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Preface

This publication contains proceedings of the international conference on "the Formation of National Intellectuals and the Development of University Network in the Regions under the Rule of Russian Empire" which was held on the 14 March in Helsinki, Finland. Thanks to the scrupulous arrangement by the Finnish Literature Society (Suomalaisen Kirjallisuuden Seura, SKS), the conference was held at the main hall of its historical building in Helsinki, which permitted us to enjoy the splendid atmosphere there. The date of the conference, however, was troubling because of the unexpected catastrophic events in eastern Japan on the 11 March 2011.

At the beginning of the conference, the Secretary General and Director of SKS, Dr. Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen gave a welcome speech and called for a silent tribute to the victims and those who were suffering in Japan. My own opening speech referred to the events as follows:

Prior to my general remarks, as a Japanese citizen I would like to refer to the earthquake and tsunami disaster in Japan. I received this news when I was in Tartu, Estonia through an e-mail from my university on the day and I was very astonished to hear about the catastrophe. It seems to be a historical tragedy from a worldwide perspective. I have heard that so many people all over the world were concerned about it, encouraged the people who were suffering, and gave moral and substantial support to Japan. I myself received e-mails from foreign friends wherein they expressed their anxiety about the safety of my family and me. Although families of some participants from Japan live in Tokyo and have suffered to some extent, the damages faced by them were comparatively small. Others who live in the western parts of Japan did not feel any direct impact of this disaster. Rather they should consider how they can contribute to supporting the suffering victims.
My nine-year-old daughter informed me of the situation through an e-mail, and I responded in the following manner: ‘Let’s thoroughly think about what to do and what we can do now. We live in Kobe; it had experienced a great earthquake over fifteen years ago and faced damages as a result. We are well aware of what help we need to extend to people who are suffering for restoration and rehabilitation. We will do our best soon’.

I would like to express our heartfelt gratitude to all the participants who are concerned with the people in Japan and have shared sympathetic words with us.

As for this conference, I was very troubled thinking about whether we should hold it as planned or cancel it. Yesterday we had a discussion with participants from Japan and decided to go ahead with it. We think that it is our obligation to make our conference a great success, since it has received the national grant-in-aid from the state agency for the promotion of science and researches, and to accomplish our responsibility to our Finnish and Russian colleagues. Soon after going back to Japan, we will attend activities to support all the people who are suffering enable the restoration of the damaged areas. That is another of our obligation.

Thanks to all the participants and colleagues who gave excellent presentations, in the end, the conference was successful and productive. I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to all of them, and especially to Dr. Tuomas M. S. Lehtonen, Professor Timo Vihavainen (Helsinki University), who were present at the conference the entire day and gave excellent comments, and contributed to discussions, and Dr. Tarja-Liisa Luukkanen (Helsinki University) and Dr. Yuko Isino (Tsuda College, Japan), who managed the logistics for the conference.

This publication includes full texts of three presentations that have been revised, an abstract of one presentation, as well as an introductory overview by me. They are tentative, since we will continue the research project and plan to
publish a book on our theme in Japanese in a few years. We hope that this publication serves as a stimulus for the promotion of international collaboration and discussion of the issue highlighted by us.

Nobuya Hashimoto (Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan)
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Introductory Overview:
The Formation of National Intellectuals and the Development of a University Network in the Regions under the Rule of the Russian Empire

Nobuya Hashimoto
(Kwansei Gakuin University, Japan)

We have been organizing an international research project on national intellectuals and the university network in the Russian Empire, including the autonomous Grand Duchy of Finland since 2009. It has been financed by the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (JSPS). It consists of not only Japanese but also Russian historians, and aims at fostering international scholarly cooperation for our theme, and introducing the academic works of the younger generation of Japanese scholars to the international scholarly community. I am pleased to hold the conference with colleagues of various nationalities here in Helsinki. We are especially honoured to have the moral and professional support of colleagues from the University of Helsinki and the Finnish Literature Society (SKS). We are also aware of SKS and Helsinki University’s brilliant history and great contributions to the formation of national intellectuals in Finland. Moreover, the historical works published by SKS have provided some of my Japanese colleagues with beneficial and evocative information regarding our issue. Many Japanese historians consider, the Slavic Library at the University of Helsinki provides very conducive working conditions. Over these ten years, I myself have often visited this library, utilized its abundant materials and resources, and enjoyed a comfortable investigative life there. I am indebted to Helsinki for many of my works on the history of education in the Russian Empire. The fact that we organized this conference here at the main building of SKS in Helsinki with colleagues from the University of Helsinki is very fortunate and meaningful for our project. All the Japanese members of the
project and I, as its organizer, would like to express our heartfelt gratitude to the President of SKS, colleagues from the University of Helsinki and other institutions in Finland, and all the participants of our conference.

* * *

The aim of the project and the conference is to analyse the process of nation building and evolution of nationalism in the national and/or ethnic groups who inhabited various regions under the rule of Russian Empire including the Grand Duchy of Finland. Therefore, we relate the process with the development of a university network promoted by the Tsarist government in the nineteenth century, through which we expect to contribute to the clarification of the socio-cultural structure of the Russian Empire.

As is well known, the history of the universities in Europe has been making great progress during the last few decades: it has been emerging from the tradition of descriptive narrative as the ‘House History’ of honoured institutions to the analytical and synthetic socio-cultural history of higher learning as a whole since the 1970s. Its aim has evolved from the display of glorious alumni and dazzling members of the professoriate at each university to the elucidation of transformations in the social structure and cultural phases prompted by universities and the contrary interactions between them. Along with this progress, some of the following analytical conceptual tools have been exploited and equipped: 1. reproduction of social class/strata on the grounds of cultural capital, 2. gender structure in higher education, and 3. functions of higher education for national awakening and nation building. I assume that the milestones of such trends are, A History of the University in Europe edited by Walter Rüegg (Cambridge University Press, 1992, until now 3 volumes have been published and one more volume is forthcoming) and R. D. Anderson’s European Universities from the Enlightenment to 1914 (Oxford University Press, 2004). It is of great interest for us that Anderson devoted one chapter of his work to ‘Habsburg and other nations’. At the beginning of this chapter, he cited the following phrase by Eric Hobsbawm: ‘The progress of schools and universities
measures that of nationalism, just as schools and especially universities became its most conscious champions'. In this chapter, he relied on Hroch’s famous theoretical formulation on nation building, making his own concrete description and analysis on various nations and universities in the Habsburg Empire.

A Czech historian/sociologist, Miroslav Hroch, exaggerated in his noteworthy pioneering works¹ that the formative process of ‘small nations’ in Eastern and Central Europe could be divided into the following three phases:

Phase A: scholarly and scientific interests in the cultural, linguistic, social, and historical characteristics of the concerned nations were produced and raised, in principle, by elitist academics (the period of scholarly interest).

Phase B: propaganda that set the national and/or ethnic individuality as the value and made the accomplishment of national autonomy the aim of national movement was developing (the period of patriotic agitation).

Phase C: massive support for propaganda was reinforced not only by elitist leaders but also among ordinary people (the rise of a mass national movement).

In this formulation, the relationship between scholarly activities by academics and the national awakening was the prerequisite for nation building in Central and Eastern Europe.

Since Hroch used the three national groups of Finns, Estonians, and Lithuanians (along with Norwegians, Czechs, Slovaks, Flemish, and Danes in Schleswig) as examples in his works, his model is also applicable to various national groups who inhabited the regions of Russian Empire. However, if we take into consideration some national groups who were not categorized as ‘small nations’ according to Hroch’s formulation, we may assume that the diversity and complexity of the national composition of the Russian Empire does not converge

with his model. Now we consider Poles, Germans, Swedes, or Muslim peoples in Caucasus, Crimea, the Ural-Volga regions, and Central Asia. Prof. Naganawa will criticize the easy and hasty adaptation of Hroch’s model to the case of the Tatar intellectuals and demand to revise this issue in his presentation.

Inspired by the arguments of a few historians of the Russian Empire, such as D. Lieven, A. Kappeler, and E. Thaden, I had discussed in my previous works\(^2\) that the educational system of the Russian Empire, which had actually started developing in the early 19th century, did not have such rigid institutional uniformity as western nation-state models, and the educational system in each region preserved specific local features, which had been constructed on the basis of the ruling structure and cultural traditions inherited from the period prior to its annexation into Russian rule. The educational system in these regions was organised by the local elites or non-Orthodox religious leaders, and the language of instruction was not Russian, but rather the local language. We can refer to such typical examples not only as a part of the popular education for Estonians and Latvians under the supervision and administration of the Lutheran church and German nobilities in Baltic provinces but also as part of Jewish traditional religious-educational institutions (Heder, Yeshiva, and Tarmud-Torah). The latter exerted an overwhelming influence among the Jewish populations living in the Western provinces, in spite of the assimilative policies for Jews developed by the Tsarist government and Ministry of Education until the 1870s (as is widely known, the situation turned around drastically after the 1880s). The regional diversity in the educational system in the Russian Empire has directed our attention to the geographical arrangement of imperial universities and higher educational institutions.

Although Moscow University was already been established at the middle of the 18th century (as the origin of Saint-Petersburg university is very problematic and controversial among Russian specialists, we have decided not to

---

The Russian Empire established new universities at the beginning of the 19th century under the enlightened atmosphere of the first half of Alexander I's reign as is following:

Derpt/Dorpat University founded in the Baltic Provinces in 1802. It inherited a remnant of an old Swedish University (Academia Dorpatensis) in the 17th century.

Vilna/Vilno (Wilno in Polosh, Vilnius in Lithuanian) University in the Western provinces founded in 1803. It was reorganised from a higher school under the Polish Commission of National Education (which had been a Jesuit Academy before it was confiscated by the state).

Kharkov University in Ukraine succeeded the heritage of the Orthodox Collegium in Kharkov. It received great influence from the Kiev Academy (the first full-fledged higher educational institution of the Orthodox Church).

The newly founded Kazan University in the Volga region.

The two latter universities were both founded in 1804 and all of these provincial universities were located in the areas where non-Russian people were dominant or had a considerable presence. For example, Derpt/Dorpat University was established as a German-model university, which had a faculty of Lutheran theology, and was situated among the German university network as if it were a Landesuniverisität in Livland (Livonia) of German Land. The language of instruction was German. Its legal status was specific and different from others until the 1880s, when Russification was enforced (it was not a simple ‘Russian’ university, but a university for various nations in the empire, including Estonians and Latvians, that the Russification policy actually brought). On the other side, Vilna/Vilno University also had kept its own Polish national character after the reorganization under Russian rule, and became a hotbed for Polish national consciousness (Cf. presentation by Sayaka Kaji). Nicholas I. closed it down along with another higher educational institution (Liceum) in Volynia, when the Polish uprising occurred in 1830. Although Kiev University was established as a Russian university, after they were closed, it not only reserved
some Polish factors but also became a nursery for the Ukrainian national awakening.

The most interesting instance is Helsinki. The Grand Duchy of Finland that was annexed into the Russian imperial rule at the beginning of 19th century, had had its own university, Åbo Academy founded by a Swedish king in the 17th century as well as the Derpt/Dorpat Academy. It moved to Helsinki in the 1820s and was renamed Alexander University. However, the Swedish cultural influence remained prominent there. It was not under jurisdiction of the Ministry of Education and kept its own specific legal status, organisation, and autonomy, which coincided with the legal and administrative status of Finland. It means that the ruling elite in Finland had autonomous moral and intellectual features that were quite different from the elite of the Empire itself. Dr. Tarja-Liisa Luukkanen will depict this situation from the religious nationalism perspective.

The fact that all three of these examples were located along the western border of the Empire is very important and suggestive. The Western provinces, Baltic provinces, and the Grand Duchy of Finland had been situated in spheres influenced by western churches since the Medieval period, and had their own universities since the early modern period. The Russian Empire had annexed these regions since the beginning of the eighteenth century in parallel with its own ‘Westernization’.

Saint Petersburg, which had churches of various denominations (Orthodox, Catholic, Lutheran, and Armenian-Gregorian) along its main street named ‘Nevskii Prospekt’, had its own specific features. The metropolis itself was, as often emphasized, multiethnic, and the bureaucratic, administrative, military, and academic elite consisted of persons from various national/ethnic groups, including foreign subjects. The younger generation with its different ambitions and desires had gathered there from various regions of the empire, and prominent scholars were invited from the West to promote the scientific and cultural development of the Tsar’s land. Prof. Zhukovskaya will examine this scenery vividly and in detail.
Since the manner in which these universities were founded were different from each other, being conditioned by their intellectual resources, cultural traditions including religious and denominational ones, the process of annexation, and ruling systems of each region, it is difficult to identify a single uniform centralized policy. We may consider, however, that such a circumstance apparently manifested the imperial structure and inter-ethnic relationships in the Russian Empire, where ethnic Great Russians could not always show off their cultural superiority and intellectual hegemony over others.

Along with such geographical (probably more accurately, geopolitical or ‘geo-cultural’ disposition of universities in the Russian Empire, our research project aims at analysing the way that national intellectuals in each region were formed. Along these lines, we should take the following factors into consideration:

1. Role of scholarly knowledge inquired and transmitted through universities and other institutions (especially history, geography, ethnography, linguistics, etc.).

2. Activities of various scientific and cultural societies organised and developed by academics (professors and students) or the educated class.

3. Structural transformation of intellectual prestige among both local elite and ordinary people.

4. Their relationships with the imperial policy toward national/ethnic questions, etc.

Therefore, we should adopt as the analytical framework, not only a formula of binary opposition between the non-dominant (‘oppressed’, according to traditional Marxist historiography) ethnic groups and the Empire but also a triangular relationship between non-dominant national/ethnic groups, local elites of non-Russian origins, and the imperial state and administration. The interaction among these elements was complicated and different in each region, and was conditioned by the local context. At the same time, we should consider the scholarly (and sometime personal) networks organised by local intellectuals with the surrounding countries or regions beyond the border of the Empire. The
vast empire was not a closed space isolated from neighbouring civilizations, and they could maintain multiple relationships with neighbouring areas or more distant cultural centres. At last, generally speaking, national intellectuals were trained or supplied not only by universities, as Erich Hoffmann suggested. For example, primary teachers, who had not been trained in higher schools, were the propellers for the national awakening among Estonians as well as Macedonians under the Ottoman Empire. The mechanism (agency and medium) through which scholarly knowledge and cultural resources were transfigured and transmitted among ordinary people must be questioned.

As is evident, I have only offered an oversimplified and rough sketch of the situation. The subsequent reports by my four colleagues will present us with more concrete and exact explanations for understanding this situation, and I would expect earnest discussions between them and all the participants.

---

Vilnius University and Lithuania in the Early 19th Century: The Polish Language and Folk Languages under the Russian Imperial Rule*

KAJI Sayaka
(Research Fellow JSPS, Japan**)

Introduction
After the partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth and the incorporation of its eastern part into the Russian Empire, Vilnius (Wilno/Vilna) University was transformed into a Russian Imperial University in 1803. Subsequently, the Empire organized the former lands of the Commonwealth into the Vilnius Educational District. Vilnius University administrated this district with the Polish school system founded by the Commission of National Education of the former Commonwealth. The university flourished as a centre for Polish high culture, producing an intellectual elite, until it was closed in 1832 by the Russian government after they had suppressed the November uprising.

In the lands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth under the Russian Empire, the nobles of the former Commonwealth kept the social rule and cultural hegemony and enjoyed quasi-autonomy, especially in the field of education. In these lands, most of the inhabitants were peasants, and a majority of these peasants were serfs. The nobles and intellectual elite were linguistically, culturally, and religiously different from the common people. The upper class was

---

*This article is based on the following article by the same author, with some modifications and supplements: S. Kaji, ‘Vilnius University and Folk Languages: Culture and Society in the Former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth in the Russian Empire’, Rekishigaku Kenkyu (Journal of Historical Studies), no.873, pp.14–24, 2010 (published in Japanese). The author expresses her heartfelt appreciation for the comments and questions raised at the conference, and the advice and support of scholars in Poland, Lithuania, and Finland.

**The title is of the time when the proceedings were published. The author was a part-time lecturer of Kyoto University at the moment of the conference.
linguistically and culturally Polonized and a majority were Roman Catholics. On the other hand, the languages of the common people were mainly Ruthenian (ruski, the prototype of Belarusian and Ukrainian) and Lithuanian. Most of them were Catholic, especially Greek Catholic, and the others were Orthodox.

Thus, when we consider the formation of national intellectuals in the Russian Empire, the following two distinctive features of Vilnius University emerge. First, it is a Polish university that was founded in an area where the common people were not Poles. Second, the university did not exist in an era of nationalism. These features may imply that it is not proper to assume that the university produced fully nationally conscious intellectuals, whether Polish, Lithuanian, or Belarusian. However, naturally, the university was not irrelevant to the formation and evolution of the national intellectuals of Poland, Lithuania, and Belarus. This article examines the attitudes of the nobles and intellectual elite engaged in school education, such as professors, school inspectors, secondary education teachers, and educational reformists, towards the folk languages in the Vilnius Educational District, and attempts to garner a perspective on the influences of Vilnius University during subsequent periods.

Hitherto, linguistic problems in the 19th century in the lands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth under the Russian Empire have been an important research object in the national histories of this region. Nationalism of Lithuania and Belarus emerged mainly on the basis of the respective languages of the common people in the latter half of the 19th century or even later. In their national histories, their folk languages have occupied an important position as the national languages even in the description of the periods prior to nationalism. On the contrary, relationships between these folk languages and the Polish language of high culture have often been marginalized in historical research. Recently, some historians in Lithuania and Belarus have treated their societies in the first half of the 19th century as multilingual ones where culture was fostered and developed collectively by speakers of elitist languages like Polish and Russian and of folk languages, and where many cultural activists were
multilingual. However, the historians have given priority to their own national languages in their works, and their descriptions have been limited to the present territories of their respective states. For its part, the historical works on the Polish culture and language have often concentrated on a literary aspect. It is noteworthy that a French historian, D. Beauvois, described an integral history of the mainly Polish-speaking intellectuals around Vilnius University and their social, cultural, and scientific activities. However, there is still some room to consider the relationships between folk languages and the elitist Polish language.

Thus, linguistic matters should be reconsidered from the perspective of the 19th century. This article reconsiders one of these matters, focusing on how people, such as professors and inspectors, who were responsible for school education and educational administration in the Vilnius Educational District observed the linguistic situation of the common people, and how they treated the folk languages through the analyses of primary schools and their educational systems during the existence of Vilnius University (1803–1832). Vilnius University dealt with a variety of the folk languages and cultures simultaneously. This article focuses on ‘historical Lithuania’ (the lands of the former Grand

---


2 Among such works, the following is a recent publication: Z. Sudolski, *Tropem detektywa: Studia materiały-sylwetki*, 2t., Warszawa, 2009.

Duchy of Lithuania) and two main folk languages, Ruthenian and Lithuanian.

1 Education in the Vilnius Educational District

(1) The world of the Polish language in the Russian Empire

The lands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth that were incorporated into the Russian Empire as a result of the partitions were transformed into eight guberniyas: Vilnius, Grodno, Minsk, Vitebsk, Mogilev, Volyn, Podolia, and Kiev. All of these belonged to the Vilnius Educational District, which was administrated by Vilnius University. The school system included primary schools, which were then called parish schools (szkoła parafialna), county schools (szkoła powiatowa), gymnasia, and a university. In this educational district, the school system was the most developed in the Russian Empire. Adam Jerzy Czartoryski, a mighty aristocrat of the former Commonwealth, was a curator of the district. The three southern guberniyas (Volyn, Podolia, and Kiev), which had belonged to the Polish Kingdom before the partitions and were called Ruthenia, were often administrated separately by Tadeusz Czacki, an inspector of these guberniyas. The other guberniyas were formed of the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania. This article concentrates on this part of the Vilnius Educational District.

In this district, the curricula and school textbooks were the same as those before the partitions in most cases. In the university and in secondary schools (gymnasia and county schools), which were precisely controlled by the university, students learned the Polish language, Polish literature, Latin, history, including Polish history, and laws, including natural law and politics. The subjects were


taught in Polish, and the Russian language was virtually taught as one of the foreign languages\(^6\). Thus, this school system encouraged Polonization of the students in two ways: Polonize them linguistically and inculcate them with Polish political thoughts, which conflicted with the Russian political system. As a result, the university produced Polish intellectuals.

Meanwhile, the Russian government was aware of the situation in the district and attempted to broaden the Russian language as a subject and language for instruction. The government also tightened control over the Orthodox Church and its believers in the district. The influences of the government were stronger in the eastern guberniyas of the districts, where the percentage of Orthodox followers was higher. In Kiev Guberniya, there was a conflict over the initiative in secondary schools between the Polish nobility and the Russian government and the guberniya was transferred to the Kharkov Educational District in 1818. In the north-eastern guberniyas, namely Mogilev and Vitebsk, incorporated into the Russian Empire in 1772, the Russian language had been occupying a certain place in school education since the introduction of the school system\(^7\). Generally speaking, however, the pressure and control of the educational system in the Vilnius Educational District by the Russian government became stronger only after the exposure of the Philomath Society (Towarzystwo Filomatów) in 1823, and especially after the November uprising in 1830–1831. Consequently Vilnius University was closed and the Vilnius Educational District was dissolved. The Russian language became a compulsory subject, as the unificatory policy was developed in other fields in the Russian Empire.

(2) Primary school system held by Vilnius University

In the Vilnius Educational District, theoretically, all schools were open to

---


children of all social classes and religions. However, in fact, secondary schools (county schools and gymnasia) and the university were meant for children of the nobles, and primary schools were meant mainly for children of poorer nobles, burghers, and peasants\(^8\). A few girls also went to parish schools. In the early 19th century, the university and secondary schools developed favourably; however, the development of primary schools, where non-privileged students studied, was rather limited in most regions of the district. Non-Christian inhabitants such as Jews and Tatars seldom went to the schools under Vilnius University or the university itself\(^9\).

Vilnius University inspected the schools of all levels in the district every year. Inspectors nominated for each guberniya by the university had to visit each school in a guberniya and report its administration, financial situation, facilities, curriculum, teachers’ carriers and performances, and students’ records and exam results. Occasionally, inspectors themselves gave the students a test. Through these inspections as well as other reports from secondary school head masters and instructions from the university, the university had comprehensive control over the secondary schools. On the other hand, inspectors often paid less attention to primary schools. In fact, the existence and continuation of many primary schools depended on the agricultural and economic situation of a parish, and some of them were open only in winter; thus, the university had difficulty in administrating primary schools, and even gathering information of their existence. Primary schools were less controlled by the university and were put in the hands of charity. They were often operated by Catholic organizations like monasteries or parish churches, or by lords who founded schools in their own lands\(^{10}\).

---


\(^9\) Still, there were a few Muslim and Jewish pupils and students in the schools from the primary level up to the university in this district. Jewish communities had their own Talmud schools. Regarding the efforts of the university to establish schools for Jews, see Beauvois, *Vilno*, s.729–731.

\(^{10}\) Beauvois, *Vilno*, s.690–695, 698–710: A. Prašmantaitė, Žemaičių vyskupas Juozapas
Nevertheless, there were some persons associated with the university who were interested in primary education. Some inspectors showed interest in language education and teaching language, and described the linguistic situation of primary schools on their reports. During the reformation of the political system before the partitions of the Commonwealth, the reorganization of the educational system, which was divided by status, was also discussed. In the end, primary schools were designated to teach reading, writing, and introduction to arithmetic, and to give practical instructions forburghers and peasants as well as religious and moral education. Instruction was conducted in the mother tongue of the majority of the Commonwealth, which was Polish\textsuperscript{11}. Basically, after the partitions, the Vilnius Educational District inherited this primary school system from the Commission of National Education.

In this article, we consider the ideas of the following three individuals on primary education. One is a famous figure in the educational reform of the former Commonwealth, Hugo Kołłątaj. The other two are inspectors, Józef Twardowski and Jan Chodźko, whose inspectional reports are rather detailed and whose thoughts on primary education and linguistic matters can be easily grasped.

When Kołłątaj was asked by Czacki to make an educational plan for Volyn Guberniya in 1804, he maintained a similar primary school system to the one that existed before the partitions in some respects. He planned educational contents and curriculum which varied according to status and social classes of the students, but he approved the single-track system of education, arguing that children who finished primary school could go to a secondary school. Kołłątaj proposed to use a textbook for primary schools, \textit{Elementarz}, compiled by the Commission of National Education in 1785, although he claimed more practical


education corresponding to children’s social class\textsuperscript{12}. Kollatay’s programme became the foundation for the norm of primary education in the Vilnius Educational District\textsuperscript{13}.

An honourable supervisor of schools in Pińsk County, Twardowski, who subsequently became a president of the university, inspected Minsk Guberniya in 1819. He wrote his view of primary education in the guberniya in his report to the university. According to the report, primary schools and their curriculum should be mainly for children of peasants and burghers. Thus, he also supported the educational system in which contents of instruction were varied according to children’s status and social classes. He did not agree with the concept of social advancement for the peasantry through education. On the other hand, like Kollatay, he maintained the single-track school system and argued that the role of primary schools in providing a first step in school education, which leads to secondary education, must be strengthened\textsuperscript{14}.

In 1820, Chodzko, who was an honourable supervisor of schools in Dzisna County in Minsk Guberniya and who subsequently inspected guberniyas in the district, contributed an article to the organ of the Charity Society (Towarzystwo Dobroczynności). His article titled ‘About parish schools and village schools: Comments’ proposed the improvement and expansion of primary education. It was a rare example of engagement with the education of the peasantry at that time. In this article, he argued that the peasantry should be rescued from poverty and ignorance, and given a feeling of dignity through enlightenment and education. However, he also insisted that the educated peasantry should continue to be engaged in agriculture, not in handicraft or other occupations, and

\textsuperscript{12} X. Hugona Kołłątaja korrespondencja listowna z Tadeuszem Czackim, wizytatorem nadzwyczajnym szkół w guberniach wołyńskiej, podolskiej i kijowskiej, t.2, Kraków, 1844, s.148–205, 330–343.
\textsuperscript{13} Beauvois, Wilno, s.691–692.
\textsuperscript{14} ‘Józefa Twardowskiego Wizyta jeneralna szkół i zakładów edukacyjnych w gubernii Minskiej odbyta w roku 1819’, Archiwum do Dziejów Literatury i Oświaty w Polsce, t.X, 1904, s.305–631. Regarding his view of primary education, see s.480–495.
he did not agree with the concept of social advancement of peasants through education. He maintained that educational contents should be varied according to the social status of the students and that primary schools for the peasantry must provide their students with practical knowledge regarding agriculture and public hygiene apart from reading, writing, and arithmetic. At the same time, Chodźko proposed the same curriculum for burghers’ and nobles’ children. He accepted that the educated and talented children of burghers went to higher schools and that young nobles and burghers should be given the same career opportunities, according to their ability and aptitude. Therefore, for that time, Chodźko’s views were not conservative. The next year, Chodźko published a book titled *Mr. Jan from Świslocz (Pan Jan ze Świsloczy)*: the content of this book was based on his views discussed in this article. Vilnius University admitted his book as a textbook for primary schools.

It is possible to say that these three figures, along with the university, treated primary schools as institutions in order to educate mainly the children of burghers and peasants and to provide fundamental and practical education. In fact, this was the situation of the primary schools in the early 19th century. However, many children of poorer nobles also studied in these primary schools. The single-track school system was maintained mainly so that the children of poorer noble families could enter secondary school after completing primary school. With respect to linguistic matters, all three figures maintained that schools should use Polish textbooks and teach reading and writing in Polish.

It is worthwhile to briefly mention the situation of the Polish language in the early 19th-century society in the lands of the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth. In 1800, in Warsaw, which then belonged to Prussia, the Warsaw Society of Friends of Science (Towarzystwo Warszawskie Przyjaciół

---

Nauk) was established and a number of scholars and people who were intellectually curious gathered from all over the former Commonwealth. Its activities covered the fields of science, literature, and culture. One of the main purposes of the society was to keep the Polish language pure. One member, Samuel Bogumil Linde, compiled a Polish dictionary in six volumes. A Polish grammar that was created by Onufry Kopczyński, another member, was published posthumously. A reformation of the Polish orthography was discussed in the society. As these examples show, the interest in the Polish language increased after the distinction of the Commonwealth.

Although the Polish language had been a written language since the early modern times, it did not have a long tradition in the fields of science or higher education. Only the Commission of National Education, in place of Latin, decided to use Polish as the language of instruction in schools; however, the Polish language had difficulty penetrating into university education, especially in the field of natural science. At Vilnius University, Polish officially became a teaching language in just 1816. Moreover, despite criticism by some intellectuals, the nobles of the former Commonwealth were adherent to the use of French as a symbol of the nobility and emphasized the importance of learning French. Therefore, in the lands of the former Commonwealth, the importance of Polish for national matters began to be argued by some people, but it was not recognized by all of the elite in the early 19th century. Obviously, the exclusive use of Polish in society was impossible.

In the Vilnius Educational District, the teaching language was expected to be Polish everywhere. In reality, however, only nobles, some burghers, and a handful of peasants who lived in the western part of the district spoke Polish as a
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16 Odezwa Towarzystwa Warszawskiego Przyjaciół Nauk, Roczniki Towarzystwa Warszawskiego Przyjaciół Nauk, t.1, 1802, s.V.

17 We can find examples of criticism by intellectuals regarding the use of the French language in a journal published in Vilnius between 1816 and 1822: Wiadomości Brukowe, nr75, 111, 113, 198, 199, etc. See also: Beauvois, Wilno, s.681–682, 718, 720; T. Kamusella, The Politics of Language and Nationalism in Modern Central Europe, New York, 2009, pp.369–370, 374.
native tongue. Apart from non-territorial minorities like Jews or Germans, the linguistic distribution of the common people was the following: the north-western part of the district, that is, Vilnius Guberniya, was inhabited mainly by Lithuanian speakers. The other parts of the district were inhabited by Ruthenian speakers. The eastern part of Vilnius Guberniya and the northern part of Grodno Guberniya were the boundaries where both the linguistic groups resided. The next two chapters analyze linguistic matters in primary schools in the educational district.

2 Primary Education in Polish in Ruthenian-speaking Lands

(1) The Ruthenian language

This chapter considers the Ruthenian-speaking area, which occupied the majority of the Vilnius Educational District. Ruthenian is a language of the Slavic people of the Eastern (Greek) rite, but here, following the nomination in the former Commonwealth, its use is limited to only the language of the Eastern Slavic people in the former Commonwealth: the language in the Grand Duchy of Moscow is excluded.

Concerning vernaculars in Ruthenian lands, there is a transitory dialectal region with no apparent linguistic border from the eastern parts of Poland to the western parts of Russia. With respect to the historical aspects of the Ruthenian language, in the Middle Ages and early modern times, the Grand Duchy of Lithuania used Ruthenian for official documents. Consequently, Ruthenian is sometimes called Chancellor Slavonic. During the Renaissance and Reformation, the Bible and other religious books were written and printed in Ruthenian and its vernaculars as well as Church Slavonic. The Lithuanian Statute was also printed in Ruthenian. As time passed, however, the Polish language, Latin culture, and Catholicism became influential among the Ruthenian nobles, and by the end of
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18 T. Kamusella, op.cit., p.169.
the 17th century, Polish dominated the literary culture of Ruthenia and replaced Ruthenian in the administration of the Grand Duchy. The Ruthenian language continued to be used mainly in manuscripts, for example, books in Ruthenian were circulated by copying them by hand. Ruthenian was written in both Latin and Cyrillic scripts. In the 18th century and first half of the 19th century, Latin script was favoured for writing Ruthenian. Additionally, as a result of the strong influence of Poland, the majority of Ruthenian people were Greek Catholic before the partitions.

In the early 19th century, even though an interest in folk languages in Ruthenia emerged as seen in the collection of folklores by Zorian Dołęga Chodakowski, views on the Ruthenian language(s) varied. Linde called the language spoken in the Ruthenian lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania ‘Belarusian’ and distinguished it from the Russian language and the language spoken in the Ruthenian lands of the former Polish Kingdom, which he called ‘little-Russian’. Generally, however, the nominations of the languages of Ruthenia were varied, like ‘Belarusian’, ‘West-Russian’ (zapadno-russkij), etc., and their independence as a language was vague. The treatment of these languages was often combined with the political stances of Poland and Russia.

(2) The Rivalry between Polish and Russian

In order to analyze how the persons associated with the university and engaged in school education viewed linguistic matters in primary schools in the Ruthenian-speaking lands, the views of the three figures mentioned above are examined.

First, we present Kołłątaj’s perspective, which can be interpreted from a letter that was appended to the above-mentioned plan for primary schools in
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20 Szybieka, op.cit., s.26–27.

21 Новік і Марцуль (ред.), op.cit., ч.1, с.292; Szybieka, op.cit., s.86, 88.
Volyn Guberniya. In the letter, he wrote:

I haven’t included the Russian language into [the curriculum of] parish schools because common people don’t need to learn it in an accomplished way and in a colloquial way they know it well enough to communicate with native Russians. If we demanded to give teachers and children textbooks written in Russian, we couldn’t communicate with people or teachers and couldn’t understand the textbooks either. Here, we intend to educate people immediately and to improve agriculture expeditiously. Moreover, it makes no sense if people couldn’t understand us and we couldn’t understand people.22

Thus, we can state that Kołłątaj planned to integrate the common people into the Polish-speaking society by introducing Polish education in primary schools, although he was aware of the linguistic differences that existed among the common people in Volyn Guberniya, which is a part of Ruthenia.

Second, we move to the reports of Twardowski and Chodźko; they were inspectors who were sent to the Ruthenian-speaking lands.

When Twardowski inspected Minsk Guberniya in 1819 and Grodno Guberniya together with Białystok Region (obwód/oblast) in 182123, he postulated reading and writing education in Polish as the standard for primary schools. He recommended the use of a Polish textbook (Elementarz)24, and for students to learn pure Polish without provincial locutions25. When he visited a school where Latin was taught, he regarded Latin as unnecessary in primary schools, and instructed that they limit language education to just teaching

22 Korrespondencya Kołłątaja, s.334.
23 Vilniaus Universiteto Biblioteka [VUB], f.2, KC518, KC519. Białystok Region was incorporated into Prussia by the partition, and transferred to Russia in 1807. The majority of the people in this region were Roman Catholic. O. Łatyszzonek i E. Mironowicz, Historia Białorusi, Białystok, [2002], s.39.
24 ‘Wizyta w gubernii Mińskiej r. 1819’, s.488
25 VUB, f.2, KC519, k.56.
reading and writing in Polish and Russian. Usually, foreign languages were not taught in primary schools. Accordingly, Twardowski treated Russian as the language of the state and especially encouraged students to learn it. Nevertheless, at that time, only those children who wanted to learn Russian studied the language in primary schools and except for in the eastern parts of the district, this number was very small. Twardowski did not mention a Russian-language textbook. In a primary school that he founded in Weleśnica, Pińsk County, Minsk Guberniya in 1819, children learned to read and write only in Polish by using Polish textbooks. The school library did not have books or journals written in languages other than Polish. Twardowski also promoted the education of the Polish language in the Ruthenian-speaking lands, though, contrary to Kołłątaj’s plan, the Russian language was introduced into the curriculum of primary schools in the district to a certain extent.

The inspectional report in 1823 by Jan Chodźko who was sent to Mogilev and Vitebsk, the north-eastern guberniyas, showed quite a different situation. In these guberniyas, the number of schools of all levels was limited. There were a few Polish-style schools and some people’s schools that were founded during the educational reformation by Catherine II. The percentage of Orthodox in the north-eastern guberniyas was higher than elsewhere in the district and Russia’s influence was quite obvious. Two primary schools in Mogilev Guberniya, which were described in Chodźko’s report, were operated by Catholic monasteries; however, even they taught some subjects based on textbooks written in Russian.

In people’s schools, the teachers usually taught in Russian. Children began by learning Russian, and not all the children learned Polish. Chodźko criticized the Carmelite order in Czausy, the town where one of the people’s schools existed, for not founding a school by itself, and moreover, not even sending a monk to the
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26 For example, see: VUB, f.2, KC519, k.51–52; ‘Wizyta w gubernii Mińskiej r. 1819’, s.425, 427.


people’s school to teach Polish and provide religious education based on Catholicism, though the order in the town was very wealthy\textsuperscript{29}. This report together with other reports on the eastern part of the educational district\textsuperscript{30} show that Russian was the main subject and language of instruction in primary schools in the eastern parts of the district, and that the inspector, accepting such a situation, attempted to maintain the education of the Polish language in some way.

From these analyses it is possible to say that for the Ruthenian-speaking lands, there was no discussion regarding the introduction of the native tongue of the populace into primary education, although the persons engaged in education understood that the language of the common people was not Polish or Russian. Polish language education was developed there, in competition with the Russian language in the eastern parts.

(3) Local diversity

Even more complicated situations in each primary school were shown in the reports of the Ruthenian-speaking lands.

According to the above-mentioned report by Chodżko in 1823, in a county capital, Bychów in Mogilev Guberniya, there was a parish school that was run by the monastery of the Canons Regular of the Lateran. In this school, the children of the Russian Orthodox belief were instructed in Russian and the Catholic and Lutheran children were instructed in Polish. All the children learned to read both Polish and Russian. Chodżko described the following difficulty faced by the teacher and children in this school: The children, who were at different learning levels and divided into two linguistic groups, studied together simultaneously

\textsuperscript{29} VUB, f.2, KC557, k.803, 841–843 (regarding the people’s school in Czausy), 881, 887. People’s schools offered primary education and the beginning of secondary education, and they differed from parish schools. However, in these guberniyas, the number of schools (or at least the schools that were inspected by Chodżko) was very small, and people’s schools are included in our analyses.

\textsuperscript{30} For example, see a report on a primary school in Rzeczyca in Minsk Guberniya in 1821: VUB, f.2, KC552, k.260–261.
and under only one teacher.\textsuperscript{31} This is a good example of the multilingualism of the common people in linguistic boundaries.

The reports by Twardowski on Minsk Guberniya and Grodno Guberniya with Białystok Region exhibited different situations. In these guberniyas, many primary schools taught Russian and some taught Latin as well as Polish. The school that was attended by children from Lutheran families also taught German. There were even a few schools teaching Ruthenian, though few scholars have paid any attention to them.

In Kleszczele in Bielsk County, which is located in Białystok Region, there were two parish schools: the Polish-Latin school and Polish-Ruthenian school. The Polish-Ruthenian school belonged to the Greek-Catholic church in the town. It taught reading in Polish, Ruthenian, and Russian. All the children learned to read in Polish, approximately half of them learned to read in Ruthenian, and a few learned to read in Russian. In the report, there is no information regarding writing education\textsuperscript{32}. In Mielnik in Drohiczyn County, which is located in the same region, a Roman-Catholic priest built a parish school with the help of a Greek-Catholic priest after the incorporation of this region into the Russian Empire from Prussia. In this school, children learned to read and write in Polish; to read, and possibly even write, in Ruthenian; and the hymns of the Eastern liturgy\textsuperscript{33}. According to the work of O. Łatyszonek and E. Mironowicz, parish schools of the Greek-Catholic Church in Białystok Region were exceptionally developed in the Vilnius Educational District\textsuperscript{34}. In Minsk Guberniya, a few parish schools also taught to read and write in Ruthenian as well as in Polish; these schools were located in Niedźwiedzica (Niedźwiedzica) and in Cimkowicze in Słuck County, and in Kojdanow (Kojdanów) in Minsk County\textsuperscript{35}.
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Then, what does the word ‘Ruthenian’ mean? We do not have any concrete information regarding the contents of the classes. The descriptions of the parish schools in Kleszczele and Mielnik included the term ‘ruski cerkiewny’ (Ruthenian of the Orthodox Church) and another term ‘rossyjski sztatzki’ (Russian of the State). Therefore, apparently, Ruthenian meant Church Slavonic 36; however, at that time, Church Slavonic was called just ‘cerkiewny’ or ‘słowiański’. Although the role of Ruthenian as a written language had diminished since the latter half of the 17th century, the Greek-Catholic Church published catechism, hagiographies, and sermons in Church Slavonic with translation in the Ruthenian vernaculars. Some of these were used as textbooks 37. Thus, the vernaculars of the Ruthenian language were probably taught together with Church Slavonic, or at least they were used as auxiliary languages in primary schools. As scholars of educational history have shown, before the partitions, in a parish school operated by Brest city, Basilians, the monks of the Greek-Catholic order, taught reading and writing in Latin and in Ruthenian as well as in Polish. Other parish schools that were directly operated by the Basilian order also taught reading and writing in Polish and Ruthenian 38.

Given this situation, we can remark that in spite of the regulations for primary schools and the instructions of the university and inspectors, the contents of primary education were to some extent influenced and adjusted to the local conditions, and that even the Ruthenian language was taught in a few primary schools.
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36 This explanation has been given by Łatyszonek and Mironowicz. Łatyszonek i Mironowicz, op. cit., s.59.
3 Primary Education in Polish in Lithuanian-speaking Lands

(1) The Lithuanian language

The last chapter analyzes the linguistic matters of the lands where Lithuanian speakers mainly lived, that is, Vilnius Guberniya. Most of the populace of this guberniya was Catholic.

The language that is currently called Lithuanian was occasionally called Samogitian at that time. Samogitia (Žemaitija in Lithuanian, Zmudź in Polish) is the western part of the guberniya and their language is now regarded as a dialect of Lithuanian. In the 19th century, the nomination was not clear. Samogitian meant Samogitian dialect, but sometimes meant Lithuanian itself. In this article, the term 'Lithuanian' is used as a generic term.

Samogitia had been an independent duchy in the Grand Duchy of Lithuania since the Middle Ages and maintained its own diocese. In Samogitia, there were comparatively numerous free peasants or tenant farmers, and poor nobles; thus, the social differences between the nobility and peasantry were smaller than those in other places. Some nobles spoke Lithuanian as well as Polish. In the Diocese of Samogitia, the sermons and prayers in the churches were given in Lithuanian. Here, the primary school system was most developed in the Vilnius Educational District. A bishop, Józef Arnulf Giedroyć, published the first Samogitian translation of the Bible for Catholics in 1816 as a part of the activities of the Bible Society in Russia, and he instructed priests in the diocese to found a parish school. On the other hand, Polish was used in the churches in the Diocese of Vilnius, which administrated the eastern part of Vilnius Guberniya and Grodno Guberniya.

40 J. Ochmański, Litewski ruch narodowo-kulturalny w XIX wieku, Białystok, 1965, s.82–83; Beauvois, Wilno, s.699–700, 721, 724; Bukowiec, op.cit., s.56–61.
41 Praşmantaitė, op.cit., p.188–192, 227–255.
(2) Lithuanian in primary schools and obstacles to Polish language education?

The situation of the Lithuanian language was different from that of the Ruthenian language. During the educational reformation by the Commission of National Education, the printing office of Vilnius University published a primary textbook in Lithuanian. This textbook continued to be published with revisions after the partitions, even in the 1860s.\footnote{Lukšienė, op.cit., p.94, 338, 342; Beauvois, Wilno, s.726–727.}

When Chodźko inspected Vilnius Guberniya in 1822, his report of the situation of education in Rosienie County in Samogitia read as follows:

In the Vilnius Educational District, there is no such numbers of schools, classic or parish, as in the ancient Duchy of Samogitia including the counties of Rosienie, Szawle, and Telsze with its neighbouring Upita County. Eagerness of the bishop, efforts of honourable supervisors of schools, good will of landlords seeing in peace their own peasants more educated, and the location of the country close to sea ports, all these facts together make it possible that each parish church has a parish school, or even some branch churches have their parish schools. Apart from this, almost every village hires bakalarz [a migratory teacher of primary education: SK], who teaches children to read in their mother tongue, i.e. Samogitian. Therefore, if you see a peasant praying with a book in a church in the other counties of Lithuania, it’s extremely rare, but here, it’s an extreme oddness to find the one who cannot pray with a book. Thus, this general desire for education is going to the right direction, …\footnote{VUB, f.2, KC515, k.6–7.}

We have other examples that indicate the concerns of the university and nobles who founded or operated primary schools for Lithuanian language education.

On the occasion of inspections in Vilnius and Grodno Guberniyas in 1804,
Hieronim Stroynowski, the president of the university at the time and future bishop of Vilnius, gave special instructions to gather information on the Lithuanian language and its exact range and to send documents and folk songs in Lithuanian to the university\(^{44}\).

According to the works of M. Lukšienė and D. Beauvois, teachers who knew Lithuanian were chosen for a primary school in Johaniszkiele in Upita County, which was founded on the will of Ignacy Karp, a lord of the town, and it is thought that Lithuanian was used at least as an auxiliary language in the school. This school was run by the university as an executor of the will. Lithuanian was also taught in primary schools in Szadów in Szawle County, run by a canon, Józef Rupejko, and in Szwonykni (Szwójniki) in Upita County, founded by Ciotkiewicz. The university was engaged in the choice of the teacher in the school in Szwonykni. In 1820, an honourable supervisor of schools in Rosienie County, Michał Chlewiński went around the county to inspect schools with Leon Uwoyń (Uvainis) who was from the region and spoke Lithuanian as well\(^{45}\). All these examples come from the Diocese of Samogitia or neighbouring lands of the Diocese of Vilnius\(^{46}\). In 1823, the Lithuanian translation of the book *Mr. John from Świsloczy* was published under the name of Rupejko\(^47\). Thus, it is possible to state that the persons carrying out educational activities around the university accepted Lithuanian language education in primary schools.

In primary schools in Vilnius Guberniya, children learned Polish, Lithuanian, Latin, German (in the case of children from Protestant burghers families), and Russian. However, Russian was taught in a smaller number of

\(^{44}\) Beauvois, *Wilno*, s.726.

\(^{45}\) Lukšienė, *op.cit.*, p.94–95, 103; Beauvois, *Wilno*, s.706–707, 727. The opinions of these scholars differed with respect to some details.


\(^{47}\) According to Bukowiec, thus far, the translator has not been convincingly revealed, although Lithuanian scholars generally regard Rupejko as the translator. Bukowiec, *op.cit.*, s.204–209.
primary schools than in the other guberniyas of the Vilnius Educational District. Some reports from inspectors and schools do not directly mention the languages that students were taught to read and write; however, on the basis of other indirect descriptions of the reports and memoirs of the contemporaries, Lukšienė concluded that Lithuanian was widely taught in the western part of Vilnius Guberniya. Although Lithuanian language education was not institutionalized, if we compare it to Ruthenian language education, it was much more popular in primary schools.

Włodzimierz Gadon, who was an honourable supervisor of schools in Telsze County, wrote later in his book that children in Samogitia learned in Lithuanian first and then they learned in Polish when they advanced. However, some schools taught only Lithuanian and inspectors instructed the schools to prioritize the teaching of Polish and to teach Lithuanian only to those children who wanted to learn the language. In some cases, inspectors indicated that children’s ability to read and write the Polish language was low even if they learnt it. Judging from these critical opinions against the Lithuanian language education at the expense of the Polish language in primary schools, the persons engaged in school education under the university did not abandon the policy of Polish language education at the level of the common people.

Concerning Lithuanian, there were some ideas to introduce it not only in primary education but also in secondary and higher education. In 1805, Filip Golański, a professor of Vilnius University and an inspector to Vilnius Guberniya, proposed teaching in Lithuanian in secondary schools so that the students with little knowledge of Polish could understand classes. Others proposed to create a

48 However, Prašmantaitė indicated that the number of primary schools that taught Russian increased during the 1820s. Prašmantaitė, op. cit., p.211.

49 Lukšienė, op.cit., p.97–106.

50 W. Gadon, Statystyka Xięstwa Żmudzkiego, Vic (Meurthe), 1839, s.52–53.

51 Maciūnas, op.cit., p.49.

special preparatory grade for county schools in Samogitia in order to teach Polish to the students who did not understand it. Although none of the proposals were realized, they indicated that even though the university pursued the principle of Polish language education in secondary and higher education, the university had difficulty in carrying it out effectively in Samogitia because of the considerable number of students with inadequate Polish language ability.

In 1822, Kazimierz Kontrym, a librarian at the university, submitted a memorandum to the curator, Czartoryski, in order to found a chair of the Lithuanian language in the university. In his memorandum, Kontrym emphasized that its introduction would be useful for training future priests, teachers, and officials who would serve for the Lithuanian-speaking area, and for sciences like linguistics or historical research. In 1825, a special commission engaged in a revision of the statute for the Faculty of Literature and Arts at Vilnius University proposed the introduction of the Lithuanian language lecture once again. Neither of these proposals was realized.

As the ukase provided, the university censored all publishing in its educational district. Vilnius University did not approve the publication of some new textbooks in Lithuanian, for example, a Lithuanian grammar and an arithmetic textbook, although an interest in the Lithuanian language began growing when the works on the history of Lithuanian law (by Czacki) and Lithuanian language (by Ksawery Bohusz) were published at the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries, respectively. Publications in Lithuanian were limited to religious books, textbooks, among which there were very few new titles, such as an elementary textbook by Kajetan Niezabitowski (Nezabitauskis) published in

53 Lukšienė, op.cit., p.104–105, 139–140.
54 In 1822, while inspecting Krožė (Kraziąja) Gymnasium, which was known as the best school in Samogitia, Chodžko had also indicated the students' low ability to read and write the Polish language in his report. Maciūnas, op.cit., p.77.
55 Kontrym planned to nominate the above-mentioned Uwoyri for the chair. S. Pigoń, Z dawnego Wilna: Szkice obyczajowe i literackie, Wilno, 1929, s.23–28.
56 Bukowiec, op.cit., s.63.
1824, and a few poems and folk songs often with Polish translations\textsuperscript{57}.

Although the Lithuanian language was not introduced into secondary or higher education until Vilnius University was closed, Lithuanian language education was often provided in primary schools. We can indicate that there was a difference between primary education that provided the minimum education like the three R’s and religious education mainly to common people, and secondary and higher education for the elite, which was dominated by the Polish high culture. We can also indicate a big gap between the idea of treating Lithuanian as an object to research and the idea of using it in public spheres.

\textbf{Conclusion}

The people who were engaged in school education in the Vilnius Educational District exhibited rather different attitudes towards Lithuanian and Ruthenian in primary education. In the Ruthenian-speaking areas, there is no mention of Ruthenian in the inspectional reports. On the contrary, in the Lithuanian-speaking areas, the persons associated with the university not only tolerated, but on occasion instructed that Lithuanian should be taught in primary schools. Scholars have already said that among the folk languages, exceptionally Lithuanian was taught in primary schools in the Vilnius Educational District. They have explained that only Lithuanian was taught because this language was used in the churches in the Diocese of Samogitia and it had a tradition as a written language in printed religious books and textbooks\textsuperscript{58}. However, in reality, as shown in this article, Ruthenian was also taught in a few primary schools where it was necessary and possible. Moreover, religious textbooks were also written in Ruthenian. According to these facts, it can be said that differences in textbook copies and in the penetration of primary education


\textsuperscript{58} For example, see: Lukšienė, \textit{op.cit.}, p.97–100: Beauvois, \textit{Wilno}, s.258–260, 726.
are important reasons for the differences in the practices of folk-language education between Lithuanian and Ruthenian. Another reason that can be adduced is the similarity between Ruthenian and Polish. Furthermore, Ruthenian was an object of research and interest in Poland and Russia. To encourage the Ruthenian language education using Cyrillic script may have caused an expansion of the influence of the Orthodox and Russian language. For this reason, the persons associated with the university might have hesitated to encourage Ruthenian language education; however, this is another subject of research. During the 19th century, disputes about the manner in which Ruthenian, and subsequently Belarusian and Ukrainian should be treated, that is, as a dialect of Polish or Russian, or as an independent language, and disputes over which script should be used to write it, Latin or Cyrillic, were stirred along with the rivalry between Poland and Russia over these lands.

In the early 19th century, the people engaged in school education under the university regarded the common people as objects of education, but they did not support the social advancement of the peasantry through education. At that time, an interest in the folk languages was growing among intellectuals from a cultural perspective and some persons associated with the university attempted to teach Lithuanian in higher schools or the university. However, the practice of the folk languages usually remained only in marginal spheres, such as teaching at non-elitist primary schools, and most of the production of folk languages were sparsely diffused by handwritten manuscripts. Folk languages continued to bear a social stigma as languages that were unsuitable for the public sphere. On the other hand, the principle that the medium of instruction for education in primary schools should be Polish and that students should be taught to read and write in Polish may have led to the integration of the common people into the society of Polish culture. At that time, when the Polish language dominated, being educated meant acquiring knowledge of Polish and its culture. The poorer

59 For examples, we can mention manuscripts of dictionaries, history, and poetries in Lithuanian and anonymous handwritten ‘hutarki’ in Belarusian.
nobles, burghers, and occasionally, even peasants had a chance to advance and enter a broader world through Polish education, even if primary education was not enough to make a career. We can remark that thanks to folk-language education in primary schools, multilingualism was maintained in lower classes of elite, such as the poorer nobles, petty officials, and burghers, and that the folk languages also had a form of a written language. The education of the Vilnius Educational District and Vilnius University as a whole gave birth to new intellectuals, including the multilingual ones who under the Polish cultural hegemony contributed to the research on folk cultures and languages and produced literary works in the folk languages, such as Simonas Daukantas (Dowkont), Simonas Stanevičius (Staniewcz), Jan Czeczot, and Vintsent Dunin-Martsinkievich (Dunin-Marcinkiewicz). It is true that folk-language education or the language problems in primary schools and cultural activities of intellectuals were connected more closely in the latter half of the 19th century, when school education began to spread on a large scale. However, the folk-language education in primary schools in the early 19th century presumably prepared a sphere of activity for the newborn multilingual intellectuals. After Vilnius University was closed, works and writings in respective folk languages were created by multilingual intellectuals under Polish or Russian high culture at least until the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries.
Ethnic Groups among Professors and Student Body of the Imperial Saint-Petersburg University in the First Half of XIX Century*

Tatyana Zhukovskaya
(Saint-Petersburg State University, Russia)

Social history of Russian universities as a top priority of studying demands the examining of social and ethnic structure of professorial and student corporations in each particular university and in the context of interuniversity interaction.

The problem of European scientists' migration to Russia, their moving to different Russian universities, their adaptation and activity have not received all the attention it deserves. The main reason of it is that the study of horizontal contacts among universities demands the integrating efforts of historians dealing with different universities.¹ The study of ethnic structure of professorial corporation has been pursued only in respect of several distinct universities.

The examination of ethnic groups among students beyond any local and chronological frames is a much more demanding task, and as for Pre-Reform

* This article is prepared by supporting of project «Столичный университет в фокусе правительственной политики России (1819-1917)» of Federal purpose program «Научные и научно-педагогические кадры инновационной России» to 2009-2013. (Мероприятие 1.2.2. ГК № 14.740.11.1112) and Subject-matter of NIR SPb. State Univ. (5.38.51.2011 «История Санкт-Петербургского университета в контексте истории российского государства и общества»)

¹ European scholars have studied the social history of the Russian professoriate and studentship, but their works are mainly too general and don't touch the questions of ethnicity and international cooperation: Kassow S.D. Students, Professors and the State in Tsarist Russia. Berkeley; Los Angeles; L., 1989; Maurer Trude. Hochschullehrer im Zarenreich. Ein Beitrag zur russischen Sozial- und Bildungsgeschichte. Köln; Weimar; Wien, 1998; Friedman Rebekka. Masculinity, Autocracy and the Russian University. 1804-1863. L.,Berkeley, 2003.

university only few observations on this problem have been made.\(^2\)

Various ethnic groups within Russian universities have been studied before as local cases and ethnic groups of the university corporation have not been thoroughly estimated at all. At the same time Russian Pre-Reform universities contrast to universities of the late XIX – the beginning of XX cent. have not been comprehensively examined. All these statements are fair to say about the historiography of the St. Petersburg University\(^3\) as well as of all other universities of the Empire.

Though we don’t claim to present the exhaustive examination of the problem in this report, but we shall try to reveal the ethnic structure of professorial and student corporations at the St. Petersburg University in the stated period, and to mark perspective ways of its more profound studying.

In the first decades of the XIX cent. the Ministry of Public Education succeeded in forming several universities with international bodies of professors and students in the Russian Empire. Contrary to the Dorpat and even the Moscow Universities the metropolitan Pedagogical Institute that was transformed into the University in 1819 was more homogeneous in ethnic sense.

The findings and conclusions of the present report are based on systematic examination of the funds of the St. Petersburg University kept in the Central Historical Archive of St. Petersburg (hereafter, CGIA SPb.) and the Russian State Historical Archive (hereafter, RGIA). The historical sources on this topic particularly professors’ career records, files on their assignments and movings are located in the archival collections of the Ministry of Public Education (the


Department of Public Education (RGIA. F. 733. Op. 20–26, 77, 86) and of Minister’s Office (RGIA. F. 735). The archival collections of the Office of the St. Petersburg educational district curator (CGIA SPb. F. 139) and the Head Board of Schools (RGIA. F. 732) are also valuable. We also use the documents of the University management and record keeping: Journals of the Pedagogical Institute Conference, records of the University Council, documents about students’ enrollment and transfer, about awarding scholarship, examinations, allocations, inspectorial supervision and police control, offences and punishment. The sources which have been assembled show exceptional position of some ethnic groups among students. The most interesting documents are devoted to police control, disciplining and persecution for political disloyalty of the Polish students. We also examined legislation and memoirs of the stated period.

We must make an essential point about the determination of the subject being analyzed. The term “nationality” can’t be found in the documents of the first half of the XIX cent., including university reports and career records of civil servants. However even if the ethnic identity of this or that person or group of people is missing the ethno-confessional affiliation which has usually been fixed in the documents can show clearly the nationality of an actor.

The ethnic groups among professoriate of the first generation of the St. Petersburg University likewise at the St. Petersburg Academy of Sciences were quite diverse.

Inviting the desired number of foreign professors was the requirement for establishing several universities in Russia in early XIX. In this respect various mechanisms were engaged to contribute the European scientists’ moving to Russia. We could name academic and bureaucratic networking, announcements in foreign press, active position of Russian diplomatic agents and of so called academic “correspondents” abroad who were paid by the Head Board of Schools.

The following idea was formulated in the project of the general university statute which was discussed in the Head Board of Schools on April 22, 1803: “If
an opportunity to attract a person who is renowned in academic sphere for his perfect knowledge appears to happen the University should apply for extraordinary salary to this person to its curator who is going to act in an appropriate way". Completing the staff of the majority of departments established in Russian universities in 1803–1804 took place upon an initiative of educational districts curators and with the help of “academic correspondents” abroad. The applicant was to submit recommendations of famous academics or to have significant research works.

To move to Russia, Foreigners had to get passports at Russian diplomatic agents abroad, and on the arrival they were to deliver these documents to the chief of local police. The invitation into a University didn’t oblige the applicant to take out Russian citizenship, he just swore fealty to the Russian crown in a definite form. If a person decided to stay in Russia for a long time he needed to nationalize. Sometimes an applicant had lived in Russia for many years without university employment, and it was the time of his entering into university staff when he took out Russian citizenship. For example, F. Videbourg who arrived in Russia in 1805 had not been a Russian subject until his assignment to the University when he wished to “take an oath in the service of Russia”. A Frenchman A. Dugou who had served at the Kharkov University for about 10 years took out Russian citizenship and changed his surname into Dugourov just in 1817 when he was enrolled on the staff of the Pedagogical Institute in St. Petersburg.

Some foreigners bothered the Emperor himself with the requests of engagements in schools. However direct appeal to the Emperor broke the system of seniority and could hardly contribute to the success of an applicant. This approach was usually utilized by people who didn’t have the required qualifications, recommendations or academic degrees and reckoned on personal

networks at the Russian court. Nevertheless this way of acting might complicate the established procedure of the foreign professors’ employment. This could be illustrated by the file on the appointment of an alien Shaumburg who “served to the House of Orange” till the invasion of Napoleon into the Netherlands. In October 1804 he presented the request about his enlisting to the Emperor. Alexander I with the help of the curator M.N. Muravyov announced Shaumburg that he could come to Russia. After Shaumburg did so, he “was sent with the complimentary letter to the Dorpat University to be appointed as a chancellor”. The foreigner had to be paid 1000 rubles before his assignment. But in the Dorpat University this suggestion was refused. The Emperor ordered to “express his surprise to the University” but didn’t insist on the employment of Shaumberg. Alexander I entrusted the President of the Academy of Sciences baron Nicolai with a task to appoint Shaumburg to the Academy. But knowledge of foreigner was unwanted in the Academy. Hence Shaumburg had not been employed for more than 3 years.7

In February 1804 the Head Board of Schools discussed the petition of P. Ceplin about the terms and conditions “under which he would accept the proposal to enter the Kazan University as a professor of historical studies”.8 All requirements of the applicant were agreed. Ceplin got into Russia and became the first German professor in Kazan where he continued to work for about 3 years.9

Data about arriving of foreign professors in Russia and their locating was published in the departmental magazine of the Ministry of Public Education. So, information about the assignment of professor Johann Bellerman from Erfut who had been advised by the Dorpat University for the Department of clerical history and philology appeared in one of the first issues.10 On the suggestion of the

10 Периодическое сочинение об успехах народного просвещения. 1803. Part. 2. P. 157.
minister P.V. Zavadovskij the Head Board of Schools confirmed the contract of the Dorpat University with Vienna professors Johan Peter Frank and his son Joseph, who were appointed the professor of clinic and therapy and the professor of abnormality respectively.\textsuperscript{11}

Obligations towards invited professors were carried out even in case of their untimely death. Even if a professor died soon after his arrival in Russia a University undertook the welfare assistance to his widow and children. On October 9, 1804 the curator of the Moscow University informed the Head Board of Schools about unexpected decease of the professor of statistics Grelmin who had come from Gottingen in the same year. The curator explained that “the professor was noted not only for his profound knowledge but also for rare heart merits”. He concluded that the Moscow University being in mourning because of the death of “the glorious man who had left his homeland only to contribute to the advancement of sciences in Russia brought in human-loving measures to endow his poor widow and her children”.\textsuperscript{12}

From the times of the Academic University of XVIII cent. all professors had been divided into Russian and foreign groups, and in the first half of the XIX cent. it remained the same. The peculiarity of the St. Petersburg University was that the group of foreign professors was more diverse in ethnic sense. At the same time in other universities the Germans prevailed.

Invitation of foreign professors to the St. Petersburg University likewise to other Russian universities was a purposeful process. Preparations for the establishing of the metropolitan university had been making since 1802. The Pedagogical Institute was established in 1804 just as a single part of the prospective university.

We suggest that it is correctly to approach the history of the Pedagogical Institute before 1819 and the St. Petersburg University after 1819 as a one whole continuing process: the former was given a new title and made its legal position

more stable in 1819, but neither staff nor nature of its activity was changed. Until 1824 the statute of the St. Petersburg University had been the one of the Central Pedagogical Institute.

In total staff of Pedagogical Institute consisted only 4 vacant positions of ordinary professors, 3 of extraordinary professors and 5 of assistant professors and foreign language instructors. These figures could be compared with the existing 28 departments of the Moscow University and 23 departments of the Dorpat University.13

The selection of this or that professor to be invited largely depended on contacts of educational districts curators and attractiveness of the concise town where a university was situated. St. Petersburg being the capital of Russia and the seat of the Academy of Sciences was a more attractive place for alien scholars than other town of the Empire. That’s why extensive campaigning on calling foreigners to St. Petersburg was not needed. Otherwise the organizers of education faced the problem of getting rid of accidental people.

In 1803 the curator of the metropolitan educational district N.N. Novosiltsev through the involvement of the surgeon at the court I.S. Orlay invited 3 professors of Slavonic origin from the universities of the Austrian Empire. They were M.A. Balugjanskiy, P.D. Lodiy and V.G. Kukolnik. The two former graduated the Vienna University and Kukolnik studied at the Lemberg Academy. All of them had doctoral degrees and experience in teaching. Before their arrival in Russia Lodiy taught in Lviv, Balugjanskiy at the Pest University, and Kukolnik in Crakow and in lyceum in Zamość. All three professors could adapt to the living in St. Petersburg quite easily and soon they started lecturing in Russian. This last thing was the principal difficulty for the majority of their colleagues. Having been advised by the curator they were appointed to the Teachers high school in view of its planned converting into university. Kukolnik

13 “Statute” of the Pedagogical Institute specified only the total number of professors (11) who had to keep positions of the staff professors and instructors and to share teaching disciplines among them. // Сборник постановлений по министерству народного просвещения. Vol. 1: 1802-1825. SPb., 1864. Column 207.
was employed at 2 departments as the professor of physical science and agriculture, P.D. Lodiy became the professor of philosophy and M.A. Balugianskiy the professor of political economy.\[^{14}\] In May 1803 the Governing Senate issued an edict according to which all three foreigners were approved to be the seventh grade servants that corresponded to the position of university professors.\[^{15}\]

On the whole the invitations of foreign professors to S.-Petersburg at that time seemed to be an exceptional event, not typical one, because there were a lot of Russian scholars and teachers of the required qualification who were trained in the Academy of Sciences, the Medico-Surgical Academy, Corps of Mining Engineers, military educational institutions. Therefore professorial corporation of the Pedagogical Institute, later the St. Petersburg University, was multi-ethnic but it consisted mostly of naturalized immigrant scholars but not newcomers. The academics of German origin predominated among them. The German scholars could in their turn be divided into several groups.

The first and the largest group was the local Germans of St. Petersburg who had come into Russian service long ago and sometimes being the second or even the third generation of immigrants they resided in St. Petersburg for many years. For example, in spring of 1806 the Chief Master of the mines Meder who had previously been the inspector of Mining Cadet Corps and had instructed in geognosy was invited to the Pedagogical Institute to lecture on mineralogy. The assistant professor of the Academy of Sciences K.F. German who had been in Russian service since 1795 was invited to read lectures on statistics in the Institute, and A. Sherer was appointed as a professor of chemistry and technology. Each of the invited scholars was paid 1000 rubles a year and A. Sherer was given besides 500 rubles “for correspondence and experiments”.\[^{16}\] F.B. Graefe who was invited to the Pedagogical Institute in 1811 also belongs to this

---


\[^{15}\] Idid. D. 77. L. 16 (verso).

group. Before the appointment he got education and obtained doctoral degree in
the lyceum in Chemnitz and then taught languages at the Alexander Nevsky
Ecclesiastic Academy. The head of the Teaches’ high school and the first head of
the Pedagogical Institute I.I. Koch who had been in Russian service since 1762 is
also a representative of the group.

The following two actors hold an intermediate position. The first is E.
Raupakh who had been an alumnus of the Halle University. He was invited to
the Pedagogical Institute after he had been living in the Russian capital trying to
find a job for several years. The second one is the Doctor of Philosophy Videburg
who graduated the University of Helmstedt. He was appointed as an assistant
professor of Greek philology in 1815. By that time the German had been residing
in St. Petersburg for 10 years and had taught in the Head Lutheran School at
Piterkirhe, but he was not a Russian subject.  

The children of St. Petersburg German artisans and petty traders can also
be referred to this group. They got education in the Academic school at the
expense of their parents or on a state's sponsorship. After that they became the
students of the Academic University and after graduation they stayed in the
University to lecture and to write there theses (F. Busse, A. Schumacher).

To the second group of the German professors we could place immigrants
from the Baltics who as a rule graduated German universities, but started their
professional career in Russia long before the invitation to the St. Petersburg
University. F.F. Middendorff, the native of Pärnu (Estonia), graduated the
University of Jena and then he taught in PETERSBURG school. In 1811 he accepted
a vacancy without paying at the Pedagogical Institute but owing to the
reorganization of the Institute in 1815 he was elected a staff professor.  

From 1828 till 1845 Middendorff was the head of the Main Pedagogical Institute at the
University. Another Baltic German was V. Shneider. He was born in Revel,
graduated the Dorpat University. Then he lectured at the Moscow University till

---

18 Ibid. L. 3, 5, 9.
1822, when he was appointed not on the staff professor of Roman law, and later he became staff professor. One more person who belongs to this group is enlightened enthusiast E.A. Engelgardt who was born in Riga. He didn't have university education but held an office of the head of the Pedagogical Institute in 1811–1817, and after that he was the head of the Tsarskoe Selo Lyceum.

It’s possible to include to this group the people who studied or even finished the Dorpat University and then immigrated to Petersburg. Among them is Alexander Postels who moved from Dorpat to the St. Petersburg University and then became not on the staff professor of mineralogy at the University. We also could mention E.H. Lenz about whom we will talk in details a bit later.

The third group of the German professors is composed of the people who had academic degrees and were invited from abroad. For instance a map-maker Lavrenti Pansner, an alumnus of the Vienna University, was the professor of mineralogy at the St. Petersburg University in 1819–1822. Foreign professors were invited most actively in the times of transformation of the St. Petersburg University in 1803, 1816, 1819.

When S.S. Uvarov was the curator of the St. Petersburg University and of the educational district (1811–1821) the general consolidation of the corporation was evident and invitation of foreign professors became more selective. Moreover in 1811–1812 12 scholars who had been sent abroad to continued their education after their graduation of the Pedagogical Institute returned home (all of them were born in Central provinces). In 1810-s the professorial corporation had been enriched by the professors of philology E. Raupach, G. Gedike, the instructors in languages Tillo, Perro, Polner, Sheller.

After the establishment of the Department of Oriental languages in St. Petersburg the young French scholars that is the arabist F. Demange and the specialist in Persian philology F. Sharmua were invited on the recommendation of Silvestre de Sacy. In 1817 the French Dugour who would soon change his surname into Dugourov moved from the Kharkov into the St. Petersburg University. As a rule foreigners were the instructors in newly taught languages.
Besides French and German languages the English (by Polner) and the Italian (by the “lecturers” Maroketti and Mancici) were taught in St. Petersburg.

In 1804 among the members of the respectively small professorial corporation of the Pedagogical Institute 12 professors and 7 instructors were not Russian. In 1819/1820 academic year that was the first year after the reorganization of the Pedagogical Institute into the University the professorial corporation embraced the following ethnic groups. The total number was 33 people among whom 16 were the Russians and the Ukrainians (Little Russians) (or the Orthodox) and 17 were not Russians. So we have reasons to state that the corporation was divided into nearly equal parts.

Among foreign professors apart from the ethnic Germans we could mark 3 groups. The first group is composed of the professors of the Slavonic origin that is the above-mentioned “Carpatho-Rusyns” (the ethnic Slovaks) who were the first to be invited to the University. But as far as M.A. Balugianskiy and P.D. Lodiy were alumni of the Vienna University, their colleagues and students could consider them “the Germans” in habits of mind, character and methods of teaching. The opinions of students about Balugianskiy may serve a good example of it. It is necessary to note that for a long time Balugianskiy had written official papers in French and Lodiy in German. The Serbian Terlaich invited in 1806 is close to this Slavonic-German group. It should be added that the first head of the Teachers’ high school was the Serbian F.I. Jankovic Mirijevski who had been invited from Austria by Cathrine II to organize schools.

The second group of professors combines the French (A. Dugourov, F. Demange, F. Sharmua, J. Ballen de Ballu, instructors in languages de la Molinier, Perro, Tillo). Among the natives of France A.A. Degourov who moved from the Kharkov University seems to be the most outstanding figure. At first he

---


taught only French philology, but after the notorious “professorial affair” and E. Raupach’s ejection he added the Department of history to his duties. Since 1825 till the enforcing of new universities’ statute Degourov had been the Rector for three times, but he was likely to advance his interest, but not to make profits for the University.\(^{21}\) Jakov Jakovlevitch Balle de Ballu, the professor of the Greek philology, came from the Kharkov University in 1811. Jean Perro was appointed as an instructor in French in 1818.\(^{22}\)

The third group is the Polish professors. V.G. Kukolnik, who was born in Galicia, seems to be the first ethnic Pole. Before his arrival in Russia Kukolnik had published several works in Polish and lectured at some Polish institutions. By the way he was an Uniate, but his children, born in Russia, were christened in Orthodox church. Another Pole at the University was Osip Senkovsky, an alumnus of the University of Vilno, who was the pioneer of oriental studies at St. Petersburg. In 1830–1850-s the number of Poles was increasing due to the students who stayed at the University after graduation and started lecturing the Polish jurisprudence and legal proceedings (M. Stasulevitch, K. Spasovitch).

Professorial corporation had been developing rapidly as did also the university science and teaching. In 1818 the Tatar Jafar Topchubashov began to train students in the Arabic and the Persian. After the dismissal of Demange and Sharmua he was the only specialist in the oriental languages. Later Mirza Kazem-bek, born in Persia, was invited from the Kazan University for teaching oriental languages.

Conflicts between the representatives of different groups within the corporation were not an exceptional thing, but they seldom went beyond the professional controversies. So in 1812 P.D. Lodiy voiced his disagreement with the early appointment of professor Y.F. Zyablovskiy’s student K.I. Arsenyev as an assistant professor. The latter was assign to do lecturing and got the rank of


Titular Councillor. To the point Arsenyev would soon be recognized as a brilliant scholar and professor. The members of the Conference (or meeting) at which that situation was examined decided that the reason of such an unpleasant accident was that Lodiy and Zyablovskiy were too emotional while settling an argument. Lodiy demanded to maintain order in appointments and lecturing. He assured that his young colleagues were trying to avoid this system. Zyablovskiy suggested that Lodiy’s criticism was excessive and Lodiy accused Zyablovskiy of the lack of respect. The affair about displacement of lectures was arranged soon but hard feelings between the professors remained unchanged. The Conference had made 3 attempts to overcome the conflict but the efforts failed because of the Lodiy’s sensibility.

The norms of the universities’ statutes including the regulations about judicial autonomy didn’t spread over the Pedagogical Institute. That was the reason of addressing to the curator to settle the controversy. The curator asked the head of the Institute E.A. Engelhardt for using his authority to force Lodiy to make at least outward peace in order “not to damage the general order at the Institute”. The peace-loving director was successful in achieving the façade of reconciliation. However this disagreeable story posed a question of extension of the universities trial’s regulations fixed in the statutes of 1804 over the Institute. It’s significant that the parties to the conflict did not appeal to the norms according to which other universities were ruled.

However conflicts between foreign professors and native scholars were inevitable although the government tried to minimize it by providing ideal facilities for work and life of the guests. The conflict lay not in academic, teaching, religious or language spheres (although it was difficult for many visitant professors to made themselves understood by students). The root of the conflict could be found in the mentality of European professors who were educated at the European universities and got a view of corporate traditions and rights there.

These views were completely different from the notions and experience of native professors fostered in the Academic school or in the Teachers’ high school. The illusions of the invited professors that the regimes of newly established Russian universities and of their German prototypes were rather close rested on liberal principles of the universities’ statutes. But all these illusions were dispelled because the foreigners faced everyday violation of widely declared autonomy rules.

The first serious ethnic conflict within the professorial corporation occurred in 1819 while the election of the University’s Rector. During the first voting in August there was equal division of votes between E. Raupach and M.A. Balugjanskiy. The election instruction written by the curator due to the absence of the University statute prescribed to settle the situation of the equality of votes by lot. Raupach was chosen by this method. But the minister A.N. Golitsin and the Emperor was dissatisfied with the figure of the German who had started lecturing not long ago. In the beginning of new academic year the minister forced to organize the repeat elections and more desired by the authority Balugjanskiy was the winner (at that time he was engaged in the codification law).24

Imbalance between the atmosphere at the University and the governmental policy on the one hand and the declaration of autonomy on the other hand disturbed the invited professors. In the years of functioning of the Pedagogical Institute during discussions on the burning questions foreign professors appealed to the experience of the Dorpat University which was considered to be a close analogue of the European universities. (There would have been no sense to refer to the regulations of the European universities themselves).

The notorious “professorial affair” of 1821 became the bitterest conflict in which different ethnic group within corporation clashed.

On our point of view the “professorial affair” revealed the conflict between

---

the university corporate traditions and the traditional Russian obedience. The motives of the “judgement” over professors and its connections with the beginning of ideological reaction period have been already examined thoroughly. The three-day trial was recorded not only by its initiator D.P. Runitch but also by the assistant professor M.G. Plisov. It is essential to underline that during the trial the administration (the curator Runitch and the head of the Institute D.A. Kavelin) played off the professors against each other, intimidated and provoked them in order to gain more discreditable materials. Besides four people who were initially blamed (they were Galitch, Raupach, Arsenyev and German, that is 2 Germans and 2 Russians) that “judgement” stopped the careers of Demange and Sharmua in Russia and worsened the positions of M.A. Balugjanskiy and Lodiy who had tried to defend at least the form of impartial inquiry. Professors’ behavior reflected in protocols revealed the conflict of mental and juridical identities. The irony of this situation is that there were people among Russian professors (although having 3-year experience of living abroad) who were able not to be servile (D.S. Chizhov, M.S. Plisov), and some foreigners played along with the authorities and didn’t understand the norms of professional ethics (A.A. Dugourov).

The outcome of the inspired false accusations was the removal of all four defendants from the University and the expulsion of E. Raupach from Russia who was accused of “free-thinking and atheism”. It is possible to assume that if Raupach had not been accused he would have left Russia on his own free will because that row deprived him of an opportunity to communicate without confrontation with all the members of professorial community. Before 1821 there were just 2 foreign professors who had left the St. Petersburg University (Kukolnik and Terlaich) but their departure could be explained by some personal circumstances (health deterioration and more favourable offer).

25 Дело о Санкт-Петербургском университете. Краткая записка об общем собрании Императорского С.-Петербургского университета 3, 4 и 7-го числа ноября сего 1821 г. М., 1866.
The students of that time P. Savelyev and A. Nikitenko recollected that in 1820-s “German fraction” of the professors of the St. Petersburg University kept themselves close and avoided any contacts with others. These circumstances complicated the adaptation of new lecturers, made them more reserved, and impeded the academic activities and the process of succession that is the preparation of Russian staff to replace invited professors.

Until 1840-s poor teaching especially of humanitarian disciplines was the characteristic of the university education. People from different universities who wrote memoirs at that time agreed on it. The student Pecherin who had left the University and had a negative attitude towards all Russian things wrote: “Professoriate is impossible thing in Russia... Indeed our honourable Graefe being the German and member of the Academy could hardly become a minor assistant professor in Oxford”. Then the memoirist mentioned a curious piece of advice given to him by N.I. Gretch before his leaving abroad: “Why are you going to study abroad? When you need some German studies we will deliver a fresh German from Germany”. 28

In 1840-s owing to increase in the level of academic knowledge and teaching many alumni of the St. Petersburg University became worldwide renowned cosmopolitan scholars for whom there were no frontiers between Russian and European academic knowledge. The brightest of them was E.H. Lenz, born in Dorpat, who had studied at the Dorpat University under the supervision of F.I. Giese and G.F. Parrot. When he was a student but had not finished his education yet Lenz was sent to the expedition around the world with O.E. Kotzebue. Lenz’s physical research during the voyage resulted in the defense of the doctoral thesis and soon he was invited at the Academy of Sciences. In 1834 he became the professor of the St. Petersburg University, the Dean of the

28 Ibid.
section of Mathematics and Physics at the Philosophy Department, and in 1863 he was elected the Rector of the University.\footnote{CGIA SPb. F. 139. Op. 1. D. 4627, 6040, 6214.}

University is cosmopolitan in its nature. However the tradition of forming “nations”, communities or the groups of students according to ethnic principle was established in the Middle Ages. In Russian universities the structuring of student corporation in accordance with ethnicity became possible just after the number of students had grown significantly. It happened in 1830’s–1840’s and was synchronized, on the one hand, with the rise of national romanticism as a stage of nation-building process which intensified historical, philological and ethnographic studies and contributed to establishing new specializations and on the other hand with revision of the Imperial policy in the Kingdom of Poland, Western and other provinces. This policy was rested on the training of political loyalty, more or less soft Russification of culture and language and the incorporation of ethnic elites into the body of the Imperial bureaucracy.

The studentship of the stated period was quite a changeable group particularly in its social and ethnic structure. Until 1820’s the majority of students came from the ecclesiastic schools and were state-funded. They were often born in the Great Russian or less frequently in the Little Russian provinces. There were 8 Ukrainians among the first graduates of the Pedagogical Institute and other students laughed at their language and customs. At the Institute Conference on October 7, 1805 the memo written by the inspectors I.I. Martynov and M.A. Balugianskiy was discussed. It was stated that according to students’ opinion Ukrainians had their own dialect, that’s why they should be advised to try to speak in Great Russian dialect. The inspectors begged the Conference to take all due measures to achieve that purpose. It was decided that students should be accommodated in a way that the Russians were mixed with the
The Ukrainians were gradually adapting to the life in St. Petersburg largely thanks to the democratic composition of the first graduates of the Pedagogical Institute and the living of Russian and Ukrainian students together. There were not many self-funded students at that time (for example, 14 in 1819), and the Germans prevailed among them.

The Ukrainians were among students of the University also in a later period. The graduates of the Kiev Academy Pavel and Aleksandr Maksomovitches were admitted to the Pedagogical Institute in 1816 at the direction of the curator.\textsuperscript{31} In 1834 Djakonov-Nosik who had Cossacks origin graduated the University.\textsuperscript{32}

In 1810\textsuperscript{-s} several Serbian students entered the Pedagogical Institute. It could be explained by the fact that Russia at that time tried to patronize the Serbian national movement. In 1820\textsuperscript{-s} the Caucasians studied at the University although the majority of them were not the Caucasus\textsuperscript{-}born mountain dwellers but the residents of South who had appropriate knowledge to enter the University. However we could name several students who were the ethnic Caucasians. Children of the noble Georgian families initially studied at schools in St. Petersburg to be able to enter the University. In June 1825 by the initiative of the minister brothers Zhafaridzevs, the natives of Imeretia, became the students with free attendance of the school in St. Petersburg. They were paid 30 rubles in paper money a year from personal finances the Emperor. The Georgian brothers came to St. Petersburg in October 1825\textsuperscript{33}, but they didn't enter the University after finishing the school. In 1820 a certain Zahar Korganov was admitted to the University and his study was also funded by the Cabinet of His Imperial Majesty. But Korganov was soon expelled because of his inability to study.

\textsuperscript{30} CGIA SPb. F. 13. D. 123 (1805).
\textsuperscript{32} Воронов А.С. Историко-статистическое обозрение учебных заведений С.-Петербургского учебного округа с 1775 по 1853 гг. SPb., 1849. P. 50.
In 1825 Solomon Dodaev (Dodashvili) entered the Department of Philosophy and Law as a student with free attendance. He graduated the University in 1827 and returned to Georgia where he published textbooks on Georgian grammar and logic. In 1830 he was arrested as a participant of the Georgian secret society and deported to Vyatka.34

Later the residents of the Southern provinces were purposefully admitted to the Oriental Studies Section of the Department of History and Philology, although as in early times not all of them were the representatives of Caucasus peoples. By the order of the Academy of Sciences the student of the Philological Section of the Philosophy Department the Georgian David Chubinov-Georgiev had been busy with the composing of Georgian-Russian-French dictionary for several years. Instead of the Latin translations of Georgian words he used their interpretations in French. In 1838 the University Council applied for publishing of this manual on oriental lexicography.35 In 1840 the Georgian prince Zaharij Palavandov graduated the University.

According to the official report of the Rector in 1838 there were 132 nobles, 65 children of junior officers, 19 representatives of church estate, 40 children of merchants, 31 burgers, 9 of “various ranks” and 5 foreigners among the students of the University.36 Under “foreigners” the Rector is likely to have meant the students whose fathers did not nationalize. No evidence is available to prove that there were students at the University who had come independently from Western Europe. But in 1830–1840’s among the students of the St. Petersburg University were the children of French immigrants who had come into Russian service at the turn of XVIII–XIX cent. (Petr Demaison, Pavel Oubri, Aleksandr Delacroix, Ivan Ribeau-pierre), of the Italians and the Greeks (Karl Rospini, Gavriil Destunis), and the offsprings of the Swedish immigrants (Lindqvist,

Pavel Igelström, Andrei Budberg).\footnote{Воронов А.С. Историко-статистическое обозрение... Supplements. SPb., 1854. Pp. 47-77.}

In 1831–1850s the students group of German origin was the third in its number after the Russian and the Polish. The information about this group is far from the precise in contrast to the data about the Poles. Frankly speaking, it’s easy to confuse German and Swedish surnames particularly the surnames of the Swedish natives of the Grand Principality of Finland.

There were not any special lists of the German students in which their place of birth and confession were determined and the general lists lacked these characteristics. However we believe that this group of students like the German group of professors was primarily composed of the ethnic Germans born in St. Petersburg and the nearest provinces and in less number of Ost-see Germans. The latter often chose the St. Petersburg University after studying for a certain period at the Dorpat’s. The brightest representatives of Dorpat “academic migrants” were A.V. Schneider and E.K. Rheingold. By and large we have just few records of students’ moving from Dorpat to St. Petersburg. It’s possible to find much more cases when students came from St. Petersburg to Dorpat. The main reasons of this were the intention to change the Department, financial and family circumstances.

The available data show that there were few German students whose parents had immigrated into Russia recently. One of such a person was Karl Kessler who studied at the St. Petersburg University in 1836–1838. In his student's days Kessler immersed himself in study of mathematics, and in 1837 he received the gold medal for the best student paper on pure mathematics about solution of equations.\footnote{[Шульгин И.П.] Краткий отчет... Pp. 22-23.} It was one of the first medals given to the students according to the statute of 1835. But soon Kessler influenced by S.S. Kutorga turned to zoology. He became a professor of the Kiev University, but then he returned to St. Petersburg. In 1867–1873 he had been elected the Rector of the
University for three times.

By the way the German impact on the models of students’ everyday behavior is the obvious example of transmission of the German universities traditions through the immigrants from Dorpat. In 1830–1840’s in the St. Petersburg University student corporations were widespread. These were the communities of the Poles, the Germans and the Russians who tried to imitate the Germans. The German corporation called Baltika was headed by P. Preis who was expelled from the Dorpat University for participation in a street demonstration. The Russian corporation called Ruthenia was founded as opposed to the German one by the future renowned poet N.M. Yazykov who had studied in Dorpat earlier. Colours of corporations that is the colours of banners and caps were almost the only distinctive feature of these unions. As in any closed communities there was a strict hierarchy within the corporation. Students often arranged sword fightings and merry holidays “in German spirit”, so called kneips and kommerses. The evidence of memoirists proves that the corporations in St. Petersburg unlike in Dorpat were not numerous: they have never united the majority of students and the corporation rules were not very strict. Contrary to the Dorpat students, the members of St. Petersburg student corporation didn’t have any conflicts with the administration and the city police. At least we have no written records about it. The corporations Baltika and Ruthenia in St. Petersburg had existed just for several years, but at the beginning of XX century there were some attempts to restore them.

In 1830’s the self-funded students born in the Kingdom of Poland and the Western provinces prevailed among the Polish students. However in course of time the Poles were admitted as boarders (since 1845 they were called scholarship holders) of the Kingdom of Poland itself. Some Polish boarders became teachers in not Polish provinces. For example Joseph Krzyżanowski was sent to the school in Ekaterinoslav where he had served for 20 years. Favourable, but not discriminating conditions were provided for the boarders of the Kingdom of Poland at both metropolitan universities.
The reasons of fast-spreading “Polonisation” of the St. Petersburg University were the following. At first the self-funded wealthy students were attracted by the perspective to start their career in the capital of the Empire. After the graduation this part of the Poles began to work in central institutions or joined the army. The second reason of the attraction of St. Petersburg and Moscow for Poles was the virtual ban on study at German universities. That prohibition was initially established in 1820-s.39

In the time of Nicholas I when the Polish Vilno and Warsaw Universities were closed and a diploma of any European University was not an argument for civil service this ban was revised and now just young Poles were embraced by this regulation. Moreover the Poles under 25 years old didn’t have the right to leave the Empire. However the most important reason that could explain the intention of young Poles to go to St. Petersburg and Moscow was the establishment of a big number of scholarships which were financed by the nobles of the Western province, the Warsaw educational district and the administration of the Kingdom of Poland.

According to the circular of the minister signed on November 14, 1836 the natives of the Kingdom of Poland with the permission of the governor could award the status of “pupils of the Kingdom of Poland” and became free from tuition fees. They might claim the material support out of the funds of the Warsaw educational district (no more than 250 rubles a year). In this case they were named “the boarders of the Kingdom of Poland”. After their graduation of a university they had to be civil servants for 10 but not for 6 years as the state-funded students did. From this 10 year term they should be employed in Central provinces of Russia for 5 years. By the way the graduates could hold an office of the 10th grade in the Kingdom of Poland and people who had got

---
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candidate degrees could be employed as the 9th grade servants.40

These requirements were preserved by the Regulation on scholarships for the natives of the Kingdom of Poland which was published on August 11, 1846. According to the document scholarships were divided into “juridical” and “pedagogical” parts, each of them amounted 300 silver rubles a year. The former was awarded by the decision of the governor of the Kingdom of Poland. The latter came under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Public Education. The boarders were compensated their transport expenses for the travelling at home while vacations and for the coming to the place of service. “Juridical” scholarship holders entered the Law Section of the St. Petersburg and Moscow Universities where the Departments of Polish Jurisprudence and Jurisdiction had been established. These students were obliged to return to the Kingdom of Poland after graduation and to serve in their specialization for no less than 6 years.41 “Pedagogical” scholarship holders studied at both the Section of Cameral Sciences of the Law Department and other Departments. They were also employed in the Polish provinces, but in absence of vacancies or in some other special circumstances they could hold an office in the Central provinces. In any case the term of compulsory service remained the same.

The number of scholarships established for the St. Petersburg University was much bigger than for the Moscow University.42 But even before the Regulation of 1846 was published the amount of the Polish students at the St. Petersburg University was not less than one-third of the total number. This figure is much bigger than at the Moscow, the Kharkov or the Kiev Universities. There were 26 Poles among 63 graduates of the St. Petersburg University in 1842, and 33 Poles out of 113 graduates in 1847.43 Correlating these figures with

40 О распространении на все вообще губернии запрещения отправлять юношество для обучения в Университеты Гейдельбергский, Иенский, Гиссенский и Вюрцбургский // Сборник постановлений… SPb., 1875. Vol. 1. Column 1699-1705.
42 Ibid.
43 Estimated according to: Воронов А.С. Историко-статистическое обозрение… Rp. 59-60;
the total number of students we should say about 100–120 Polish students who studied at the University at the same time.

Since the end 1830s special lists of the Polish students had been drawn at universities to be presented to the Ministry of Public Education. There are no doubts that Nicholas I himself who kept under his own control all actions of disloyalty of the Polish subjects including accidents with students looked through these lists. Since 1849 the practice of Polish students enlisting was changed into the composing of the general list of students with information about their background, confession, etc.

According to statistics the number of ethnic Poles among the graduates was much bigger than the number of Polish scholarship holders. It could be explained by the large amount of students who was born in the Western province and whose study was funded at their own expense. In this connection we can say that confession but not ethnicity was recorded in the documents of the period under examination. However the complex of significant signs (such as name and surname, confession, social origin, the school the person finished before his enrollment and the place of employment after the graduation) gives us an opportunity to identify the Poles among other students. The student lists for different academic years are kept in the archival collections of the University, but they include also students with free attendance and people who had not finished their study. The complete list of the graduates for 30 years (1823–1853) are drawn by A.S. Voronov.44

The special “Rules...” confirmed on November 27, 1847 were established for the students born in the Kingdom of Poland at the St. Petersburg University. According to the document the “juridical” scholarship holders were to take the whole course on the Polish legislation but at the same time they were excused from attending the lectures on financial legislation, public law of the European

67-69. See the lists of the boarders of the Kingdom of Poland for various years: RGIA. F. 733. Op. 77. D. 74, 75.

powers and foreign languages.\textsuperscript{45}

The Regulation of August 11, 1846 had been in operation until the end of the reign of Nicholas I. The exact number of awards for both “juridical” and “pedagogical” scholarships was defined annually. The number of people who wanted to hold “juridical” scholarship always exceeded the quantity of vacant positions. However by the decision of the minister a worthy applicant could be awarded “pedagogical” scholarship without obligation to have a teaching employment in the Warsaw educational district after graduation the University or during the process of studying the person could change “pedagogical” scholarship to “juridical” one. A scholarship holder avoided compulsory service if he could prove his poor health with medical documents.

Despite all the advantages the study of the Poles at the St. Petersburg University was complicated by the unnecessarily suspicious attitude towards them of the University administrators and inspectors. In addition to the Regulation about scholarships the minister S.S. Uvarov suggested that 1000 rubles were given from the scholarship money annually to “elaborate the methods of supervision over the Polish students in universities of the Empire”.\textsuperscript{46} Inspectors tried to find political motives in all the offences of the Poles, and in this case the punishment could be the expulsion of a student. So the students Krupskij, Polubinski and Walicki who had gone to Minsk province for vacation time were arrested there because of the denunciation that they had said something offensive about the government. The investigation showed up that the students hadn't had any political motives and the denunciation couldn't be proved by any facts. However the young men were punished for keeping the forbidden books. Nicholas I who always examined such accidents scrupulously was pleased to “allow the students to pass an exam after their arrest, so that that case wouldn't impede their promotion to the next classes or the obtaining some

\textsuperscript{45} Сборник распоряжений по Министерству народного просвещения. SPb., 1866. Vol. 2. Column 590.

\textsuperscript{46} RGIA. F. 733. Op. 77. D. 74. L. 105.
benefits after the graduation”. 47

At a certain moment an increase in numbers of the Poles at the metropolitan University led to forming the organization of the Polish students in a mode that was permitted by the University administration. It happened in the second part of 1830’s, at the time when the German and the Russian student corporations had been forming. In 1838 the Poles created the first student library at the University, soon they began to issue a handwritten journal “Pamętnik” and the almanacs “Forget-me-not”, “Pamętnik północny”. 48 The Polish community (which was called Ogul – society) was not closed, vice versa its representatives often visited literary and musical soirees arranged by the Rector P.A. Pletnev and the student inspector Fitzthum von Eckstedt.

The contemporaries wrote in their memoirs that by the end of 1850’s the Polish community differed from the corporation although it was named so. It was headed by the delegate committee and the proposals of that committee were confirmed at the general meetings. L.F. Panteleev who studied at that time recollected that “the Polish students kept themselves apart from the Russians and didn’t try to establish some close relations with them”. This society was headed by the “koroniarze”, that is to say the natives of the Kingdom of Poland. The community at that time had “an excellent library and the special Polish money-box”. 49

The “ritual” side of corporate life of the Polish Ogul was hidden. At the same time the mutual help in everyday life was at the forefront like in the later students communities of 1860–1870’s. The compact settlement of the Poles contributed to it: the Polish boarders lived at the University building, and the self-funded Polish students preferred to live in groups at the Vasiljevskaja and

the Admiralty parts. The lists of the self-funded students’ places of living which are kept in the archive prove this statement.\textsuperscript{50}

The new growth in numbers of the Poles at the St. Petersburg University could be fixed in the first years of the reign of Alexander II when after removal of all enrollment restrictions the total number of students had been increasing in 150–200 people a year. It’s a well known fact that in October 1861 and almost till August 1863 the St. Petersburg University was closed because of the unrest among students. The Poles were active participants of the unrest, some of them were sent away from St. Petersburg and many of the Polish students left the University on their own decision.

In circumstances of the second Polish uprising the question about the number of students at the University became sharp again. In May 1864 the minister inquired “how many students of the Polish origin or of catholic religion studied at the St. Petersburg University each year from 1853 through 1863”. On June 2, 1864 the Rector of the University A.A. Voskresenskiy responded through the curator that it was impossible to find information about the number of the Poles because of absence of the accurate sources. However the University provided reference information from the Office of the University Council about the quantity of students of Roman-Catholic religion for the stated period. The data were the following: 81 Poles in 1853 (the total number of students was less than 400), 72 in 1854, 75 in 1855, 106 in 1856, 227 in 1857, 269 in 1858, 301 in 1859, 425 in 1860. After the closing of the University the number of the Catholics registered by the inspection dramatically fell: 126 in 1862, 151 in 1863 (among 2057 students studied in 1863).\textsuperscript{51}

Thus from 1853 till 1860 we can fix 5-fold growth of the Polish students whereas the total number of students for the same period increased thrice. In 1861 the University was closed that’s why for that year the inspection registered only the students who stayed in St. Petersburg. In 1862 and especially after the

beginning of the Polish uprising the Polish students started leaving St.
Petersburg and this fact naturally caused anxiety of the government.52

Summing up the results of our research we may conclude that contrast to the
Kazan and the Moscow Universities in 1800–1820-s or to the Academic
University in the mid-XVIII century at the St. Petersburg University we didn’t
find any signs of separation of the German professors within the professorial
corporation. Almost all invited foreign professors adopted the system of relations
within the University smoothly and quickly. In 1820–1830-s professors from
German universities stopped coming to St. Petersburg, but professors from the
Dorpat University continued going there.

It is possible to say about more mixed composition of the professorial
corporation at the St. Petersburg University than at other universities. The
ethnic Germans were the predominant but not monolithic group among the
foreign professors. The German professors included the representatives of
different groups that is the Ostsee Germans graduated the Dorpat University or
moved from Dorpat to St. Petersburg in their students years, the
Carpatho-Rusyns invited from the Austrian Empire and the offsprings of the St
Petersburg Germans who finished schools in the Russian capital. Concerning the
St. Petersburg University unlike provincial universities the terms “German” and
“foreigner” which defined the origin of the professors were not synonyms. Until
1820-s the teaching process had been deeply influenced by the invited professors.

There were just few conflicts between different groups of professors, we
could name the controversy about “professional courtesy” between P.D. Lodiy and
Y.F. Zyablovskiy (1811), the Rector’s election in 1819, “professorial affair” (1821).
According to the reports of the Conference and the University Council there were
not any other conflicts.

Even being engaged in the system of imperial administrative institutions

the invited professors didn’t achieve high social positions. Although P.D. Lodiy, M.A. Balugianskiy and V.G. Kukolnik got the rank of Civil Councilor (VII grade) in 1803, but they achieved the rank of Collegiate Assessor (VIII grade) which gave the right to hereditary nobility just after 10 years of service in Russia. All in all marginal position of foreign professors hindered them to become the part of the St. Petersburg society. The process of social adaptation of the invited professors at the provincial universities, for example the Kazan one, was much more intense.53

The composition of the St. Petersburg studentship of the first part of the XIX century was also original and different from the one of other universities. The large Polish community had existed at the St. Petersburg University for about 30 years – till 1861. That was the result of establishing new principles of Polish politics in the reign of Nicholas I. They were the following: the Russification of the Western province, political subjection of the Kingdom of Poland to the Russian Empire while preserving its cultural independence. A big number of Polish students was a distinctive feature of the St. Petersburg University only in Pre-Reform period. According to the legislation of the next decades the position of the Poles at universities of the Empire was made equal to the position of other ethnic groups, and in mid-1860’s the national Polish University in Warsaw was opened again after long pause.

These directions were reflected in the university politics. Since 1820’s the rate of the Baltic and the Petersburg Germans among the students had been growing but it hadn’t exceeded 25 % of all students. This figure correlates with the size of the large German community in military-bureaucratic St. Petersburg.

The network of universities and military educational institutions which provided civil servants and military elite for the imperial institutions became the instrument of forming the new identity of the young Poles, Ukrainians and Caucasians. This new identity shouldn’t be opposed to the dominant idea of

“Russian” “official nationality” on which the state ideology was based. This statement is fair in regard to all ethnic groups including the Poles who could in a generation lose or distort their ethnic identity as a result of cultural extraterritoriality and confessional restrictions. The study at Russian universities and the compulsory service at imperial institutions after the graduation could be estimated as the first stage of training the loyalty among the “rebellious” young Poles.

It’s necessary to underline one more essential point. At that time we didn’t find the direct impact of Russification (or to be more precise unification) policy of the imperial government on dealing with Russian universities. The universities had too many academic goals to be achieved. In this case discriminatory measures against “Polishness” as a symbol of “rebellion” didn’t impede the study and teaching of the Polish legislation, history and language equally with other Slavonic languages at Russian universities. So the goal of the governmental policy was not only to control but also to direct intellectual activities, ideological and professional education of ethnic elites.

Who were the Tatar Intellectuals?  
A Reappraisal in the contexts of the Russian Empire, Islamic World, and Local Politics

Norihiro Naganawa  
(Hokkaido University, Japan)

Recent historiographies of Islam in the Russian Empire rarely pose substantial questions concerning the intellectuals. This is the case in North America, Europe, and Russia. In particular, historians working on the Volga-Urals region tend to illustrate amicable and stable relationships between the state and Muslim population, downplaying tensions involving ‘national’ intellectuals during the late imperial period. My presentation attempts to reconsider the roles of the Tatar intellectuals by eschewing the teleology of nation building and demise of the empire. I place them in the imperial period, which ranged from the late eighteenth to the beginning of the twentieth century.

As intellectuals are, by definition, those involved in the production, proliferation, and utilization of knowledge, the roles of the Tatar intellectuals changed depending on what kind of knowledge was valid for the Muslim community in a certain historical context. My presentation focuses on the ways of transmitting the modern disciplines to the Volga-Urals Muslims, and the local politics among a variety of intellectuals over authentic knowledge for the community. First, I argued that the Tatar intellectuals grew as the state reinforced their involvement in the control of the local population since the state required collaborators to effectively implement its policies. They featured as civil and military officials, pedagogues at the state-sponsored schools, and even the Muslim clergy. Established in Ufa in 1789, the Orenburg Muslim Spiritual Assembly was used as a leverage for disciplining indigenous Muslim communities with their clergy de facto serving as the lowest officials. This system
facilitated confessional autonomy and standardization of religious knowledge among the Muslim scholars (so-called ulama) under its jurisdiction.

Second, I illustrated that the modernity born in Western Europe reached Russia’s Muslim communities not only from the Russian rule but also from the literature and educational institutions in the Ottoman Empire. The option of going to the Ottoman Empire under the reign of Abdulhamid II (1876—1909) became increasingly fascinating for the Tatar youth: a trend that was reinforced by the development of a transportation system and the common challenges stemming from the reconciliation between Islamic scholarship and modern disciplines. I showed the remarkable association between two reformist projects in the Islamic institutes of the Volga-Urals region, on the one hand, and the academic centres of the Ottoman Empire, on the other.

Third, I raised doubts regarding a thesis forged by nationalism theorists, which states that the formation of the modern nation led to the secularization of society and thereby marginalized the clergy and religious scholarship. After the reaffirmation of the religious tolerance in 1905, actors contended for authority to speak for Islam and the community multiplied alongside the religious scholars as established religious authorities. This was further engendered by the relaxation of censorship after the revolution, which enabled the Tatar print media to create a sphere where the public opinion became a new source of authority among the intellectuals. I argued that religious scholars also adapted themselves to this competitive discursive space in the Tatar press. They continued to claim to be the guardians of a distinct sphere of religion in the Tatar society, where religion-based collectivity as a category of imperial rule still maintained its robustness.

Some of the important ideas in my presentation have been derived from my following previous works:


‘Molding the Muslim Community through the Tsarist Administration: Mahalla under the Jurisdiction of the Orenburg Mohammedan Spiritual Assembly after 1905’, Acta Slavica Iaponica 23 (2006), 101–123.

Other key ideas will appear in my forthcoming articles:


“Holidays in Kazan: Public Sphere and the Politics of Religious Authority among Tatars in 1914,” Slavic Review (conditionally accepted).
Recent decades have witnessed a growing interest in the study of nationalism. However, some of the theoretical approaches to nationalism cause bewilderment in those who have studied the Finnish nationalism. Anthony D. Smith, who has seriously questioned whether there is such a thing as nationalism-in-general, has pointed out, that nationalism emerged in Finland and in some other places before the beginning of industrial development. Thus those leading scholars and theorists of nationalism who identify the rise of nationalism with modernization and industrial development seem quite out of place when the discussion focuses on Finnish nationalism.¹

Attempts have been made to interpret Finnish history, in and outside Finland, using the general theoretical models developed within the international study of nationalism. The problem is, however, that these theoretical models have been generally developed and applied without sufficient knowledge of the special characteristics of the Finnish case. These theories either ask us to accept their universal validity or they require us to proceed on the assumption that they apply mainly to those countries, cultures, social conditions and historical periods with which the studies in question are familiar.

Although some theoretical insights can be generally applied to various types of nationalism in order to explain and understand past and present nationalistic movements, the varieties of nationalism cannot be captured by a single theory. Any effort to come up with a ‘field-theoretical’ definition, without

recognizing the specific types of nationalisms in different historical contexts and ignoring the variety of forms in which nationalism can manifest itself even within a single culture, leads us astray. In the worst case scenario this leads to picking and choosing historical examples in favour of the theory while rejecting those historical phenomena that do not fit into the chosen theoretical framework.

Finnish nationalism, which predated the advent of industrialism, was a movement both revolutionary and conservative in nature. An excellent example of this duality can be found in the nationalism of the Finnish Lutheran clergy. Adrian Hastings has maintained that in order to understand the construction of nationhood, the role of religion and the clergy should not be overlooked. In this article I wish to discuss the theme of the new intelligentsia in the 19th century Finland and also show why Hasting´s remark is relevant to a historically accurate understanding of Finnish nationalism.

An opportunity for a new identity
The Russian occupation of Finland at the beginning of the 19th century created a vacuum of loyalties and a window of opportunity for building a Finnish identity among the educated and within the Lutheran Church. Under Swedish rule until 1809, being a Lutheran in Finland was equivalent of being a citizen of Swedish empire, and the Lutheran church supported and preached the divine legitimacy of power of the Swedish kings. But after 1809, the new Russian ruler of Finland, emperor by the divine grace of God, was of different creed and language than the inhabitants of the conquered territory. The former identification factors with the new rule, other than the traditional divine authority of the powers-that-be and the reality of military occupation, were absent.

Ernest Gellner maintains that ´in a traditional milieu´ an idea of a single overriding and cultural identity makes little sense. However, he fails to see the variety of processes that are able to stir up the traditional milieu and prepare the

---

ground for the acceptance of new national identities. John Hutchinson sees a window of opportunity for national revivals and what he calls a process of mythic overlaying when the community is plunged into crisis.  

Throughout Finland, the traditional milieu was shaken to the core by the war of 1808–1809 which made the Finns subjects of a new ruler. An oath of loyalty to the emperor was required of each and every man in 1808. A study by Nils Erik Villstrand has shown, that in traditional milieus, in parishes throughout the country, this was met with opposition among even the common people.  

Finland, with its Western rule of law, free peasants and Lutheran creed, was attached as a Grand Duchy to an autocratic empire with such alien elements to Finns as a soul-owning nobility, serfs, and Orthodoxy. Swedish was no longer a common language shared by the educated subjects and the administrative core, and there was no ecclesiastical authority of faith outside Finland, no Swedish archbishop, no Lutheran king to turn to. As years passed, it turned out that what the Lutheran Church – and the academically educated class as well – had left were the Finns.  

In his criticism of Ernst Gellner’s views on high culture and its role in nationalism Anthony D. Smith points out that they in no way explain how the low cultures of small and powerless people, deprived of elites of their own, became high cultures. According to Smith, nationalism is not a product of a new high culture and the mass education system, but predates them.  

And indeed, this took place in Finland. The new political context under Russian rule brought about an identity crisis within the Finnish high culture. Its representatives could no longer be Swedish, but at the same time they were absolutely unwilling to adopt the culture of the dominant ethnic population of the Empire, that of the Russians. This was a voluntary choice in a historical situation, not an artificial construction, but a form of a policy of resistance. Whereas Gellner depicted national identity as the identification of citizens with a public, urban
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4 Hutchinson 2001, 82.  
high culture, the early Finnish agents of nationalism, i.e. those representing a public and urban high culture, identified themselves with an existing, non-dominant ethnicity and its language, Finnish.

In his study *Social Preconditions of National Revival in Europe*, originally published in German in 1968, Miroslav Hroch outlined three different phases in Finnish nationalism. The first phase, *Landespatriotismus*, was characterized by the involvement of the learned and academically educated in questions of nationalism. According to Hroch, a new phase in Finnish nationalism took place in the early years of 1830’s, when the academic interest of relatively few changed into active promotion of nationally motivated goals. A concrete sign of this new strategy of political agitation for national goals was the founding of the Finnish Literature Society in 1831 with the aim of promoting and creating Finnish literature. National activism in association with the University of Helsinki occurred over a period of 40–50 years in the middle of the 19th century. The third phase began in the 1880’s as the nationalistic revival reached the masses.7

Hroch called attention to the large-scale recruitment of Lutheran pastors as members of the Finnish Literature Society. In its early years about 40% of its members were clergymen. They have been described as forming a nation-wide network of local level activists working not with the educated in the capitol or in the university but among the ordinary people throughout the country.8 However, the activity of this Finnish-minded network of clergy became more intense and diversified in the second half of the 19th century.

Although 19th-century Finland was a part of the Russian empire, its official language remained that of the previous European superpower Sweden. In a society where education, cultural life in its various forms, and government were conducted in Swedish, the majority of Finnish inhabitants were nevertheless

7 Hroch 1985, 23, 72, 178.
Finnish speakers. In terms of Gellner’s imaginary “Ruritania”, the Finnish speakers were the ‘blue’: concentrated near the bottom of the social scale. Culturally, politically and educationwise the Finnish-speaking majority of the population was in the margins of the society. Looking at the division of labour the Finnish speakers were peasants and workers, mainly agrarian workers since industrialization took place in Finland quite late, during the last decades of the 19th century. There were, naturally, also Swedish speakers on the lower steps of the social ladder, but unlike the Finnish speakers, in order to rise on the social scale, they did not have to get rid of their ‘blueness’, i.e., their mother tongue.

19th-century Finnish nationalism and the advancement of the Finnish language were connected to the University of Helsinki, the only university of the country, to such an extent that the history of Finnish nationalism or the history of nationally motivated activism cannot be understood without taking into account the role of the university and the academic surrounding it provided for its students and teachers. In the European context this is in itself not exceptional. The Finnish case is one example of the 19th-century university nationalism. As elsewhere within the Russian empire, this academic nationalism concentrated on furthering the cause of a language, often the vernacular, and nationally interpreted history.

Eric Hobsbawm maintains that Finnish nationalism did not concentrate on the question of language until in the 1860’s. This, however, is a misinterpretation of Hroch’s views and in contradiction with the historical sources. The question of the Finnish language was essential from quite early on. In 1833 a student petition was presented to Nicolas I during his visit to Helsinki.
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9 Gellner 1983, 67–69. Until the first Finnish-speaking school was founded in 1858 in the town of Jyväskylä, the only education in Finnish was given by the Lutheran Church. The first students graduating from this Finnish-speaking school in 1865–1867 and entering the University of Helsinki were only 18 seven of which began to study theology. Autio 1971, 96–113.


It included “our most devout prayer” that Finnish would be made an official language of administration and education in Finland. The petition portrayed the situation of Finland as a part of the Russian empire as the result of Divine Providence willing to rescue the Finnish language and nationality. The petition was presented by two university graduates, Bengt Olof Lille, later Professor of Church History, and Johan Vilhelm Snellman, later Professor of Philosophy, senator and the ‘national philosopher of Finland’. Both were members of the so-called Saturday Society.\(^\text{12}\)

Anthony D. Smith writes that where a vertical or demotic type of what he calls an ethnie throws up an indigenous intelligentsia opposed to imperial rule, it will seek to mobilize ‘the people’ for political purposes through the rediscovery of ethno-history and the politicization of vernacular culture, which has often been preserved by the church and/or by local communities.\(^\text{13}\) One could not give a more accurate characterization of Finnish nationalism or of its agents in the Saturday Society.

The Saturday Society was an informal gathering of university graduates and graduate students founded in the early 1830’s. Its later influential intellectuals, including Lille and Snellman, had a clear picture of the future role of Finnish language already in the 1840’s. A proposal was made in 1846 to found a chair in Finnish language and give grants to those wishing to study Finnish. All three professors behind this proposal were former members of the Saturday Society. Two of them, Axel Laurell and Bengt Olof Lille, were professors in the Faculty of Theology. In a private letter in 1844, Matthias Castrén, the first professor of the Finnish language, wrote to Johan Vilhelm Snellman of their

---

12 Lille and Snellman also glorified the benevolence the emperor had shown to the country and the university, thanked him for protecting the Finnish laws, for supporting the university library as well as a lectureship in Finnish language. Their expressed their gratitude for the tscharrevits, at that time six years old, functioning as the chancellor of the university and asked forgiveness for the past trespasses of the university students. HUL, Coll 212, Stormäktigaste, allernädigaste kejsare [Most powerful, most merciful emperor, a manuscript], the petition in print in Snellman, Samlade arbeten I: 504–505, 762.

common goal of cultivating Finnish and establishing it as the official language. Castrén knew of the plans, at that time not yet made public, concerning the language grants and the chair, but saw these merely as means to further the general policy of russification. According to him, by favouring the Finnish language, the Russian administration was attempting first and foremost to undermine the position of Swedish as the language of the country and then replace it with Russian.\footnote{Castrén to J. V. Snellman, 8 October, 1844, in Snellman IV (Collected works), 622, 623. The only monograph on the Saturday Society is Ilmari Havu’s somewhat outdated \textit{Lauantaiseura ja sen miehet} [The Saturday Society and its Men, Helsinki 1945].}

The private correspondence of Fredrik Wilhelm Berg, the General Governor of Finland, actually gives evidence of this as well as of the ‘blueness’ of Finnish-speakers. He wrote in 1856: ‘I think Snellman is greatly mistaken in prophesying a future for the Finns. I feel this race is not meant to play any part among the civilized European people. It [=favouring Finnish language] is however a means of separating Finland from Sweden, sooner or later. This is our foremost goal. We must take care that the Finnish-speaking population gets what it badly needs: good education in matters of religion and farming. We may even favour innocent folk poetry. \textellipsis Anything else the pro-Finnish minded desire to accomplish is in my opinion mere soap bubbles.’\footnote{Berg to Alexander Armfelt, the letter published in Rein 1905, 197.}

Castrén’s private remarks, never made public during his lifetime, give a different and a rather surprising picture. Therefore I think that all our work the present is simply preparing for a mutiny. Not that we ourselves are capable of carrying out such a great task, but we must take advantage of the opportunity. Sooner or later the Russians will get into conflict with the Turks. The Turks will be supported by Kyrgyzs and Tatars, the whole Caucasus. Poland is just waiting for this sort of opportunity to take up arms. At that time also we have to shout, from the swamplands of Finland, down with the Muscovites. But until
then, I think we must avoid of making any fuss.’

In 1844 another member of the Saturday Society, Jakob Johan Nervander, Professor of Physics, had written a letter to Snellman in which he described the Finnish language as a delicate plant. According to Nervander, the times were so bad that the roots of the plant would rot and the plant would not be able to bloom. Therefore, blessed would be the one who could come up with a way of keeping the roots safe, as in a cellar, until the more favourable spring would arrive. Nervander’s own suggestion was that in order to ‘keep the roots safe’ it would be a good start that the pastors and lawyers would know Finnish and use it in their work. Two years after the suggestion, in 1846, it became mandatory for the future pastors and lawyers to take part in exercises in Finnish as part of their university studies.

Nervander also wrote to Snellman about the latter’s ideas of the necessity of creating a Finnish literature. According to Nervander, the Finns constituted a people, since they shared the same language, Finnish, but they were not a nation, because they lacked a history. Therefore, what was primarily needed was a Finnish history. In his opinion, the prerequisite for its creation was a state of independency. Since this was not yet the case, Finns should live like the children of Israel under Egyptian bondage: prosper, multiply and wait for those seven hardships that would set them free. In addition, Nervander thought that in order to become successful, the pro-Finnish movement should engage the masses, the peasants, instead of only the elite. However, Nervander was quite uncertain of the future of the Finnish language. Nowhere in the world had a vernacular replaced a living official language, he said and added that it was doubtful this would take place for the first time in history in Finland. If it were to happen, one would have to believe also in such irrational and impossible things as the rise of Estonian culture and language as well.

---

16 Castrén to J. V. Snellman, 8 October, 1844, in Snellman, Samlade arbeten IV, 622, 623.
17 Nervander to J. V. Snellman, 6 January, 1844, in Snellman Samlade arbeten IV, 559.
18 Nervander to J. V. Snellman in [s.d.] 1846, in Snellman Samlade arbeten V, 627–628.
The intellectual circle of the Saturday Society produced, in addition of those members who already held chairs, some 10 professors of the University of Helsinki. In a university with fewer than 20 permanent chairs, this was a large number, and these new professors were able to work for the pro-Finnish cause within the academic community. Their private correspondence gives somewhat a different picture of their interests than that given by their public activities. Their nationalism took various forms including elements found in later interpretations of nationalism: those of nationalism as a cultural construction, a political movement, and of a separation of a cultural community from an existing state.\(^{19}\)

Looking at the members of the Saturday Society from today points of view they seem to be representatives of the Finnish elite, because many of them played an important role in the development of the Finnish culture and later became members of the elite. However, this was not the case in 1830. Members of the Society were young men searching their place in life. When we study their social background we see that they did not stem from the elite of the country. Most of them had what today could be called a middle class background.

In the early years of the 19th century the Finnish university personnel was a group rather tied together by birth and marriages. Together with senators, nobility and high officials they formed the elite of the country. This started to change and give room for a social upward mobility. The regulatory basis for this development was the new university statutes of 1828. It has been stated that these statutes gave a start to a scientific development within the University, a development toward a research university. The statutes required, for the first time, that those applying chairs at the university have to write and publish a qualifying thesis in the field they wish to become professors.\(^{20}\) No longer could a person without merits or without at least some knowledge of his field be nominated as professor. The new rules also gave a possibility for those coming outside the elite – the new elite like the Saturday Society – to pursue an


\(^{20}\)Tommila 2003, 39–41.
university career and compete on somewhat equal terms with those whose merits were acquired by birth, kinship or marriage.

According to Eric Hobsbawm the Finns were state patriots who remained loyal to the Russian emperor until the russification policies were implemented beginning in the 1880’s.²¹ Bearing in mind the absolute power of the autocrat, the existence of censorship system, the system of informants and spies and the overall control of expression in Finland, it is not reasonable to describe Finns as state patriots who retained their loyalties towards Russia until the end of the 19th century. This view might be defensible if Finnish nationalism is seen as a mass movement. However, the activists mentioned above at the University of Helsinki were holding separatist ideas and working for the cause of Finnish language already in the early decades of the 19th century.

The conditions in Finland were such that open acts and demonstrations of disloyalty or separatism would have led to personal destruction: one might have been expelled from the country or from the University or lost one’s job and all future prospects. People were not free to express themselves politically and publicly. Even a politically incorrect student play led to changes in the university administration. Given the externally imposed restrictions on freedom of speech and press, we cannot conclude that Finns were loyal to the system when they kept officially silent within a system that did not grant these freedoms. Remaining outwardly loyal to an empire that garrisoned tens of thousands of soldiers in Finland was a means of occupational survival, whatever one’s position in the administrative or educational system.

Early activist of Finnish nationalism were not hanged for their views like their counterparts in Belorussia. Thus Castrén, who was waiting for an opportunity for an uprising against Russia, died peacefully after overworking himself with his scientific work and field trips. Neither was the university closed.

in order to russify the educated class, like in Poland. Finnish nationalism was cultivated quietly and without entering into open conflicts which would have led to certain defeat.

**The religious and religiously motivated nationalism**

National revivalists are generally dependent on alliances with religious and social reform movement in their struggle to detach communal memory from established power holders, John Hutchinson writes. He discusses the emergence of the educated middle class generation, and according to him, it is this intelligentsia that creates a counter-cultural social movement of national revivals. Hutchinson points out that the capacity of such movements to create national communities could be limited even if the revivalists could gain control of the state and the educational system.

In an agricultural Finnish society the new liberal minded university elite of Saturday Society was the bearer of nationalistic ideas and ideals. However, these ideas did not remain the interest of the few educated men at the university. In different combinations the members of the Saturday Society founded the Finnish Literature Society, *Helsingfor Lyceum* which was the first modern-type school in Finland, they were active newspaper writers, and strived in order to found a Finnish art collection. As university professors they were also teachers of the new generation of educated citizens.

Anthony D. Smith and Steven Crosby have discussed Elie Kedourie’s views on religion and nationalism. In the case of the Finnish nationalism religion was not swept aside by nationalism, but joined forces with it. The first academically educated, nationwide elite group to become pro-Finnish was the
Lutheran clergy. This took place from the 1850’s onward, prior to the spread of nationalistic sentiments throughout the Finnish society at the end of the 19th century. The Faculty of Theology had four professors teaching students in 1840, and two of them, Bengt Olof Lille and Axel Adolf Laurell, were Saturday Society intellectuals.

The education the students of theology received at the university, revolutionary changes in the basic educational system and the changing social background of the students all contributed to the fact that it was the students of theology, the future Lutheran clergy, who were the first academically educated citizens to adopt the cause of Finnish language and become predominately pro-Finnish.

The University of Helsinki was the only autonomous university within the Russian Empire. It was autonomous in the sense that it was governed by the rector and the collegial body of professors. It was not under the auspices of the Russian Ministry of Enlightenment, as were the other universities within the empire, but nevertheless its autonomy was only relative, since the final decisions were made in St. Petersburg. Originally founded in 1640 in the city of Turku and moved to Helsinki in 1828, the university was older than any of the Russian universities. By modern standards the university, politically correctly renamed the Imperial Alexander University in Helsinki, was small with fewer than 400 students in the early 1850’s and about 1000 by the end of the 1870’s. However, in comparison to the overall population, there were some seven times more university students per capita in Finland than in Russia.26

In spite of its small size, the university gathered together all those Finns with scientific, cultural and literary interests and offered some means of furthering them. It educated all of Finland’s civil servants: lawyers as well as doctors, pastors and teachers. All of Finland’s 19th century authors, poets and newspapermen, with the exception of the few literarily active women, had

---

studied at the university.\textsuperscript{27}

Along with other academically educated citizens, the Finnish Lutheran clergy were educated at the university. During the period of 1853–1918 some 2500 students were enrolled into the Faculty of Theology. The fact that upon enrolment each student’s social background, i.e., father’s occupation, was recorded in the University matriculation book permits their social standing and class origin to be traced. After enrolment, students could choose whatever field of study they pleased.

Compared to the latter half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century, the first half was a period of notable social stagnation within Finnish society. Economic development and industrialization of the country at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century provided some means for social mobility, but in an overwhelmingly agricultural society these were no options for large-scale upward social mobility.

University nationalism, as described above, was nationalism of the horizontally stratified few at the top of educational ladder. Gellner’s characterization of an agro-literate polity applies here, but in a Protestant variant. According to Gellner, agro-literate societies do not possess means for making literacy near universal. He maintains that had nationalism been invented in such a period its prospects would have been slender indeed.\textsuperscript{28}

However, the Finnish Lutheran Church, through its religiously motivated folk education originating from in 17\textsuperscript{th} century, was able to reach practically everyone. According to the Protestant principle, it was the task of the Church and its pastors to teach people to read in their own language in order that God’s Word – or at least that of Martin Luther – would be available to everyone. The level of literacy varied in different parts of the country. Nonetheless, the Finnish nationalism as a mass movement arose in a largely literate society whose population was sharply divided into estates, but in which

\textsuperscript{27} Klinge 1996, 18. Women were not allowed to enroll at the University of Helsinki until the 1870’s.

\textsuperscript{28} Gellner 1983, 8–13.
reading-skills were formally and in theory required of everyone for religious purposes and taught to the Finnish-speakers first by the Lutheran Church, later by the schools.

However, referring to the spread of Protestantism and nationalism, Jonathan Hearn has pointed out that reading is only one way of taking in ideas. Both ideologies were no doubt facilitated by an expanding literacy, but their success “probably also relied on verbal dissemination of these ideas by the literate to the illiterate, especially in settings where the speaker’s authority was sanctioned.” This was the case in Finland. An additional factor that contributed to the success of Finnish nationalism in an agro-literate society was the unique role played by the Lutheran clergy. Its social background and language started to change dramatically. The clergy, the educators of the masses, became national-minded, predominantly Finnish-speaking and formed a nationwide network of academically educated, pro-Finnish citizens.

Pastor’s profession lost its appeal among the higher segments of society in the 1860’s. The expanding administration, the Russian army and later the growing economical activity provided new, more lucrative career possibilities. Because the sons of educated and higher class families chose not to study theology, their proportionate number among the students of theology diminished. Although a similar trend can be seen in Germany and Sweden, there is a major difference: the Finnish clergy were being recruited in growing numbers from a group, whose mother tongue was not that of ruling elite of the country.

At the same time the number of first-generation students, those coming from families without university education – or any other formal education for that matter – started to rise. Sons of Finnish-speaking farmers, tenant farmers and workers chose a career in theology. Proportionately speaking students at the Faculty of Theology were of the lowest social background, lower than those in other faculties.

30 Hope 1995, 515, 519.
It is noteworthy that the percentage of first-generation students, first-generation meaning that they were the first in their families to enter the university, was much higher in the Faculty of Theology than elsewhere at the university. From the 1850’s to the 1870’s about 50%, later some 60% of the theology students came from uneducated families at the same time when the majority of all university students, 68%, came from the gentleman class which was the highest class of the Finnish society of estates. This highest class included also Lutheran pastors. The theological education constantly produced new members with humble social backgrounds to the top rank of the society.

The percentage of these first-generation students in the 1880’s was 75% and thereafter some 80%. At the time of the General Strike in 1905, the Faculty of Theology was the most proletarian at the university in terms of the social background of its students. Theology was arguably the most democratic academic discipline at the university since its students were more representative of the diversity of Finnish society than those of any other faculty.³¹

During the latter half of the 19th century a university education provided an outlet for strong social upward mobility. Important in this was the founding of Finnish-speaking schools and high-schools beginning in the 1850’s. These schools provided pathways to university education in a language which had previously been in the margins of culture and education as well as pathways for students who, because of their mother tongue and social background, had previously only limited access into the sphere of education and scientific knowledge.³² The Finnish clergy became Finnish-speaking and pro-Finnish from below. This took place in two ways. The Finnish-speaking youth went to school, entered careers in theology and promoted their own language at first within the university and later in the Lutheran Church and the Finnish society in general. Graduates of


³² It seems that the Finnish-speakers of lower class origins were more eager to educate their children than the Swedish-speakers from similar social backgrounds. See, Jutikkala 1984, 106–107.
theology accepted positions in schools and parishes around the country bringing their pro-Finnish orientation with them.

These new Finnish-speaking university students were not content with university education provided solely in Swedish. Already in 1853, prior to the founding of Finnish-speaking schools, the Association of Students of Theology had been the first official organization within the university to choose Finnish, the vernacular, as its “official language”. However, this was more of an ideological choice, and in spite of the decision Swedish was the working language. The situation started to change when those who had Finnish as mother tongue and had received their basic education in Finnish began to study theology. The first academic lectures in Finnish at the University of Helsinki were naturally given to those studying the Finnish language, but the second subject to be taught in lectures was Exegetics. These lectures were given at the instigation of the students starting in 1864. Finnish was re-chosen as the official language of the Association in 1873, this time by the Finnish-speakers and it became a working language as well.\(^{33}\)

Already from the 1880’s forward about 80% of theological lectures were given in Finnish. This was not the case in other faculties. More than 80% of students of theology had Finnish as mother tongue while the majority of students in other faculties were Swedish-speakers. In 1902, for the first time in history, the majority of all university students were Finnish-speakers (some 60%), but most of the education was still being given in Swedish. The Faculty of Theology was the most Finnish-speaking faculty at the university.\(^{34}\)

---

\(^{33}\) Helsinki University Library, minutes of the meetings of the Association of Students of Theology (AST) 14 February, 1853, 7 March, 1864 and 5 November, 1873. Luukkanen 2005, 56–59, 81–82, 114–116. Students had also detailed plans of founding a Finnish-language newspaper in the 1850’s. However, the language edict then in effect permitted Finnish-language publications only of economic or religious matters and the plans could not be carried out.

\(^{34}\) University of Helsinki, Central Archive, Faculty of Theology, protocol 31 May, 1905. Official university statistics 1902–1905 in Redogörelse 1905.
Number of lectures and of professors according to the language in which they lectured at the University of Helsinki 1903–1904.\textsuperscript{35}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Finnish</th>
<th>Swedish</th>
<th>both</th>
<th>foreign</th>
<th>total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theology</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reorganization of the student life at the University of Helsinki took place in the beginning of the 1850’s. In part, this was an effort to monitor and control the students, the future civil servants of the country, more closely. New student associations were founded and the old ones forbidden. According to the new university statutes of 1852 the old system of student nations (nationes) was replaced by faculty-based student associations, and for this reason a vast amount of source material on students of theology has been preserved. Students namely met weekly and kept careful records. Most discussions were recorded even to the detail of who said what. This was not the case in other faculties; for example, the records by the students of law or medicine are sporadic and scarce. But students of theology were loyal to the written word. Each set of minutes was approved in the following meeting and if somebody thought that the minutes were not accurate, they were revised. Therefore, it can be assumed with confidence that these sources describe rather accurately, from the point of view of those actively participating in the meetings, what took place and what kind of spirit dominated within the organization.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} Suomalainen Nuija [The Finnish Mallet] was an ardent Finnish-minded activist organisation for all pro-Finnish students at the university. The original statistics, based on official university records, were used by the Finnish Mallet in their propaganda for more lectures in Finnish. Statistics in: The Finnish National Archive, the documents of \textit{Suomalainen Nuija} [The Finnish Mallet], minutes 30th October, 1904.

\textsuperscript{36} Unlike other Finnish student organizations of the period, theologians have produced a rather unbroken series of weekly discussions, debates, and records of the student activities from 1853 until the present day. In addition, the students of theology had a student
Therefore we know that the new pro-Finnish orientation was reflected in many minor decisions, e.g., not wanting to buy a piano from Russia in the 1850’s and refusing to order an official seal with a Swedish text in the 1870’s. The first notable 19th-century translator of books into Finnish, Johan Murman, was a student of theology and Fredrik Polén, the secretary of Association, was the first to publish a doctoral dissertation in Finnish. In the 1870’s the love of fatherland was defined as a virtue of a true woman. Well-paid opportunities to work as a Lutheran pastor in the St. Petersburg area and in Ingermanland were considered to be for those who wished to abandon their fatherland for good. In the beginning of the 20th century an effort was made to fire a professor of Dogmatics on account of his poor Finnish skills.\footnote{Luukkanen 2005, 66–72, 162, 290–303. Murman worked with Uno Cygnaeus, a Lutheran pastor and the founding father of Finnish-speaking schools and teachers’ education. Murman and Polén studied theology in the 1850’s.}

A notable feature of student activism was that the students could meet, write and discuss among themselves rather freely as long as there were no informants reporting the disloyal opinions to the university officials. For example, the first and only open plea to recruit students of theology into the service of nationalism was published in their handwritten newspaper Kyyhkynen [The Dove] in 1856. This lengthy and passionate article with its biblical imagery was of such a nature that no official newspaper could have published it. For lesser reasons students were expelled from the university or the rector of the University could be fired. As Anto Leikola has stated, the Russian authorities expected unconditional loyalty from the university,\footnote{Leikola 1996, 127. Luukkanen 2000, 147–149 (a student play in 1858 caused Gabriel Rein’s resignation from the office of the rector of the university).} which makes it all the more peculiar that early Finnish nationalism was born and preached at the university.

In this article the ´god´ was the country, which for its part testifies for the varieties of nationalistic formulations even within one culture. The
passionate article stated that although Finland was an occupied land under oppression, it would quite soon “be free from the chains of darkness”. What was needed was “true love” and students’ persistence in working and preaching the gospel of the fatherland. Devout and true patriotism could not be defeated. It was not God but Finland who called the students to work in His vineyard and gather national treasures upon the Finnish soil “where moth and rust do not corrupt”. If the heart of the nation was reborn among the students, the rewards would be immense. The Finnish people would live, prosper and advance in matters of culture, education and skills and finally receive their reward: their own language, freedom, independence.

The article itself is both an argument for an ethno-symbolic analysis of nationalism and an example thereof. The author based his argumentation on the claim that the Finnish-speaking nation was a structure of kinship, a family of brothers and relatives. What both God and Finland required of these relatives was that they work for the future glory of the nation. The nation had been given to them as a gift by God and it was the duty of this family, as householders, to see to it that this gift was not wasted. In 1857 students of theology discussed the powers-that-be on the basis Romans 13:1-2. All agreed that in the Finnish context this biblical passage meant obeying the Finnish laws.39

**Education of the clergy at the university**

Theological education also underwent changes. For the first time, beginning in 1853, future pastors were educated in Finnish history as part of their theological curriculum. This education was a Finnish version of the historicist approach of discussing historical origins as well as cultural authenticity. It was based on the reading of the *Kalevala*, the Finnish national epic. Teaching history to future pastors was an effort to reconstruct the “true” history and culture of the ancient Finns. As Lauri Honko has pointed out, historical interpretations of the *Kalevala* 39

---

seem to appear in times when national identity is thought to be threatened and in need of strengthening. In some respects also the early 1850’s was such an occasion even though the national identity was still in making. The threatened were the educated and their activities. There were restrictions on publications in Finnish, new membership restrictions were imposed on the Finnish Literature Society, the new university statutes reorganized student life, and the overall control seemed to increase.40

The teaching of history in general, which started in 1840, was a novelty in the Faculty of Theology. It was not introduced into the theological curriculum by a joint effort of the faculty or as a part of some official reorganization or development of the education of the clergy. Instead, it was introduced by a single individual, namely the above-mentioned Bengt Olof Lille, personal friend of Snellman and J. J. Nervander. Prior to Lille, Church History in the Faculty of Theology consisted of studying the New Testament verse by verse. One of the consequences of this was understandably that the older clergy was neither well informed about Church History as a formal discipline nor familiar with the methods of historical study.41 The rise of nationalistic interests among Finnish theologians coincided with the growing knowledge of history after this field of academic study was made a part of the curriculum.

This is evident when we look at Lille’s first lectures on Finnish history, given in Swedish, in 1853. First of all, he applied the “pedagogy of the oppressed” by criticizing foreign authorities and their views of Finnish history. As students had practically no historical works written by Finns at their disposal, Finnish history was available to them only in books written by foreign scholars, for example by Friedrich Rühs and the Swedish historian Sven Lagerbrinng. These works portrayed the ancient Finnish-speaking Finns in a rather negative way as

41 Luukkanen 2002, 75–90 (the reception of the German church historical study in Finland).
savages without cultural merits. Even their language was undeveloped and lacking in abstract concepts.\textsuperscript{42}

In his teaching Professor Lille turned these arguments upside down. Scholars have paid attention to the importance of the \textit{Kalevala} in the development of national sentiments, art and music at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century.\textsuperscript{43} However, the first edition of the \textit{Kalevala} was published already in 1835, at the time when only few educated Finns were able to read it. One of the few was Lille, one of the founders of the Finnish Literature Society, who unlike most of his colleagues at the university, was fluent in Finnish.

The \textit{Kalevala}’s importance in the education of Lutheran clergy lay in the fact that Lille used it as historical evidence to refute the conclusions of foreign authorities who had written on Finnish history. The mere existence and survival of Finnish folk epic was, according to him, a sign of a highly developed oral culture. One component of this level of development was monotheism, which according to Lille was detectable in the poems. The poems testified that Finnish-speaking Finns had not been savages since times immemorial. On the contrary, they had been a nation of poets and monotheists even prior to the Swedish conquests.

According to Lille, the presence of indigenous Finnish words referring to dwelling places, social institutions and agriculture in the \textit{Kalevala} testified to cultivation of the land, an ordered way of life, monogamy and of social structures. This was the use Lille made of the \textit{Kalevala} in his lectures taught to future pastors as early as 1853. Important were neither the heroes nor anti-heroes of the \textit{Kalevala} nor the motifs of national mythology, but the way of life of the ancient Finns, the myth of a civilized past.\textsuperscript{44} Lille’s historicist approach was a

\textsuperscript{42}HUL, Coll 127.1, \textit{Föreläsningar i Finsk Kyrkohistoria} [Lectures on Finnish Church History]. Lagerbring 1773, 154, 155. Rühs 1823, 143, 144.


\textsuperscript{44}HUL, Coll 127.1. \textit{Föreläsningar i Finsk Kyrkohistoria} [Lectures on Finnish Church History]. For a detailed analysis of the lecture, see Luukkanen 2003, 71–89. Another member of the Saturday Society was Gabriel Rein, professor in History. His lectures on the
means of rejecting the “blueness” attributed to the Finnish speakers first by foreign scholars and later by pro-Swedish race theories.

Anthony D. Smith has criticized what he calls the modernist orthodoxy for dismissing the importance of myths, memories, ancestry, origin and the golden ages in the formation of nationalism. Lille’s teaching shows that ethnies were central in furthering the nationalistic message. Teaching Finnish history to the future pastors of supposedly historyless Finns was based on the depictions of the Finnish culture and social way of life in Kalevala’s folk songs and mythical poems. The accounts of ancient Finnish history thus described provided a cultural intimacy, binding together the society, elites and the masses, with the common history of the ethnie.45

Smith has analyzed the ethnic separatism from old empires on the western, northern and southern fringes of Europe, including also Finland. He importantly points out the phenomena of rediscovering and inventing history. The uses of ethno-histories were essentially social and political and formed a cultural basis for separatist goals.46 There were, however, two somewhat different ways using the Kalevala as a source of Finnish ethno-history. The social and political context of the 1850’s was different from that of the last decades of the 19th century and so were the uses. Lille’s teaching was not directly separatist. Instead, his formulation of ethno-history challenged the outwardly implemented interpretations of the inferiority of the Finnish-speaking ‘race’.

The new positive image of ancient Finnish speakers came into good use especially when arguments of the superiority of the Germanic Aryan race, i.e., of Swedish-speakers and the inferiority of the racially Mongolian Finnish-speakers were adopted by the pro-Swedish activists. The main idea of this racial argumentation was that Finland could not and should not be made officially

history of ancient Finns did not interpret the ancient past as being so culturally developed as Lille did. Rein 1870, 17–18, 25, 88.

Finnish-speaking since the racially inferior Finnish-speakers were incapable of creating or sustaining culture. As one proponent of the racial argument put it, the Finnish-speakers were never intelligent enough to become free or create a culture. They were best suited for manual labour in the fields. Even if they became extinct, the guardian angel of humanity would not weep for them.47

Theological Ethics, on the other hand, was an established field of theological study taught from 1853 until 1875 by Axel Fredrik Granfelt. Studying ethics under him was not a study of ethics in any traditional meaning of the word. In his lectures, which were later published in more than 1000 pages in the early 1870’s, Granfelt taught the patriotic ethics of an ethnie. The central nationalist sentiment was not hate, as Gellner defines it,48 but love.

According to Granfelt it was the will of God that everyone should love her own country. The innermost will of the people was their patriotic love for their country, and loving one’s country translated this general will of the people into a personal will. Thus, by embracing “the will of the people”, as Granfelt saw it, the love-motivated sons and daughters of the country would live and work for the good of all, for the well-being of the state. To obey the Finnish laws, develop the school system, educate the women and found societies for various purposes – all these were ways to make the God-given ethical principles manifest within the society. In this view, genuine patriotism did not consist of extraordinary self-sacrifices, but of leading morally pure lives and working peacefully according to the spirit of Finnish laws and institutions.

As part of his teaching in Theological Ethics Granfelt defined the natural boundaries of a state in geographical and ethnographical terms. He also defined ‘sovereignty’ in reference to the totality of the state and thus managed to create an ideal type of Finnish autonomy. Sovereignty was also an ethical principle and

thus striving for its realization was the right thing to do. According to Granfelt, in
its ´ideal´ form sovereignty meant that a people was free to organize its state
without the interference of a foreign power. The right to the ownership of
national wealth was this principle´s material formulation.\textsuperscript{49}

In the 19\textsuperscript{th} century the notion that Finnish-speaking Finns should be
able to study at the Finnish university using their own language was
revolutionary. It was not introduced by the academic fathers or political decision
makers, but by students. These future pastors to be were students from humble
origins. The social upward mobility, provided by a university education, was like
a constantly operating machine, continuously feeding fresh, Finnish-speaking
first-generation students into the Faculty of Theology and into the service of the
leading religious organisation of the country. The second half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century
witnessed a phenomenon of educational revolution in the sense that those
Finnish-speaking classes previously rather excluded from higher education
started to produce university students in growing numbers. At the Faculty of
Theology these students were radicalized, but into conservatism and nationalism.

Nationalism and an engagement in the promotion of the
Finnish-language was a natural choice to those to whom Finnish was a mother
tongue. The strong commitment of the Lutheran clergy to the Finnish language
stemmed from their own background. By the time of the imposition of
russification policies at the end of the 19\textsuperscript{th} and in the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century
a nation-wide network of academically educated Finnish-speaking pastors had
been established. Pastors-to-be were educated in such novelties as the national
history of Finland and the divine legitimacy of the Finnish state. They
incorporated these convictions and their commitment for the Finnish language
into the work of the Finnish Lutheran Church.

The study of the Saturday Society and the students of Theology seems to
suggest that in formation of the new national elite and in the rise of the

pro-Finnish clergy the social factors played a part; both were expressions of the social upward mobility.
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