BOOK REVIEWS

ON LITHUANIANS IN THE ACADEMY AND THE BOOK

Irena Wodzianowska, *Rzymskokatolicka akademія w Petersburgu [1842–1918]*, Lublin: Towarzystwo naukowe KUL, 2007, 319 p.; ISBN 978-83-7306-361-7

To refer to this text as a book review when three years have passed after the publication of the book does not seem fully appropriate. However, a few remarks about the book should be made. All the more so as the object of research is rather specific and hardly any scholar will take it up in the near future.

I am not a researcher into the history of this institution – the St. Petersburg Imperial Roman Catholic Theological Academy. Still I have studied certain aspects or rather details of the history of this institution *en passant*, while, analysing the biographies of some former students and professors, while doing research on the position of the secular authorities towards the Catholic clergy in the Russian Empire in the so-called Northwest Province (By the way, certain sources that the author and I analysed are the same.) Thus, while reading this book, I first took into consideration and concentrated more on those issues that have already been researched to a certain extent. Therefore this article, which consists of fragmentary remarks made observing the author's text cannot be called a canonical book review.

Historical studies of this institution, which was in operation in St. Petersburg from 1842 to 1918, are far from abundant, thus research based on material from numerous archives, published sources and scholarly analysis have been awaited eagerly by investigators of the history of the Catholic Church. Careful and close attention to this theological academy, which was important both from the point of view of the history of the Catholic Church and investigating the formation of modern nations (Belarusians, Latvians, Poles, Lithuanians, Ukrainians, Russians) as well as issues related to the general stance and attitude of a certain social group – the Catholic clergy – in the Russian Empire in the nineteenth century, was much desired.

The published work represents multifaceted research, which apart from the preface (pp. 5–19) and conclusion with a list of abbreviations, bibliography, a list of charts and diagrams and a summary in the Russian language (pp. 285–318), consists of four chapters. The first chapter dwells on the foundation of the academy and its facilities (pp. 21–71), with subdivisions:

1. Vilnius Roman Catholic Theological Academy and the circumstances of its transfer to St. Petersburg; 2. the St. Petersburg Academy in the light of canon- and secular law; 3. the funding of the academy.

The second chapter is devoted to the organisational structure of the academy (pp. 73–128), with subdivisions: 1. the administration of the academy; 2. the organisation of its departments; 3. academic departments and auxiliary workers. The second chapter also analyses the organisation and fate of the seminary library (pp. 111–122).

The third chapter focuses on the academics and their activities (pp. 129–219), with subdivisions: 1. the recruitment of academics and their expertise; 2. the implementation of the curriculum; 3. scholarly and social activities undertaken by the academy professors. This chapter presents the chronology of the foundation and liquidation of the departments, alterations in subjects and rotation of the professors.

The fourth chapter is dedicated to the academy students (pp. 221–283), with subdivisions: 1. Terms of admittance; 2. Everyday life and spiritual training; 3. Specialisation and graduation; 4. Alumni of the academy in the life of the Church. According to the author, this sequence and structure of research was predetermined by her analysis of the academy as an institution (p. 15), however, chapters three and four suggest that the author's interests lay not only in the structural composition of the institution but also in its significance in the society of that time. The analysis of the issues raised in chapters one and two is impossible without studying the policy of the secular authorities towards the Catholic Church.

The author employs the classical model of analysis of an academic institution, which does not limit research to the structure of the institution but also involves a wider scope of analysis taking into consideration the social and cultural significance of the institution. Monographs by Adolf Pleszczyński, Daniel Beauvois, Vytautas Jogėla, Irena Kodulska, and Leszek Zasztowt¹ are also attributable to this type of research. Not all of them appear in the bibliography of the book, even though they would have been useful from the methodological point of view: they would have widened the field of the research of an educational/academic institution and broadened the Author's opportunities to develop her insights.

The sources, on the basis of which the research is designed, come not only from Polish archives but also from those of Lithuania, Russia and Vatican City. The data were organized into charts, diagrams and biograms. From this angle, the work done makes an impression and deserves respect.

¹ A. Pleszczyński, *Dzieje Akademii Duchownej Rzymsko-Katolickiej Warszawskiej* (Warsaw, 1907); D. Beauvois, *Szkolnictwo polskie na ziemiach litewsko-ruskich, 1803–1832*, 2 t. (Lublin, 1991); V. Jogėla, 'Vilniaus Romos katalikų dvasinė akademija 1833–1842 metais: Organizacija ir veikla', *Lietuvių Atgimimo istorijos studijos*, t. 14 (Vilnius, 1997); I. Kodulska, *Akademia Połocka. Ośrodek kultury na Kresach 1812–1820* (Gdańsk, 2004); L. Zasztowt, *Kresy 1832–1864. Szkolnictwo na ziemiach litewskich i ruskich dawnej Rzeczypospolitej* (Warsaw, 1997).

Research of this scope, which analyses not only the structure of the school but also recaptures the social behaviour, mobility, career fluctuations and scholarly activities of the professors and students of the academy, lacks a personal name index – the main tool that would help the reader navigate his way through the abundance of names and dates given here.

However, it was not the fact that the book lacked a personal name index or that certain books, which would have been worth mentioning in the research of an educational institution did not find their way to the bibliography that made me read this book several times. The author's approach to the object of research as well as the content of analysis and argumentation at times seemed challenging and rather unexpected.

The analysis of the institution of the Catholic Church that was in operation in Vilnius until 1842 and in St. Petersburg until 1918 as the centre of one culture is possible. However, is it worthwhile or ethical in the context of research at the end of the twentieth century and the beginning of the twenty-first century? At least the object of research should have been defined employing specific terms and an explanation of this approach, elaborating this aspect of research. One language used by the social elite, to which the clergy were also attributed, did not suggest the complete identity of its users in the territories of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania (the so-called Western or Northwest Province) and in the Kingdom of Poland. A comment on the content of the notion of Polish/Lithuanian national identity and the statement of the differences in the policy of the secular authorities in the territories of the former GDL in the nineteenth century would have facilitated the perception of the author's analysis, or perhaps would have even adjusted it to an extent.

In the preface stating the reasons underlying the transfer of the Vilnius Roman Catholic Theological Academy to St. Petersburg in 1842 'the climate of Polish Wilno' (p. 6) is mentioned; later it is said that 'the academy was transferred from Vilnius to the imperial capital in order to restrict the so-called fanatical influence of Polish society on the education of young clerics there' (p. 13). In the conclusions generalising about the journey the academy made 'from the Vilija to the Neva', the Author states that 'at both ends of the journey there were great figures of Polish and ecclesiastical history' (p. 291) as though it the Polish identity which instigated the secular authorities to transfer the academy to St. Petersburg in 1842 was identical to modern Polish nationalism of the twentieth century. The state of recent scholarship (I put aside research that has appeared since 2007, although prior to that year there were discussions on the subject and it was analysed in the context of other studies² justifies the expectation of an explanation of the content of no-

² J. Ochmański, *Litewski ruch narodowo-kulturalny w XIX wieku (do 1890 r.)* (Białystok, 1965); J. Jurkiewicz, *Rozwój polskiej myśli politycznej na Litwie i Białorusi w latach 1905–1922* (Poznań, 1983); J. Jurkiewicz, 'Jeszcze Polska nie zginęła, póki Żmudzini żyją! (Kilka uwag o Pieśni Żmudzinów z 1831 r.)', *Praeities baruose*, ed. A. Tyla (Vilnius, 1999), pp. 171–180; J. Bardach, *O dawniej i niedawniej Litwie*

tions used to describe nationality – Polish, Lithuanian – as in the nineteenth century it was neither static nor self-explanatory.

Higher theological education acquired in the Polish and Latin languages at the St. Petersburg Academy as well as career possibilities facilitated by the education influenced, enriched and renewed more than the Polish Catholic Church. At the end of the nineteenth century, a number of students from the academy favoured modern nationalism(s) and participated in the formation of modern states.

The preface dwells a great deal on the analysis of changes in the structure and administration of the Catholic Church after the Partitions of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. However, alongside the enumeration of changes, this chapter would have also benefited from analysis of the reasons for them, and moderate discussion on the national and confessional policy of the Russian Empire. Research carried out during the last decades in Poland, Lithuania, Russia and Western countries provide such possibilities. Contemporary historians focusing on the national and confessional policy of the Russian Empire allow us to name and analyse the differences in the policy the Russian authorities pursued in various regions of the empire.³ Thus, the

(Poznań, 1988); Z. Mediškienė, 'Lietuvos samprata XIX a. viduryje', *Praeities baruose*, pp. 217–224; D. Szpoper, *Pomiedzy caratem a snem o Rzeczypospolitej* (Gdańsk, 2003); K. Buchowski, *Litwomani i polonizatorzy. Mity, wzajemne postrzeganie i stereotypy w stosunkach polsko-litewskich w pierwszej połowie XX wieku* (Białystok, 2006).

Problems repeatedly addressed in *Lietuvių Atgimimo istorijos studijos* (17 vols., 1990–2001) and other publications such as E. Aleksandravičius, *Kultūrinis sąjūdis Lietuvoje 1831–1863 metais. Organizaciniai kultūros ugdymo aspektai* (Vilnius, 1989); idem, *XIX amžiaus profiliai* (Vilnius, 1993).

Local student movements in the territories of the former GDL and the Kingdom of Poland are described in T[rifon] G[alaktionovich] Sny'tko „Studencheskoe dvizhenie v nachale 60-kh godov i vosstanie 1863 g.“, *Vosstanie 1863 g. i russkopol'skie revoliucionnye sviazi 60-kh godov* (Moscow, 1960), pp. 176–322.

³ Here are mentioned just a few studies that appeared prior to 2007: *Russification in the Baltic Provinces and Finland*, ed. E. Thaden (Princeton, 1981); T.R. Weeks, *Nation and State in Late Imperial Russia* (DeKalb, 1996); D. Staliūnas, 'Lietuviškojo patriotizmo pėdsakai XIX a. viduryje', *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis 2000*, pp. 310–325; D. Staliūnas, "'The Pole'" in the Policy of the Russian Government: Semantics and Praxis in the Mid-Nineteenth Century', *Lithuanian Historical Studies*, 5 (2000), pp. 45–67; T. Snyder, *The Reconstruction of Nations. Poland, Ukraine, Lithuania, Belarus, 1569–1999* (New Haven and London, 2003); M. Dolbilov, 'Polonofobiya i politika russifikatsii v Severno-Zapadnom krae imperii v 1860-e gg.', *Obraz vraga*, ed. L. Gudkov (Moscow, 2005), p. 127–174; H. Głęboccki, *Kresy Imperium: Szkice i materiay do dziejów polityki Rosji wobec jej peryferii (XVIII–XXI wiek)* (Kraków, 2006); M. Dolbilov "'Tsarskaia vera": massovy obrashcheniya katolikov v pravoslavie v severno-zapadnom krae rossiiskoi imperii (1860-e gg.)', *Ab Imperio*, (2006), No. 4, pp. 225–270; *Zapadnye okrainy Rossijskoj imperii*, ed. M. Dolbilov, A. Miller (Moscow, 2006); idem, *Imperia Romanovykh i natsionalizm* (Moscow, 2006).

differences between the Kingdom of Poland and the so-called Western Province would have become obvious.

The Catholic Church in the Russian Empire was universal but society, including its Catholic part, while heterogeneous from the point of view of nationality and estate, was segmented and divided into hierarchies. The attitude of the secular authorities, their policy and projects directed towards society and its separate groups, including that of the Catholic clergy, was diverse in different administrative units of the empire. The secular authorities understood their uneven potential to influence the Catholic Church, and thus pursued a different confessional policy in separate dioceses recognising their uneven influence and significance in the political life of the empire. Different periods of the nineteenth century were marked by the aspiration of the authorities to implement projects of assimilation and integration of different intensity in the so-called Western Province.

After the 1831 Uprising and especially after that of 1863 the authorities sought to weaken Polish political and cultural tradition in the so-called Northwest Province, which was associated with the traditional social and political elite – the nobility. The authorities considered the Catholic clergy to be sympathetic to the political ideals of the gentry in their cultural and political bearing; therefore, repressive/restrictive methods were also directed against this social group and the Catholic Church as an institution. However, the content of the Polish identity in this region was specific and attributable to the tradition and historical legacy of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania.

The preface reviews the current state of scholarship and her decision to choose the subject. I take up the Author's assertion that no monographs on Catholic seminaries have been published before: 'for example. The seminary at Kamieniec Podolski, nor a full history of the seminaries of the dioceses of Lutsk, Zhytomir, Zwinograd, Minsk, Mogilev, Vilnius, Kaunas or Brasław...' (p. 5). However, being acquainted with the research done by Z. Genienė and J. Genys, V. Merkys, A. Prašmantaitė, I. Šenavičienė, J. Stakauskas (to mention only those that appeared prior to 2007) I would not be so categorical, but the author is so, leaving aside the Žemaičiai (Telšiai) and Vilnius seminaries; on the other hand, the problems raised in the study are not exhausted and hardly ever will be.⁴

The author also claims (pp. 13–14) that in the legal system of the empire the academy in its status was equal to a university. As the problem is not referred to again (it is not analysed in the part of the first chapter dwelling

⁴ Z. Genienė, J. Genys, *Varnių kunigų seminarija* (Vilnius, 1999); V. Merkys, *Tautiniai santykiai Vilniaus vyskupijoje 1798–1918* (Vilnius, 2006); idem, *Motiejus Valančius, tarp katalikiškojo universalizmo ir tautiškumo*, (Vilnius, 1999); A. Prašmantaitė, *Žemaičių vyskupas Juozapas Arnulfas Giedraitis* (Vilnius, 2000); I. Šenavičienė, *Dvasininkija ir lietuviybė. Katalikų bažnyčios atsinaujinimas Žemaičių vyskupijoje XIX a. 5–7-ajame dešimtmetyje* (Vilnius, 2005); J. Stakauskas, *Naujieji nacionalizmai ir Katalikų Bažnyčia Lietuvoje*, ed. A. Katilius (Vilnius, 2003).

on the academy in civil and canon law), it should be mentioned that the legal status of the academy as well as of its graduates was not explicitly defined. On 1 July 1833 (O. S.), the statute of the Vilnius Roman Catholic Theological Academy was in effect at the St. Petersburg Academy as well. Alongside the statute of 1833, there were certain administrative decrees and *ukazy* that regulated the operation of the academy. No projects of new statutes were adopted in the nineteenth century.

Certain regulations that appeared in the *Svod zakonov Rossiiskoj imperii* of 1857 were not necessarily included in subsequent editions. Furthermore, even the laws that were in effect were subject to different interpretations at various periods, depending on the political course of the secular authorities. In the 1870s, the fact that according to the statute of the Vilnius Roman Catholic Theological Academy of 1833 the academy was considered equal to a university was undisputed, while in the 1890s the law *Ustav o sluzhbe grazhdanskoi* [Civil Service Decree], which indicated what type of education was equivalent to certain ranks in the civil service, was interpreted in a different manner. For example, *Ustav o sluzhbe* (*Svod zakonov* t. III, 1876, *stat'ia* 79) states that 'the rights and privileges of persons holding a seminary degree are determined by personal status'. However, a comment follows that this is applicable to Orthodox academies only. It is also indicated that according to the *Ustav o sluzhbe grazhdanskoi v Tsarstve Polskom* [Civil Service Decree for the Kingdom of Poland] issued on 10 March 1859, students of the Warsaw Roman Catholic Theological Academy when entering the civil service exercised the same rights as university students⁵, yet there are no similar indications about the Vilnius Roman Catholic Theological Academy or that of St. Petersburg. The outcome of the cases of the alumni of the St. Petersburg Academy who sought employment in secular institutions in 1876 and 1877, 1896, 1904 suggest that for the most part decisions did not depend on the provisions of the law. These issues were solved by way of exception, the background (*proiskhozhdenie*) of the graduate and his education acquired prior to the studies at a seminary or academy⁶ were taken into consideration. In 1896 Aleksandr Mosolov wrote that it was impossible to equate seminaries and academies with corresponding secular schools because of the peculiarities of their curricula, and 'furthermore, this is undesirable for well-known reasons'⁷.

In the 1860s and 1880s a significant part of the draft statutes of the St. Petersburg Imperial Roman Catholic Theological Academy was taken up by proposals regarding the rights and privileges of alumni, (*o pravach i preemushchestvach*) as well as the legal status of professors, their social security, i.e. retirement benefits (this is mentioned by the author on p. 36) etc.

⁵ Note: *RGIA*, f. 821, op. 125, d. 380, fo. 31.

⁶ 30 Oct. 1904 letter from the Department of Religious Affairs of Foreign Confessions at the Ministry of Interior Affairs, *RGIA*, f. 821, op. 125, d. 380, fo. 52.

⁷ 25 Apr. 1896 A. Mosolov's letter, *RGIA*, f. 821, op. 125, d. 388, fo. 23.

Incidentally, at the beginning of the preface the author claims that 'Graduates from the Roman Catholic Seminary in St Petersburg received along with their diploma a medal inscribed with a texts from the Second Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians: Know nothing more than Jesus Christ Crucified (2 Cor ii.2)'. This quotation, in fact from the *First* Epistle to the Corinthians appeared on the design of a graduate badge in 1909[?]⁸. However, as provided by the academy statute of 1833 graduates received gold plated crosses: masters of arts pinned them to their clothes while doctors used to wear them round their necks.⁹ In the draft statute of the 1860s this article remained unaffected¹⁰ and the new draft statute of 1884 preserved the same badge, although candidates were supposed to receive silver crosses.¹¹ Alumni would wear their crosses eagerly. They can be seen in the photographs of graduates taken at the beginning of the twentieth century; the crosses indicate the academic degree obtained from the academy.

The first chapter of the book mostly dwells on the statutes of the academy and its reforms. It was not recorded in the statute of 1833 that the academy was obliged to train clergymen obedient to the authorities, as the author claims (p. 24), and the first paragraph of the statute of 1833 ('Akademia Rzymsko-Katolicka duchowna w Wilnie zakłada się dla wyższego ukształcenia osób Duchownych, sposobiących się do zajęcia wyższych obowiązków Rzymsko-Katolickiej Hierarchii w Rosyi'¹²) is almost identical to the first paragraph of the statute of the Warsaw Roman Catholic Theological Academy adopted in 1837 ('Akademia Duchowna Rzymsko-Katolicka w Warszawie, zakłada się dla ukształcenia osób Duchownych do obowiązków Rzymsko-Katolickiej Hierarchii w Królestwie Polskiem, wymagających wyższego udoskonalenia naukowego'¹³), which is quoted by the author as an example of a different course taken by the Warsaw Academy. The training of clergymen loyal to the secular authorities was a requirement of the political context not recorded explicitly in the statutes.

The first chapter may leave the reader with the impression that the statute of the academy was revised several times. However, the document that the author describes as the statute designed and adopted between 1860 and 1862 and the changes that it provided for (e.g. the fact that 45 students were granted financial aid from the treasury or the fact that the statute adopted in

⁸ Design of a proposed graduate badge for those who completed the whole course at the Imperial Roman Catholic Theological Academy, *RGIA*, f. 821, op. 125, d. 388, fo. 25.

⁹ *Ustav` Vilenskoj rimsko-katolicheskoi dukhovnoi akademii* ([lacking place of publication,] 1833), (para. 84).

¹⁰ [1860?] Draft statute, *RGIA*, f. 821, op. 125, d. 383, fo. 67 (para.79).

¹¹ Statute of the Imperial Roman Catholic Theological Academy (1884), *RGIA*, f. 821, op. 125, d. 378, l. 284.

¹² *Ustav` Vilenskoj rimsko-katolicheskoi dukhovnoi akademii* (1833).

¹³ Pleszczyński, *Dzieje Akademii Duchownej*, II.

1833 did not define where students, who were not funded from the treasury, should reside, whereas the new one forbade their residing outside the academy. Nonetheless, the fifth paragraph of the 1833 statute stated that these students should live in the academy or outside it with a special permit) was just a draft, which never became more than a draft. What the author indicates as the text from the new statute (p. 37, f.n. 80) is actually a document about a new draft statute and not the statute itself.

One more statute is referred to in the book. A project of the statute prepared in 1884 by Albin Franciszek Symon, rector of the academy (pp. 39–41). I am not going to debate the interpretation of its contents, but the author repeatedly claims in various contexts (p. 40, f.n. 95; p. 41, f.n. 99) that this statute was adopted and its text appeared in the academy publication *Academia Caesarea Romano-Catholica Ecclesiastica Petropolitana* in 1892. These propositions are followed by an analysis of changes in the academy at the beginning of the twentieth century when Jerzy Józef Szembek was appointed archbishop of Mogilev. However, the 1884 draft statute was never approved. What the author calls the statute approved by Metropolitan Aleksandras K. Gintautas and published in the 1892 *Academia* (p. 40, f.n. 95 and p. 89, f.n. 65) (actually, there was no such text in the publication *Academia* in 1892) is practically the *regulae* of the academy – a document that regulates the internal life of the school, not a statute but a document that defines the administration and structure of the institution¹⁴.

Documents found in archives suggest that in 1909, the issue of a new statute was raised once again; there were discussions and drafts, but nothing more. From the legal point of view, the situation of the academy changed in 1915.

In the second chapter of the book the author repeatedly refers to *Rector Symon's* statute (p. 62, 77) adopted in 1882, although, according to the Author, from November 1877 to May 1884 the rector of the academy was S. Kozłowski, whereas A. F. Symon held office from April 1884 to 19 August 1897 (p. 92). However, on page 86 (f.n. 48) and on page 87 it is indicated that Kozłowski was in office from 1877 until May 1883. In 1882, there was no statute project as the agreement between Russia and the Holy See was signed in December 1882. The issues of the academy statute as well as the problems related to the reformation of diocese seminaries emerged after this agreement and the letter from Cardinal Jacobini that followed this agreement was sent to the bishops of the empire and the Kingdom of Poland in September 1883¹⁵

¹⁴ The *regulae* were approved in 1886 by Aleksandras Kazimieras Gintautas, the metropolitan of all Catholic Churches of the Russian Empire and the archbishop of Mogilev. *Academia Caesarea Romano-Catholica Ecclesiastica Petropolitana anno academico 1891–1892* (St Petersburg, 1891), pp. 11–22.

¹⁵ Cardinal L. Jacobini's letter to the bishops of the Empire and the Kingdom of Poland sent on 15 Sept. 1883 (copy and translation), *RGIA*, f. 821, ap. 125, b. 378, fo. 15–18; *ibid* (copy), *LVI*A, f. 696, ap. 2, b. 368, fos. 2–4.

(the Author also mentions it on p. 39). There is no doubt that draft documents are revealing and a valuable source of research, however, if they remain mere designs, they fail to enlighten the real situation. Speaking about real changes in the academy, the 1880s marked the introduction of a new order in the awarding of degrees, namely the award of a doctorate in canon law¹⁶. (Changes mentioned by the Author are on p. 89.)

On the one hand, inaccuracies are not as important as they appear in every work. This is true, but on the other hand, attention to dates, names, surnames and archival references would have made it possible to reduce the number of repetitions and inaccuracies. May be it is worth commenting on the use of names and dates.

In the part of the second chapter, which dwells on the reorganisation and introduction of the departments (p.105), the establishment of the Department of Sociology is mentioned, stating that 'classes were given by the Revd Dr A. Woycicki', but later (p. 182) Jurgis Matulaitis, who started the course of sociology at the academy in the academic year 1906–1907, appears.

In the second chapter, where the auxiliary workers are analysed, the precise use of concepts would have saved the book from statements like '... they were Poles, mostly scions of the gentry. They came mainly from the Vilnius District, Žemaitija, Podole and Volhyn' (p. 108). The content of the first two geographic names is rather complex. May be the above-mentioned employees of the academy were the representatives of the traditional elite from the lands of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania who viewed the academy as a means of building their secular careers.

The third chapter, pp. 132–133, is concerned with the nationalities of the academy professors in between 1843 and 1918: 'More than half of the professors were Polish – 61 persons. The rest were Lithuanian (9 men), Russians (7), Belarusians (3), and Jews (3)' (p. 132). The list of the academics is not presented and even if it were, it would be interesting to get the Author's explanation underlying this classification. The question remains the same – what concept of nationality was considered as the basis of this method. The period between 1843 and 1918 is significant. As has already been mentioned Lithuanian or Pole at the beginning of the nineteenth century cannot be equated to Lithuanian or Pole at the beginning of the twentieth century. Besides, various reasons could have induced changes in a person's individual stance and the identity he declared. Who were these 'Lithuanian' professors, were there really nine of them and why nine? I will try to identify those 'Lithuanians': M. Valančius, A. Beresnevičius, G.F. Cirtautas, J. Dovydaitis, A. Baranauskas, J. Mačiulis (Maironis), A. Dambrauskas (Jakštas), J.B. Pra-

¹⁶ *Ordo in solemnibus ad lauream doctoralem in S. Theologia vel jure canonico promotione in Caesarea Romano-Catholica Ecclesiastica Academia Petropolitana servandus*, LVIA, f. 1135, ap. 17, b. 194.

naitis, K. Jaunius, J. Matulaitis (actually, only his name, though in a different context, is also written in its Lithuanian form), P.P. Būčys (referred to as F. Buczys, or P. Buczys. p. 216), B. Čėsnyš, A. Grigaitis, and I. Baltrušis. What nationality should we consider for B. Žongolavičius (Żongołowicz)? (After all, being a student of the academy, he participated in student activities with a modern Lithuanian nationalist character). What nationality was the Revd Prefect B. Lukoševičius (Łukaszewicz, mentioned on p. 29), a graduate of the Kražiai grammar school and Vilnius seminary? What is the use of this viewpoint and classification without a more extensive comment and review of the socio-political context? The rotation of the staff, academics and students could have been taken into consideration with regard to the facts of the abolition of serfdom and shutdown of the Warsaw Roman Catholic Theological Academy.

Attention to detail and a broader historiographical context would have reduced the number of inaccuracies in the book: at times Kaunas Seminary is mentioned (p. 5), some times it is referred to as the seminary in Telšiai (pp. 103, 137, 146, 167, 213, although the Žemaičiai (Telšiai) Seminary, which at that time was located in Kaunas, is meant), some times it is called the Žemaičiai Seminary. Moreover, this is the same seminary for the Žemaičiai (Telšiai) diocese, which was in Varniai until 1864 and in 1865 was transferred to the centre of the Kaunas Region. However, in Kaunas it was still called the Žemaičiai (Telšiai) seminary. The Telšiai (Žemaičiai) Seminary, to be exact as this name appears in the items of the concordat agreements of 1847. In historical writing the name Žemaičiai (Telšiai) diocese and seminary are used more commonly. There was no Catholic seminary in Telšiai in the nineteenth century.

In the enumeration of the academy professors penalized by the secular authorities the name of Aleksandras Dambrauskas (Jakštas) (pp. 129–130) appears. Yet it was not his teaching activities at the academy that were the reason for his exile to Siberia but rather his teaching of religion in Panevėžys, in the Žemaičiai (Telšiai) diocese. His career at the academy started in 1902. The context of the seminary clergymen, who faced repression at the hands of the authorities, requests mentioning the case of the Kielce seminary and its aftermath, though these events are presented in Chapter four (pp. 281–282).

K. Jaunius' and S. Ptaszycki's involvement in the commission on the writing of Polish Catholic names at the Ministry of the Interior is discussed in the context of the public activities of the academy professors. The question is whether it could have been the year 1909 as the author indicates (p. 216): Jaunius died in 1908.

Besides, public activities undertaken by the clergy were not limited to charitable activity. The charity association of Žemaitijans and Lithuanians supported by several professors from the academy, which started its

activities in 1892 in St. Petersburg,¹⁷ is depicted only in the context of the 1910s and the contribution of academy professors J. Mačiulis (Maironis), A. Dambrauskas (Jakštas) and P. P. Būčys organizing the Christian Democratic Party in Lithuania was not taken into consideration as well as the same generation clergyman Francis Trasuns' activities in Lettigallia.

The fourth chapter is devoted to the academy students. Speaking about the students who paid for their studies (p. 230–231), the author indicates that normally their names did not appear in the lists of the academy students; very seldom were they mentioned in administration reports (exclusively alumni from the Kingdom of Poland) and they never found their way onto diocesan liturgical directories. Nonetheless, this group of students was not considered special in any way and was not secret. The official annual reports sent from the academy to the Ministry of the Interior in the 1890s contained information on these students whether they were from the Kingdom of Poland or the empire.¹⁸ Their names also appear in the *Directorium* of the Žemaičiai (Telšiai) diocese. At that time, they would pay 300 silver roubles for an academic year.

The author also discusses the students' social background and national diversity. She indicates that between 1875 and 1905 'alumni came most often from gentry, burgher and peasant families. From the 1880s most were from middling peasant families, who made up 40 per cent of all those studying at the Seminary in 1905' (p. 237). The author maintains that the majority of 1,294 alumni who studied at the academy during a period of 76 years were Polish (p. 237): 'The national composition of the Seminary changed significantly for the first time in the twentieth century. Apart from the Poles, Lithuanians also made up a considerable group (from the dioceses of Vilnius and Telšiai) along with Belarusians (the Diocese of Minsk) and Germans (the Diocese of Tiraspol).' Again, the issue of criteria used determining who of them were Polish and who was Lithuanian arises. There were also Ukrainians, Latvians, Germans and Belarusians. The logic of this quotation suggests that Lithuanians are referred to from the ethno-linguistic point of view. Actually, at the turn of the twentieth century there were quite a few who considered themselves Lithuanians in the Sejny diocese or among seminarians sent from the Mogilev archdiocese. The St. Petersburg seminary was popular with grammar schoolboys from the Kaunas and Vilnius regions or those who passed examinations of a certain standard elsewhere than at the examination commission of the Vilnius Education District.

Changes in the social background of the academy students indicate that dynamic tendencies of the clergy's social structure, which at that time were

¹⁷ J.S. Laučiūtė, *Peterburgas Lietuvos mokslo ir kultūros istorijoje* (Vilnius, 2002), pp. 52–54.

¹⁸ [1890–1897] Reports on the administration of the Imperial Roman Catholic Theological Academy, RGIA, f. 821, op. 125, d. 392.

more and more explicitly manifested in the Žemaičiai (Telšiai) and Vilnius seminaries, were not so apparent in St. Petersburg.¹⁹ By the 1870s, the majority of students at diocesan seminaries were from the peasantry whereas at the academy these democratic processes were delayed – nearly half of the students were former burghers and noblemen. These classes were identified with Polish culture and tradition. This culture and tradition were natural to students from dioceses in the Kingdom of Poland (they were sent from seven dioceses and constituted half or one-third of alumni). The social structure of the academy students suggests the assumption that manifestations of the tension of modern nationalisms in the academy at the end of the nineteenth century was rather slow and not so acute, whereas analysis of student behaviour shows attempts to combine rather than radically opposing aspirations of modern nationalism with Polish cultural tradition. The tension was reduced by the specifics of theological institution of higher education. However, the end of the nineteenth century already witnessed some inequalities, grouping by dioceses and on ethno-linguistic basis.

In the second section of chapter four the author recaptures everyday student life: ‘Seminar life in the Academy was regulated generally by so-called student obligations. There was a regulation for students in use back in Vilnius from 1839. [reference 67: instructions 30 May 1839, RGIA, f. 826, op. 3, d. 86, fo. 74]. A copy of these instructions was presented every time to a new inspector. In the archives there are only two texts of regulations from 1862 and 1882 they are identical in content and differ only in date and the signatures of the metropolitan [reference 68: RGIA, f. 826, op. 3, d. 86, fo. 74–82; *ibid.*, d. 88, fos. 84–90] ... They remained unchanged until 1918’ (p. 237). Thus, having mentioned that two identical texts of the rule of the academy can be found in state archives, the Author makes use of them in her further research. It seems that the Author had no opportunity to work at the St. Petersburg Central State History Archive (shelf marks are given in the review of sources (p.18) but cater on the Author regrets not having had the possibility to work in the above-mentioned archive, p. 237). Thus, she might

¹⁹ In 1886, 44 alumni attended the academy: 10 came from noble families, 14 were townspeople, 17 were peasants, one was a colonist and two from lower ranks of the military or civil servants. See the statistical data on academy students before 1 Jan 1887, *St. Petersburg Central State History Archive* (henceforth – *St. Petersburg CGIA*, f. 46, op. 1, d. 961, fo. 4. In the academic year 1894–1895 there were 62 students at the academy (48 were state-supported and 14 alumni had to pay their tuition fees themselves). Fifteen were from noble families, 27 were peasants, 14 were town dwellers, three were sons of civil servants, and one was a colonist. See data on academy students before 1 Jan 1895, RGIA, f. 821, op. 125, d. 392, fo. 179. At the beginning of 1898, 61 students attended the academy (50 were state-supported and 11 had to pay their tuition fees themselves); 20 were from noble, 24 from peasant families, 14 were townspeople, one was a son of a civil servant and two were colonists. See data on academy students before 1 Jan. 1898, RGIA, f. 821, op. 125, d. 392, fo. 213.

have not known that instructions issued on 30 May 1839²⁰, together with the alumni's duties, stated in them, are not identical to the rule of 1862 and 1882 used and cited in her study. However, the academy rule was not the only one. The 1886 *regula* is called a statute in the book and is disregarded when analysing everyday student life. However, the *regulae* of 1886 are a substantial document of Rector Symon's period, which, if compared with earlier *regulae*, organised student life in a rather different way, focused more on spiritual exercise, introduced eight-days' recollection, etc. Certain paragraphs (5, 6, 19, 38, 51, 52, 54, 85) of the above mentioned *regula* of 1886 were translated into the Polish language and cited in the book that the author also relied on in her study (T. Górski MIC, *Blogosławiony Jerzy Matulewicz*, [Warsaw, 2005], pp. 28–29). Furthermore, state archives in Lithuania and Russia hold much more than two copies or issues of the rule/rules.

Describing the students' activities the Królestwo Baublisa (Baublys Kingdom) was mentioned – original activities of the academy students from the end of the 1840s; in 1862 it was prohibited by Rector Beresnevičius. After it was mentioned student organisations based on the national identity of Belarusian and Lithuanian students appeared, according to our Author, at the beginning of the twentieth century (p. 254). Lithuanian organisations based on ethno-linguistic factors appeared at least a decade before the above mentioned events. In the case of the Baublys Kingdom, the Author relies on Rector Beresnevičius' explanations on the frivolous manner of this phenomenon in the academy (pp. 249–251). Yet patriotic sentiments can be felt in the theatricality of the members of the Baublys Kingdom, writings of students, which at that time appeared in the academy newspaper.²¹ The authors of the newspaper, naturally using the Polish language, wrote poetry about Lithuanians attributing themselves to the tradition of the GDL.²²

The grouping of students by ethnic/ethno-linguistic criteria, which started at the end of the nineteenth century, did not necessarily evoke a conflict or tension with the Polish culture and linguistic environment that prevailed in the academy (though at the end of the nineteenth century certain clashes were not evaded. For example, K. Prapuolenis recalled: "The Lithuanian movement emerged among my peers [Prapuolenis attended the academy from 1881 until 1885] ... A circle of nationality conscious Lithuanians was formed. It was on such bad terms with Polish students that, for instance, we do not have a picture of all the students of that year together"²³, but this did

²⁰ Minutes of the 30 May 1839 meeting of the Board of the Vilnius Roman Catholic Theological Academy, St. Petersburg *GIA*; f. 46, op. 1, d. 410, fos 58–74 (Duties of alumni are presented in 54 entries).

²¹ Aleksandravičius, *Kultūrinis sąjūdis*, p. 78.

²² [Poems], *RGIA*, f. 821, op.1, d. 963, fos 88, 90.

²³ J. Keliuotis, 'Pas mūsų veteraną kun. kan. K. Prapuolėnį', *Naujoji Romuva*, 1931, No. 36, p. 851.

not imply identifying with it. Alongside the grouping by dioceses, such notions as ‘Pole of the Crown’ and ‘Lithuanian’ (in the ethno-political sense and at the end of the nineteenth century in the ethno-linguistic sense) were in operation. For example, academy seniors were elected from final year students in rotation: one year from the Kingdom of Poland, the next year from (the Grand Duchy of) Lithuania.²⁴

This dualism of the academy was its outstanding feature. V. Jogėla, to whom the author also refers (pp. 15, 22–23), in his analysis of the organisation and operation of the Vilnius Roman Catholic Theological Academy from 1833 to 1842 indicated that the academy in Vilnius was a small model of the ‘nation’ of the former Grand Duchy of Lithuania [‘nation’ being understood from the ethno-political point of view] as the academy was attended by clerics from all its territories.²⁵ This feature was sustained by the academy in St. Petersburg as well. After 1867 when the Warsaw Roman Catholic Theological Academy was closed and the Warsaw diocese started sending students to St. Petersburg as well, this institution can be called a model of the Commonwealth of the Two Nations. Although the notion of a nation changed over time, in the second half of the nineteenth century, alongside a historic nation, there appeared concepts of modern nations.

Such are editorial and subject related comments in expectancy of the author’s new work, a sequel to this study, namely a publication of a list of academy students (p.19).

It would have saved me a good deal of writing, if the Author had assessed the context of her subject in a more accurate manner, given it more thorough consideration, and commented on certain notions and her attitude towards historical studies written languages other than Polish.

In conclusion, I would like to offer a few quotations from the above-mentioned studies. For instance, from E. Aleksandravičius’ article ‘Bandymai atgaivinti universitetą Lietuvoje 1832–1918’ (Attempts to Restore the University in Lithuania in 1832–1918): ‘The idea of a university as the educator of a nation’s culture is related directly with a nation’s self-awareness and self-consciousness, and changes in geopolitical conditions. The fact that the old university of Vilnius was a source of heterogeneous cultural

²⁴ Entries in Povilas Januševičius’ diary testify and other sources confirm (see P.P. Būčys, *Atsiminimai* (Chicago, 1966), t. 1, p. 126) that academy seniors were elected from fourth-year students in rotation: one year from Lithuania, the other year from the Kingdom of Poland. Actually, on 30 August 1897, in his diary Januševičius marked that a student from the Kingdom of Poland became senior though it should have been one from Lithuania: “– NB. Senioriu Szemiatai turejo buti izs Lietuvos, nes pernei buvo izs Lenkyjos, bet kitoniszkaiz stojas – nes Inspektoriu paliko «k» Ciepliakas – kurs yra izs kelczizų” (Povilas Januševičius, *Visokių atsitikimų sąrašas: 1895–1898*, prepared by V. Žaltauskaitė, *Bibliotheca Archivi Lithuanici*, t. 5, (Vilnius, 2004), pp. 243–244). Therefore, the rule was not without exceptions.

²⁵ Jogėla, ‘Vilniaus Romos katalikų dvasinė akademija’, p. 96.

traditions of the Grand Duchy of Lithuania from the ethnic point of view predetermined a complex and controversial division of these traditions between the new Lithuanian and Polish ethno-cultural communities. ... On the other hand, in civilised circumstances common traditions can become an integrating factor, which helps discover the golden mean and find a common language. The latter method of the acquisition of common university traditions was not fully exhausted either between the two wars or any time later. Politicians and administrators determined the outcome of arguments and the tradition remained intact – alive, vital, problematic'.²⁶

In 2006, Reda Griškaitė published her article 'A Few Reflections on the Topic of a Long-Awaited Book or Once Again on Different Views on *Common History*'.²⁷

It seems that a lot has been said about *common history*; therefore, hope remains.

Vilma Žaltauskaitė

²⁶ Aleksandravičius, *XIX amžiaus profiliai*, p. 163.

²⁷ R. Griškaitė, 'Kelios refleksijos ilgai lauktos knygos tema, arba dar kartą apie skirtingą požiūrį į bendrą istoriją', *Lietuvos istorijos metraštis 2005*, 2, pp. 135–162.