

## SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY. GALICIAN DISCOURSES OF LANGUAGE HEGEMONY AT THE BEGINNING OF THE SECOND HALF OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY<sup>1</sup>

JAN SURMAN

### ABSTRACT

Following the 19th-century language debates on the language of science and higher education, this paper follows three Polish texts from the middle of the century dealing with the Galician school and university system. These dispositives of language discourse, defined here as an outcome of the transformations at the nexus of hegemony, linguistic theories and the remainders of the Republic of Letters ideology, are analysed concerning the positioning of the Polish language as confronted with German and Ruthenian/Ukrainian, as well as the political implications resulting from the perceived misbalance. Given the political context of Habsburg neoabsolutism's hierarchical understanding of languages and its application, the authors deal with both deconstructing the underlying ideology concerning German, and sustain it regarding Ruthenian

KEYWORDS: higher education, Galicia, postcolonialism, language, nationality



The history of scholarship in Central Europe, here in Habsburg Galicia, provides manifold materials for scholars interested in postcolonial theory. "Nauka"<sup>2</sup> as an educational factor (not in the modern meaning of science) was inscribed in the cultural processes, but through the intercultural interdependence of the République de Lettres became a platform linking and dividing states, empires, cultures or nations. Knowledge (and thus also science and scholarship) is power, for example of institutional stability, technology, or the possibility of defining "truth", even if it is not absolute and could be disputed or discussed, as is the case, for example, in the historical sciences. It inscribes directly onto the enlight



<sup>1</sup> I would like to thank Iaroslava Kravchenko, Klemens Kaps and Burkhard Wöller for their comments on the first versions of the article.

<sup>2</sup> "Nauka" is the Polish term denoting both science and scholarship.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
 .....

ened concept of civilization and becomes not only a measurement of social development, but also inclusion or exclusion to the “cultured nations.” The possibility and capability of articulating one’s own claims in a scientific way became a central issue for defining independent culture in the nineteenth century and continues to be so up to the present day. Ironically speaking, in a coalition with politics, science/scholarship became similar to religion, a means of oppression, defining the possibility of contact, and gave voice to the subjects only if they accepted the central (i.e. scientific) premises.<sup>3</sup> This statement is particularly important in the postcolonial context, where it was analyzed, for example, by Dipesh Chakrabarty and Gyan Prakash.<sup>4</sup>

One of the crucial questions in the debate on the development of modern science and scholarship, as well as the stabilization of its central cultural and technological position, is the issue of scientific language. It is by no means only a matter of terminological adaptation of one’s own claims so that they are heard in the times of the “scientific society”,<sup>5</sup> but also of the language of communication between scholars. This latter is also a central argument in early postcolonial studies, asking about the possibility of a symmetric scientific discourse or of cultural articulation. Dipesh Chakrabarty’s question on the possibility of having an autonomous discourse and the (future) existence of polyphony of memory-joins here with the Spivak’s argument about the subaltern, loss of language for one’s voice to be heard.<sup>6</sup> In what language should one write about history, culture, music and also specialist texts on natural sciences, to best present one’s own standpoint? Both Chakrabarty and Spivak give no

.....

3 Apart from the current debates in the sociology of science about the communication between laymen and specialists, see: S. Harding, *Sciences from Below: Feminisms, Postcolonialities, and Modernities*, Durham, London 2008, and B. Latour, *Jubiler ou les tourments de la parole religieuse*, Paris 2002.

4 Chakrabarty analyzes the conditions necessary to be perceived; See: D. Chakrabarty, *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference, New Edition, With a new Preface by the Author*, Princeton 2007; Prakash underlines the role and symbolics of science in the process of shaping contemporary India, see: G. Prakash, *Another Reason: Science and the Imagination of Modern India*, Princeton, New York 1999.

5 “Scientific society” does not denote the policentric mode of production based on knowledge and technology and not on the mass production which is called science society, knowledge economy or the knowledge society, but rather a *Wissenschaftsgesellschaft* as used by Rolf Kreiblich (1986), an power which is asymmetric and hierarchic due to science, see: S. Bösch, P. Wehling, *Wissenschaft zwischen Folgenverantwortung und Nichtwissen: aktuelle Perspektiven der Wissenschaftsforschung*, Wiesbaden 2004, pp. 29-30.

6 D. Chakrabarty, *op. cit.* For the concept of polyphony of memory see: R. Traba, *Przeszłość w teraźniejszości. Polskie spory o historię na początku XXI wieku*, Poznań 2009, pp. 82-88.

JAN SURMAN

.....

answer – although their writing in English shows the direction; language cedes its position from the subject to the object of inquiry – for example climate-centred global history, which forms cultural symmetry.<sup>7</sup> Why do postcolonials also speak English, the language of the colonizer, which is growing in importance and becoming a sign of the emancipation of the colonized?

According to theories on postcolonial literature, it is the use of hybrid terms and words in the work of postcolonial authors that signalizes the protest. Ismahil Talib, however, mentions other conditions.<sup>8</sup> Through globalization of communication, English has become a non-nationally-defined language, no longer linked to the colonial empire. If so, it is the symbol of another “colonizer,” now a cultural one – the United States – which, as Talib does not mention, also acts in a hegemonic manner towards Great Britain. According to Talib, from the historical point of view, English is not an equivalent to the language with which nativist postcolonial scholars are concerned – it is not bound to an ethnicity, and shows in itself traces of manifold past colonizations.

The non-postcolonial historians voiced a similar approach to changes of language use in science.<sup>9</sup> Scientific language serves as an instrument of international communication; it thus comprises communicational and symbolic values.<sup>10</sup> While for postcolonial theory the latter is a starting point of an analysis pointing towards oppression, historians tend to see scientific communication as a prerequisite of scientific practice.<sup>11</sup>

Concerning Central Europe in the nineteenth century, two issues grow in importance. Firstly, “nauka”, as science and scholarship, encompasses here also education, thus different publics with diverse language capabilities are its addressees. Secondly, it is interesting to look diachronically at the interrelation between the communicational and symbolic value of

.....

<sup>7</sup> See: D. Chakrabarty, *The Climate of History: Four Theses*, “Critical Inquiry” 35 (Winter 2009), pp. 197–222.

<sup>8</sup> I. S. Talib, *The Language of Postcolonial Literatures: an Introduction*, London, New York 2002.

<sup>9</sup> For example S. L. Montgomery, *Science in Translation: Movements of Knowledge through Cultures and Time*, Chicago 2000.

<sup>10</sup> For language and its communicational function cf. J. Fellerer, *Mehrsprachigkeit im galizischen Verwaltungswesen (1772–1914). Eine historisch-soziolinguistische Studie zum Polnischen und Ruthenischen (Ukrainischen)*, Köln 2005.

<sup>11</sup> Exceptions here are the constructivist linguists, who, based on the Whorf-Sapir hypothesis, claim multilinguality as a precondition for scientific progress.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
 .....

language for the conditions under which the importance of symbolical value of language outgrows the communicational, i.e. at which moment languages become markers pointing toward ‘colonizers’ oppression.<sup>12</sup> There is no historical stability – Latin, notwithstanding its exclusivity, is seen in the idealizing depictions of République des Lettres as a non-symbolic language solely serving a communication purpose, not belonging to any nation. However, the arguments against the use of Latin, related exactly to its symbolic value, in this case link it with scholasticism.<sup>13</sup> One can also observe, that in science and partially also in cultural matters, communication in German within the Habsburg Monarchy was also continued after this language was disqualified on a symbolic level at the end of the nineteenth century, for example in Polish-Czech contacts.

Inasmuch as the policy of language homogenization within the empires in Central Europe points toward ‘colonizing’ practices, the exclusion of vernacular languages is but partial; in education or jurisdiction they were tolerated, although this (apart from Galicia) changed with time. Although the historically defined logic of imperialism prescribes homogenization (in contrast to the colonies, where racial segregation was practised), one should also add here the shift accompanying the modern, ethnic-cum-linguistic definition of the nation.<sup>14</sup> In each of the three Central European empires, one can discern a parallel shift in the understanding of language – as soon as loyalty to the empire confronts identity, language, one of the most important markers of difference, is repressed. At the same time, precisely this repressed language becomes a symbol of oppression and denationalization, gaining symbolical importance over communicational values. This metamorphosis symbolizes the passage from the territorial nation (*natio*) to the ethnic one, which took place in the

.....

<sup>12</sup> See P. M. Judson, *Changing Meanings of ‘German’ in Habsburg Central Europe*, in: Ch. W. Ingrao, F. A. J. Szabo (ed.), *The Germans and the East*, Purdue 2008, pp. 109–128.

<sup>13</sup> J. Schiewe, *Die Macht der Sprache. Eine Geschichte der Sprachkritik von der Antike bis zur Gegenwart*, München 1998, pp. 86–95.

<sup>14</sup> I do not mean here the lack of practices of imposition of the imperial language, but on the necessity of their conceptualization and leaving the narrative paths constructed in the nineteenth century through historiography dividing between the good *natio* and the bad empire. As the authors of the monumental work *The History of Polish Intelligentsia until 1918 (Dzieje inteligencji polskiej do roku 1918)*. ed. J. Jedlicki, Warszawa 2009), we deal here with temporarily differing perceptions of empires and nationalities and various practices of engendering loyalty and identity, which do not always conflict each other, see also M. Janowski, *Justifying Political Power: The Habsburg Monarchy and Beyond*, in: A. Miller, A. J. Rieber (ed.), *Imperial Rule*, Budapest 2004, pp. 69–82.

JAN SURMAN  
 .....

nineteenth century in the cultures of the 'colonizers', 'colonized' and the 'colonized colonizers'.<sup>15</sup>

The importance of this shift in the understanding of language is particularly important in the context of Central Europe, where languages coexisted, overlapped, mixed or separated as a result of historical processes, not necessarily of imperial character.<sup>16</sup>

Cultural differentiation between languages was important, for example, for the distinction between the nobility (*szlachta*) and the common folk, or scholarly jargon from everyday speech. These differentiations can also be read through postcolonial eyes, although with shifting understanding of belonging to imagined or legal communities. It is here that, with the submission defined not in political but cultural terms, the additional value of the postcolonial approach exceeds the original context of discovery, showing, however, plentiful prospects for analysis.

Such an approach was proposed by the authors of Habsburg Postcolonial for Central Europe.<sup>17</sup> The postcolonial view of the continental empires and the change of their designation does not contest the existence of dependencies; however, it enables us to go beyond the political and polarized dichotomy of colonized-colonizer and look at a concurrence of networks of (inter)dependence and discourse which is accessible through adequate focus.

Cultural and political emancipation under a 'colonial situation' was not only a Slavic experience – German-French relations are also characterized by dependencies (connected with both conquests and 'cultural imperialism'); one can discern them in the process of unification under the sceptre of Prussia where religion was the indicator of 'othering', or earlier, during the quest for a common German literary language.<sup>18</sup> Different intensities of

.....

15 As an introduction see: A. D. Smith, *Ethnic and Territorial Nationalism*, in: A. S. Leoussi, *Encyclopaedia of Nationalism*, New Brunswick, New Jersey 2001, pp. 62-64.

16 See: J. King, *Budweisers into Czechs and Germans: A Local History of Bohemian Politics, 1848-1948*, Princeton 2009.

17 *Habsburg postcolonial. Zentraleuropa – Orte Innerer Kolonisierung?* J. Feichtinger, U. Prutsch, M. Csáky (eds.), Innsbruck, Wien, München 2003.

18 See e.g. S. Zantop, *Colonial Fantasies: Conquest, Family, and Nation in Precolonial Germany*, Durham 1997, p. 90; Religious differences, Prussian cultural-Protestantism and Habsburg Catholic, are gaining in importance at the end of the seventeenth century, when a common German language is accepted, see H. Walser Smith (ed.), *Protestants, Catholics, and Jews in Germany, 1800-1914*, Oxford, New York 2001; K. Faulstich, *Konzepte des Hochdeutschen der Sprachnormierungsdiskurs im 18. Jahrhundert*, "Studia linguistica Germanica" 91 (2008), pp. 232-238.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?
 

---

dependence and submission are implications of cultural homogenization and heterogenization, for which postcolonial studies – especially in the Foucault-influenced tradition of understanding power as ‘capillary’ – offer research tools. Decontextualisation and distinction between the postcolonial methodology and decision-making on the colonizer/colonized from typically colonial typologies seems very productive here, especially as the rejection of the postcolonial approach is very often linked with a statement that this or that country was never a colony/colonizer.

The use of postcolonial theory as cultural criticism also allows for an analysis of the position of the so-called “colonized-colonizer” which was put forward by, for example, Maria Janion. Excluding the discussion on the political conditions of subalternity, this position allows a deeper understanding of cultural interdependence seen not as a dichotomy, but as a set of divisions and distinctions in which a given subject (person, group, society) is formed. If, in accordance with Derrida, we acknowledge the *différance* as the basis of ideological self-understanding, this differentiation does not take place on a binary, but on a multipolar basis. Imagined cultural hierarchies, as the European East-West for example, which also played a role in cultural processes within the German Confederation, recall the stabilization of imagination of the ‘Germans’ cultural superiority over the Poles or Russians, who, in turn, orientalized and civilized their ‘East.’<sup>19</sup>

## LANGUAGE AND NATIONALITY

This article analyzes three texts concerning the language of higher education (= science and scholarship), written between 1853 and 1865, and thus in the time of Habsburg neoabsolutism and its direct aftermath between the defeat of Solferino and the federalization of 1867. It was a period during which the hopes for national autonomies, articulated in 1848, experienced a setback, censorship was reintroduced, and the clericaliza-

---

<sup>19</sup> This change is synonymous with the change from Said’s Orientalism to the “nesting orientalism” of Bakić-Hayden, see: M. Bakić-Hayden, *Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia*, “Slavic Review”, vol. 54, 4 (1992), pp. 917-931; see also, for an interesting discussion of this concept M. Buchowski, *The Specter of Orientalism in Europe: From Exotic Other to Stigmatized Brother*, “Anthropological Quarterly” 3/79 (2006), pp. 463-482.



JAN SURMAN  
 .....

tion and ‘Germanization’ of the province grew in intensity. These texts are concerned with the question of national schooling from a Polish-patriotic point of view – they are thus located between the nationalistic (in the Polish meaning of the word) and Germanophile positions. They neither claim that there is only one, Polish, nation in Galicia (and Ruthenians only as the invention of the provincial governor Franz Stadion)<sup>20</sup>, nor are they texts postulating retention of German as the language of instruction in schools.

The genealogy of the dispute analyzed here over the language of scholarship, or more broadly, language of instruction at schools and universities is both politically as well as culturally complex; it is, though, worth recalling the context in which these publications came into being. After 1848, the Monarchy experienced a reform of the schooling system during which the philosophical faculty became a part of the university (earlier it was a preparatory study), and national languages were introduced in Cracow and partially in L’viv (one chair in Ruthenian). In 1853, however, German was introduced as the language of administration and jurisdiction, which was explained as necessary for practical reasons (communication with Vienna, mobility of clerks) – on the other hand, this was seen as an act of Germanization, especially in connection to scholarly matters.

At folk-schools, pupils were taught in the language of the majority; gymnasium education was, according to 1849 rules, to be conducted in Polish (Western Galicia) and German (Eastern Galicia); the latter, as was claimed, until Ruthenian was sufficiently developed.<sup>21</sup> In 1854, this rule was revised and German was settled on as the language of instruction for higher gymnasium classes; in practice, however, more and more classes were taught in German throughout gymnasia. In 1853, German was declared to be the language of instruction at the Jagiellonian University, de jure on the proposal of its (no longer autonomous) academic senate, which claimed an outflow of students because Polish was not of much use for clerks, and

.....

<sup>20</sup> See e.g. the statements of Aleksander Borkowski, later deputy to the Galician Diet, during the Kroměříž/Kremsier Assembly from 26. January 1849 (online: <http://www.psp.cz/eknih/1848urrs/stenprot/079schuz/so79001.htm>, last access 1.2.2011)

<sup>21</sup> On the language changes in the schooling system see J. Moklak, *W walce o tożsamość Ukraińców: zagadnienie języka wykładowego w szkołach ludowych i średnich w pracach galicyjskiego Sejmu Krajowego 1866-1892*, Kraków 2004, pp. 25-35.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
 .....

problems with unsettled terminology in sciences.<sup>22</sup> In 1861, the Jagiellonian University was given ultraquistic (bilingual) status; that is, apart from a few subjects, Polish was to be the language of instruction; the issue of gymnasium education and L'viv University remained unsettled.<sup>23</sup>

After 1859 and the Habsburg defeat at Solferino, which caused the fall of the centralistic Bach government, the language question was discussed anew. The Habsburg statisticians claimed accessibility of scholarly literature, that is, the lack of such in respective vernacular languages and thus the need for higher education (i.e. higher gymnasium classes and university) to be conducted in German until provincial languages were 'scientific' enough.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, in Eastern Galicia, the conflict between Poles and Ruthenians over education in their own language grew stronger, after it had hindered the formulation of joint claims for education as far back as 1848.<sup>25</sup> The question was not just unconditional acknowledgment of Ruthenian as being an appropriate language for instruction, but also for retaining German education instead of replacing it with Polish, as the narodovtsy claimed. German, according to their argumentation, allowed Ruthenians to retain their cultural identity, while education in Polish would cause cultural differences to smooth out and would mean gradual Polonization.<sup>26</sup> It was not only language that was at stake here, but also the alphabet – a continuation of the Alphabet War of 1859, when, not for the first time,

.....

22 The writing of the academic senate was discussed also in the faculties, which partly agreed to the changes. Unfortunately, the act from this process have been 'erased' from the archives in Cracow and Warsaw while the information on them is included in the Dziennik Podawczy of the Jagiellonian University, the acts in the months in question have been removed from the respective fascicles. Only the copy of the application to the Ministry by František Tomáš Bratránek has been preserved (in his estate in the Moravský Zemský Archiv Brno). See the transcription of Bratránek's letter in J. Batron, *Der vergessene Mähr. Verehrer Goethes, Ph. Dr. P. Thomas Bratranek OSA, Professor an der Universität Krakau*, 1937; and the analysis of the Vienna materials in W. Heindl, *Universitätsreform und politisches Programm. Die Sprachenfrage an der Universität Krakau im Neoabsolutismus*, "Österreichische Osthefte", 20 (1978), pp. 79-98. More on the arguments used in J. Surman, *Die Figurationen der Akademia. Galizische Universitäten zwischen Imperialismus und multiplen Nationalismus*, in: *Doktoratskolleg Galizien* (ed.), *(De-) Konstruktionen Galiziens*, Innsbruck, Vienna, Bozen 2009, pp. 17-40.

23 "Czas", 17. and 19. February 1861.

24 J.-A. Freiherr von Helfert, *Die sprachliche Gleichberechtigung in der Schule und ihre verfassungsmäßige Behandlung*, Prague 1861.

25 V. Záček (ed.) *Slovanský sjezd v Praze roku 1848; sbírka dokumentů*, Praha 1958.

26 Cf. J. Moklak, *op. cit.*; J. Kozik, *The Ukrainian National Movement in Galicia, 1815-1849*, Edmonton 1986.



JAN SURMAN

.....

the issue of Latin or Cyrillic alphabet as the official script for Ruthenians was raised, – was interpreted as another assault against Ruthenian cultural independence.<sup>27</sup>

In the national debates about language, one very often finds essentializing and emotionalizing arguments, i.e. language is ascribed the role of cultural panacea – traces of this can be found in virtually every debate on primary and higher education. The use of one's own language is to guarantee scientific, cultural and artistic development, to hinder foreign influences (e.g. of Muscophiles in Galicia), to allow better understanding of foreign languages etc.<sup>28</sup> Enlightened linguistic theories, the French Grammaire tradition, the German Herder-Adelung-Grimm approach and the Polish conception of Onufry Kopczyński – to name only a few of the most influential in the region – postulated the possibility of perfection of language; only through a perfect language could a complete understanding of the world be achieved.<sup>29</sup> This allowed – often with an appeal to the “spirit of language” – the emphasizing of the constructive and undeniable role of an idealized and homogenous nation in the educational process, and rejection of the concept of language as merely a transmitter of information, i.e. its communicative function, which – almost exclusively – had been Latin beforehand. The communicative function of language appears in the discourse of imposing language – i.e. in the discourse of the hegemon, who, in full awareness of foreignness, imposes or proposes the imposition of their own language on a culturally distinct territory to facilitate communication. Not only to facilitate communication of administration, but also to ‘allow’ given groups access to its cultural and civilizational ‘achievements.’

In the case of the Habsburg Monarchy, it is thus no surprise that the communicational argument was summoned relatively frequently in the Germanophone discourse – not only during the neoabsolutist period, but

.....

27 Cf. A. Miller, O. Ostapchuk, *The Latin and Cyrillic Alphabets in Ukrainian National Discourse and in the Language Policy of Empires*, in: G. Kasianov, P. Ther (eds.), *A Laboratory of Transnational History Ukraine and recent Ukrainian Historiography*, pp. 169-210.

28 See, for example, В. Качмар, *Проблема заснування українського університету у Львові на рубежі XIX-XX ст. у контексті національного життя*. "Вісник Львівського університету. Серія журналістика", 26 (2004).

29 Z. Florczak, *Europejskie źródła teorii językowych w Polsce na przełomie XVII i XIX wieku, Studia z Okresu Oświecenia / Polska Akademia Nauk. Instytut Badań Literackich; Vol. 15*. Wrocław 1978; J.P. Stern, *Language Consciousness and Nationalism in the Age of Bernard Bolzano*, "Journal of European Studies", 19 (1989), pp. 169-189. P. Burke, *Languages and Communities in Early Modern Europe*, Cambridge 2005.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?
 

---

also later, at the moment of taking the decision in Prague or L'viv. In these cases a complete separation and nationalization of the universities was also opposed by the scholars themselves, who proposed utraquization and then, through the education of cadres under juridically guaranteed language equality, opening their own university.<sup>30</sup> These, however, were, as far as the language of instruction was concerned, only sporadic commentaries which did not fuel positive emotions in the broader public, where unconditional nationalization was regarded as a prerequisite of cultural development.

The argument of communicational value is, however, impossible without the creation of a hierarchical position for one's own language, and thus one's own culture. The assumption of the cultural hierarchy of languages is a typical argument by a politically stable colonizer, providing an argument for the exclusion or degradation of others and/or a 'civilizing mission.' One can see this difference by looking at the changes of argumentation in German at the time of its delineation from French, or in Czech during the emancipation from German influences – the argument here is not the historical development of the language, but its closeness to everyday speech and thus authenticity and better opportunity to experience reality. It is also not an argument foreign to Polish linguistic thought; it was used by Kopczyński and Jan Śniadecki, who also appealed to the spirit of language. In the nineteenth century, one also has a dichotomy between the 'authenticity' of folk culture on which the idealized language should be based, and the 'historicity' of language. 'Authenticity' – as voiced by Herder or Jungmann – places the language most closely to the vernacular culture, but it prohibits the argument of cultural hierarchies, as these are locally disparate. 'Historicity' – as voiced by Adelung,<sup>31</sup> but which is stronger in the French tradition – allows the creation temporary hierarchies which can be changed through intensive work.

Symbolics, communication, authenticity, and historicity are certainly not exclusive categories, but rather a conceptual framework upon which the thoughts presented here are based.

---

<sup>30</sup> J. Goll, *Rozdělení Pražské university Karlo-Ferdinandovy roku 1882 a počátek samostatné University české*, Praha 1908; S. Pacholkiv, *Emanzipation durch Bildung. Entwicklung und gesellschaftliche Rolle der ukrainischen Intelligenz im habsburgischen Galizien (1890–1914) Schriftenreihe des Österreichischen Ost- und Südosteuropa-Instituts; Bd. 27*. München 2002, and J. Moklak, *op. cit.*, pp. 86–87;

<sup>31</sup> J. Adelung, *Vorrede*, in: *Karl Thams Deutsch-Böhmisches Nationallexikon*, Prag, Wien 1788.

JAN SURMAN  
 .....

In discourses on the position of language in education, the argumentation can be inscribed each time in the linguistic-hegemonic imaginations sketched here, thus obtaining a picture of cultural auto-identification and the position each author takes against other languages.

In the mash of Galician discourses, the positioning of the Polish language in the period 1850-1867 is of particular interest. At this time, questions of Germanization on the one hand and Russification on the other were intensively debated – the Polish-Galician narration treated as a possibility; the loosening of its own cultural identity towards German; but also of losing Eastern Galicia to a growing self-awareness and activity as a nationality – of the Ruthenians. I will thus approach the three texts looking closely at the attitude presented there towards languages of education at that time – German, Polish and Ruthenian – and how these attitudes are constructed through references to the above outlined imagination of language.

### CULTURAL DYCHOTOMIES: CZAS, DIETL, HELCEL

In 1853, the Cracow conservative daily *Czas* (Time) disputed, as probably did many newspapers around the Monarchy, the series of articles on universities from the journal *Wiener Lloyd*.<sup>32</sup> The *Lloyd* series was part of a ministry of education and religious-led campaign describing the reform in a positive way – as a reaction to the negative campaign against the reinstatement of pre-1848 rules instigated by conservatives in the government.<sup>33</sup> One of the points presented in *Lloyd* (according to *Czas* in number 221) was the language issue. The anonymous Viennese authors stated that only two languages in the Monarchy – German and Italian – could be placed in world literature. German, apart from its communicative function, was depicted as a language whose literature “... is filled with the

.....  
 32 *Die Universitätsfrage in Oesterreich. Beleuchtet vom Standpunkte der Lehr- und Lernfreiheit (Besonders abgedruckt aus dem Wiener Lloyd)*, Wien 1853.

33 "Czas" 10 August, 181 (1853), pp. 1-2; "Czas" 12 August, 183 (1853) pp. 1-2; "Czas", 14 August, 185 (1853), pp. 1-2; "Czas", 19 August, p. 188 (1853), pp. 1-2; "Czas", 24 August, 192 (1853), pp. 1-2; "Czas", 31 August, 198 (1853), pp. 1-2; "Czas", 4 September, 202 (1853), pp. 1-2; "Czas", 28 September, 221 (1853) pp. 1-2; "Czas", 13 October, 234 (1853), pp. 1-2.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
 .....

spirit of tolerance towards other folk (plemie)".<sup>34</sup> Based on this statement, the author criticized and neutralized individual nationalist attempts in the provinces – forcing pupils to learn in a language which they would not subsequently use in the civil service. Due to the current regime – so said the author – education in German should be the rule, and education in national languages allowed only exceptionally – for example in subjects such as the history of the province, the history of language, for exceptionally gifted scholars who did not know German, and as a lectureship for students.

The answer of *Czas* to the *Lloyd* argumentation was ambiguous – it should be borne in mind that the article was published after the first news on the introduction of German as the sole language at the Jagiellonian University had been received, but before any official statements and legal acts.<sup>35</sup> On one hand the *Czas* author admitted that if “political” reasons were considered (career question), he would sign the act for the introduction of German as the language of instruction. On the other hand, the statement that only German and Italian were languages “placed in the first league in world literature” led the author to assume the conclusion (which “*Lloyd* nowhere states”) that not only were those languages to be the only ones allowed as languages of instruction at the universities, but that this reasoning also negated the development of other languages in the Monarchy, which, as *Czas* followed the argue of *Lloyds*, possessed no scientific terminology. Subsequently, the author admitted that German and Italian had a higher standing in world literature; he added however, that it was not the position of the language in the world that counted, but the question of whether students were able to understand it:

a language situated in the general hierarchy even in second place, can nevertheless have first place in the hierarchy of knowledge in its own country.

The educational argument, the main topos of national argumentation against the claim of the cultural superiority of German, is, however, turned round in the next sentence, and the author comes back to issues of hierarchy:

.....

<sup>34</sup> This quotation and the ones below are quoted after “*Czas*”, 29. September, 222 (1853), pp. 1-2.

<sup>35</sup> The University’s petition for introduction of German language was discussed in “*Czas*” 18. September 1852, p. 1.

JAN SURMAN

.....

Placing the Polish language, in regard of poverty of scientific terminology, on the same level as languages and dialects which have no terminology so far, not in the administrative, juridical, nor scientific sphere, such as Magyar, Croat, Ruthenian, Slovak etc., insulted the state of affairs: because Polish, although it might be below some [languages] in the world hierarchy, has in this hierarchy an important and indubitable position, so that it cannot be equated to those languages which in the said literature have no place at all.

It is thus accepted, that Polish language is to be situated below German and Italian, but its comparison to the “less developed” languages is regarded as an insult. It is exactly this equalization, which for the author constitutes the starting point of the polemics with *Lloyd*: the statements of the Viennese journal are to be corrected “above all because they insult the state of affairs, secondly because they place Polish language, which has its history and literature and is finally a literary language, on the same level as dialects which have no past nor literature, and are not literary at all, such as Croat or Slovak dialects.

The set of categories articulated here, which distinguishes languages from dialects, includes historicity, literacy, or the existence of (historical) scientific terminology. While the author differentiates between the general and the country of the literature, he does not use this distinction talking about other languages of the Monarchy – apart from Czech, which is not mentioned in the article. Whereas one would have to create for Polish “artificial scientific terminologies, as it was indeed attempted for the abovementioned dialects,” then “concerning education and even civilization, we would agree with Lloyd that the Polish language cannot be a language of instruction at Galician universities.”

The ‘mistake’ of *Lloyd* was thus not the poor formulation of relations between the language of instruction and culture and civilization, as might be concluded from the first quotation, but the misplacement of Polish and its degradation to the developmental level of the ‘dialects.’ The editor of *Czas* thus accepts the argumentation which was often used to exclude languages from the category of the developed – from the position of German toward Polish or Czech – but also takes exactly the same stance regarding Polish and Czech compared to Slovak or Ruthenian/Ukrainian.

In 1860, Antoni Helcel, Cracow professor of law, removed from the chair in 1853 for political reasons and a known political activist, published a brochure entitled *Uwagi nad kwestyą językową w szkołach i uniwersytetach Galicyi i Krakowa* [Considerations of language issues at the schools and universities of Galicia and Cracow]. It discussed the letter of Franz Joseph,

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
 .....

in which the Emperor acknowledged that teaching at schools should take place in the language in which knowledge is absorbed best – which was a change from the edict of 1854 in which German was described as the language in which higher gymnasium classes should be taught.

Helcel began with the genesis of language as an expression of nation – language is a “mirror of genius and national character,” “the whole thought clothed in flesh”,<sup>36</sup> etc. Essentializing the language further, he came to “the indivisible nature of language”, that is to the ascription of the exclusivity of one language to one (ethnic) nationality: a German thinks in German, a Frenchman in French, a Pole in Polish, and even if one would master another language, one “would never have it in spirit and body as [one has] the native and own [language]”.<sup>37</sup> With regard to the untranslatability of concepts, he noticed that if “the sciences (nauki) are given to [the students] in a language which is incomprehensible to them”,<sup>38</sup> this hurts the pupils rather than improves their performance. Further, however, he adjures that children going to school barely talk Polish and speak no German at all – during a twelve-year education “contaminating his own pure, domestic, native tongue with Germanisms, but by no means acquiring fluency in it [i.e. German – J.S.], [a student] will stand at the gates of the university not being capable of speaking or writing fluently and correctly in either German or Polish”.<sup>39</sup> This poses difficulties in learning at university – (Polish) students concentrate on understanding the form and not the content of a lecture, which repels from learning and makes absorbing of scientific issues impossible. Thus, Helcel comes to the conclusion that public education strengthens the German youth and weakens “ours” – ours, because the recently colonized Galicia is an exception, in the other provinces “a centuries-long habit and massive foreign colonization gave these peoples almost two languages in the common use of higher classes”.<sup>40</sup> In Galicia, on the contrary, Polish inhabitants of the county only used Polish in their daily speech and German served only for special purposes.

.....

36 A. Helcel, *Uwagi nad kwestyą językową w szkołach i uniwersytetach Galicyi i Krakowa, osnowane na liście odręcznym Jego C. K. Apostolskiej Mości z dnia 20 października 1860 r.*, Kraków 1860, p. 15

37 *Ibid.*, p. 16.

38 *Ibid.*

39 *Ibid.*

40 *Ibid.*, p. 19.



JAN SURMAN  
 .....

Thus, on one hand the essentializing role of language in Helcel's writing assumes that one can be fluent in one language only; on the other it acknowledges bilingualism – excluding Galicia. Whether one can develop fluency in both languages is not discussed further – neither is the issue of what national relations would be like in such cases, given the unity of language and nation. Helcel, however, does not refute the necessity for learning German – it is needed not only for practical purposes (career), but also for the scientific, because “the abundance of German literature in all branches of knowledge and [their] deep research spirit”,<sup>41</sup> is leading even Englishmen and Frenchmen to learn this language. For the Poles, German is even more important, because, due to the unfavourable educational conditions caused by the loss of statehood, science had become impoverished. Thus, teaching of German should be conducted at gymnasias, since they led to careers in scholarship or administration, so that pupils could achieve fluency in it – as a separate but obligatory subject; other subjects should be taught in Polish. Consequently, German should be taught less in technical, real and woman's schools, which should ensure that their alumni know modern languages (German and French) but not to the same extent as gymnasium students.

At the very end of the brochure, Helcel turns to the Ruthenians, hoping that they will also find their desires fulfilled by the new reforms of the educational system. But he briskly revises his idea of “desires” exchanging them for “moral needs”<sup>42</sup> – he thus symbolically gags his Galician “fellow citizens” by taking the possibility of expression from them. How can one also fulfil the “moral needs” of the Ruthenians? Helcel begins with the lack of Ruthenian scholarly language and literature, moreover, neither

Russian nor Polish literature is proper for their dialect, which takes almost an intermediate position between Russian and Polish; leaning more towards the latter, it remains in a relationship with it like the communal patois of various provinces to French.<sup>43</sup>

Helcel thus recalls the distinction between languages and dialects and writes Ruthenian into the Polish language – patois were regarded in the nineteenth century as local, uncultivated variants of the French language

.....

<sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 33.

<sup>42</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 38: after expressing the hopes that the Ruthenian wishes will be fulfilled, the next sentence already points to “special circumstances” which must be considered in this case.

<sup>43</sup> This and further quotations p. 39.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
.....

– peasants’ dialects.<sup>44</sup> Little-Russian “communal patois” was not suitable for academic teaching:

With this state of things, it would be hard to reach the higher levels of skills through the Little-Russian dialect, and it is impossible to demand that at the L’viv University there will be chairs with Little-Russian tuition soon. But it is also easy to assure oneself that the real need of Little-Russian does not yet require it.

And further:

Each and every Little-Russian who leaves his village and reaches for education at the higher schools can speak Polish perfectly; a language which is anyway well understandable for all Little-Russian folk – as the nearest. Whereas German is even less common among the Little-Russian population than Polish.

Further, however, he writes about linguistic fluency in the dichotomy of language and dialect:

Ruthenians themselves do not treat Polish as a foreign language, but indeed as the literary language of their dialect, more apt for expressing the higher subjects of their public relations.

Helcel returns thus to the point of departure of the 1850s, to bilingual schools – in the lower classes with teaching in the language common in the region, in gymnasia in the “cultural language”; German, however, as more foreign for the Ruthenians, is replaced by Polish. Neither the hegemonic argumentation nor the gradation of languages change, though – as in the earlier German claims for the introduction of German in the higher classes of gymnasia. Helcel does, however, open up a place for Ruthenian – when, through having contact with Polish, it attains a higher culture, then one could start to think about higher education in this language.<sup>45</sup>

In comparison to the article in *Czas*, Helcel does not establish a gradation with a hegemonic position of German. Talking about German science and scholarship, he does not miss an opportunity to critically notice the favourable conditions for their development; but Polish prevails in all questions

.....  
44 ”[A]ll folk dialects, that is provincialisms”; S. Orgelbrand, *Encyklopedia powszechna: z ilustracjami i mapami*, T. 11., Warszawa 1901, p. 337;

45 A. Helcel, *op. cit.*, p. 40.

JAN SURMAN

.....

of language apart from the categories of “sensual matters”, where it is not as good as English and French, in each category of linguistic questions it is more diverse and original (i.e. words correspond to the diversity of concepts), and as far as richness of form is concerned, it “towers [...] above all non-Slavic languages”.<sup>46</sup> The apotheosis of Polish thus establishes a hierarchy in which this language assumes first place – and as the author informs the reader, this is not only his private opinion, but also that of German linguists, here of Johann Samuel Kaulfuss, who recommended that Germans learn Polish, as the more developed language.<sup>47</sup>

Language as an instance of culture and civilization thus allows the announcement of a civilizational mission towards the Ruthenians, the outcome of which should be the development of their language – and thus culture – to a higher level. There is also no possibility of assimilation – either in the German-Polish or the Polish-Ruthenian case – because for Helcel cultures are constant and unchangeable. Helcel supports the choice of Polish and not German for the Ruthenians with the claim of fewer differences and better understanding, but there is also – although not directly referred to – a vision of both languages belonging to one culture. This recalls the romantic *natio*, but is at the same time already ethnic, because Helcel did clearly decline the idea of territorial nationalism.

In a book *On the Reform of the Country's Schools* [O reformie szkół krajowych], Józef Dietl – a politically engaged professor of anatomy (1833-1851 physician in Vienna), prominent academic politician and, after 1865 and the political repression at the university, mayor of Cracow – does not claim the imperishability of Polish culture as Helcel did. In his eyes, the use of German at schools in Galicia was only to serve Germanization,<sup>48</sup> which had been consistently conducted from 1849 to culturally unify Austria. According to the author this, however, barely bore fruit, as more Germans were Polonized than Poles and Ruthenians

.....

<sup>46</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 26.

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28. J. S. Kaulfuss, *Ueber den Geist der polnischen Sprache. Eine Einleitung in die polnische Literär-Geschichte, für Deutsche*, Halle 1804; Kaulfuss, known better as Jan Samuel (around 1780-1832), was a gymnasium professor in Poznań and classical philologist who propagated equal rights for languages with their concomitant gradation – for example in another published talk he praised the superiority of German over French. On his biography, see: J. Dudź, *Jan Samuel Kaulfuss, dyrektor gimnazjów w Poznaniu i Szczecinku*, “Koszalińskie Zeszyty Muzealne”, 16 (1986), pp. 101-112.

<sup>48</sup> J. Dietl, *O reformie szkół krajowych. Zeszyt 1. Stanowisko szkoły, rada szkolna krajowa, język wykładowy*, Kraków 1865, p. 90.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
 .....

Germanized – which, as Dietl claimed, was mainly caused by the persistence of Polish patriotism and because Polish continued to be used on a daily basis, but also due to the deficiencies of teachers.

Dietl’s argument summons the double function of language – the pedagogic one (i.e. teaching in the language the young were most fluent in) and the didactic (in which language is education best developed). The linguistic claims of the higher pedagogical value of folk-language is evoked – since Latin had lost in importance and the mother tongue was used in teaching “school, freed from the fetters of an alien and dead language, approached the folk, for whom it was from that time on the hearth of accessible education”.<sup>49</sup> Because Polish remains as a vernacular, “for the Polish youth, and we count in that number also the more educated Ruthenian youth, which has a better command of Polish than of Ruthenian,”<sup>50</sup> German will forever remain a foreign language. Leaving the second part of the above-quoted statement aside, it is worth mentioning that Dietl differentiated languages into “own” and “foreign” and ascribes the cognitive values to this dichotomy. It is better to learn in one’s “own” language, that is the one in which information is more easily absorbed; but another hierarchy is displayed where the didactic question is concerned, that is in the question of in which language the student has the best access to higher knowledge. Here Polish has clear deficiencies when compared with German, and these are caused by historical conditions. More precisely, it is because Polish is not used in education, hence there is no need to publish scientific books. Dietl does however appeal to the past, when Polish had proven its scientific nature, even if at present German towered above Polish in the scientific literature, it was only because it was the language of tuition, for the purpose of which books were published, which Polish lacked; but “also in Germany there would definitely be no German textbooks if one had taught there in Latin or French”.<sup>51</sup> Thus:

when the adversaries of Polish lectures falsely claim: if there are books, there will also be Polish lectures, we can sincerely and conscientiously claim: if there are lectures, there will also be books.<sup>52</sup>

.....  
 49 *Ibid.*, 84.  
 50 *Ibid.*  
 51 *Ibid.*, 90.  
 52 *Ibid.*, 92.

JAN SURMAN

.....

Dietl does not, though, reject the didactic and practical values of German, whose civilization he cherishes – it may also be remarked that, on assuming the chair in Cracow in 1851 after a long stay in Vienna, he proposed a certain exchange: he would teach Galicians medicine and they would teach him Polish, of which he apparently did not have a good command.<sup>53</sup> German could, however, fulfil its communicational function only when it was well taught, that is, when it was based on a perfect command of Polish – learning German from the beginning of education led only to distortion and lack of fluency in both languages. Similarly, Dietl assesses teaching in German at the universities – it admittedly allowed better information-relay, but as a “foreign” language it inhibited free thinking. Universities were there to educate enlightened citizens and not servile clerks (a recollection of education before 1848 and of Alexander Helfert, whom Dietl accuses of a clerk’s mentality); especially humanistic sciences, “taught in a foreign language will bear learned, well-read and well-trained people, but they will not bear independently thinking people, creative, inspired by the higher spirit; it will be rather a drill than higher education”.<sup>54</sup>

Dietl postulates the inclusion of German into language training – not as a language of teaching but in incorporation of German terminology in scientific lectures, exams on German during the state-exams, and lectures in some subjects (e.g. juridical – history of state-law, legal medicine) in German. As in Helcel, we have here the “othering” of this language, but with wider inclusion into the educational process so that the contact with German scholarship and literature is sustained: the opposite would bring harm to scholarship, but the clerks would also be disadvantaged in comparison to bureaucrats from other provinces, and their careers would be hindered if they were not fluent in the administrative language.

As part of the language question, Dietl also turns to the second provincial language. At the beginning, he remarks that Ruthenian nationality is a historic and real one and that the same rules apply to it as for the Polish. It is in the national interest that “we not only not oppose the development of Ruthenian, but on the contrary, that we favour it and support it as much as it depends on us”,<sup>55</sup> because it would strengthen

.....

53 A. B. Skotnicki, *Lekarz, profesor, prezydent. W dwusetną rocznicę urodzin Józefa Dietla*. "Alma Mater", 5 (2004), pp. 30-32, here pp. 30-31

54 *Ibid.*, p. 117.

55 *Ibid.*, p. 133.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
.....

the Slavs against the inclination towards Germanization. He did, however, warn Ruthenians against rapprochement with Russia: even if it meant emancipation from the Poles, Russification was a “physiological and also political” mistake: a healthy nation stemmed from historical and folk values and cooperation with Russia, as an action against the Poles, pushed the Ruthenians into an Empire much less liberal than the Habsburg one.<sup>56</sup> This warning also concerns the language – (not more specifically defined) New-Russian, which replaced the Ruthenian which had been used prior to 1848, which is a foreign language for Ruthenians and is forced on them; the same concerned the Russophile Sviatojurtsi-movement, who want to discard the historical ties between Poles and Ruthenians and lead to a division of Galicia – which would cause isolation and a stalling of Ruthenian culture.<sup>57</sup>

What is Ruthenian culture for Dietl? Using examples from administrative statistics, he shows that (especially in the higher classes) Poles and Polish-speaking Ruthenians and Jews predominate in each district. What is more, regarding the gymnasia in Eastern Galicia, he remarks on an unrealistic growth in the of number of Ruthenians in the official statistics from 443 to 1154 between semesters 1855/6 and 1856/7, concluding, that “what was in 1856 still a Pole, remade itself in 1857 – or rather was remade”.<sup>58</sup> The latter statement is not necessarily an argument regarding the artificiality of Ruthenian nationality, but on the imprecision of statistics where nationality is defined by religion. This led Dietl to disprove statistics which artificially heightened the number of Ruthenians, while many Greek-Catholics and Jews speak fluent Polish, or even regard themselves as Poles; Dietl remarks, that “nationality [...] is constituted mainly by language and one’s own conviction,”<sup>59</sup> which are not included in the statistics. Be that as it may, “all more educated people in the [higher] society and at school are linked by language – the Polish language”.<sup>60</sup> Finally – summing up the statistically shown mix of both groups in every district, the fact that Polish serves as the language of more educated classes and that both languages are similar, Dietl subsumes:

.....  
56 *Ibid.*, p. 135.  
57 *Ibid.*, p. 136.  
58 *Ibid.*, p. 140.  
59 *Ibid.*, p. 138.  
60 *Ibid.*, p. 140.



JAN SURMAN  
 .....

Involuntarily the conviction rises that Polish may be a language of tuition without detriment to scholarship at middle and higher schools, later at gymnasia, real and technical schools [i.e. Realschulen and Technische Hochschulen in the Habsburg system – J.S.] and universities.<sup>61</sup>

Dietl, coming back to the distinction between pedagogy and didactic, claims that as the Ruthenian intelligentsia speak Polish (even better than Ruthenian, which “beyond village folk ceases to be a social language (język towarzyski)<sup>62</sup>), and as, for historical reasons, the literature is better accessible in Polish; this language should be the language of instruction in gymnasia of all districts. German only superficially fulfils the claim for emancipation – it creates a mirage, that Polonization is not progress, but because it is not mastered, scholarship loses through its use, and it is scholarship that should be the main aim of higher education. Thus provisionally, Polish should replace German in gymnasia and higher schools, and with the development of Ruthenian, new schools with this language as a tuition language should be opened – both languages of the province ought to be taught at all gymnasia in the country.<sup>63</sup>

Dietl, however, consequently goes much further than Helcel in acknowledging national equalization – in the lower classes, the Volksschulen should teach in one or the other language, in the higher, “Polish and Ruthenian are to be taught equally”,<sup>64</sup> which means that children should “read, write and count” in both languages; in the gymnasia Polish should be the language of instruction – until Ruthenian literature is enriched and one will be able to open separate gymnasia, one should teach geography, literature and history there – Ruthenian has to be an obligatory language both for Ruthenians and the Poles; at universities (and at Technical Academies) Polish ought to be the language of instruction (apart from Ruthenian history and literature, forensic medicine, civil and penal law, which should be taught in both languages) – although the Privatdozenten should also have the option to teach other subjects in one or the other language.<sup>65</sup>

.....

 61 *Ibid.*, p. 143.

 62 *Ibid.*, p. 145.

 63 *Ibid.*, pp. 147-148.

 64 *Ibid.*, p. 148.

 65 *Ibid.*, pp. 148-152.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
 .....

Within fifty pages we thus have a radical change in argumentation – in the case of German, pedagogy decides about the use of Polish language; the lack of literature will be compensated for as only schools and universities with Polish as the instruction language are established; arguing for Ruthenian, it is the didactic which decides that Polish should be the language of learning – only through contact with it can Ruthenians develop nationally. The change in the argumentation is only possible when Dietl does not equate the policy of Germanization and Polonization – while the earlier is real politics, the second is only an element of the (Ruthenian) imagination, not only because the Poles acknowledge the equal rights of the Ruthenian nationality, but also because “the Austrian government will never allow one nationality to rise above another”.<sup>66</sup>

**NATIONALISM, CULTURE AND COMMUNICATION – FOR AND AGAINST  
 A CIVILIZATIONAL MISSION**

The abovementioned texts, which appeared at the moment the Poles argued for their cultural autonomy in Galicia, may be characterized together with the help of the division between the symbolic and communicative value of language which were sketched in the introduction. They underscore the symbolical value of communication while talking about German, and thus also the oppressive character of non-absolutist linguistic-educational policy. While analyzing the second culture/nationality in Galicia, however, the symbolical argumentation is replaced by the communicative – the ‘underdevelopment’ of the Ruthenian culture causes Polish to be regarded as the civilisational language, which, disregarding the symbolical sphere and the demands of autonomy which they incorporate, is to guarantee the Ruthenian cultural development. Arguments from the other side are not included – Helcel most clearly inscribes the position of a civilizing agent speaking about the needs of the Ruthenian language but not engaging in a dialogue with Ruthenian demands; Dietl also criticized the approaches of symbolic separation from Polish culture which are undertaken in Eastern Galicia, claiming they lead to cultural decay in solitude or to a dangerous liaison with Russia – in his text in particular, one can sense the awareness of his argument being

.....

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 147.

JAN SURMAN

.....

politically controversial. The text voices care about the “other” claiming the importance of nearing to the “own”, but the “otherness” is accepted only through a prism of familiarity – emancipation from Polish culture is denounced as either rapprochement to Russia or as self-harm through keeping German in the schooling system.

The gradations of languages voiced here correspond to the linguistic theories of the Enlightenment, in which the history of language is seen as a straight line leading from the first uttered words to the most complete, cultural speech, which becomes both the measurement of civilizational development and its prerequisite.<sup>67</sup> The “historicization” of language makes an appeal to the enlightened university tradition – the date of the founding of the Cracow Academy and a short history of science in Polish can be found in all the texts mentioned here. This temporary arrangement allows for a comparison of the languages and thus also the cultures in a developmental continuum, in which the current situation is the result of history. Thus, it is not a discussion of the current state, but of the conditions leading to it, that is, carried out. This allows emphasis of the hegemony of German science and scholarship and at the same time disqualifies it as caused by a rupture in the Polish developmental continuum. At the same time, this argumentation allows a statement on the non-existence of the scientific history of the Ruthenians, which, given national claims, can now commence, although only through the mediation of Polish culture and civilization, and not through cultural autarchy. The bright past which compensates the murky present thus helps not only to emancipate the area from German, but also to take a position of cultural hegemony against the Ruthenians, thus drawing a Polish mental map of Central Europe. On this map, the position of colonized colonizer is demonstrated through both acknowledging “temporary” subalternity to the colonizer, but also a “temporary” hegemony toward the colonized – the proposed means to achieve the balance are, however, depending on the addressee, diametrically different.

.....

<sup>67</sup> Cf. U. Ricken, *Linguistics, Anthropology, and Philosophy in the French Enlightenment: Language Theory and Ideology*, New York 1994.

SYMBOLISM, COMMUNICATION AND CULTURAL HIERARCHY?  
.....

## SUMMARY

Nineteenth century ideological discourse concerning higher education and its language can be analysed regarding four definitora. Non-exclusive categories of communication, symbolism, authenticity and historicity provide the corners for a four-dimensional field in which I describe texts by Józef Dietl, Antoni Helcel and an anonymous journalist at the Cracow journal *Czas*. All these texts, written between 1853 and 1863, allow us to follow the localisation of the Polish language in the Polish mental map of post-1848 Central Europe, in which the centralistic tendencies favour (and impose) German, but at the same time Ruthenian nationalism threatens Galician entity through a cultural separatist movement. Here, the authors pursue a double-edged strategy – in the first place they appeal to essentialist categories while claiming the need for Polish higher education – the importance of the mother tongue for education – but also the cultural and civilisational development of Polish; German – whose position is located ‘above’ – was politically favoured and could thus achieve higher development, which is still only temporary, however, and can be exceeded when sciences are taught in Polish. Yet at the same time, when turning to Ruthenian, the argumentation rejects the claim of necessity of education in the mother tongue and highlights the role of Polish as an instance of culturality. Thus if Polish culture should grow it should be accomplished through emancipation, but in the Ruthenian case only close contact with Polish would allow it to develop. This underscores the Janus-facedness of ‘colonised-coloniser’ discourse in multihegemonic Galicia