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Introduction

Nations and nationalisms have typically been understood and approached in the framework of public sphere. The context of the private sphere has been regarded as apolitical, and hence irrelevant. This has contributed to an emphasis on male actors, who have been associated with the public, and to the exclusion of women, who have been connected with the private. Consequently, in many national histories, men are treated as actors, whereas women represent the nation’s tradition in a metaphorical and symbolic role. More often than not, conventional national historiography fails to take gender into account or to incorporate women’s experiences and activities. Nevertheless, interest in the relation between gender and nationalism has increased in recent decades.¹

Moreover, emotions have traditionally been associated with the feminine and the private and seen as secondary to reason, which in part explains why emotions are often missing from the analysis of decision-making and

actions. During the 2000s, the history of emotions has constituted a growing field in historical research. Emotions are, in a way, intrinsic to nationalism and belong to a nation’s ontology. They are part of the relation an individual has with the nation, and nations can even be seen as ‘emotional communities.’ In more general terms, the significance of emotions for politics has increasingly been recognized. In addition, the ‘emotion’ approach can be associated with an emphasis on the personal meanings of nationalism. Anthony Cohen’s notion of ‘personal nationalism’ underlines the individual interpretations of nationalism, their link to self-construction and the attempt to understand ‘personal sentiments’ linked to nationalism.

Drawing from this background, new perspectives can arise by explicitly connecting the analysis of gender, emotions and nationalism with each other, and by bringing them to the level of concrete lives and relationships. This article provides an analysis of a family circle involved in nationalistic activities that ties together all of these aspects. In general, family ties have been important in various areas of power outside the home, such as in politics, business and academia. In the Grand Duchy of Finland, the academic Tengström family came to play a key role in the process of nation-building during the mid-nineteenth century, after several upcoming male nationalists married the family’s culturally prominent daughters. The men of the family are somewhat well-known in Finnish historiography, and they figure, for instance, in the histories of university, society and the press. The women of the family have received some attention in studies about women’s activities in mid-nineteenth century Finland, though they remain scarce. Consequently, Finnish historiography of nationalism has largely concentrated its focus on male actors – sometimes designated ‘national heroes’ – and their public activities. Connections between personal relationships and nationalistic ideology have been analysed in some studies in the context of the marriages of national ‘great men.’
Examining the Tengström group as a unit and designating them as members of the same family circle highlights the significance and impact of mutual relationships in nation-building. In this way, the scope of themes and actors in the history of nationalism, and especially that of Finland, can be broadened. How did emotions and nationalism affect each other in the group’s formation and in its members’ nationalistic activities? What do the gendered roles look like when juxtaposed to each other and how do the different aspects of life interlock? This article combines biographical data with epistolary sources and argues that the family formed an ideological-emotional environment that encompassed both women and men. Moreover, the social and emotional ties constituted a pivotal motivator which further enabled the family’s engagement with nationalistic ideas and endeavours. In more general terms, I propose that emotions as well as familial and social relationships – in which the women’s role is central – can be important driving forces of nationalist thought and movements, rendering them an important element to take into account in research.

In this article, I approach the Tengström family from a group biographical viewpoint. Biographical research in general can be an effective way to analyse the connection between different aspects of life. It serves to reveal the interconnectedness of both women’s and men’s public and private lives and how they benefited from each other’s networks. More specifically, group biography addresses a somewhat small group which is recognised as such by the members themselves and/or their contemporaries. The research setting draws attention to the importance of personal interaction in the development of ideas, thereby offering new approaches to intellectual history. The (male) intellectuals and politicians can be analysed in connection with their loved ones and social circles, thereby revealing emotional structures and deconstructing national canons by avoiding the artificial isolation of individuals. Group biography ties together multiple life stories and focuses on the relationships within a group of people by concentrating on the shared aspects of their lives. Moreover, it is assumed that the group’s members most likely influenced
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each other’s agency and even personalities. One pervasive question concerns the dynamics between the group and the individual: how does membership to the group explain an individual’s actions and views? Group biography obviously provides multiple opportunities for comparison, for instance, between different people and different social roles.

Letters have often been a popular source material for researchers interested in subjective experiences, emotions and thoughts. The culturally and linguistically mediated nature of the letter has, of course, been widely problematized. However, it can be argued that both the writer and the letters are constructed in the same culturally and socially shared reality. Letters can be approached as spaces of self-construction instead of merely reflecting or conventionalizing something ‘authentic’ somewhere beyond. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that letters offer only a certain viewpoint to the person: it is an epistolary self. Along the same line of thought, William Reddy’s notion of ‘emotive’ helps to conceptualize the emotional language and expressions in letters. Emotive does not merely state some inner emotional experience, but rather evokes and constructs it. In terms of contextualization, the dialogical nature of letters is important. They are always written in a certain situation and relation.

In the nineteenth century, letters were idealized as an authentic and spontaneous way of self-expression and served as a means to process one’s feeling and construct emotional relationships. By the standards of our time, the overwhelming romantic vocabulary might seem feigned or just as a fad, but this strangeness is not a reason to deem it insincere. It can be argued that the nineteenth-century letters did not just tell what had been done, but did what they talked about. The letters had very real consequences and most importantly, the writers and the recipients tended to take these letters – and the feelings expressed within – seriously, which affected their writing as well as other actions.
The analysis begins with a short overview of the Tengström family's background. I will subsequently establish how the mutual feelings and shared nationalistic interests contributed to and enabled the formation of the tight-knit emotional-ideological group. After this, I will analyse the men's and women's activities respectively and then the family's shared efforts and continuity. Lastly, I will present my concluding remarks. The timeframe concentrates on the 1840s and 1850s: the group's biography begins when the group emerges, and ends when the unique setting dissolves due to several untimely deaths.

**Finnish-minded Academic Family Tradition**

In the aftermath of the Napoleonic wars, Sweden had to cede its eastern parts to Russia in 1809, reforming the area to a kind of an autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland under the rule of the Russian Empire. It had been an integrated part of Sweden for centuries which helps to explain why the language of the administration and education was Swedish. However, Swedish only constituted a minority language in the Grand Duchy. Approximately 85 percent of the inhabitants spoke Finnish. The Swedish-speaking upper and educated class constituted less than two percent and the Swedish-speaking common people only around 10 percent of the total population. As a part of the European nationalistic currents – the Romantic conception of language as the expression of national spirit, and Herderian and Hegelian philosophy – and in this new political situation, interest in the Finnish language and culture and their development increased. Moreover, some members of the educated class felt that there was a need to bridge the gap between themselves and the common people, and believed that this could be done by learning Finnish. As the century progressed, Finnish nationalism developed into the so-called Fennoman movement.¹⁷
Within the Tengström family, the tradition of promoting Finnishness dated back to the beginning of the nineteenth century. An important figure in the Tengström family and on the Finnish political scene was the Bishop and Vice Chancellor of the University, Jacob Tengström (1755–1832). He established close relations with the Tsar and his representatives, and exerted a significant influence over the decisions made during the years 1808 and 1809. His plans called for the consolidation of Finland as a separate entity, which in his estimation required the awakening and strengthening of the national spirit, a clear separation from Sweden, and a positive attitude towards Russia. Jacob Tengström managed to improve his and his family’s position. For instance, his children were ennobled and he himself became the first Archbishop of Finland in 1817.18

In the generation of the Archbishop’s children, the family’s academic nexus formed around his daughter Sofia Magdalena af Tengström (1803–1832) and his nephew, professor J.J. Tengström (1787–1858). They got married in 1821. Sofia Magdalena af Tengström died in 1832 leaving J.J. Tengström a widower with four children between the ages of nine and two. Three years later he married his other cousin, Carolina Bergbom (née Tengström, 1803–1885), who had also been widowed.19 Marriages have played an important role in the creation and renewal of family networks or even ‘dynasties.’ The same applies to the families of university professors and to the academic ‘clan’ of the Tengströms. Both J.J. Tengström’s marriages were so-called close marriages, since both of his wives were his cousins. Cousin marriages were quite common in ‘dynastic’ families. The close marriage guaranteed loyalty among kin, which could manifest as nepotism. Matches like this were actually quite common among the European bourgeoisie in the nineteenth century. This reductive marriage strategy enabled and aimed at retaining existing resources under the control of the same group. J.J. Tengström’s first marriage to Sofia Magdalena af Tengström contributed to the development and maintenance of the family’s influence in academia, and unsurprisingly resulted in the Tengström clan being accused of nepotism, as J.J. Tengström became
professor of philosophy in 1827 due to his uncle’s influence.\textsuperscript{20} In addition, J.J. Tengström’s second marriage to Carolina Bergbom appears highly advantageous from the perspective of the kin group, since the childless widow and the widower with four children found each other.

Although J.J. Tengström himself was quite moderate, he, as an important Hegelian scholar, did figure as a background actor in the rise of the Finnish national movement. He emphasized the development of the Finnish language and its position although he did not want Finland to become monolingual and encouraged scholars to amass Finnish folklore before it disappeared.\textsuperscript{21} The Tengströms’ relationships to the historiographical key figures of the rising Finnish nationalism were close. Carolina Tengström was the sister of Fredrika Runeberg (née Tengström, 1807–1879), who was married to ‘the national poet’ J.L. Runeberg (1804–1877). In addition, ‘the national philosopher’ J.V. Snellman was close to the family and especially to his teacher, J.J. Tengström. The men were part of the so-called Saturday Society, which was an informal but influential Finnish-minded cultural group in the 1830s. The women of the same social circle held their own discussions while the men had their gatherings.\textsuperscript{22}

**Ideological and Emotional Suitability**

As the Tengström children grew up, their status and social networks contributed to the appeal of the family circle. The eldest child, Robert Tengström (1823–1847), was a promising philosopher and an enthusiast of all things Finnish. The sisters Sofi (1826–1906), Helene (1829–1857) and Natalia (1830–1881) were well educated and interested in the issues of the day. Tragically, Robert already died in 1847 at the age of twenty-four, rendering the daughters’ marriages as the family’s chance to consolidate its position, ensure continuity, and to attach itself to the new, rising generation of academic and cultural life.\textsuperscript{23}
The historian Kai Häggman has crystallized the marriage strategy of the Finnish educated bourgeoisie, which also seems to apply to the wider European context: people sought ‘the one’ among those who were suitable. Social life largely played out amongst the same social group, within which the spouse was expected to be found. There were numerous, in other words enough, suitable partners available, and as a result the ideal of true love could be and indeed was emphasized. However, at a time when many spheres of life were gendered, siblings’ friends were another important source of potential spouses. The social structure itself could ensure that young people were likely to become interested in people which were considered to be ‘suitable’.

All three Tengström daughters found their spouses from the same, Finnish-minded circle of friends. The eldest daughter, Sofi Tengström, married her brother Robert’s best friend and future linguist Herman Kellgren (1822–1856) in 1849. Through Kellgren, a fellow student and later business partner, the journalist Paavo Tikkanen (1823–1873) became close to the family at the end of the 1840s. The second daughter, Helene Tengström, became interested in Paavo Tikkanen and they married in 1851. The youngest child, Natalia Tengström, likewise married within the same circle of friends. Her spouse, after 1850, was the linguist and explorer M.A. Castrén (1813–1852) who had made his name by studying languages related to Finnish in Siberia.

Castrén was slightly older than the other sons-in-law and had socialized with the older Tengström generation and the Saturday Society in the 1830s. Moreover, he had been a teacher and a friend to Robert Tengström and Herman Kellgren. The sons-in-law were of somewhat humbler social origins than the Tengströms. They represented the rising estates of the nineteenth century. Kellgren was a merchant’s son from Kuopio, Castrén was the son of a clergyman, and Tikkanen was among the first Finnish-speaking students of peasant origins.
The significance of the family networks in the society was pivotal, especially in creating lasting administrative and ideological positions, but other relations, such as friendships forged at school or in student organizations, constantly increased in importance. Interestingly, even though J.J. Tengström had gained his professorship with the help of a powerful relative, he himself objected to nepotism and emphasized an individual’s own merits. This attitude is consonant with his eager acceptance of sons-in-law from the upwardly mobile social groups.

Emotional attachment between the couples was a prerequisite for all the matches. Romantic exchanges and expressions, including letters, poems and flowers, are extant from the couples’ engagement periods. Engaged couples had the need to solidify their newly established bond, and, in line with Reddy’s notion of emotive, this can be seen as an emotive construction of the mutual relationships, which at the same time evoked and strengthened the emotions of both parties. In addition, the writers take each other’s emotions seriously, which subsequently affected their own expressions and actions.

In the Castréns’ case, the correspondence indicates that the ideological commitment was actually a prerequisite for mutual love. M.A. Castrén declared ‘I have loved in you the glad temperament, the warm heart, the high feeling for truth, for knowledge, for the fatherland, for everything that is noble and good,’ and assumed that Natalia Tengström loved in him ‘the spirit that has shown to be ready, according to its measure, to work for everything true and noble.’

Natalia Tengström, for instance, hoped that her fiancé would not leave Finland for an academic position in St. Petersburg, and thanked him for his decision. She thought that it was ‘unforgivable, for one’s own benefit, to abandon one’s own country. And you see, it would have been very hard for me.’ The couple emotively constructed not only their relationship but also their connection with the nationalistic cause.
However, the young men were also interested in becoming members of the Tengström clan and strengthened their relationships and attachments with emotionally loaded expressions. During his engagement to Sofi Tengström, Herman Kellgren already forged his relationship with his future parents-in-law by stating that their home was ‘another home’ for
him. He wrote to J.J. Tengström that he was like his ‘other Father’ and called Carolina Tengström his ‘Mother’ – albeit with quotation marks. J.J. and Carolina Tengström reciprocated his emotive register and especially after their only son’s death regarded him as another son. The parents’ attitude and readiness to reciprocate Kellgren’s emotive relationship demonstrates how the sons-in-law were also important for the family as a guarantee of its position and continuity.

M.A. Castrén also admired and was very fond of J.J. Tengström, and the affection was mutual. He, ‘with immense pleasure respected him with the name of father’ and would gladly ‘bring joy to his old days.’ However, it was not impossible to express negative attitudes in these newly formed relationships. M.A. Castrén’s relationship with his fiancée’s mother, Carolina Tengström, was somewhat complicated and their attitudes towards each other were reserved, though these doubts did not play a role in the match. Nevertheless, this indicates that a national reputation and fame did not suffice when joining a family circle, as the personal qualities and preferences had to be negotiated as well.

Paavo Tikkanen, despite his background in the Finnish peasantry, was also warmly welcomed into the family and the parents rejoiced at his good influence over Helene Tengström’s mood and self-esteem. Both J.J. and Carolina Tengström confided their feelings to their eldest daughter Sofi, to whom they occasionally wrote in confidence about their views on the younger sisters. Paavo Tikkanen might actually have been an appropriate addition to the sons-in-law from the family’s perspective: a man who embodied the admirable qualities of the idealized Finnish common people.

Compared to the earlier generation, the marriage strategies changed. The daughters’ marriages can be considered as reproductive or even partially expansive. Expansive strategy on the one hand aims outside the family circle and at accumulating resources and the number of contacts. Reproductive strategy, on the other hand, is a way to expand without risk: the knot is tied between people who belong to the same social group but
are not related to each other.\textsuperscript{36} None of the three daughters married within the kin although there were unmarried male cousins available, even in the same town. However, the family of the cousins, the academically established Laguses, was reserved or even critical towards Finnish nationalistic thinking, which may have contributed to the absence of matches with them.\textsuperscript{37} Instead, all marriages tended in the same direction: socially towards the rising estates of the nineteenth century and ideologically towards the developing Fennoman movement. All three sons-in-law came from outside the established academic families. The ideology and the social position of the sons-in-law, of course, coincided: nationalism was first and foremost a project of the educated bourgeoisie.

\textbf{Men’s Endeavours in the Social Circle}

Men’s activities in the Tengström circle concentrated on academic careers, publications and business. Social relations played a significant role. Robert Tengström and Herman Kellgren became close friends at university during the early 1840s. A few years later, Kellgren and Sofi Tengström became engaged, but secretly, probably because of their young age. M.A. Castrén’s lectures on the \textit{Kalevala} were an important source of inspiration for both Robert Tengström and Herman Kellgren, and the men were also friends outside of academia.\textsuperscript{38} In addition, all the men were associated with the Finnish Literature Society, and both Castrén and Kellgren had even held formal positions as the society’s secretary during the 1840s. Paavo Tikkanen also was an active member whereas Robert Tengström does not appear to have been particularly engaged.\textsuperscript{39}

The shared enthusiasm for the Finnish cause served to intensify Tengström and Kellgren’s friendship. Kellgren explicitly stated in a letter to Tengström that the nationalist cause had ‘perhaps more than anything else bound our souls together.’\textsuperscript{40} ‘[W]e are brothers in more than one respect and created for each other’, Tengström wrote, drawing from their deep
emotional connection but also their relationship as future brothers-in-law.\textsuperscript{41} He also emphasized their common destiny as the future leaders of the Finnish nationalistic movement.\textsuperscript{42} Marrying a friend’s sister could, indeed, be a way of sealing a friendship.\textsuperscript{43}

Tengström and Kellgren were the leading Fennomans of their generation and they acquired an influential position amongst their fellow students. They were looked up to by many of their peers and Kellgren had a formal leading position within his student association as its curator.\textsuperscript{44} The young men began to promote their ideology with publications in the mid-1840s. The fashion for literary almanacs, which had been widely in vogue in Europe during the first half of the nineteenth century, arrived in Finland in the 1840s. Tengström and Kellgren’s publications can be seen as an elucidation of this trend.\textsuperscript{45} \textit{Finsk Anthologi} (‘Finnish Anthology’) (1845) included folklore translations into Swedish as did \textit{Fosterländskt Album I–III} (‘Patriotic Album’) (1845–1847). The latter also included essays on Finnish language and culture.\textsuperscript{46} Runenberg’s poem ‘Vårt land’ (‘Our country’), which later became the words of the Finnish national anthem, was published in \textit{Fosterländskt Album}.\textsuperscript{47}

These publications were targeted at the Swedish-speaking educated elite and bourgeoisie. The circulation of \textit{Fosterländskt Album} was not very great in terms of numbers: in towns of some thousand inhabitants for instance, the average number of copies sold was only twenty to twenty-five. The booksellers, nevertheless, considered \textit{Fosterländskt Album} ‘the most current book in the entire new literature’ and it had received praise from the buyers.\textsuperscript{48} The aim of the publications was to create Finnish literature and culture but also to disseminate it to the educated so that, in the long run, they would come to acknowledge Finnish as their own language. As Robert Tengström put it when explaining their endeavours to M.A. Castrén: ‘Our task, I think, is to nationalize the country’s educated class, that is, to let it know the country [who] we are, that we namely are not Swedish or Russian, but Finnish.’\textsuperscript{49} For the young men, the publications were also a
way to test their strength and to get recognition from their peers in the academic field.\textsuperscript{50}

The efforts at educating the Finnish-speaking masses took place simultaneously. In the mid-1840s, Herman Kellgren and Paavo Tikkanen’s student association began to publish a collection called \textit{Lukemisia Suomen kansan hyödyksi} (‘Readings for the Benefit of the Finnish Nation’). Tikkanen’s role in particular was central. The publication included educative essays for the Finnish-speaking common people as well as translations, for instance, of Runeberg’s poetry. It had its predecessors in folk literature published in Sweden and England. Like the \textit{Fosterländskt Album}, \textit{Lukemisia} appeared three times during the years 1845–1847. \textit{Lukemisia}’s circulation however was much larger. The edition of the first part ran to 4,000 copies and 6,000 for the two subsequent parts.\textsuperscript{51} Herman Kellgren was able to witness the popularity of \textit{Lukemisia} at first-hand while travelling in eastern Finland: the volumes had become worn out after being loaned to many readers, and the map that was included was hung on the wall in many peasant houses. One man was particularly happy that, because of \textit{Lukemisia}, they had been able to resolve ‘in a scientific way’ a disagreement on whether the Earth was moving or stationary. Poetry however did not prove to be as popular: Runeberg’s verses were seen as ‘empty rhyme’, since they did not portray something that had really happened.\textsuperscript{52}

\textit{Fosterländskt Album} and \textit{Lukemisia} can be seen as analogous projects which epitomized the twofold core objectives of the Fennoman project, as formulated by J.V. Snellman in particular: nationalizing the civilized gentry and civilizing the nation. The projects delineate the differences in the emphasis of the members of members-to-be of the Tengström circle. Swedish-speaking, well-born Robert Tengström was keener on familiarizing his fellow educated bourgeoisie with the interesting and possibly even somewhat exotic Finnish folklore and culture, whereas Paavo Tikkanen, the peasant’s son from a Finnish-speaking background, emphasized the development of the Finnish language and education of the
Finnish-speaking populace. Herman Kellgren identified with both aims, since his own background was Swedish-speaking, but he had grown up in a Finnish-speaking area.

Herman Kellgren and Robert Tengström left for a long sojourn in Europe in 1846. Robert Tengström however would never come back: he died of typhus in Paris in 1847. Kellgren returned to Finland a year later, but he had lost his best friend as well as his closest companion in nationalistic endeavours. Kellgren and Tikkanen’s partnership became closer afterwards, but the nationalistic aims would now be realized through business instead of idealistic, non-profit publications.

Paavo Tikkanen, along with fellow students, moved on from Lukemisia to their next project and in 1847 began to publish one of the first Finnish-language newspapers called Suometar. Its somewhat idealistic aim was to unify Finland and advance its culture. The four-page Suometar was initially issued once a week. The circulation was 500 but the number of subscribers was only 260. The problem was that the target group, the Finnish-speaking educated class, did not yet really exist. However, during the Crimean War people’s interest in reading and news grew steadily, ultimately resulting in the Suometar becoming the most important Finnish-language newspaper, acquiring a circulation of 5,600 in 1856.

At the end of the 1840s, Tikkanen and Kellgren bought a bookshop and a publishing house and started a printing house whilst simultaneously continuing to publish Suometar. This business constituted the first Finnish nationalist enterprise in the book and publishing industry. Literature was featured in the edifying Fennoman project and it thus seems natural that Tikkanen and Kellgren were interested in this line of business. They did however receive the critique that they wanted to make money out of their ideology. For Kellgren, the business was also important in strengthening his economic and social position before his marriage to Sofi Tengström. In addition, becoming brothers-in-law with his business partner and joining
the Tengström family by marrying Helene Tengström sealed Tikkanen's upward social mobility.

At this point, M.A. Castrén, who had returned from a long linguistic expedition to Siberia, differs somewhat from his brothers-in-law. Kellgren and Tikkanen were business partners, former fellow students and about a decade younger than Castrén. M.A. Castrén openly told his fiancée Natalia Tengström that he was not very fond of his brothers-in-law. Perhaps M.A. Castrén rather wanted to see men like Snellman and Runeberg as his peers. Nevertheless, the Tengström sons-in-law held together outside the family circle. They gave the impression of having good and warm relations, but Robert Lagus, a cousin of the Tengström girls, who was not very fond of their husbands or their nationalistic ideas, stated that he detected pretentiousness in their behaviour.

Women's Educational Activities and Common Causes

In the Tengström circle it was not only the men who were interested in education, culture and the Finnish cause. In the family tradition, special attention was given to the education of women. Archbishop Jacob Tengström had criticized the prevailing superficiality of women's education. J. J. Tengström likewise invested in his daughters' education, studying Euclid for example with his daughter Helene, who was mainly homeschooled because of her poor hearing. In addition, at Sofi and Natalia Tengström's school, courses were given in geography, history, arithmetic, religion and several languages as well as in music, singing, drawing and handicrafts. However, at the age of 13, Natalia found studying Finland's geography 'rather boring'.

The Tengström sisters had literary, educational activities of their own. In the summer of 1845, they formed a book discussion club during which the eldest of the sisters, eighteen-year-old Sofi Tengström, usually gave a
presentation on a novel. It is not known where the idea came from, but a year earlier her brother Robert had encouraged her to read ‘good’ novels, since an aesthetic education was what belonged to a woman ‘more than all knowledge’. The sisters sometimes mentioned books they had been reading in their letters, and many of these were connected to Romanticism, including, among others, Alphonse de Lamartine’s Les Confidences, Sir Walter Scott’s The Heart of Midlothian, and Wilhelm von Humboldt’s letters. They also read literature written in Finland, but at the time the main language was Swedish.

The Tengström women were also interested in academic knowledge. They attended ‘literary evenings’ at the university, during which scholars, among them M.A. Castrén and Herman Kellgren, gave popular lectures on their respective topics. Carolina Tengström read a dissertation on King Eric XIV as a dramatic character ‘with great interest’ and daughter Natalia wanted to read it, too. Moreover, Natalia Tengström read a book based on E.G. Geijer’s university lectures in Sweden which were described as philosophy of history or, in other words, an introduction to human history. This highlights the gendered situation: Natalia Tengström studied similar topics as the men but was not allowed to enroll at university. One of the most interesting reading materials was Sofi Kellgren’s, whose husband was an expert in oriental languages: ‘I am without reading matter, so yesterday (Sunday) I began to study the Koran [Quran], but in French translation.’

In 1846, the sisters organized their own study group to learn the Finnish language. Sofi Tengström had initiated the idea and, according to their brother Robert, only Natalia was more enthusiastic about it. Helene was in the group too, despite her poor hearing. Robert asked his fellow student August Ahlqvist to teach them and hoped that learning Finnish would become fashionable. He was quite impressed with their efforts: ‘It is anyway a significant sign of the times.’ Moreover, the university students greatly admired the young women’s diligence. Robert praised the girls, saying ‘it is so beautiful that you are studying Finnish, because it shows that You have a heart for the nation and its overall efforts.’
Kellgren thought that it could serve as a good example and hoped that others would follow it, but he assumed that the girls might be criticized and ridiculed. Later during the same year, Paavo Tikkanen’s student association started a study group which he and August Ahlqvist frequently attended. In addition to this, many young men, among them the youth of the Tengström circle, studied Finnish by travelling to Finnish-speaking regions.

Other women took corresponding initiatives in different towns. The sisters’ aunt, Fredrika Runeberg, and Herman Kellgren’s sister, Josephine Kellgren, for example studied Finnish in similar groups in their respective home towns. One friend who had ordered a Finnish publication with a dictionary, informed Sofi Tengström that ‘my patriotism does not extend to grasping the grammar.’ In addition, Herman Kellgren wrote admiringly from Vyborg about the study efforts of the local teachers’ wives, which might have been part of the inspiration for his fiancée Sofi Tengström to form her own group. The Tengström sisters’ interest in the Finnish language continued. The restrictions imposed on the use of Finnish by the Russian Empire were of interest to them, even more so when the newspaper business of their male relatives was directly affected. Natalia Tengström, at least, continued with Finnish during the next decade.

As part of the general trend of forming societies and associations, the women’s place in ‘public’ was constructed as an extension of their idealized role as mothers and wives. By Finnish standards, the Tengström women were early participators in philanthropy and the women’s organizations. In Oslo, Stockholm, Copenhagen and St Petersburg similar philanthropic societies had been founded ten to thirty years earlier. In the Grand Duchy of Finland, the first Ladies’ Society was founded in Vyborg in 1835. Carolina Tengström, who had been active in organizing teaching for poor girls in Helsinki in the 1830s, became a board member when the Ladies’ Society was founded there in 1848, and Sofi and Natalia would also become board members in the 1850s and 1860s. The members of the Ladies’ Society each had their own district within the city of Helsinki.
where they visited the poor. In addition to material assistance, they might distribute books, which were often of a religious nature. Alexandra Ramsay interprets this as an indication that the Tengström sisters could combine their interest in Finnish language with their philanthropic work. Finally, the Tengström sisters were invited to join the Finnish Literature Society in 1848, but did not take an active part in the Society's activities, as female membership was more or less just a formality.

Eira Juntti has argued that in the newspaper discussions of the mid-nineteenth century, ‘national activities’ were designated as part of the realm of men. By contrast, women’s activities, such as associations and charities, were feminized and subsequently dissociated from the state and the official, allegedly leading to the development of the new sphere of the ‘social’. Gender played a role in how their different activities were interpreted in line with the public–private dichotomy, but women's activities can also be considered as ‘common causes’ and in that way national.

However, it appears that for the contemporaries the different spheres were not necessarily distinct nor gendered. J.J. Tengström for instance had been involved in founding schools for poor children in 1830s. Moreover, when Robert Tengström wrote home about pauperism issues in Germany, he conveyed to his father that charity was a concern of an educated citizen. The son addressed his letters to his mother and sisters in particular, outlining the local charity innovations to them and encouraging them to introduce them to Finland as well. In his mind, this was a task especially suited for women. In addition, in an example closely connected to the Tengström circle, women’s activities were explicitly linked to the national. When Suometar summarized an article on a girls’ school in the city of Kuopio, the women’s activities were framed in national terms: ‘Not only for the sake of the example but also for the sake of the awakening of national self-respect should the newspapers and the public follow these matters.’ Suometar stated that even though it was said that a woman and her activities were not created for the public sphere, it had been observed
elsewhere that ‘where a woman engages in public activity, she is made no worse by public talk than is a man who aims at something honest and useful.’

The Tengström sisters received spirited nationalistic encouragement from their brother Robert. He wanted them to be genuinely educated and civilized and to understand the nationalistic ideas. Robert did not want women to be excluded from the inspiring new developments. Using Hegelian terms, he urged his sisters to love ‘all that is noble and beautiful in life’ and to recognize how it manifests itself in the world. The most important thing, however, was to love their country. Girls should not be afraid of these thoughts and feelings, quite the opposite: they were their greatest asset. ‘A new spring awakens in the whole country, why should only You be left behind?’ he asked rhetorically. Interestingly, Robert Tengström was nevertheless opposed to admitting female members to the Finnish Literature Society because he thought that the Society had more important things to do and he did not see how women could actually contribute to it.

Surprisingly, the Tengström women hardly made any mention of their activities in their letters. The information about their language studies and the book discussion club emerges from their brother’s letters and the information about their active role in the women’s associations stems from the organization’s sources. Eva Helen Ulvros has speculated that openly displaying one’s social commitments might have been contradictory to the contemporary ideal of female modesty. Ulvros also points out that many women wrote self-deprecatingly about themselves and with resignation, even though this was not necessarily consonant with their actual behaviour and activities. In the Tengström case, the explanation may simply be that the activities were integrally linked to their mutual relations: they were only active together when they were at the same place, hence the activities do not figure in the letters which are written at times when they were geographically apart. For instance, we do know, again from the brother’s letter, that Sofi Tengström wrote about her
language studies to her fiancée Herman Kellgren, but the letter has not survived. Moreover, as mentioned above, friends of the Tengström girls commented on the language studies in their letters, hence we can presume that the girls themselves also wrote about their endeavours.91

**Family Efforts and Continuity**

Around the Tengström family a larger group called ‘Kruununhaka’ or ‘Kruununhaka Society’ took shape, which can, at least to some extent, be equated with the salon phenomenom of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.92 Before the emergence of public sphere structures in the Habermassian sense, such as mass media and associations, the semi-private networks and salons – in which women’s role was prominent – played an important role in cultural cultivation.93 In Finland, participation in informal groups and early associations was often concurrent.94 In the era of mass organization in the late nineteenth century, there still were culturally influential salons.95

When it comes to the ‘Kruununhaka Society’, contemporaries took note of the national tone of the gatherings. Robert Lagus, a cousin of the Tengström sisters, described the social life of the Tengströms to his brother in his letters in 1851 and wrote that ‘the families dedicated to Fennomania’ had formed their own society in the Kruununhaka neighbourhood.96 ‘The clique’s national tone’ would grow steadily, as Lagus wrote how ‘this Kruununhaka Society has frequent conferences to which the uninitiated naturally have no access’, and facetiously referred to the society as ‘the National Constituent Assembly’, making a direct link to the French Revolution.97 Robert Lagus listed the couples – men by their surname and women as their Mrs – and explained: ‘You probably wonder why I attach such importance to the young ladies, but you should not do that, since the ladies are just as influential and appreciated in their popularity as the men, and they have an even more important air about
them.\textsuperscript{98} Even though the cousin’s tone was somewhat derisive, his emphasis on the women’s position within the group illustrates how the role of women within the Tengström circle was socially and even ideologically pivotal.

The Tengströms also operated as a unit within the academic world. The whole family used their networks and resources to support their family members and, as a consequence, indirectly advance the Finnish cause. During the first half of the 1850s both M.A. Castrén and Herman Kellgren became university professors which granted them a certain amount of power within the university as they also became members of its Consistorium. The university of the Grand Duchy was an important cultural and political institution, especially during the time when the Diet did not convene (1809–1863).\textsuperscript{99}

When the recently engaged M. A. Castrén was somewhat unsure about his academic and economic future, he received reassurance from his fiancée Natalia Tengström and, through her, also from his future father-in-law, professor Tengström. The couple had agreed that taking up a post in St Petersburg would be contrary to their Finnish-minded ideals. Natalia Tengström argued that ‘being a Professor in Helsinki’ would be as good. Moreover, she informed M.A. Castrén that her father was convinced that he would not be left without a post in Finland either.\textsuperscript{100} In the same year, a professorship in Finnish language and literature was founded at the university. M. A. Castrén applied and was appointed in March the following year.\textsuperscript{101} Tragically, he was not able to enjoy his new position for long, as he passed away in May 1852.

Herman Kellgren’s way to the position of Professor of Oriental Literature in 1853–1854 was more difficult and the whole family had to work together towards this common objective. The situation was socially awkward since his rival was a cousin of the Tengström siblings, W.G. Lagus. The two men had different viewpoints on the national question: Kellgren was an enthusiastic advocate of the Finnish cause, whereas Lagus was
rather reserved. Kellgren received academic advice from his father-in-law and counsel from his wife when deciding what to do. The Tengström women did their best to acquire information from the Lagus family, who were somewhat reticent. The information they managed to get was sometimes accurate but sometimes not – perhaps they were even deliberately misled. Moreover, both applicants tried to get good publicity for themselves in the Finnish newspapers. As Kellgren studied for the professorship abroad, he used his brother-in-law and business partner Paavo Tikkanen as a mediator. In the end, even though neither candidate was deemed competent, Kellgren was appointed to the position in 1854.

Natalia Castrén was overjoyed at the decision and linked it to the Finnish cause. She saw in Kellgren the successor to her late husband within the university: ‘In addition, I hope that in the Consistorium he, too, can become one of the good [ones], one of the fighters for the cause of the fatherland for which Castrén constantly so enthusiastically struggled, but unfortunately so often had to retreat due to lack of support.’ Kellgren however, just like Castrén, would not hold the professorial position for long, as he passed away in September 1856 when he was only 34 years old.

After losing a loved one, the Finnish cause and personal feelings intertwined in cherishing and constructing their memory. M.A. Castrén’s widow Natalia Castrén strove to be actively involved in the acquisition of her late husband’s memorial and in the process of publishing and editing his unpublished academic work. This posed several problems for her, and she received help and support from her brother-in-law Kellgren. She tried to ensure that M.A. Castrén got all the credit she believed he deserved in terms of publications and obituaries. Later on, Sofi Kellgren honoured her late husband Herman Kellgren’s wishes and memory by making a donation to the Finnish Literature Society.

The young Tengströms wanted to bring up the next generation to appreciate and advance the Finnish cause. Natalia Castrén found a purpose in the nationalistic upbringing of her son Robert, a namesake of
his uncle. She wanted Robert to appreciate and continue his father’s work.\textsuperscript{111} She was determined to raise the boy ‘to hold Finland dear, and before anything to think of its best’ – so that she could ‘also say that my life has not been in vain.’\textsuperscript{112} Following his mother’s wishes, Robert Castrén learned Finnish.\textsuperscript{113} The Tikkanens’ aim was to educate their children to be bilingual in Finnish and Swedish, as the children learned to write letters in Finnish from early on.\textsuperscript{114} The main language of the Tikkanen children however remained Swedish. Their mother, Helene Tikkanen, died in 1857 and their father Paavo Tikkanen in 1873, which led to them being brought up by the Swedish-speaking Tengström women.\textsuperscript{115} Moreover, all the marriages of the Tengström circle ended in their spouses’s death before the end of the 1850s, and would also include their father, J.J. Tengström, who passed away in 1858. The result was that by the end of the decade, there were only widows, a widower and children left, resulting in the dissolution of the unique and active group.

The Castréns’ and the Tikkanens’ children did not become ardent political Fennomans. All of them, however, became closely attached to the academic world. The historian and journalist Robert Castrén was actively involved in politics but he was a liberal and constitutionalist, and supported bilingualism. However, as the language struggle between Finnish and Swedish intensified and parties were formed, the liberals (who held the middle ground), faded away. J.J. Tikkanen became the country’s first professor of art history, but was reluctant to take a stance on the language question. Johanna Tikkanen married her brother’s friend, the historian M.G. Schybergson, who was considered to be somewhat Swedish-minded.\textsuperscript{116} She was one of the first female inventors in Finland and ran a school of home economics.\textsuperscript{117}
Conclusion

By creating a group biographical research setting of the Tengström family, I have analysed how emotions and social relations affected the ideological project and vice versa. The shared ideology contributed to the groups’ formation and fostering of close emotional bonds. The tight-knit emotional and social group motivated and enabled the advancement of the national cause, which was a simultaneous and co-operative effort of the family members. Moreover, the analysis of the relationships proves that nationalism was personal, as it had profound emotional and social meanings for the Tengströms.

At the beginning of the nineteenth century, the Tengström family was already inclined towards Finnishness, but mostly concentrated on cementing its position in academia. In the next generation, in the family of J.J. and Carolina Tengström, their daughters’ marriages ensured the family’s social position after the loss of their only son. The marriages attached the family tightly to the rising Fennoman generation. In the matches, the ideological and emotional factors intertwined in many ways. While the potential spouse’s ideological commitment might have constituted a prerequisite for the marriage, ideology alone did not suffice, as the emotional connection also proved to be vital. The Tengström sisters apparently found ‘the ones among the suitable.’ Taking Häggman’s definition back into account, ‘the one’ in this case illustrates how intense romantic feelings and suitability were connected to their shared ideological commitment. From the family’s perspective, the sons-in-law represented the desired ideological trend and an attractive new rising group in society, and via their choice of sons-in-law, the Tengström family contributed to this social change as well.

For the sons-in-law it was important to attach themselves to their new family, though their positions and strategies differed. Herman Kellgren had long been emotionally close to the whole family and was regarded as
‘another son’ by the parents. The celebrity among the sons-in-law, M.A. Castrén, was more fastidious in his attachment and mostly valued the ‘genuine’ Tengströms and the academically and ideologically respected father of the family in particular. Paavo Tikkanen completed the series of sons-in-law by embodying the new and entrepreneurial self-made man who had made his way to success from the Finnish-speaking peasantry.

The men’s social background had an impact on their emphases within the nationalistic project. Well-born Robert Tengström was a philosopher who was interested in idealistic publishing projects. The Finnish-speaking peasant’s son Paavo Tikkanen, on the other hand, was a more practical actor and managed to make a living for himself with his bookshop and publishing business. Herman Kellgren was flexible and his interests altered in accordance with his companions. Kellgren’s case demonstrates how the current social relations affected the men’s choice of activities. However, all these efforts aimed at disseminating nationalistic ideas to a wider public, whether it was the Swedish-speaking elite and bourgeoisie or the Finnish-speaking common people.

The Tengström women were eager to educate themselves and took an active interest in the nationalistic project. In this, their sisterhood proved to be an indispensable resource. They were active in their own right, which is illustrated by their study of the Finnish language, even though they were influenced and encouraged, for instance, by their brother Robert. Although the women’s activities in civil society have generally been interpreted as ‘social’, in the Tengström circle, their actions were linked to the national and ‘common causes’, which was further supported by the men designating charity as an indispensable part of active citizenship.

The Tengström women and men were also engaged in common efforts which were linked to their ideological goals. The Finnish-minded ‘Kruununhaka’ circle in some ways resembled the eighteenth and nineteenth-century salon culture and the women’s role in the circle was pivotal. Unfortunately, no much is known about the circle’s concrete
activities and level of planning, though we do know that in contemporaries’ eyes it was designated as a group with a specific Fennoman agenda.

Securing the position and influence of the family within academia continued to be important for the younger Tengström generation, just as it had during the beginning of the nineteenth century. They stuck together within the university and women and men alike actively used their networks to help their relatives, since a professorship gave political influence, and was recognized and appreciated within the family. The nationalistic upbringing of the next generation was also considered important. Natalia Castrén, for instance, attached the value of her feminine contribution to her ability to support the men she loved, even though she had active interests of her own. In securing the family’s position and continuity, mutual emotions and family loyalty intertwined with the nationalistic aims. The Tengströms were key figures in the rise and development of the Finnish language and culture. However, as the politicization of the Fennoman movement intensified, the prevalence of the family was weakened by a number of untimely deaths, resulting in the next Tengström generation either withdrawing from the political scene or being on the losing side of the political struggles.

The group biographical approach, which is based on personal letters, enables the incorporation of gender and emotions into the analysis of how a nation is constructed and experienced. It highlights the women’s active role in the nationalistic networks and brings up gendered dynamics. However, in the simultaneous analysis of both women and men, many activities do not appear as markedly distinct but instead as intertwined. In conclusion, the study of personal and familial relationships highlights the significance of mutual emotions for the formation of an active group and for shared national endeavours – and, in this way, subsequently illustrates the relevance of emotional ties to the project of nation-building in general.
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