

**Sustaining Kinship in Wartime: Finnish-Hungarian  
Contacts in the Light of the Yearbook *Heimotyö*  
(1937–1944)**

**H. K. RIIKONEN**

1. Finnish-Hungarian contacts have so far been studied in a number of books and articles. In Hungary, they were described as early as 1943, in a book entitled *Finn-magyar kapcsolatok* by Dezső Gaskó and Iván Nagy.<sup>1</sup> Some forty years later, Viljo Tervonen and Irene Wichmann compiled a bibliography of Finnish-Hungarian cultural contacts up to 1981, including over 1900 items. Most book-length studies, however, date from the 1980s and 1990s. The collection of essays *Ystävät sukulaiset*, a semi-official publication, was edited by Sara Karig in 1984. This book, covering Finnish-Hungarian contacts over a period of one hundred years, was published simultaneously in Hungary under the name *Barátok rokonok. Tanulmányok a finn-magyar kulturális kapcsolatok történetéből*. Yrjö Varpio and Lajos Szopori Nagy have studied literary contacts between Finland and Hungary (*Suomen ja Unkarin kirjalliset suhteet vuosina 1920–1986*, 1990); like *Ystävät sukulaiset*, this work too was also published in Hungary (*Ismerkedő ismerősök*). In Hungary, Emil Koren chronicled contacts between the Finnish and Hungarian Lutheran churches in his book *Testvéreink Északon. A finn-magyar egyházi kapcsolatok története* (1986). His book was then expanded and translated into Finnish by Martti Voipio, under the name *Sukukansojen uskonyhteys* (1988).

The most recent publication, *Folia Hungarica 7: Yhteyksiä*, edited by Mikko Cajanus and Sándor Csúcs, is a collection of essays covering various areas of contact, especially since the Second World War. It is also worth noting that in 1988-1991 an empirical comparative study of Finns and Hungarians as readers was carried out,

as a joint Finnish-Hungarian project. The results have been reported by Yrjö Varpio (*Finns and Hungarians as Readers*, 1991).

Despite these and some other studies, there are still some gaps. We might ask, for instance, whether the often repeated claims concerning diminished contacts between Finland and Hungary during World War II are in fact reliable. In the collection of essays *Ystävät sukulaiset*, Jaakko Numminen, Finnish Undersecretary for Education, maintains that the war put a stop to any cultural exchange on a regular basis, although there were occasional contacts.<sup>2</sup> The same view has been repeated by Jari P. Havia in an article published ten years later.<sup>3</sup> Such views are certainly not the whole truth. Even the essays in *Ystävät sukulaiset* themselves offer information about diverse contacts. This is quite understandable: when many doors were closed to Finland during the war, contacts with Hungary and Hungarians were cherished with special care, especially at a time when relations with Estonians became more difficult to sustain.<sup>4</sup> But even more important was the need to break down the isolation threatening Hungary as a result of the Peace of Trianon. Cultural exchange was an opportunity for Hungary to establish contacts with the outside world; one of the results which were achieved was the agreement over cultural exchange between Finland and Hungary in 1937.<sup>5</sup> This agreement was one of the landmarks in Finnish-Hungarian contacts. It is not a mere coincidence that the text of the agreement was published *in extenso* in the first volume of the *Heimotyö* yearbook. The flourishing contacts between Finland, Estonia and Hungary were, as Aladár Bán suggests, also due to an important similarity in their history; they had all become independent in the First World War.<sup>6</sup> The aftermath of the war, however, also had its darker side. For Hungary, it meant a peace whereby it lost a considerable part of its territory. For Finland it meant the exclusion of the population living in present-day Russian Karelia, which led to the so called *heimo* (folk) wars of 1919–1922.<sup>7</sup>

From the Finnish point of view, the most spectacular event in Finnish-Hungarian contacts was the visit to Hungary by Edwin Linkomies in 1943. Linkomies visited Hungary in his capacity of Second Vice-Speaker of the Finnish Parliament, and as Professor of Roman literature. In his memoirs, published in 1970 but written in 1947–1948, Linkomies tells us at length about his visit.<sup>8</sup> As a conservative, Linkomies was able to appreciate the worldview and

values of his hosts. His general judgement of Hungarians, which he presents as a conclusion to his visit, may be the most impressive description of Magyars ever written by a Finn.<sup>9</sup> It should also be remembered that in 1942, a book called *Unkarin kirja (The Book of Hungary)* was published. Edited by Väinö Musikka and Sándor Kulai, this was an extensive (about 470 pages) and diversified introduction to Hungary, its people, history and culture. In Hungary, correspondingly, some important books and articles about Finland were published.<sup>10</sup> In the following year, 1943, one of the greatest works of Hungarian literature, Imre Madách's *Az ember tragédiája (The Tragedy of Man)*, was published in Toivo Lyy's masterly translation.<sup>11</sup> It is one of the ironies of literary history that the most extensive Finnish work of fiction published in Hungary in that year, 1943, was Unto Seppänen's *Markku ja hänen sukunsa (The House of Markku)*, English translation by Kenneth Kaufman in 1940), a lengthy family trilogy, which can hardly be regarded as a classic of Finnish literature. In Hungary, Seppänen's novel (translated by István Atányi and Lajos Garam) was entitled *Az orosz határon (On the Border of Russia)*, with the consequence – as Lajos Szopori Nagy<sup>12</sup> reminds us – that after the war and up until 1988 the book was available only to accredited scholars in the Hungarian National Library.

Linkomies's visit to Hungary, the publication of *Unkarin kirja* and Lyy's translation of Madách marked the culmination of Finnish-Hungarian contacts during the war, but we should not forget that contacts occurred on many levels and in many forms. The intensity of Finnish-Hungarian relations during the war is witnessed by the yearbook *Heimotyö*, which was issued in seven volumes during 1937–1944 (some 1050 pages in all). The yearbook was edited by F. A. Heporauta and Väinö Musikka, and was published by the Suomalais-ugrilaisen kulttuuritoimikunnan Suomen osasto (Finnish division of the Finno-Ugric Cultural Committee). By way of comparison it is worth mentioning that at the same time in Germany the *Ungarische Jahrbücher* had become the organ of the German-Hungarian Society (Die Deutsch-Ungarische Gesellschaft). The latter, however, was on a more scholarly basis, consisting mostly of scholarly articles and reviews. It paid considerable attention to cultural relationships between Hungary and other countries. It often

discussed books or problems which had one or another connection with Finland.<sup>13</sup>

In the present study, I am to describe the *Heimotyö* Yearbook as an organ for *heimo*<sup>14</sup> work, especially in relation to Finnish-Hungarian contacts. It should be kept in mind that *Heimotyö* was by no means the only organ devoted to Finnish-Hungarian contacts. During 1941–1944 the Suomen Heimotyöseura (Finnish Society for Kinship Work) published a magazine entitled *Heimokansa* ('Kindred Folk'), containing news about the Finno-Ugrian peoples, language courses, reviews and essays. During 1942–43, the Suomalaisuuden Liitto (Finnish League) published the magazine *Finnország*<sup>15</sup>, the purpose of which was to present the achievements of Finnish science and culture to Hungarian readers. By way of comparison I shall pay some attention to these publications as well. I do not include in the present study the *Suomen Heimo*, the organ of the Academic Karelia Society, which was mainly concerned with the most closely related Finno-Ugrian peoples living in Karelia. To some extent the three publications, *Heimotyö*, *Heimokansa* and *Finnország*, tended to overlap. It is also easily observed that the same names often occur on the pages of all these publications. The charges of clannishness which have sometimes been raised<sup>16</sup>, are not altogether unjustified.

2. The very title of the *Heimotyö* yearbook reveals one basic ideological concept, that of the *heimo*. Covering a wide and vague semantic field, it is a term which is difficult to translate into English (see note 14). A common English translation is kinship (cf. the German translation *Verwandtschaft*, which is perhaps more adequate). In order to avoid connotations of a narrow anthropological sense, however, the Finnish form *heimo* will be used in this article.

The *Heimotyö* yearbook was one of several publications and organizations which bore the word *heimo* in their titles. As such they were part of the *heimo* ideology or *heimo* movement, which dominated cultural contacts between Finno-Ugrian peoples in the 1920s and 1930s, and which in their extreme forms led to a kind of mysticism. At one extreme the scope of the *heimo* movement included the writer Ilmari Kianto, who at the *heimo* celebration in Uhtua, Russian Karelia, rejoiced at not seeing any "European

clothes or silk blouses from Helsinki” and who congratulated himself at having met “at last a people not completely raped by civilization.”<sup>17</sup> At the other extreme were the official state visits and the cultural agreement between Finland and Hungary.

The history of the *heimo* movement has yet to be written, although it has often been discussed in historical and sociological studies.<sup>18</sup> Biographies of some leading *heimo* ideologists are also sometimes revealing.<sup>19</sup> In this study it is not possible to give any extensive account of the movement; instead, I confine myself to describing the *heimo* work in the light of Finnish-Hungarian contacts, as revealed by the *Heimotyö* yearbook.

The *Heimotyö* yearbook can be regarded – if I may be allowed to use an anachronistic term – as the organ of the network of all those who were interested in Finno-Ugrian peoples. Naturally, however, it differs from the present network of hungarologists in two important respects. First of all, its ideology was based on the idea of a special relationship between these peoples, the idea of the so called *heimo*. It is also to be noted that along with terms such as *heimo* and ‘suku’ the vocabulary of the yearbook included such notorious terms as ‘race’ and ‘blood’, which were common in the ideological debate of the 1930s and 1940s. In the yearbook, however, they occupied a secondary place as compared to the term *heimo*. Various aspects of Finnish theories and opinions concerning race have been discussed by a number of scholars, who have touched in passing on the *heimo* ideology as well<sup>20</sup>; I shall not go into them here.

Secondly, kinship work, as revealed in the *Heimotyö* yearbook, had a strong official and rhetorical dimension, which becomes evident when we read the speeches held at various public events and then published in the yearbook. These speeches were written in the most elevated rhetorical style. Such heightened rhetoric was of course not unusual in the 1930s, but it conferred on kinship work a certain official or even sacred status. Formal ceremonies were also important. Even the courses in the Hungarian language held by the Hungarian institute at the University of Helsinki were opened and closed with special formal ceremonies, consisting of speeches and artistic performances.<sup>21</sup> Due attention was naturally paid to the celebration of the official ‘*heimo* day’ (February 15, later the third Saturday in October). These ‘*heimo* day’ ceremonies are described

in detail by Iván Nagy, in an article on Finnish-Hungarian contacts in the *Ungarische Jahrbücher*.<sup>22</sup>

The *Heimotyö* yearbook took notice of all contacts between these peoples, not only in the arts, the humanities or politics, but also in such areas as athletics and dentistry. With regard to contacts in such fields as technology or medicine, the question was sometimes raised whether these contacts should actually be regarded as part of so called 'heimotyö', kinship work, at all. In his review of the first volume of *Heimotyö*, H. Dibelius maintained that Finno-Ugrian contacts for instance among teachers of mathematics (they had a Finnish-Hungarian friendship group) were quite bloodless.<sup>23</sup> According to Dibelius, it was quite natural for Finns interested in promoting the Finno-Ugrian cultural movement (*die finnisch-ugrische Kulturbewegung*) to have contacts with their neighbours, the Estonians, in all fields of public life; to maintain similar contacts with Hungary, a more distant country, could only do harm to a good idea.<sup>24</sup> Nevertheless, the concept of 'heimo work' was interpreted in the yearbook in a very wide sense. It is evident that the friendship groups which were organized on a professional basis (physicians, lawyers, etc.) were very active.<sup>25</sup> In each of its seven volumes the yearbook also included bibliographies and statistical information.

In many respects the articles and essays in *Heimotyö* can be read even today without thinking about *heimo*. On the other hand, the concept of *heimo*, which after the Second World War disappeared almost completely from the vocabulary<sup>26</sup>, was crucial in the discussion of cultural contacts in the 1930s and 1940s. It is not possible here to discuss the entrance of this term into the ideological debate or its prevalence in Finland. Rather, I would like to emphasize that the relationship between Finland and Hungary was sustained by a number of societies, foundations and clubs. Their meetings, records and annual reports were carefully reported in *Heimotyö*.<sup>27</sup> A leading role in these organizations on the Finnish side was played by schoolteachers and headmasters, such as F. A. Heporauta (1879–1946, headmaster of the Helsinki Normal School), Matti Pesonen (1868–1957, inspector of the Helsinki elementary schools) and Väinö Musikka (1887–1962, headmaster of a secondary school).<sup>28</sup> In this respect it is understandable that the *heimo* ideology was strongly propagated in Finnish schools – sometimes even *ad nauseam*, as witnessed by the case of Elvi Sinervo,

who later on became a prominent leftwing writer. She was so sick of the *heimo* propaganda at her school that she rejected even the poetry of Sándor Petőfi, whom she had previously greatly admired.<sup>29</sup> As Yrjö Varpio has pointed out<sup>30</sup>, the textbooks used in the Finnish elementary and secondary schools favoured Hungarian folk tales and folk poetry along with the poetry of Petőfi.

Along with schoolteachers, important and effective spokesmen for Finnish-Hungarian friendship included university teachers, who taught Finnish in Budapest or Hungarian in Helsinki, and scholars such as Lauri Kettunen and Viljo Tervonen in Budapest or Gyula Weöres and Jenő Fazekas in Helsinki.<sup>31</sup> Finnish and Hungarian cultural attachées and scholarship-holders from either Hungary or Finland also played an important role in the cultural exchange between the two countries. The yearbook also listed priests and theology students who visited Hungary or Finland. This theological exchange constitutes a chapter of its own in the story of Finnish-Hungarian contacts; it has been chronicled in detail, and even movingly, by Emil Koren and Martti Voipio.<sup>32</sup> The precursors of Finnish-Hungarian contacts, such as Antal Reguly, O. A. F. Blomstedt, József Szinnyei, Antti Jalava and Artturi Kannisto, were often mentioned. In the seventh volume of *Heimotyö*, Viljo Tervonen wrote an essay on Szinnyei and Jalava, with extracts from their correspondence.

3. The yearbook also listed carefully the events which were arranged by various societies in Hungary; not only by the Hungarian-Finnish Society (Magyar-Finn Társaság) but also by the La Fontaine Society (La Fontaine Társaság)<sup>33</sup>, and the Turanian Society (Turáni Társaság)<sup>34</sup>. As we learn from *Heimotyö* and other sources, the Turanian society played host to official Finnish visitors, but its basic ideology seems to have remained foreign to the Finns<sup>35</sup>.

The Finnish visitors to Hungary mentioned in *Heimotyö* included, along with Edwin Linkomies, the President of the Lotta Svärd organization Fanni Luukkonen, who in turn played host to Mrs. Anna Keresztes-Fischer, the head of the Egyesült Női Tábor organization, on her visit to Finland. In 1943 ten Finnish scientists, scholars and artists visited Hungary as guests of the Hungarian Ministry of Culture. The members of the delegation were presented in

the *Finnország*<sup>36</sup>. The visit was reported by V. A. Koskenniemi in *Valvoja*; it is also mentioned in some memoirs, written many years later.<sup>37</sup>

In this connection I might mention the suggestion made by Admiral Horthy to Professor Linkomies, that some ten thousand Finnish men could be transferred to Hungary. There they could become farmers and marry Hungarian wives, thus improving Hungarian racial characteristics by an admixture of Finnish *sisu*. This suggestion, however, did not receive a positive response from the Finnish side.<sup>38</sup> Similar ideas, inevitably, were not unknown in Finland either. The Finnish state leader, President Risto Ryti, had also referred favourably to racial improvement.<sup>39</sup> Such thoughts had long been an undercurrent in the *heimo* ideology. As Hannes Sihvo has pointed out,<sup>40</sup> the writer Ilmari Kianto was one of the first to express racial theories in connection with the idea of 'Great Finland'.

Along with practical information and general essays, the yearbook published official speeches which had been held on public occasions, celebrations and anniversaries, such as the speeches by Professors Artturi Kannisto and Edwin Linkomies in Volume II and the speech by the Lord Mayor of Budapest, *Geheimrat* Jenő Karafiath, in Volume VI. In its report on the *heimo* day on 3rd October 1938, the yearbook referred to the speech delivered by Urho Kekkonen, who was then the Finnish Secretary for Home affairs.<sup>41</sup> More importantly, along with the official rhetoric of these speeches, some efforts were made to define the nature of the *heimo* ideology, in other words, what the *heimo* ideology or *heimo* work was actually about.

In the second volume of *Heimotyö* F. A. Heporauta maintained that, since Finland had till then been influenced almost exclusively by Western countries, Finns could now imbibe new impulses from their related peoples. According to Heporauta, it was cultural exchange (*kulttuurivaihto*) which would guarantee the vitality of the *heimo* work. This cultural exchange was supported by a strong *heimo* feeling, which was evident in the friendly spirit which these peoples showed towards each other and in the way they followed their mutual development. Heporauta also offered a definition: The aim of *heimo* work is to look after the ancient and original Finno-Ugrian culture, or its remains in the conditions and manners of the



peoples, to protect the best of the culture of each Finno-Ugrian people, its essence, especially that which is lacking in Finnish culture.

In a speech delivered on the national day of Hungary, on the other hand, Professor Lauri Kettunen was sceptical about racial contacts between Finns and Hungarians. Instead, as a linguist, he emphasized the central role of language. The Finnish and Hungarian languages, according to Kettunen, represent our common heritage; this fact alone is enough to make these two peoples dear to each other.

Viljo Tervonen, who in the *Unkarin kirja* to which I have already referred had contributed a chapter on Finnish-Hungarian contacts, held a different view. According to Tervonen, a common linguistic heritage is not enough, even when supported by a spontaneous *heimo* love. Therefore the Finns need contacts between Finland and Hungary even in fields which are not directly concerned with kinship. A mutual cultural influence can be beneficial to both peoples; this is how the peoples in question will be able to develop their own special Finno-Ugrian nature.<sup>42</sup>

The yearbook enumerated carefully the meetings of various Finnish-Hungarian societies and organizations. It was fairly well aware of the importance of the media. It not only listed visits to Hungary by Finnish politicians, scholars and artists, but also told readers how these visits were reported in the Hungarian newspapers. There were also lists of radio programs devoted to Hungary and Estonia.

The yearbook offered abundant information concerning contacts between the Finno-Ugrian peoples, as well as about urgent political and economic problems in these countries. In Volume IV, for instance, there were articles on the Hungarian land reform and on the Jewish question. It is interesting to notice that the latter, one-page article mainly contained statistical information, offered as background to the new 'Jewish laws' in Hungary. It is a revealing coincidence that the articles on land reform and the Jews followed one another: Jenő Fazekas, in an article on Hungarian cultural history in Volume VI, was prepared to maintain that the greatest social problems in Hungary were the question of land and the Jewish question. The latter problem, according to Fazekas, was the

result of the emancipation of 1868, when the 'pockets of Jewishness', as he called them, of Galicia emigrated to Hungary.<sup>43</sup>

The Jews were also mentioned in the magazine *Heimokansa*. There was a short notice on the edict concerning the "purification of the Hungarian culture from Jewish writers". The writers in question were enumerated.<sup>44</sup> In his "Letter from Budapest" Viljo Tervonen told readers how easy it was now to find a free table in restaurants. This was partly caused by the fear of bombs, but the main reason was that the Jews "were no longer the first everywhere". Tervonen also told readers about the yellow star that Jews now had to wear. He continued: "Whatever we might think about this sign, in any case it is a good thing for a foreigner. One no longer has to be afraid of talking to strangers. A man who does not have a star is of course not always unquestionably one hundred percent Hungarian, but in any case the danger of embarrassing mistakes is now smaller than earlier in Budapest".<sup>45</sup> On the other hand, Tervonen warned readers against mixing politics with *heimo* work.

In the fourth volume of *Heimotyö* the history and the present state of Transylvania was discussed in a major article by Sándor Kulai.

Some attention was also devoted to Hungarian politicians. The death of the Prime Minister, Count Pál Teleki, was of course noted.<sup>46</sup> The Hungarian state leader, Admiral Horthy was portrayed in an impressive article by Antti Sovijärvi, Professor of Phonetics at the University of Helsinki.<sup>47</sup> This article was followed by a shorter one, in which Sándor Kulai presented István Horthy.<sup>48</sup> Similarly, in the magazine *Heimokansa* the Finnish translation of Lily von Doblhoff's biography of Miklós Horthy was reviewed.<sup>49</sup>

In this connection I would like to mention that Edwin Linkomies in his book *Vaikea aika (Difficult Time)* tells us how he during his visit to Hungary met Admiral Horthy and how impressed he was by his personality.<sup>50</sup> In the 1930s the writer Aino Kallas had also met Horthy; she describes her visit, as the wife of the Estonian ambassador, in her book *Kanssavaeltajia ja ohikulkijoita* (1945). After the war, in the 1950s, Horthy's autobiography was translated into Finnish, and was favourably reviewed by Edwin Linkomies.

4. From today's perspective, the most fruitful contribution of *Heimotyö* were its essays on culture, literature and art. These essays

occupied a considerable proportion of the total number of pages. The essays were also relatively extensive and sometimes offered quite diverse information. In some cases they were also very well written. In the following, I shall give some examples.

In the fifth volume of the yearbook one section was devoted to art, architecture and design, a total of 55 pages, most of them by Dénes Radocsay. The main part of the section consisted of short presentations of painters and sculptors. Most of them were established artists, and the article was rather indifferent to avantgarde art. It should also be remembered, as Kalevi Pöykkö has pointed out, that at the end of the 1930s it was 19th century Hungarian art which was in focus in Finland. Some Hungarians living in Finland emphasized the national character of art, thus supporting the *heimo* ideology; accordingly, they deplored the presence of foreign elements in Hungarian art.<sup>51</sup>

There were also two major articles by Jenő Fazekas, a personal friend of Professor Lauri Kettunen<sup>52</sup>, who in the 1940s became Lecturer in Hungarian and head of the Hungarian institute at the University of Helsinki. In 1944 he emigrated to Sweden.<sup>53</sup> In the sixth volume of the yearbook, Fazekas outlined the cultural history of Hungary, and in the next – and last – volume of *Heimotyö* he presented the history of modern Hungarian literature, in an essay of almost 50 pages. It was a miniature literary history, written from a sociological point of view. As Tuomo Lahdelma maintains<sup>54</sup>, it is a continuation of Aarni Penttilä's *Unkarin kirjallisuuden historia* (History of Hungarian literature), which was published in 1939, as well as an interesting methodological experiment. It suffers, however, as Yrjö Varpio points out<sup>55</sup>, from rather conservative views and from an antisemitic attitude. Fazekas was not at all happy about Jewish infiltration, as he puts it, into Hungarian middle class. Fazekas emphasized the importance of the agrarian class, which he regarded as the best stratum of the Hungarian people; correspondingly, he emphasized agrarian elements in literature. He did not wholeheartedly accept the aims of the periodical *Nyugat* and its westernizing tendencies, because they meant abandoning the old traditions of Hungarian literature. On the other hand, he had, perhaps unwillingly, to admit the great achievements of Endre Ady. In any case, Fazekas devotes some of his most rhetorical passages to Ady. To give one example: Fazekas compares Ady to Cassandra,

because as a gloomy and enigmatic poet he prophesized the tragedy, leading to destruction, which awaited the Hungarian people and its nature.

In characterizing János Kodolányi, Fazekas noted his interest in Finland and his translations of Finnish literature. According to Fazekas, Kodolányi's image of Finland is characterized by exaggerated idealism and uncritical praise; yet he has greatly contributed to Finnish-Hungarian cooperation. Kodolányi's book about Finland, *Suomi, a csend országá* (Finland, the country of silence) was also reviewed in the third volume of *Heimotyö*.

In his shorter outline of the cultural history of Hungary Fazekas – rather surprisingly, when we recall his emphasis on agrarian elements in Hungarian culture in his essay on literature – concentrates on the Renaissance in Hungary, and on the close Hungarian links with European culture and with Italy.

Hungarian literature was also discussed by other scholars: Gyula Weöres wrote about modern Hungarian poetry<sup>56</sup> and István Csekey about Vörösmarty's "Szózat" and its influence abroad.<sup>57</sup> Vörösmarty's poem and its relation to Runeberg's "Maamme" is a much discussed problem; here I can merely refer to Vilmos Voigt's study "Vörösmarty: Szózat – Kellgren: Ungersk nationalsång – Runeberg: Vårt land/Maammelaulu"<sup>58</sup>, where he draws comparisons between Vörösmarty's, Kellgren's and Runeberg's poems. *Heimotyö* also contained some specimens of Hungarian poetry in Finnish translation.

Some Finnish contributions should also be mentioned. Viljo Tervonen wrote about Arvi Järventaus and his relation to Hungary.<sup>59</sup> As all students of Finnish-Hungarian contacts know, Arvi Järventaus occupies a special place among those Finnish writers who have been interested in Hungary. Järventaus wrote three novels dealing with Hungarian history, a collection of poems with Hungarian and Lappish themes, and a book of memoirs dealing with his experiences in Hungary. His books were admired in Hungary. He was also awarded a honorary doctorate by the University of Debrecen. In his essay on Järventaus and Hungary, which is still quite readable, Tervonen also referred to Järventaus's attitude towards the *heimo* ideology and its corollary, nationalism. Helmi Helminen reviewed Gyula Illyés's book on Petőfi<sup>60</sup>. This review is at the same time a brief biography of Petőfi.

In the light of the *Heimotyö* yearbook, it is reasonable to conclude that the most intensive contacts can be found in the field of music. Both Hungarian folk music and art music, especially Kodály and Bartók, were presented on the pages of the yearbook. The yearbook often told readers about visits to Hungary by Finnish musicians, singers and conductors. The most significant musical event, reported in the seventh volume of *Heimotyö*<sup>61</sup>, were the performances of Leevi Madetoja's opera *Pohjalaisia* (Hung. *Északiak*) in Budapest. In the 1940s Artturi Järviluoma's drama, by the same title, was presented in Hungarian theatres<sup>62</sup>. In Helsinki, correspondingly, Ferenc Erkel's *Bánk bán* was performed. This was the first performance of this national Hungarian opera outside Hungary. The event was reported only briefly in *Heimotyö*.

### Notes

<sup>1</sup> Finn-magyar kapcsolatok I-II (Vol. I: Dezső Gaskó, Társadalmi kapcsolataink Finnországgal; Vol. II: Iván Nagy, Kulturális kapcsolataink Finnországgal).

<sup>2</sup> Jaakko Numminen, Unkarin ja Suomen kulttuurisuhteiden kehitys. In *Ystävät ja sukulaiset. Suomen ja Unkarin kulttuurisuhteet 1840–1984*. Ed. Sára Karig (SKS, Helsinki, 1984), 18.

<sup>3</sup> Jari Havia, Heimopäiväaate elpymässä. *Kanava*, no. 8 (1994), 491.

<sup>4</sup> Väinö J. Huotari, Kielisukulaisuudesta kulttuuriyhteistyöhön. Piirteitä suomalais-unkarilaisten kulttuurisuhteiden historiasta. (Unpubl. MA-thesis, University of Helsinki, 1984), 41.

<sup>5</sup> Tenho Takalo, Kulttuuri- ja heimosuhteita. Suomen ja Unkarin kulttuurivuorovaikutuksesta vv. 1920–1945. *Kanava*, no. 2 (1982), 111–113; Unkari Suomessa 1920- ja 1930-luvuilla. *Heimotyötä, kulttuurisuhteita vai revisiopolitiikkaa?* In *Yksilö ja yhteiskunnan muutos. Acta Universitatis Tamperensis. Ser. A, vol. 20* (Tampere University, 1986), 196; Huotari, *Kielisukulaisuudesta kulttuuriyhteistyöhön*, 3, 27–28.

<sup>6</sup> *Heimotyö*, vol. I, 75.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Hannes Sihvo, Ilmari Kianto ja Vienan Karjala. *Kirjallisuudentutkijain vuosikirja 24* (SKS, Helsinki, 1969), 169–174.

<sup>8</sup> Edwin Linkomies, *Vaikea aika. Suomen pääministerinä sotavuosina 1943–1944* (Helsinki, 1970), 109–133; cf. Dezső Gaskó, *Társadalmi kapcsolataink Finnországgal* (Budapest, 1943), 113–129.

<sup>9</sup> Linkömies, Vaikea aika, 130–131.

<sup>10</sup> Yrjö Varpio, Lajos Szopori Nagy, Suomen ja Unkarin kirjalliset suhteet vuosina 1920–1986 (SKS, Helsinki, 1990), 103–104.

<sup>11</sup> Lyy's translation was favourably, albeit without greater enthusiasm, reviewed in Finnish newspapers. However, Professor Lauri Kettunen, who during the war was visiting lecturer in Budapest, in an article published in the periodical *Valvoja* in 1944 (283–286), was not at all satisfied with the metrics of the translation (cf. Varpio, Szopori Nagy, Suomen ja Unkarin kirjalliset suhteet, 45–48). On Lyy's translation of Madách, see Éva Gerevich-Kopteff, Néhány irodalmi modell és fordítása. Az ember tragédiája fordításelemzésének néhány szempontja (Unpubl. Lic.-thesis, University of Helsinki, 1994); Imre Madáchin Ihmisen murhenäytelmä Toivo Lyy'n tulkintana. *Folia Hungarica* 7: Yhteyksiä. Eds. Mikko Cajanus, Sándor Csúcs. Editions Castrenianum, vol. 47 (Helsinki, 1994). On Lyy as a translator of Hungarian poetry, see Hannu Launonen, Hirvipoika. Tutkielmia Unkarin kirjallisuudesta. *Suomi* 120:2 (SKS, Helsinki, 1976), 27–40; Tuomo Lahdelma, Unkarilainen kirjallisuus Suomessa. In *Ystävät sukulaiset*, 184–185.

<sup>12</sup> Varpio, Szopori Nagy, Suomen ja Unkarin kirjalliset suhteet, 108.

<sup>13</sup> I am grateful to Dr. Holger Fischer (Hamburg) for drawing my attention to German parallels.

<sup>14</sup> The literal meaning of the Finnish word is 'tribe' or 'clan'; it is used, for instance, in cultural anthropology. In the present context, the closest equivalent is perhaps 'kindred folk'.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Kari Tarasti, *Suomalaisuuden liitto 1906–1966* (Porvoo, Helsinki, 1966), 101–107.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 102.

<sup>17</sup> Ilmari Kianto, *Vienan Karjala. Erään Suur-Suomi unelman vaiheita*. Ed. Raija-Liisa Kansi (Helsinki, 1989), 362; cf. also Sihvo, Ilmari Kianto ja Vienan Karjala, 172.

<sup>18</sup> See e.g. Risto Alapuro, *Akateeminen Karjala-seura. Ylioppilasliike ja kansa 1920- ja 1930-luvuilla* (Helsinki, 1973), 88–101; Hannes Sihvo, *Karjalan löytäjät* (Helsinki, 1969), 51–52, 186–192.

<sup>19</sup> Ritva Sievänen-Allen, *Tyttö venheessä. Elsa Enäjärvi-Haavion elämä 1901–1951* (Helsinki, 1993), 251–255; Aale Tynni-Haavio, *Olen vielä kaukana. Martti Haavio-Mustapää 20-luvun maisemassa* (Helsinki, 1978), 275–293.

<sup>20</sup> See e.g. Aira Kemiläinen, Marjatta Hietala, Pekka Suvanto (Eds.), *Mongoleja vai germaaneja? – rotuteorioiden suomalaiset. Historiallinen arkisto*, vol. 86 (SHS, Helsinki, 1985); Toivo Nygård, *Suur-Suomi vai*

lähiheimolaisten auttaminen. Aateellinen heimotyö itsenäisessä Suomessa (Helsinki, 1978). Finnish emigrants carried the *heimo* movement even to Australia, where it was combined with utopian socialist ideas. The *heimo* idea among the immigrants was usually confined to the Finns themselves, although they had some contacts with the Estonians. On this interesting chapter of the idea of *heimo*, see Olavi Koivukangas, *Sea, Gold, and Sugarcane. Attraction versus Distance. Finns in Australia 1851–1947. Migration Studies, C 8* (Institute of Migration, Turku, 1986), 301–325.

<sup>21</sup> Heimotyö, vol. VII, 118.

<sup>22</sup> See, vol. XXIII, 309.

<sup>23</sup> Ungarische Jahrbücher, vol. XX, 138.

<sup>24</sup> H. Dibelius also wondered how Matti Kuusi, who a little earlier (in the yearbook of the Academic Karelia Society) had emphasized that the Finns had brothers only in Estonia, could now write such odes as "Budapestin kellot" (The Bells of Budapest) and "Tonavan rannat" (The Banks of the Danube).

<sup>25</sup> The president of the physicians' Finnish-Hungarian friendship group, Martti J. Mustakallio, contributed effectively to the publication of M. J. Dalnoki's book about the Peace of Trianon and its consequences in Finnish translation, see Heimotyö, vol. II, 123, and vol. VI, 99.

<sup>26</sup> In the 1990s some aspects of the *heimo* ideology have been resuscitated (see Havia, *Heimopäiväaate elpymässä*), and the word itself is once more fairly current.

<sup>27</sup> On these various organizations, see also Huotari, *Kielisukulaisuudesta kulttuuriyhteistyöhön*, 42–44; cf. the table presenting the scheme of these organizations on the back cover of the fourth volume of Heimotyö.

<sup>28</sup> On Pesonen's activities in the field of Finnish-Hungarian contacts, see also Pentti Taipale, *Salatun voiman mies. Matti Pesosen elämä ja toiminta* (Lapua, 1980), *passim*. Pesonen was able to correspond with Hungarian clergymen even after the war, up to his death in 1957.

<sup>29</sup> Kalevi Kalemaa, *Elvi Sinervo – vuorellousija* (SKS, Helsinki, 1989), 26.

<sup>30</sup> Varpio and Szopori Nagy, *Suomen ja Unkarin kirjalliset suhteet*, 25–26.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. *Ibid.*, 27, 42–43.

<sup>32</sup> Emil Koren and Martti Voipio, *Sukukansojen uskonyhteys. Unkarin ja Suomen kirkkojen suhteet* (Jyväskylä, 1988). The Hungarian original: *Testvéreink Északon. A finn–magyar egyházi kapcsolatok története* (Budapest, 1986).

<sup>33</sup> Iván Nagy, *Kulturális kapcsolataink Finnországgal* (Budapest, 1943), 210.

<sup>34</sup> On 19th century opinions about the 'Turanians', see Anssi Halmesvirta's book *Turanilaisia ja herrasneekereitä. Aatehistoriallisia tutkimuksia brittiläisestä rotujattelusta* (Turanians and Negro Gentlemen – Studies in British Racial Thought). *Historiallinen Arkisto*, vol. 103 (SHS, Helsinki, 1993), 110–111, 114. I would like to add that James Frazer, in his influential book *The Golden Bough*, maintained that "the Magyars belong to the great Turanian family of mankind", a phrase which the Oxford English Dictionary gives as an example of the use of the word 'Turanian' (See, s.v. 'Turanian'). In Finland the Turanian movement was discussed in 1923–1925 by *Suomen Heimo*, the publication of the Academic Karelia Society; see Takalo, *Unkari Suomessa 1920- ja 1930-luvuilla*, 187–188.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Brynolf Honkasalo, *Elämä antaa ja ottaa. Oikeuselämässä harmaantuneen miehen kertomaa* (Hämeenlinna, 1967), 235.

<sup>36</sup> See, vol. 1 (1943), 3–4.

<sup>37</sup> See, Honkasalo, *Elämä antaa ja ottaa*, 232–241.

<sup>38</sup> Linkomies, *Vaikea aika*, 122; cf. T.M. Kivimäki, *Suomalaisen poliitikon muistelmat* (Helsinki, Porvoo, 1965), 109.

<sup>39</sup> Martti Turtola, Risto Ryti. *Elämä isänmaan puolesta* (Helsinki, 1994), 277.

<sup>40</sup> Sihvo, Ilmari Kianto ja Vienan Karjala, 172–173.

<sup>41</sup> President Urho Kekkonen's relations with Hungary extended from the interwar period until the beginning of the 1980s. His first visit to Hungary was in 1928, as a representative of the *Suomalaisuuden liitto* (Finnish League) and in 1978 he was able – as Paavo Väyrynen, the former Foreign Minister of Finland reminds us in his memoirs (*On totuuden aika I*, Helsinki, 1993, 178) – to celebrate the 50th anniversary of his first visit to Hungary, in Helsinki and in the company of the Hungarian ambassador. Only few Finnish public figures have had such long contacts with Hungary, despite all political and ideological changes.

<sup>42</sup> Väinö Musikka and Sándor Kulai (Eds.), *Unkarin kirja* (Porvoo, Helsinki, 1942), 464–465.

<sup>43</sup> Some Finnish scholars were well aware of the land reform. T. M. Kivimäki, former Prime Minister, visited Hungary in 1938, lecturing there on the legislation concerning settlement policy. His lecture was listened to by Hungarian landowners; Kivimäki, *Suomalaisen poliitikon muistelmat*, 111–112.

<sup>44</sup> *Heimokansa*, vol. 4 (1944), 198.



- 45 Heimokansa, vol. 3 (1944), 121.
- 46 Heimotyö, vol. III, 3.
- 47 Ibid., vol. V, 23–32.
- 48 Ibid., vol. V, 33–35.
- 49 See, vol. 4 (1944).
- 50 Linkomies, Vaikea aika, 119–123.
- 51 Kalevi Pöykkö, Mitä Suomessa tiedetään Unkarin kuvataiteesta? *Hungarologische Beiträge*, vol. 1 (1993), 224–225.
- 52 See, Lauri Kettunen, *Matkapakinoita ja muita muistelmia 1925–1960* (Helsinki, 1960), 296, 354–355.
- 53 Fazekas seems to have emigrated to Sweden in a great hurry, and he did not resign officially from his post as a university lecturer. It was typical of the bureaucracy that fourteen years later, in 1958, the Helsingin hovioikeus (i.e. the First Court of Appeal in Helsinki) announced his removal from office. See *Helsingin yliopisto. Opettajat ja virkamiehet 1939–1968* (Helsinki, 1977).
- 54 Lahdelma, Unkarilainen kirjallisuus Suomessa, 179–180.
- 55 Varpio and Szopori Nagy, Suomen ja Unkarin kirjalliset suhteet, 44–45.
- 56 Heimotyö, vol. IV, 39–60.
- 57 Ibid., vol. IV, 21–34.
- 58 Vilmos Voigt, Vörösmarty: Szózat – Kellgren: Ungersk nationalsång – Runeberg: Vårt land/Maammelaulu. *Skandinavistikai Füzetek. Papers in Scandinavian Studies* 4 (Budapest, 1990).
- 59 Heimotyö, vol. V, 69–77.
- 60 Ibid., vol. IV, 75–82. Helmi Helminen, of the Finnish National Museum, translated Hungarian fiction into Finnish in the 1930s. Cf. Takalo, *Unkari Suomessa 1920- ja 1920-luvuilla*, 191.
- 61 See, 108–109.
- 62 Cf. Klára Móra, *Suomalainen musiikki Unkarissa*. In *Ystävät ja sukulaiset*, 153.