

VAATENURK

PROTECTRESSES OF NATIONAL SPIRIT¹ IN THE GRAND DUCHY OF FINLAND AND NADDNIPRYANSHCHYNA

Denis Kovaliov

The ‘national spirit’ is an abstract term used by politicians and representatives of cultural circles, and therefore is an integral part of the nation and state. Through their own patriotism, the apologists of the national spirit played an important role in the attitude of those peoples who were considered to be unhistorical at the time.² The broad national movement that arose in Europe at the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1810–1820 subsequently spread to the territory of the multinational Russian Empire. In the Romanov state, some (tsarist officials and nobles close to the dynasty) perceived this movement as being hostile due to its radical slogans, while others (such as educated strata of the Polish, Finnish and Ukrainian peoples), on the contrary, were very friendly towards the image of romantic nationalism that the classics of German philosophy propagated with their works.³ It should be noted that over the years, the tsarist authorities started fostering their own nationalism. The expression of this nationalism became

¹ E. Alander, J. S. Rothman, T. J. W. Hultin, S. Lindfors-Rusova.

² Karl Marx and his followers held the opinion that Czechs, Croats, and along with them Ukrainians and Finns are among the unhistorical nations, and therefore do not have the right to self-determination and independence; see George Grabowicz, ‘Toward a History of Ukrainian Literature’, *Harvard Ukrainian Studies*, 4 (1978), 407–523; Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12 (New York: International Publishers, 1979), 126–128, 783.

³ Georg Hegel, *The Philosophy of History* (New York, 1900), 14–15, 457; Johan Gottlieb Fichte, Bernard Willms, *Beitrag zur Berichtigung der Urtheile des Publikums über die französische Revolution* (Danzig: Verlag Ferdinand Troschel, 1793), 8–9, 121.

the so-called “Black Hundreds”, who defended autocracy, the all-Russian national concept, and the indivisibility of the Russian Empire, and fought for democratic and social reforms. They regarded constitutionalism and the influence of non-Russian communities on national politics as an encroachment on “faith, the tsar, and the motherland.”⁴ The Finnish national movement known as Fennomania was quite moderate in its external forms. The emphasis of its participants was placed exclusively on fostering the Finnish language, culture and education.⁵ One of its features was that it did not appeal to a glorious past because the modern Finnish nation was only just starting to establish itself. At the same time in Naddnipryanshchyna,⁶ the descendants of the Cossack hetman, who equated themselves to the lowest stratum of the nobility, gravitated to ethnographic and historical research, trying to exalt the heroic past of their ancestors. It should be noted that through the press, officials, loyal scholars and the clergy, the tsarist government tried in every possible way to inculcate the idea that Ukrainians are Little Russians, and that their language is only a Polonized dialect of the Russian language, into the consciousness of the Ukrainian population. The Ukrainian national movement started becoming radical thanks to Russian pressure in the mid-19th century, and political slogans were increasingly heard.⁷ Significant changes in tsarist politics were outlined after the Russian defeat in the Crimean War (1853-1856) with the advent of a new monarch.⁸ Alexander II Romanov was to become a symbol of the reforms that his subjects expected throughout the Russian Empire. However, not all national territories (the Grand Duchy of Finland, Naddnipryanshchyna, the Kingdom of Poland) were waiting for the same transformation. The decisive year was 1863. In that same year, the January Uprising broke out in Poland, which the tsarist government drowned in blood. It issued the so-called “Valuev Circular”, which prohibited the publication of religious

⁴ Rukovodstvo chernosotentsa-monarkhista (Moskva: in *Moskovskiye Vedomosti*, No. 123, 1906), 16; Russian State Historical Archive (RGIA) – Fund 1282. Register. 1. Case. 101, 1137, 1142, 1150, 1154, 1165.

⁵ Ilkka Liikanen, *Fennomania ja kansa: Joukkojärjestäytymisen läpimurto ja Suomalaisen puolueen synty* (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1995), 124-125, 367.

⁶ The name of the territory that was incorporated into the southern provinces of the Russian Empire, which are now part of modern Ukraine, populated mainly by Ukrainians); also see Paul Robert Magocsi, *A History of Ukraine: A Land and Its Peoples* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 378.

⁷ Daniel Beauvois, *La bataille de la terre en Ukraine (1863-1914). Les Polonais et les conflits socio-ethniques* (Lille: Septentrion, 1998), 79-80, 351; Yuriy Zems'kyy, *Zarodzhennya ukrainskoho modernoho natsiyetvorenniya* (Horodok, 2018), 123, 255.

⁸ Aleksey Miller, “Ukrainskiy vopros” v politike vlastey i russkom obschestvennom mnenii: vtoraya polovina XIX veka (Sankt Peterburg: Aleteya, 2000), 66, 270.

and educational books in the Ukrainian language, which was called fictitious. It also adopted the “Language script” (“Kielireskripti”, or “Suomen kielen Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen Asetus”) – granting the Finnish language official status in Finland.⁹ Accordingly for the Russian Empire, the subjects of the Grand Duchy of Finland were more loyal than the Poles and Ukrainians, who constituted a direct threat of the overthrow of the current autocratic system. However, tsarism exaggerated the threat, since the Ukrainian national movement had not yet entered a stage of development similar to that of the Polish movement, the features of which would prompt the broad masses to carry out uprisings.¹⁰ The main prerequisite for the readiness of the modern nation to recognise itself as a distinctive and self-sufficient community was an increase in the level of education, and access to education for peasants, workers and the poor. This had just begun to take shape in Finland and Naddniprovyanshchyna under the conditions of the tsarist reform.

Until the 1860s, the church, which was led by the Tsarist Synod, was in charge of public education in the Russian Empire. It is worth mentioning here that the first attempts at education reform were made by Alexander I Romanov, who founded the Ministry of National Education in 1802, and in the following year, regulations on the construction of relevant educational institutions were issued. New principles in the educational system envisaged the continuity of educational institutions and programs (but this did not become the norm). The territory of the Russian Empire was divided into 6 educational districts, each headed by trustees, over which stood the academic councils at the universities. And under Nicholas I Romanov, education acquired a closed class character: parish schools — exclusively for peasants; county schools — exclusively for children of merchants and other urban dwellers; and gymnasiums — for children of nobles and officials.¹¹ Education was provided with a clearly expressed class character: for the lower strata of the population — parish two-class schools; for children

⁹ Fedir Savchenko, *Zaborona ukraïnstva. Rik 1876* (Kyïv, 1930), 159-160, 430; Taras Hunczak, *Russian Imperialism from Ivan the Great to the Revolution* (New Brunswick: University Press of America, 1974), 408; Matti Klinge, *Keisarin Suomi* (Helsinki: Schildt, 1997), 284, 542; Denis Kovaliov, “Tsarat i natsional’ne vidrozhennya: finam — “movnÿi pryanyk”, ukraïntsyam — “movnÿi batih””, in *Dzerkalo Tÿzhnya*, <http://dt.ua/HISTORY/carat-i-nacionalne-vidrozhennya-finam-movniy-pryanik-ukrayincyam-movniy-batig-326053_.html/>, [accessed 11 October 2019].

¹⁰ Miller, “*Ukrainskiy vopros*” v politike vlastey i russkom obschestvennom mnenii, 84, 270.

¹¹ Sergey Knyaz’kov, *Ocherk istorii narodnoho obrazovaniya v Rossii do epokhi reform Aleksandra II* (Moskva: Pol’za, 1910), 101-102, 240.

of merchants, office workers and prosperous bourgeois — district schools, sometimes gymnasiums; for the children of the nobility — gymnasiums, lyceums and universities.¹² In addition to state-owned schools, private educational institutions operated. The tsarist government imposed a system of education that, firstly, was to satisfy the state's needs for qualified personnel, and secondly, at the same time helped to destroy identity among the inhabitants of the national territories (Finland and Naddnipryanshchyna), imposing a sense of inferiority, creating an idea of the leading role of the so-called “Russian nation” in the life of all subjects of the Russian Empire. The reorganisation of the educational system initiated by Alexander II Romanov also aimed at this goal: in 1861, the network of primary educational institutions expanded significantly, transferring schools to the supervision of institutions of local government popularly known as *zemstvo* administrations, and not the church; regulations for these schools were worked out in 1864-1871.¹³ These schools were better funded and therefore had better facilities, better teachers, and well-stocked libraries. The network of extracurricular education for the adult population consisted of Sunday schools, and evening and repeated classes (for those who did not study in childhood). The educational reform of Alexander II Romanov established universal compulsory primary education for children aged 6 to 14 years.¹⁴ All schools were transferred from the jurisdiction of the church to state guardianship. However, although education was declared mandatory, due to the lack of schools and the difficult financial situation of the peasants, the vast majority of the population of Naddnipryanshchyna and the Grand Duchy of Finland still remained illiterate before the beginning of the 20th century.

The differences in educational reform for Ukrainians and Finns should be emphasised. In 1869, according to the royal manifesto in Finland, the Higher School Council was founded, which became an instrument for creating a system of national school education.¹⁵ This document gradually opened the way to knowledge for a larger number of children, including from rural areas. Another link in the systematisation of national education in Finland was the similarity of reforms to German and French models

¹² Larýsa Medvid', *Istoriya natsional'noi osvity i pedahohichnoi dumky v Ukraïni* (Kyïv: Vikar, 2003), 135, 335.

¹³ Pëtr Zaënkovskii, *Krizis samoderzhaviya na rubezhe 1870-1880-kh gg.* (Moskva: Politizdat, 1964), 513.

¹⁴ Nikolay Bunge, *K voprosu o narodnom obrazovanii v Rossii* (Kiev, 1901), 49, <<https://dlib.rsl.ru/viewer/01003557137#?page=28/>>, [accessed 8 December 2019]

¹⁵ Klinge, *Keisarin Suomi*, 369, 542

of educational institutions that prepared their students for admission to universities.¹⁶ Classical disciplines gave way to modern foreign languages (German, French, English), natural sciences and applied sciences, with preference being given to national history in the native language. Fennomans immediately realised the importance of these educational institutions for the formation of a Finnish-speaking public. Therefore, the founding of private lyceums, where training was conducted only in the Finnish language, began in the 1870s.¹⁷ These measures brought their first results after 10 years, when active public figures who were worried about the fate of Finland and its society, both men and women, started graduating and joined the educated environment. In particular, Amanda Elisabeth Alander (22 April 1859 – 16 June 1940), Johanna Sofia Rothman (10 September 1856 – 29 June 1920) and Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin (18 April 1864 – 31 March 1943), started graduating from the women's folk schools. At the same time, in the territory of the Grand Duchy of Finland, Uno Cygnaeus, the representative of the Fennoman movement, was engaged in educating the masses. He had discontinued his exploration of Siberia and his participation in the colonization of Russian Alaska that had begun earlier, and was imbued with the study of pedagogy through the works of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi and Friedrich Fröbel.¹⁸ It was he who carried out the inspection of Finland in the late 1850s in order to study the situation regarding school education in rural areas. According to Uno Cygnaeus, a public school should develop children both spiritually and physically, and its main task was to teach children not only to count and read, but to think critically — to understand what was read, to think and put the knowledge into practice. As an outspoken Fennoman, he noted that a public school should become a powerful factor that contributes to the moral and economic development of a nation.¹⁹

The public school (Fin. *Kansakoulu*), which was advocated by Uno Cygnaeus, was to become a state school and give children of all walks of life a general primary education. His ideas in Finland were ahead of his time

¹⁶ Kaius Sinnemäki, Anneli Portman, Jouni Tilli, *On the Legacy of Lutheranism in Finland: Societal Perspectives* (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 2019), 121–122, 351.

¹⁷ *Herää Suomi: Suomalaisuusliikkeen historia*, päätoim Päiviö Tommila (Kuopio: Kustannuskiila, 1989), 268, 479.

¹⁸ Veli Nurmi, *Uno Cygnaeus – Suomalainen koulumies ja kasvattaja* (Helsinki: Valtion painatuskeskus, 1988), 74, 280.

¹⁹ Martti Kuikka, *Suomalaisen koulutuksen vaiheet* (Helsinki: Otava, 1991), 89, 167; Veli Nurmi, *Suomen kansakoulunopettajaseminaarien historia* (Mikkeli, 1995), 157, 393; *100 suomalaista pieneniselämäkertaa*, päätoim Timo Vihavainen (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 2004), 570–571, 814.

and aroused much criticism, but in May of 1866, the tsar agreed to reformat school education in the Grand Duchy of Finland. Uno Cygnaeus, the father of Finnish pedagogy, coordinated his thoughts with the ideas of Pestalozzi: the task of the public school was to teach the people to help themselves both spiritually and materially. Particular emphasis was placed on the need to train female teachers and on the education of girls, “because how well the future generation is able to cope with their duties depends first of all on women,” Uno Cygnaeus emphasised.²⁰ He also believed that girls should be taught general hygiene and to care for the spiritual well-being of children. Despite his positive attitude towards patriarchal society, Uno Cygnaeus didn’t mind women taking an active part in the social and political life of the Grand Duchy of Finland.²¹ That’s why the already mentioned Amanda Elisabeth Alander, Johanna Sofia Rothman and Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin were among his faithful students. They not only continued the theoretical and methodological developments of their teacher, but also in a certain sense became protectresses of the Finnish national spirit.

Amanda Elisabeth Alander was a member of an aristocratic Swedish family from the Åland Islands, but despite her origin, she sought to be as close to the common people as possible. She was born on 12 April 1859 in Helsinki and studied at a private girl’s boarding school in Stockholm, after which she returned to her homeland, where she continued her studies at the school founded by Uno Cygnaeus.²² Assisted by Cygnaeus, Amanda Elisabeth Alander met Fennomans in the late 1870s. She received her qualifications for teaching preschool (3-6 years old) and primary school (7-10 years old) children in 1881. It is quite characteristic that, along with the problem of public education in Finland, Amanda Elisabeth Alander was interested in the affairs of women in Europe and America. However, she wasn’t interested in politics. She saw the meaning of her life in education, which together with the Finnish language and the Finnicization of society (Fin. *Suomalaistaminen*) was the foundation of the modern Finnish nation.

In the 1890s and 1900s, Amanda Elisabeth Alander founded a number of educational institutions in central and northern Finland, mainly in rural areas. The charters of these institutions contained the ideas of Fröbel, Pestalozzi and her teacher Cygnaeus.²³ The activities of these institutions were aimed at implementing the educational revolution and expanding

²⁰ Nurmi, *Uno Cygnaeus*, 106, 280.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 138.

²² Ilmari Heikinheimo, *Suomen elämäkerrasto* (Helsinki: Werner Söderström, 1955), 20, 855.

²³ Heikinheimo, *Suomen elämäkerrasto*, 22.

existing reforms, namely by providing comprehensive support to public schools for the illiterate rural majority, financing such educational institutions from the budget of the Grand Duchy of Finland and voluntary charitable foundations of wealthy industrialists, and the creation of auxiliary educational unions on a voluntary basis, with the aim of uniting individual citizens and entire population groups from different social strata into a single community. When she met another student of Cygnaeus, Johanna Sofia Rothman, who had been professionally involved in the development of preschool education, they jointly set up a public kindergarten with Finnish as its language of instruction in the Sörnäinen (Fin. *Sörnäisten kansanlastentarha*) district in Helsinki.²⁴ Their main goal was to educate young pupils on the basis of Lutheranism and the Finnish folk tradition, where the main focus was on home (family) study. Amanda Elisabeth Alander and Johanna Sofia Rothman shared the opinion that a kindergarten is not so much a building or preparation for school as a “family nest”, where national foundations and home education are cherished.²⁵ For the high-quality implementation of the reform of school and preschool education in the Grand Duchy of Finland, it was not enough to nationalise it and to introduce the native language to education. It was necessary to change the entire system, to introduce fundamentally different goals and principles of education, and to fill the work with new content. Uno Cygnaeus expressed this opinion and so did his followers, such as Amanda Elisabeth Alander and Johanna Sofia Rothman.²⁶

School and kindergarten should be active components of the entire educational system and therefore be based on the principle of the initiative of children, emphasised Amanda Elisabeth Alander on the eve of the First World War.²⁷ It should be noted that the tsarist government was biased against the initiatives introduced by Amanda Elisabeth Alander in school education but did not offer any resistance.²⁸ Radical sentiment began to spread in the Grand Duchy of Finland on the eve of the 1905-1907 revolution, and before that, local government and the vast majority of the population

²⁴ Jorma Virtanen, “Elisabeth Alander, Aukusti Salo ja suomalaisen lastentarhan idea”, *Kasvatus & Aika*, 3(3) 2009, 71.

²⁵ Hannele Salminen, Jukka Salminen, *Lastentarhatoiminta – osa lapsuuden historiaa: Friedrich Fröbelin lastentarha-aate ja sen leviäminen Suomeen* (Jyväskylä: Gummerus, 1986), 36-37, 112.

²⁶ Nurmi, *Uno Cygnaeus*, 141, 280; Virtanen, “Elisabeth Alander, Aukusti Salo ja suomalaisen lastentarhan idea”, 72.

²⁷ Jorma Virtanen, *Esiopetuksen polut ja koulutusjärjestelmän muutos* (Tampere, 2009), 90-91, 195.

²⁸ Virtanen, *Esiopetuksen polut*, 92.

remained loyal to the Russian Empire. Amanda Elizabeth Alander died at the age of 81 — on 16 June 1940, however her legacy lived on in folk education as the main instrument of nation-building in Finland.

Actually, the modern Finnish school owes its appearance to the development of the ideas and work of Amanda Elisabeth Alander, where teachers and educators pay attention to the individualisation and socialisation of students through the practical application of acquired theoretical knowledge.

As for Johanna Sofia Rothman, her specialty was preschool education. She was the daughter of a wealthy Swedish burgher from western Finland, and was born on 10 September 1856.²⁹ She was trained at a private seminary in Berlin, after which, as a young woman, she decided to devote herself to raising young children. To this end, Johanna Sofia Rothman returned to Finland in the late 1880s, where she met Uno Cygnaeus and Amanda Elisabeth Alander. Together they studied a pedagogical technique that was new for that time. Johanna Sofia Rothman was more a practitioner than a theorist — she tried to implement currently known teachings on children's education, focusing on social education and development of the younger generation through the preservation of family traditions. At the public kindergarten in the Sörnäinen that was founded in 1890, pupils were encouraged to become self-sufficient and at the same time to promote biblical motives of young people respecting their elders. Subsequently, this practice was extended to the so-called Ebenezer educational home (Fin. *Ebeneserkoti*).³⁰ As already mentioned above, the kindergarten she created was a second home for its pupils. At this kindergarten, personality traits were to be developed along with a sense of community, since Johanna Sofia Rothman considered each child to be a separate member of human society, a national community united by one culture, customs and language.³¹

According to the teacher, kindergarten and subsequently school should become the centre for processing all spiritual and moral impressions in the child's mind not only in accordance with their personality, but also largely determined by the friendly atmosphere that is created in communication with peers, the trusting relationships between educators and pupils, and the general organisation of the educational process. Johanna Sofia Rothman implemented her ideas in 1899 and 1901, establishing a private kindergarten for rural children (3-6 years old) in a Helsinki suburb

²⁹ Salminen and Salminen, *Lastentarhatoiminta*, 39, 112.

³⁰ Maija Meretniemi, Inger Österberg, *Ebeneser – 100 vuotta lasten hyväksi* (Helsinki: Ebeneser-koulutus oy, 2007), 25, 175.

³¹ Salminen and Salminen, *Lastentarhatoiminta*, 11, 112.

and a Sunday primary school for future students (aged 7-9 years).³² It was a major educational project, the purpose of which was to confirm a sense of belonging to one society among the children. Its common features were the Lutheran faith and the Finnish language. A relatively important public goal was at the heart of Johanna Sofia Rothman's system of collective education — the joint activity of children aimed at achieving a particular social aim, namely the Finnish nation. She considered games and work to be important means for uniting children into a team. Before her death on 29 June 1920, Johanna Sofia Rothman was able to see the result of her work — her pupils were at the forefront of the fighters for Finland's independence in 1917-1919. Along with courage and heroism, they demonstrated ardent patriotism and solidarity, embodying the ideological attitudes of their teacher in reality.³³

Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin deserves special attention. She became the first woman in the Grand Duchy of Finland who not only was able to enrol in, but also completed her studies at university, subsequently receiving a Ph.D. She was born on 18 April 1864 in the territory of Ladoga in Karelia (now the so-called "Lost Lands" or "Luovutetut alueet") in a family of minor officials.³⁴ She was trained at private schools for girls — first in Sortavala (1874-1878), then in Fredrikshamn (1878-1881), after which she studied at the Helsinki Postgraduate School in 1883-1885. In 1886, Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin began her studies at the Imperial Alexander University (now the University of Helsinki), and after 10 years she successfully defended her doctoral dissertation on mining in Finland.³⁵ From 1893 to 1901 she was a full-time correspondent for the *Päivälehti* newspaper. She met the leader of the Svekomman opposition Leopold Mechelin in the editorial office of that newspaper, later becoming his personal secretary.³⁶ Unlike Amanda Elisabeth Alander and Johanna Sofia Rothman, who saw

³² Meretniemi, Österberg, *Ebeneser – 100 vuotta lasten hyväksi*, 30, 175.

³³ According to Ilkka Liikanen, representatives of the educational sector of that time should be referred to as the so-called "buditelé" or "buditelius" of the Finnish nation, which among the Fennomans could more legally and without any political bias contribute to the Finnicization process of society without ideological motives, but with a lofty goal — to turn compatriots into educated Europeans; see Ilkka Liikanen, *Fennomania ja kansa – Joukkojärjestytyksen läpimurto ja Suomalaisen puolueen synty* (Helsinki: Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, 1995), 246, 363.

³⁴ Venla Kiiski, *Tekla Hultin, poliitikko* (Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto, 1978), 13, 320.

³⁵ Kiiski, *Tekla Hultin*, 24; Tekla Hultin, *Historiska upplysningar om bergshandteringen i Finland under svenska tiden. 1* (Helsingfors, 1896), 247; *100 suomalaista pienoiselämäkertaa*, 687, 814.

³⁶ Ilmi Hallsten, *The position of woman in Finland* (Helsinki, 1925), 13, 40; *Historik över Svenska Kvinnoförbundets verksamhet 1908-1918* (Helsingfors, 1918), 8, 56.

their calling in the education and schooling of peasant children, Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin saw herself as an active participant in the political battles of that time, which took place at meetings and on the sidelines of the Diet of the Grand Duchy of Finland, as well as on the pages of leading newspapers that served as mouthpieces of the Fennomanian and Svekomian parties.³⁷

At the start of the Russification implemented by Governor General Nikolai Bobrikov, the doctor of philosophy Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin was already known for her active position as a teacher at a girls' school in the city of Hämeenlinna.³⁸ In parallel, she translated economic literature from Swedish and German into Finnish as commissioned by Leopold Mechelin. However, the more actively the tsar's governor of Finland applied administrative pressure on autonomy, the more quickly Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin understood the need for resistance to Russification. Already in 1902, she became the founder of the "Naiskagaali" underground women's organisation, the members of which called on fellow citizens to put up passive resistance to tsarism, and declared propaganda supporting the Finnish national idea as their main weapon without focusing on the existing language divide.³⁹ The organisation included both Fennoman and Svekoman women, so on the eve of the revolution of 1905-1907, Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin accepted more radical ideas of the Fennomans regarding the future structure of Finland and its place in Europe and the world. At the same time, "Naiskagaali" women activists smuggled and distributed nationalist and anti-royal publications, which were banned in the autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland, importing them from Sweden and Denmark. They also raised funds for building schools in the countryside.⁴⁰

Participation in the ranks of an underground women's organisation brought Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin popularity among the masses, who began to idealise her, identifying the real person with the folk symbol "the Maiden of Finland" (Fin. *Suomi-neito*). Despite the fact that she was a political student of Leopold Mechelin, in the 1900s she focused her

³⁷ Kiiski, *Tekla Hultin*, 69, 320.

³⁸ Juhani Paasivirta, *Suomi ja Eurooppa: Autonomiakausi ja kansainväliset kriisit (1808-1914)* (Helsinki: Kirjayhtymä, 1984), 383, 548.

³⁹ Seppo Zetterberg, Allan Tiitta, *Suomi kautta aikojen* (Helsinki: Otava, 1992), 338, 576; Denis Kovaliov, 'Pidpil'na orhanizatsiya "Kagaali": finlyands'kõi opir moskovs'komu samoderzhavstvu', *Borÿsten*, No. 2/307 (2017), 25.

⁴⁰ Zetterberg, Tiitta, *Suomi kautta aikojen*, 339; Kovaliov, 'Pidpil'na orhanizatsiya "Kagaali"', 26.

attention on the struggle against both Russian tsarism and Swedish dominance in the linguistic, cultural and political spheres of public life. The “November Manifesto”⁴¹ was published by Nicholas II in 1905. It restored Finland’s legal rights, and the next year the representative body of the estates — the Diet of the Grand Duchy of Finland — was reformed into a unicameral legislative parliament formed by members of political parties, which allowed Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin to plunge headlong into politics and ideological struggle.⁴² Her active position contributed to the fact that her spiritual mentor Leopold Mechelin initiated an appeal to the Russian tsar with a request to provide women of the Grand Duchy of Finland with the right to vote. Nicholas II approved universal suffrage in that same year of 1906, and only 2 years later a special manifesto allowed Finnish women to be elected to parliament as spokespersons or deputies.⁴³ According to Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin, this decision was no less important than the recognition by the Christian Church of the presence of a soul in women.⁴⁴

In 1907 she took up the creation of the “Finland Women’s Union” (Fin. *Suomalainen naisliitto*) and at the same time was in the ranks of the Young Finnish Party, or the Constitutional-Fennoman Party (Fin. *Nuorsuomalainen Puolue, Perustuslaillis-Suomenmielinen Puolue*), where she was engaged in expanding and improving women’s education, and improving the social status of women.⁴⁵ After the parliamentary elections in 1909, Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin concentrated on power at the head of the “Finland Women’s Union” with her neighbour and best ally, Lucina Hagman. In subsequent years until Finland gained independence on 6 December 1917, she was one of the activists who organised the Jäger Movement (Fin. *Jääkäriliike*) from the outbreak of World War I, ideologically promoting war against the Russian Empire on the side of Germany as a necessary measure to obtain the national independence of her homeland.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Popularly known as “Keisarillisen Majesteetin Armollinen Julistuskirja toimenpiteistä laillisen järjestyksen palauttamiseksi maahan”; see Jan-Magnus Jansson, *Hajaanuksesta yhteistoimintaan – Suomalaisen parlamentarismien vaiheita* (Helsinki: Gaud-eamus, 1993), 159, 280.

⁴² Juhani Mylly, *Edustuksellisen kansanvallan läpimurto* (Helsinki: Edita, 2006), 335, 118-119.

⁴³ Mylly, *Edustuksellisen kansanvallan läpimurto*, 120.

⁴⁴ Thiodolf Rein, *Leo Mechelinin elämä* (Helsinki: Otava, 1915), 148, 225.

⁴⁵ *100 suomalaista pienoiselämäkerta*, 689, 814.

⁴⁶ Matti Lauerma, *Jääkärien tie* (Helsinki: WSOY, 1984), 42, 654; Kalle Silfverberg, ‘Ensimmäinen sanomalehtinainen saa nimensä kartalle’, *Helsingin Sanomat*, <<https://www.hs.fi/kaupunki/art-2000002721619.html>>, (04.04.2014).

She was an important figure who not only inspired young *jäger* fighters to go to the front, but also directly transported the propaganda publication *Vapaita Lehtisiä* from Stockholm to Finland, which published news of the military successes of Finnish volunteers in the German Imperial Army on the Eastern Front.

At the same time, her ideal was a woman whose love was strong and decisive, and for whom enlightening and active social activities make it possible to choose her own path in life — marriage and family life, or training and a career that matches her inclinations. Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin chose a policy that she did not change even in “the most difficult hours” of the civil war in 1918, finding herself in Helsinki “on the wrong side”.⁴⁷ Against the backdrop of the terror unleashed in Helsinki by the Finnish Red Guards (Fin. *Suomen Punainen Kaarti*), the pro-German sympathy and monarchical orientation of Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin became clear. In the 1920s–1930s, she was one of the women engaged in caring for war veterans and fostering the patriotic education of youth, attracting state funds as a deputy for the development of education, including initiatives headed by Amanda Elisabeth Alander and Johanna Sofia Rothman that have already been mentioned in this article.⁴⁸ As a public and political figure, she was also repeatedly the object of public criticism, especially at the hands of male members of parliament from the Social Democratic Party and the Swedish People’s Party.⁴⁹ The fiery patriot of Finland, Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin died in Helsinki at the height of the Continuation War (Fin. *Jatkosota*) — 31 March 1943⁵⁰ — leaving a towering legacy to her followers and colleagues in the political sphere and among the public.

The contribution of the above-mentioned people to the development of the modern nation of Finland can hardly be overestimated, as discussed by modern scholars.⁵¹ These women were real guardians, protectresses of the national spirit. Two of them found their vocation in the field of education, while the third found hers in politics and public life. However, they could travel around Europe and speak about Finland and its people,

⁴⁷ Sainio Venla, ‘Hultin, Tekla. – Kansallisbiografia-verkkojulkaisu’, *Studia Biographica* 4, <<http://urn.fi/urn:nbn:fi:sks-kgb-003486>>, (Viitattu 09.10.2019).

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*

⁴⁹ Kiiski, *Tekla Hultin*, 275, 320.

⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 298.

⁵¹ Osmo Jussila, *Nationalismi ja vallankumous venäläis-suomalaisissa suhteissa 1899–1914* (Helsinki: Suomen Historiallinen Seura, 1979), 325; Seppo Zetterberg, *Itsenäisen Suomen historia* (Helsinki: Otava, 1995), 185; Matti Klinge, *Kulttuurista. Kansalaispuheenvuoroja* (Helsinki: Gaudeamus, 1986), 175; Timo Vihavainen, *Venäjän kahdet kasvot: Venäjä–kuva suomalaisen identiteetin rakennuskivenä* (Helsinki: Edita, 2004), 472.

asserting its national spirit under the autocratic Russian Empire, where national minorities were under pressure from tsarism. Faith and confidence that it is necessary to live and act for the future of their homeland helped Elisabeth Alander, Johanna Sofia Rothman and Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin to bear their cross, to be called upon by their own nation. Until the last days of their lives, each of them was engaged in social and pedagogical activities without abandoning an important goal — to give compatriots the light of enlightenment and political self-awareness. So, Finns created themselves and their country without waiting for permission from the tsar, who bore the title of Grand Duke of Finland. By the time of the fall of the autocracy in 1917, Finns had a sufficiently developed national identity to gain state independence. In addition to male Fennomans and Svekomans, women enlighteners — Elisabeth Alander, Johanna Sofia Rothman and Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin — played a prominent role in this process.

As for Naddnipyryanshchyna, the situation was the opposite, unlike what we observe in the Grand Duchy of Finland during the same historical period. Remaining under imperial rule led to a change in the content of Ukrainian culture as it was known then. Relations between Ukrainians and the Russian Empire in the 19th century acquired a different character than in earlier times — tsarism purposefully turned Naddnipyryanshchyna into an ordinary province. The reform of education that began in 1864, which was approved by Alexander II, had the same goal — the tsarist “Regulations on primary public schools” introduced a unified system of primary education, where the Russian language and Russian culture dominated; at the same time, classical male and female gymnasiums were created in the field of secondary education, where tuition fees were very high.⁵²

The revival of the Ukrainian national movement, whose representatives took advantage of the reforms of Alexander II, at first did not arouse concern in the tsarist government and among the Russian public. However, the “explosion” of the Polish Uprising in 1863-1864, fears that Ukrainians would demand the restoration of their former rights to cultural activities⁵³,

⁵² Thus the Ukrainian population — 90% landless peasantry — turned out to be beyond the reach of the tsarist innovations, while at the same time becoming part of the “triune Russian people” with the light hand of the Russian authorities; see Stephen White, Ben Eklof and Morten Frederiksen, *School and Society in Tsarist and Soviet Russia: Selected Papers from the Fourth World Congress for Soviet and East European Studies* (Harrogate: Springer, 1993), 254.

⁵³ We are talking about Cossack liberties and privileges of the local gentry, which were cancelled by several Russian emperors — Peter I, Catherine II, Alexander I and Nicholas I, — after the occupation of a significant part of Ukrainian lands; see Daniel Beauvois, *Le Noble, Le Serf, Et Le Révivor: La Noblesse Polonaise Entre Le Tsarisme Et*

and even demand independence, led to the publication on 20 July 1863 of a secret document, the “Valuev Circular”, and then on 18 May 1876 the “Ems Ukaze”, restricting the public use of the Ukrainian language in the state donations, schools, churches, and printed literature.⁵⁴ This prompted the so-called “buditelius” of the modern Ukrainian nation to develop their own path of struggle for a linguistic, educational and cultural identity. In this turbulent time for Naddnipryanshchyna, a rather outstanding personality appeared, who would direct the Ukrainian national revival movement towards the European conditions of that time, or rather, adjust the movement’s path to more European positions.⁵⁵ This person is Sofia Lindfors-Rusova — the innovator of Ukrainian school education with an extreme bias in favour of Ukrainian antiquity and tradition.

She was born on 18 February 1856 in the Oleshnya estate in the Chernihiv governorate in a Swedish-French family: her father, Theodor Lindfors, was a Swede by descent, and her mother, Anne Jervés, was a Frenchwoman who died when Sofia was only 4 years old.⁵⁶ In 1866, the family moved to Kyiv, where Sofia Lindfors studied at the Fundukleevskaya Gymnasium, from which she graduated with a gold medal in 1870. Despite her origin, her childhood was saturated with the Ukrainian spirit — a Ukrainian nanny sang Ukrainian songs to Sofia Lindfors and acquainted her with the hard life of the surrounding peasants, who lived in serfdom and captivity in those times.⁵⁷ Upon completing her schooling, Sofia Lindfors found herself in a new Ukrainian environment. She met and made friends with a family of prominent Ukrainians — the Starytskys family, the composer Mykola Lysenko, and other Ukrainian patriots. The Ukrainian youth of Naddnipryanshchyna, which included Sofia Lindfors, “went to the people” — they communicated directly with peasants in the villages and workers in the suburbs, collected and wrote songs, tales and traditions. Subsequently, she decided to engage in pedagogy — in 1871, her efforts culminated in opening

Les Masses Ukrainiennes (1831-1863) (Paris: Éditions des Archives Contemporaines, 1985), 365; Natalia Jakowenko, *Historia Ukrainy od czasów najdawniejszych do końca XVIII wieku* (Lublin: Instytut Europy Środkowo-Wschodniej, 2000), 397.

⁵⁴ Yuriy Zems’kyyi, *Zarodzhennya ukraïnskoho modernoho natsiyetvorennya* (Horodok, 2018), 195, 255.

⁵⁵ Serhiy Svitlenko, *Narodnytskyy rukh v Ukraïni 1860-1880-kh rokiv* (Dnipropetrovsk, 1996), 64, 128.

⁵⁶ Yevhen Kovalenko, Iryna Pinchuk, *Osvitnya diyal'nist' i pedahohichni pohlyady Sofii Rusovoi* (Nizhyn, 1998), 12, 213.

⁵⁷ Marta Bohachevs'ka, *Duma Ukraïny – zhinochoho rodu* (Kyïv: Voskresinnya, 1993), 9, 110. Olena Proskurova, ‘Sofia Rusova – talanovyta dochka Ukraïny’, *Pochatkova shkola*, No. 3 (2003), 44.

the first kindergarten in Kyiv, where the methodology of Friedrich Fröbel was practiced.⁵⁸ This institution became the centre of Ukrainian national culture, where Ukrainian intellectuals gathered in the evenings, including the future husband of Sofia Lindfors — Oleksandr Rusov. After their marriage in 1876, they issued an uncensored full edition of *The Complete Kobzar* by Taras Shevchenko together in Prague.⁵⁹

The existence of the “Valuev Circular” and the “Ems Ukaze”, which exerted the linguistic and cultural pressure of tsarism on Ukrainians in Naddniprovyshchyna, forced Sofia Lindfors-Rusova to abandon educational activities and go to study as a medical assistant at the central medical collegium of Chernihiv Governorate. In the 1880s, she and her husband joined the revolutionary movement and were friends with the “Narodnaya Volya”, for which Sofia Lindfors-Rusova was imprisoned for 3 months in the autumn of 1881.⁶⁰ However, after 2 years the Rusovys family moved to Odessa, where Sofia Lindfors-Rusova compiled catalogues of Ukrainian literature, read out pedagogical works and became an active participant in the Ukrainian national movement. By the end of the 19th century, she was constantly under police surveillance by the tsarist gendarmerie. In June of 1906 at the village of Jystilä, Sofia Lindfors-Rusova participated in the 3rd Congress of the All-Russian Union of Teachers and Figures of Public Education, where she was seeking to promote the problems of national culture and education of the Ukrainian people as widely as possible.⁶¹ The revolution of 1905-1907 made it possible to focus on teaching and socio-political activities. In 1906, Sofia Lindfors-Rusova created and published the Ukrainian Primer, and in 1910 she edited the first Ukrainian pedagogical magazine *Svitlo*.⁶² In 1908-1917, she taught at the Kyiv Commercial Institute, taught a preschool education course at the Kyiv Fröbel Institute, and then participated in the world press conference in Brussels.⁶³ Tsarist education reform was a real profanity for Sofia Lindfors-Rusova because instead of studying, it was aimed at planting inferiority complexes in Ukrainians in Naddniprovyshchyna and inculcating dependence on the Russian people.

⁵⁸ Bohachevs'ka, *Duma Ukraïny*, 11; Proskurova, ‘Sofia Rusova...’, 45.

⁵⁹ Bohachevs'ka, *Duma Ukraïny*, 13; Proskurova, ‘Sofia Rusova...’, 46.

⁶⁰ Galyna Milenina, *Pedahohichni idei Sofii Rusovoi ta Marii Montessori: porivnyal'nïy analiz* (Kirovohrad, 2015), 40, 300.

⁶¹ Oksana Dzhuz, *Zhÿttya i tvorchist Sofii Fedorivnÿ Rusovoi* (Ivano-Frankivs'k: NAIR, 2016), 114-115, 216.

⁶² Dzhuz, *Zhÿttya i tvorchist*, 116.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 117.

After the revolution in February of 1917 and the overthrow of tsarism, Sofia Lindfors-Rusova was full of hopes for the development of Ukraine's own national pedagogy. She was an active member of the Central Council of Ukraine (also called the Tsentralna Rada), the presidium of which delegated her to the newly created Ministry of Education of the Ukrainian People's Republic to head the department of out-of-school education and preschool education.⁶⁴ At the beginning of 1919, she was evacuated along with the Ukrainian government to Kamianets-Podilskyi.⁶⁵ During the last years of Ukrainian statehood, Sofia Lindfors-Rusova worked productively in the Red Cross, saved the lives of many Ukrainian soldiers who were held captive, and also dealt with schools and preschool institutions in the territory controlled by the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic. In 1920, together with her husband, she emigrated to Prague, where she developed her own concept of the Ukrainian national system of education.⁶⁶

National education is the main and determining idea in the pedagogical concept of Sofia Lindfors-Rusova, which methodologically acquires the basic and most important laws of development of the theory and practice of school education and upbringing. Sofia Lindfors-Rusova gives the central place to the child with his/her innate inclinations, abilities, capabilities, and talents. At the same time, the main task of upbringing is to ensure the development of these factors, as well as developing national identity and universal morality, the formation of a socially mature, hardworking, creative person who is capable of conscious public choice and the enrichment of the intellectual, spiritual, economic, socio-political and cultural potential of his people.⁶⁷ Like many representatives of the Ukrainian national movement, Sofia Lindfors-Rusova cherished hopes for a revival of Ukrainian identity not so much among a people that is saturated with tradition and

⁶⁴ For a year, until the capture of the Red Army in Kyiv in January of 1918, Sofia Lindfors-Rusova headed the All-Ukrainian Teachers Union, and in pedagogical activity and creativity she concentrated her attention on the creation of a national system of instruction and children's education; see Sofia Lindfors-Rusova, *Nova shkola sotsial'noho v'khovannya* (Katar'noslav-Leipzig, 1924), 6-7, 152.

⁶⁵ Then it was already the Directory of the Ukrainian People's Republic, headed by Ataman Simon Petlyura, who led the rebellion in December of 1918 to overthrow the last Hetman of Ukraine, Pavlo Skoropadskyi, see Serhiy L'ytv'yn, *Sud istorii: S'ymon Petliura i petliuriana* (K'iv, 2001), 640.

⁶⁶ In this framework, important fundamental theoretical and methodological problems — goals, tasks, content, methods, principles, forms of education, training — were received; see Sofia Lindfors-Rusova, *Teoriya i prak'yitka doshkil'noho v'khovannya* (Praha, 1924), 18-19, 130.

⁶⁷ Sofia Lindfors-Rusova, *Nova shkola sotsial'noho v'khovannya* (Katar'noslav-Leipzig, 1924), 20-21, 152.

linguistic uniformity, but in the leading stratum — the socio-political elite and intelligentsia of Naddniproshchyna. In her opinion, the concept of the native Ukrainian school should have solved this problem. Despite all the important and unusually valuable work that she carried out from 1880 to the 1920s, Sofia Lindfors-Rusova had to live thereafter in exile, and died in a foreign land in Prague on 5 February 1940.⁶⁸

The work of Sofia Lindfors-Rusova is quite interesting and relevant nowadays. It emphasised that social and national education begins in kindergartens, schools and playgrounds at the age of 4-5 years. She believed that children under 5 do not show social inclinations. They are individualists, even selfish. But with the development of speech, interest in friendship arises in the child, first with toys, then with real people. Sofia Lindfors-Rusova emphasised that the game is the first social form, and adults retain the need for it.⁶⁹ Labour is of great social importance in education. Collective labour produces more significant results than individual labour. Unlike Elisabeth Alander and Johanna Sofia Rothman, there were also problems of religious education in Sofia Lindfors-Rusova's circle of pedagogical interests. Sofia Lindfors-Rusova noted that every child is both a child of his/her parents and a child of God.⁷⁰ She considered issues of morality in the spirit of Christian doctrine. Sofia Lindfors-Rusova explained her approach to parenting as a necessity for the discipline of love and affection. As a teacher, like her colleagues Elisabeth Alander and Johanna Sofia Rothman, she called for respect for the freedom of the individual along with a sharply negative attitude towards violence against human dignity.⁷¹ The child was considered to be a very vulnerable personality who should be approached with kindness, and the teacher should strive to awaken the child's interest in learning new things. The teacher considered the mother tongue to be a powerful tool, a source of unique national outlook that was equally important for the harmonious development of the child. Sofia Lindfors-Rusova considered native literature to be a system by which the peculiarities of perception, as well as the reflection of the surrounding reality, are formed in the child's mind.⁷² Elisabeth Alander and Johanna Sofia Roth-

⁶⁸ Oksana Dzhus, *Zhŷttya i tvorchist Sofii Fedorivnŷ Rusovoï* (Ivano-Frankivs'k: NAIR, 2016), 123, 216; Natalia Dŷchek, 'Sofia Rusova i zarubizhna pedahohika', *Pedahohika i psŷkholohiya*, No. 3 (1996), 169-177.

⁶⁹ Lindfors-Rusova, *Teoriya i prakŷtka doshkil'noho vŷkhovannya*, 74-75, 130.

⁷⁰ Lindfors-Rusova, *Nova shkola*, 6-7, 152.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, 28-29.

⁷² *Ibid.*, 61-62.

man made the same observations, as evidenced by Maija Meretniemi and Inger Österberg.⁷³

The main difference between the activities of Elisabeth Alander, Johanna Sofia Rothman, Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin and Sofia Lindfors-Rusova is determined by the attitude of the imperial authority towards them. If the government of the Russian Empire reacted neutrally to the process of Finnicization of public education in the territory of the Grand Duchy of Finland because the government considered this process to be indispensable in the Russian government's own struggle against Swedish influence, then such steps in Naddnipyryanshchyna, namely the Ukrainianization of schooling, were seen by the tsarist central government as an unacceptable mistake, which the government would not allow or tolerate. That is why in the 1900s and 1910s, tsarist officials placed serious obstacles before Sofia Lindfors-Rusova, trying to prevent the implementation of her innovative educational system based on the theories of Pestalozzi, Fröbel and even Maria Montessori. It was the prohibition of educational activity in the schools of Naddnipyryanshchyna that did not allow Sofia Lindfors-Rusova to put the theoretical concepts that she laid out in numerous works into practice.⁷⁴ However, it should be emphasised that at the time of the liquidation of the Russian Empire as a multinational state, Ukrainians were among the illiterate peoples, while the Finns were among the most literate.⁷⁵ Perhaps this is where the significant difference lies between the persons studied, who, independently of each other, tried to give their people a so-called "ray of hope" for the future through universal access to education.

It should be noted that numerous books and journal articles on pedagogy, educational history, comparative and social pedagogy form the theoretical heritage of Sofia Lindfors-Rusova.⁷⁶ Despite the fact that her life was different from the lives of Elisabeth Alander, Johanna Sofia Rothman and Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin, hers was also not indifferent to the fate of her people, wishing them to be educated and recognised in Europe. The work of Sofia Lindfors-Rusova pays considerable attention to the problems

⁷³ Meretniemi, Österberg, *Ebeneser – 100 vuotta lasten hyväksi*, 150, 175.

⁷⁴ Milenina, *Pedahohichi ideï Sofii Rusovoi ta Marii Montessori*, 105-106, 300.

⁷⁵ Alexandra Ovsyannikova, "The Sytem of public education of the Russian Empire in the second half of 19th – early 20th centuries", *Social-politic sciences*, No. 2 (2017), 95-99.

⁷⁶ Sofia Rusova, *Z malovidomoho i nevidomoho (u 3-kh chastynakh): Chastyna 1. "Nestorka ukrains'koï pedahohichnoi literatury"* (Ivano-Frankivs'k: Hostynets', 2006), 456; *Chastyna 2. "Senyorka ukrains'koho zhinotstva"* (Ivano-Frankivs'k: Hostynets', 2007), 364; *Chastyna 3. "Ya ne poetesa... Ya ne vchena... Ya – hromadyanka"* (Ivano-Frankivs'k: Play, 2012), 604.

of charity and morality, since by nature she was a person who never tired of helping and supporting her neighbours, especially women, children, orphans and other vulnerable groups of the population.⁷⁷

The common denominator among the aforementioned persons is the desire to establish national upbringing and identity in Finland and Ukraine through public education, that is the development of national education regardless of the imperial reform of the already existing system of education. The educational ideal that they shared in common, namely the education of a harmonious person and citizen on the basis of love and reverence for the best national traditions, was contrary to the existing tsarist regime. Of course, in comparison with Naddnipyrianshchyna, the Grand Duchy of Finland was in a more favourable position due to its autonomous status, but there, too, the imperial authorities considered national education as an attack on the state system and the reforms introduced by the tsar from the Romanov dynasty, which no one dared to contradict. Sofia Lindfors-Rusova, Elisabeth Alander, Johanna Sofia Rothman and even Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultin were convinced that school and education, as well as the linguistic and cultural identity of the people (Ukrainians and Finns) can be successfully implemented provided that school and the upbringing process are national and popular, not bureaucratic and ideological according to the decisions of the imperial authorities, namely the Russian Empire. Undoubtedly, the aforementioned women are pearls of world pedagogy since they placed the individual at the centre of their scientific interests, the child as a national and social unit, the total number of which, regardless of age and condition, will be raised and educated on a national basis, and will later form the current national community.

KEYWORDS: Naddnipyrianshchyna, the Grand Duchy of Finland, Education, National Identity

DENIS KOVALIOV is a PhD student in the history of the Dnipro Polytechnic University.*

⁷⁷ Lindfors-Rusova, *Teoriya i praktyka doskil'noho vykhovannya*, 121, 130; Lindfors-Rusova, *Nova shkola*, 146, 152.

* Correspondence: E-mail: Denis Kovaljov <sichslavsokil@gmail.com>

KOKKUVÕTE: *Rahvusliku vaimu kaitsjad Soome Suurvürtsiriigis ja Dnepri Ukrainas*

Ukraina ja Soome võrdlev ajalugu nende ühisel Vene impeeriumi koosseisu kuulumise perioodil on väheuuritud teema. See kehtib eriti nende isikute kohta, keda ajaloolased on ka oma kodumaal vähe uurinud. Käesoleva vaatenurga eesmärk on võrrelda naisõpetajate eluteid ja loomingulist pärandit. Neil nn soome ja ukraina rahvusliku vaimu kandjail oli oluline roll nende rahvaste rahvusliku vaimu ja identiteedi kujunemisel. Autor analüüsis 19. sajandi teise poole ja 20. sajandi alguse keiserliku võimu mõju Soome Suurhertsogiriigile ja Dnepri Ukrainale kui rahvuspiirkondadele. Ta leidis, et Romanovite riigil oli vallutatud rahvaste suhtes topeltstandard: ühelt poolt valitses lojaalsus ja sallivus soomlaste suhtes, teisalt venestamine ja rõhumine ukrainlaste suhtes, keda ei nähtud venelastest eraldi seisva rahvana. Autor tuvastas Euroopa teoretikute ja haridusvaldkonna praktikute mõju naisõpetajatele Elisabeth Alanderile, Johanna Sofia Rothmanile, Thekla Johanna Wirginia Hultinile ja Sofia Lindfors-Rusovale. Autor rõhutas nende rolli soome ja ukraina rahvusliku vaimu kujunemisel tsaaririigi kriisi ajal ja iseseisvate riikide tekkimisel revolutsiooniperioodil (1917–21). Ta tõmbas paralleele nende naiste elutegevuse ja loomingulise pärandi vahel. Vaatamata geograafilisele vahemaale ja erinevatele poliitilistele vaadetele oli neil ühine eesmärk: oma kaasmaalaste harimine ja ümberkujundamine kirjaoskajateks kodanikeks.