academia, who also tend, both historically and contemporarily, to take fewer and smaller risks in their educational choices. Haavio’s place in academia was not secure, but it stood on a more conventionally safe ground than Enäjärvi’s. It appears that Haavio in this sense could afford more emotional decision-making.

It would be interesting for future research to study more in depth the role of emotions in persona constructions and academic life. Perhaps these questions could be approached in terms of Barbara Rosenwein’s concept of emotional communities or William Reddy’s concept of emotional regimes. A better understanding of the function of emotions and the spectres of desired, approved or disapproved emotions within particular scholarly communities would undoubtedly give us interesting insights into how these communities work and, by extension, what consequences they have for knowledge production. Moreover, the concept of emotional communities would, supposedly, not only work well for studying particular disciplines, but also for further investigations of the various arenas of knowledge production.


Där forskare blir till. Könade arenor för personaformering i finsk folkloristik, 1918–1932


vid universitetet år 1920 och efter flera år av kamratskap varvat med romantiska relationer, gifte de sig år 1929.


Avhandlingen huvudfrågeställning är hur Enäjärvi och Haavio agerade för att nå erkännande som vetenskapligt trovärdiga folklorister och hur de reflekterade över sig själva och andra som forskare, samt hur flera av dessa uppfattningar om vad som krävdes av folklorister även var könade. Huvudfrågeställningen delas vidare in i fem delfrågeställningar:

1. Vilka explicita och implicita krav, förväntningar och ideal om studier, forskning och forskare reflekterade Haavio och Enäjärvi om och hur erhöll och delade de denna information?
2. På vilka sätt aktiverades dessa krav, förväntningar och ideal i offentlig verksamhet utanför universitetet?
3. Hur formade Haavio och Enäjärvi en plats åt sig i sitt akademiska samfund genom disciplinspecifika praktiker utanför universitetet?
4. Vilken roll spelade internationella och transnationella kontakter och resor Enäjärvi och Haavio som forskare och vilken roll spelade dessa kontakter för hur disciplinen formades?
5. Hur påverkades Haavios och Enäjärvis etablering i deras disciplin av att de bildade ett par? Hur reflekterade de över valet av partner och äktenskap?

Inspirerad av metoder utvecklade av den så kallade nya biografin, söker avhandlingen svar på frågorna genom en närläsning av privata och offentliga dokument om och av Enäjärvi och Haavio om implicita och explicita förväntningar och krav på forskare: såväl deras forskning som deras personliga egenskaper och anknytningar. Huvudsakligen används deras dagböcker och privata brev till varandra, familjemedlemmar och studiekompisar, men undersökningen baserar sig även på artiklar, böcker, utlåtanden och ansökningar.

Tidsmässigt avgränsas avhandlingen till Enäjärvis och Haavios första år vid universitetet, från att de började studera till deras doktorspromovering, från 1918 till 1932. Den här fasen är intressant att studera eftersom den är genomsyrad av behov av information om vad som gäller för att klara sig inom den unga forskarens vetenskapliga fält samt ett aktivt självformerande för att
skapa sig en plats inom det akademiska samfundet. Trots det står den tidiga fasen av en akademisk karriär sällan i fokus för undersökningar om hur forskare som individer uppfattar akademinis förväntningar och praktiker och hur de agerar i förhållande till dessa. I allmänhet har tidigare forskning antingen undersökt akademiska strukturer genom undersökningar av större grupper eller så har den första delen av akademiska karriärer behandlats som en slags bakgrundsfas till det egentliga akademiska livet.


Uppfattningar om medfödda egenskaper hos goda forskare är intressant ur ett genusperspektiv. Forskning om genus i vetenskap har visat att många egenskaper som förknippats med vetenskaplighet har samtidigt förknippats med maskulinitet och att denna association har använts för att utesluta kvinnor från högre utbildning och forskning. Avhandlingen visar att både Enäjärvi och Haavio beskrev mån som generellt mer kvalificerade för akademiska studier och forskning. Medan Haavio beskrev detta som en självklarhet, uttryckte Enäjärvi en ambivalentens över huruvida det berodde på medfödda egenskaper eller uppostran. Inga av Haavios skrifter uttryckte tveksamhet över hans
lämplighet för en forskarbana, medan Enäjärvi betydligt oftare ifrågasatte huruvida hennes personlighet lämpade sig för en akademisk karriär—hon kritiserade sig återkommande för att vara lat, osäker och benägen till att låta sig frestas av mindre uppdrag i stället för att fokusera på sin doktorsavhandling. En analys av tidningsartiklar om Enäjärvis disputation visade att kontrasteringen mellan vetenskap som en manlig sfär och Enäjärvis kvinnlighet även var ett återkommande narrativ i pressen, såväl hos manliga som hos kvinnliga skribenter.


Kapitel 3 undersöktes huvudstaden Helsingfors som en arena där akademiker deltog som en del av en kulturell och politisk intelligentsia. Det var även en arena för akademiska och semiakademiska sällskap. Dessa var viktiga sammanhang för folklivsforskare. För studenterna och de yngre forskarna var universitetet nästan uteslutande en plats för föreläsningar och skriftliga tentamina. Seminarier, presentationer, arkivarbete, studier, muntliga tentamina samt samtal om forskning och studier skedde vid bibliotek, i professorers hem, i arkiv och vid de olika föreningarna och sällskapen, framför allt vid Finska Litteratursällskapet. Sällskapen erbjuder även stipendier och i vissa fall arbetstillfällen, vilket hade stor betydelse i en tid då universitetsämnen som folkloristik sällan anställde mer personal än en stolsprofessor, och undervisningen huvudsakligen delades mellan en stolsprofessor och docenter, som undervisade på timbasis. Sällskapen var även platser för nätverkande, där studenter och forskare kunde träffa varandra under mindre formella omständigheter, liksom även utländska gäster. På så sätt var de även viktiga förmedlingspunkter av information.

Enäjärvi och Haavio var minst lika kända som offentliga personer i kultur och politik som akademiker, under den undersökta perioden till och med mer kända. Haavio deltog i den inre kretsen av den högernationalistiska och rysslandsfientliga Akademiska Karelenförbundet. Han och Enäjärvi var också

En intressant observation var frånvaron av reflektioner om könade praktiker vid akademiska och politiska sällskap. Trots att tidigare forskning visat att föreningar och sällskap uteslut kvinnor genom ett flertal skrivna och oskrivna regler, och att dessa hade stora konsekvenser för kvinnors akademiska avancemang, och trots att Enäjärvi i retrospektiv skrev om sådana uteslutande praktiker under sin tidiga tid vid universitetet, saknas beskrivningar av detta i hennes samtida texter.

I kapitel 4 undersökte Enäjärvis och Haavios resor på landsbygden och hur dessa fungerade som insocialiserande praktiker för folklorister. Under början av 1900-talet var det vanligt att såväl akademiskt utbildade folklivsforskare som amatörer samlade in dialektmaterial och folklore på landsbygden. Insamlingen uppmuntrades till med nationalistiska argument om att samla in och bevara folkkultur, som man befarade att skulle försvinna i och med urbanisering och modernisering. Man menade att man på landsbygden kunde finna folklig kultur, som gav insyn i arkaisk, äkta finsk kultur.

Undersökningen visade hur insamlingsresor dels var tillfällen där studenter kunde lära sig praktiska färdigheter i att samla material inom sitt ämne, men att de även fungerade som initiationsriter för tillträdande till det folkloristiska samfundet. Dels kunde studenter visa att de klarade av att röra sig på fältet och de beskrev ofta om sina utmanande resor längs svårtillgängliga vägar, och hur de utstod hetta, kyla, regn och storm. Dels utstrålade deras berättelser från landsbygden även begeistring över uppdraget och de nationalromantiska vyerna. Enäjärvis och Haavios beskrivningar av dessa erfarenheter skilde sig genom att Enäjärvi var mer selektiv med vem hon delade information om sina mindre konventionella researrangemang och verkar även ha undvikit sådana till en större grad än Haavio. Hennes brev hem understrekt att hennes resor var trygga och trevliga och att hon övernattade på bekväma och säkra ställen. Haavios brev snarare stoltserade med erfarenheter om att övernatta utomhus.
eller i lador och svåra reseomständigheter. Den här skillnaden kan förstås i ljuset av tidigare forskning om hur vetenskapliga resor och fältarbete ofta har förssatt kvinnor i delikata situationer, då verksamheten varit manligt kodat och att lämpligheten för kvinnor att delta i flera av praktikerna ifrågasattats. Undersökningen visade hur Enäjärvi tog till olika strategier för att kunna delta i de för disciplinen så symboliskt och meritmässigt viktiga praktikerna utan att det skulle framstå som olämpligt beteende.

Vid sidan om praktiska erfarenheter gav också resorna på fältet tillfällen för studenterna att framhäva sin akademiska expertis i relation till deras studieobjekt, landsbygdsbefolkningen, vilket studenterna framför allt kommuniserade till sina studiekompisar. Analysen av beskrivningarna om fältet och landsbygdsbefolkningen visade även en intressant kombination av identifiering och förfrämjande. Å ena sidan beskrev de sin omgivning i idealiserande ordlag om äkta finskhet, en kategori som de själva förknippte sig med. Å andra sidan skapade de en distans mellan sig själva som akademiskt utbildade folklorister och lokalbefolkningen som folkloristens studieobjekt. Denna distans konstruerades genom att framhäva lokalbefolkningens lägre civilisationsnivå, isolation från omvärlden och brist på utbildning. Studenterna framhävde även sin egen expertis genom beskrivningar om graden av autenticitet och vetenskapliga relevans av den folklorn de påträffade samt av det vetenskapliga värdet som informanter bidrog med.

Kapitel 5 och 6 behandlade Enäjärvis och Haavios resor och kontakter utomlands. De hade allra mest utbyte med estniska studenter och kollegor, ett utbyte som drevs av såväl politiska som praktiska orsaker. Det rådde i Finland ett allmänt intresse för finskbesläktade folk, med vilka man strävade efter att öka politiskt och kulturellt utbyte, men även i vissa fall territoriella sammanslagningar eller övertaganden. Utbytet med Estland var praktiskt på grund av dess nära läge, en tids visumfrihet och förhållandevis låga kostnader för de resande. Samarbete mellan finska och estniska föreningar och studentorganisationer gjorde även logistiken enkel för resande studenter och forskare. Enäjärvis och Haavios beskrivningar om det estniska utbytet visade att de uppfattade utbytet samtidigt som fruktbart för deras studier och forskning och som rolig och vänskaplig samvaro. De beskrev även att de uppfattade att resorna utvidgade deras perspektiv och utvecklade dem som personer. I de kamratliga sammanhagen knöt studenterna nära, förtroliga och varaktiga vänsskapsband, som även kom att påverka deras akademiska karriärer. Samarbetet mellan de estniska och finska vännerna och kollegorna ledde också till att finsk och estnisk kunskapsproduktion i folkloristik och närliggande ämnen var i konstant dialog och utvecklades på likadana sätt.

Kontakterna med akademiker i andra europeiska länder riktades framför allt till de nordiska länderna samt till Tyskland, som i början av 1900-talet ännu var ett vetenskapligt centrum. Utbytet präglades av den historisk-geografiska metoden, som förutsatte internationellt samarbete i form av utbyte av information om arkivmaterial och även kopior ur materialet. På basis av de
bevarade brevkorrespondenserna, hade Enäjärvi under den undersökta tiden vidare internationella akademiska nätverk och mer frekvent brevväxling än Haavio.


Det sista empiriska kapitlet handlade om hemmet som en akademisk arena. Både Enäjärvi och Haavio skrev om valet av partner som en fråga om känslor och rationella överväganden, men analysen visade att Enäjärvis beslutsfattande i frågan grundade sig i betydligt högre grad på rationella motiv. Skillnaden kan förstås i ljuset av att hon som kvinna hade betydligt högre risker att marginaliseras från en vetenskaplig karriär än Haavio. Enäjärvi beskrev samma dilemma som tidigare forskning visat att kvinnor i akademin mötte mer generellt. Att förblå ogift kunde leda till marginalisering socialt, dels för att de akademiska praktikerna ofta arrangerades med utgångspunkten att forskarna var gifta, dels för att kvinnors sedlighet lättare ifrågasattes om de förblev ogifta. Samtidigt var äktenskapet också en risk, då det fanns praktiska, sociala och i vissa fall även juridiska hinder för gifta kvinnor och mödrar att fortsätta med lönat arbete och forskning.

Ett intressant resultat av analysen var att Enäjärvi i den här frågan nyttjade till sin fördel sådana egenskaper, som tidigare forskning visat att har varit egenskaper som använts för argument för att ifrågasätta kvinnors vetenskapliga trovärdighet. Liksom diskuterades ovan, uppfattades kvinnor i vetenskap stereotypt som manhaftiga och oattraktiva. Till en viss grad var det en strategi för kvinnor att förkroppsliga sådana egenskaper, då det samtidigt hävdades att egenskaper som uppfattades som kvinnliga—såsom att vara ödmjuk, undvika konflikter, en mjuk framtoning, känslomässighet—inte lämpade sig för vetenskaplig forskning. Enäjärvi verkar ha lyckats kombinera ett förhållandevis gott anseende som akademiker med en kvinnlig, charmig och attraktiv framtoning. Undersökningsen visade att hon därför hade möjlighet, och uppfattade sig själv ha möjlighet, att välja bland partnerkandidater för att nå bästa möjliga framtidsutsikter, och att hon även
trogid på sig att förhandla med Haavio om hundrat deras förhållande och äktenskap skulle bli.


Avhandlingen hävdade att personaformering även kan förstås som ett skapande av förhållanden till andra på liknande sätt som postkoloniala studier har observerat hur förfrämligande av den Andra är ett sätt att framställa sig själv och sin egen tillhörighet. Inte minst kom detta fram i studenternas framställningar av landsbygdsbefolkningen och sina studieobjekt. För att skapa sig legitimitet som folklorister, beskrev Enäjärvit och Haavio dessa å ena sidan i idealiserande ordlag som medlemmar av samma nationella gemenskap som folkloristerna. Å andra sidan beskrev de landsbygdsbefolkningen som tillhörande en annan, lägre civilisationsnivå än de själva.
Bägge beskrivningarna var även sätt att framhäva sin egen kompetens som folklorist. De första visade att man kunde identifiera relevanta studieobjekt (den nationella traditionen och utomnationella traditionen), medan det senare var ett sätt att åberopa en hierarki som gav legitimitet och auktoritet att undersöka och skapa vetenskaplig kunskap om forskningsobjektet.
Appendix A

Original text of Haavio’s and Enäjärvi’s engagement contract.  

Kihlaussopimus

Mennessämme kihloihin 1.1.28 teemme me Elsa ja Martti seuraavan sopimuksen, jota lupaamme kunniamme ja omantunomme nimessä noudattaa.


2. Elsa esiintyy aina rehellisenä. Samoin Martti.


4. Elsa ei tule Martin asuntoon teatterin jälkeen eikä yleensä jälkeen klo 10 illalla.

5. Elsa välttää myöhästymistä sovituisissa kohtauksissa Martin kanssa.


Elsa ja Martti liittävät kohtalonsa yhteen toivossa ja pyrkien siihen että kumpikin ihmisenä kehittyisi mahdollisimman korkeaan suuntaan. Tässä pyrkimyksessä tukee toistaa ystävällisellä ja iloisella käytöksellä, keskinäisellä ymmärtämyksellä, myötämielisyydellä ja avuliaisuudella.

Elsa ja Martti lupaavat rakastaa toisiaan myötä- ja vastoinvälistä.

Helsingissä uudenvuodenaattona 1927

Elsa Enäjärvi       Martti Haavio

---
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